THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1950—51

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 6th *June*, 1950.

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS, (*Deputy Speaker*), Messrs. L. E. SMITH, (*Chairman of Committees*), F. E. MILLER, R. G. MAPP, T. O. BRYAN, M. E. COX, F. L. WALCOTT, L. E. R. GILL, F. E. C. BETHELL, J. H. WILKINSON, O.B.E., and F. C. GODDARD.

Prayers are read.

MINUTES.

The Minutes of the meetings which were held on the 25th April, 2nd May and 9th May, 1950, respectively having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

Messrs. E. K. WALCOTT, ADAMS, and FOSTER enter the House and take their seats.

DOCUMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following:—

Financial Report of the Colonial Treasurer for the month ended 30th April, 1950.

Statement on tenantry roads from the Commissioners of Highways of the Parish of St. Thomas for the half year ended 31st March, 1950.

Statement of Revenue and Expenditure from the Commissioners of Highways of the parish of St. Thomas for the half year ended 31st March, 1950.

Statement on tenantry roads from the Commissioners of Highways of the parish of Christ Church for the half year ended 31st March, 1950.

Statement of Revenue and Expenditure from the Commissioners of Highways of the parish of Christ Church for the half year ended 31st March, 1950.

Statement on tenantry roads from the Commissioners of Highways of the parish of St. George for the half year ended 31st March, 1950.

Statement of Revenue and Expenditure from the Commissioners of Highways of the parish of St. George for the half year ended 31st March, 1950.

PAPERS LAID

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

The Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux—Twentieth Annual Report of the Executive Council 1948—49.

Contract between Messrs J. N. Harriman & Co., Ltd. and the Executive Committee of the Island of Barbados for the construction of a new runway, taxiway, and parking apron at Seawell Airport.

Statement showing the gross Customs and Excise receipts for twelve months ended 31st March, 1950.

The Labour Welfare (Housing Loan) Regulations, 1950.

The Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1950.

The Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) No. 2. Order, 1950.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 6 Order, 1950.

The Customs (Amendment) Regulations, 1950.

Post Office Advances for the payment of Money Orders to the 20th April, 1950.

Colonial Estimates 1950—51.

The Wages Board (Bridgetown Shop Assistants) Order, 1950.

PETITION

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker; I beg to present a petition from Oscar Pillersdorf, Lazar Spira, Srul Jacob Bernstein. Peltyel Pasternak, Harry Burak, and Jacob Hersch Altman, persons of the Jewish Faith resident in this Island, and Eustace Maxwell Shilstone representing for the purposes of this petition the Barbados Museum and Historical Society, praying the House to pass a Bill declaring the petitioners to be a corporate body known as the "Synagogue Burial Grounds Committee." The petition is respectfully worded and I ask that it be taken as read.

The petition is taken as read.

NOTICES

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1950" made by the Governor on the 11th May, 1950, under the provisions of section 2 (1) (a) of the Pensions Act, 1947.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) No. 2 Order, 1950" made by the Governor on the 17th May, 1950, under the provisions of section 2 (1) (a) of the Pensions Act, 1947.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 6 Order, 1950" made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the 27th May, 1950, under the provisions of section 3 of the Civil Establishment Act, 1949.

Mr. ADAMS: (On behalf of Dr. CUMMINS) Resolution to authorise the Governor to enter into agreements with persons to serve in the Barbados General Hospital in any of the following offices, namely:—Medical Superintendent, Specialist Surgeon, Specialist Physician, Special Radiologist, and Medical Officer, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule to this Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of $1,369 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1950—51, Part I, Current, as set out in the Supplementary Estimates 1950—51, No. 1, which form the schedule to this Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of $18,430 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1950-51, Part II, Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1950-51, No. 2, which form the schedule to this Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of $79,367 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1950-51, Part I, Current Estimates, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1950-51, No. 3, which form the schedule to this Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS (On behalf of Dr. CUMMINS): Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Wages Board (Bridgetown Shop Assistants) Order. 1950" made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the 27th May, 1950, under the provisions of section 3 of the Wages Board Act, 1943.

Mr. COX: Resolution to sanction the Regulations

Mr. ALLDER enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. ADAMS: Bill to abolish grand juries and to amend the law relating to the presentment of indiements.

Mr. ADAMS: (On behalf of Dr. CUMMINS): Bill to amend the law relating to Separation and Maintenance.

Mr. ADAMS (On behalf of Dr. CUMMINS): Bill to amend the Settlement of the Poor and Bastardy Act, 1897.

Mr. COX: Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921.

Mr. ADAMS: Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at the next meeting to consider the money Resolutions of which notice has been given a few moments ago.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT gives notice of a Bill to incorporate the Synagague Burial Grounds Committee.

QUESTIONS

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

Will Government take the necessary steps to survey the East Coast Road for which the sum of $7,600 is provided for in the Estimates, with the view of starting the construction of the same road, and relieving unemployment, now that the crop season is almost completed?

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

1. In view of the ban put by the Government of Trinidad on persons entering that colony and seeking employment, and in view of the unemployment situation locally, will the Government take steps to impose a similar ban on Trinidad born entrants into this colony?

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

Is Government aware of the fact that the Head Teacher's residence in Chalky Mount in the parish of St. Andrew is greatly in need of repair, and is a considerable distance away from the new school?

2. Will Government take the necessary steps to repair and remove same to a more suitable site near the school?

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

Is Government aware of that fact that the district in Hillaby known as Church Road is urgently in need of water?

2. Will Government take immediate steps to supply this district with water?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. Cox, a Bill to abolish Grand Juries and to amend the law relating to the presentment of indictments is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. Cox, a Bill to amend the law relating to Separation and Maintenance is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. Cox, a Bill to amend the Settlement of the Poor and Bastardy Act, 1937, is read a first time.

Mr. MOTTLEY enters the House and takes his seat.

On the motion of Mr. Cox, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, a Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. E. K. WALCOTT, seconded by Mr. WILKINSON, a Bill to incorporate the Synagogue Burial Grounds Committee is read a first time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO DR. CUMMINS

Mr. Mapp asks for two months' leave of absence for Dr. Cummins as from the 9th May, 1950, then withdraws his request and asks, instead, for one month's leave for the honourable member as from today.

There being no objection, the senior member for St. Thomas is granted one month's leave of absence from his duties as a member of the House as from today.

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT REPLY TO THE GOVERNOR'S SPEECH POSTPONED

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, —To move the consideration of the Report of the Select Committee appointed to prepare a draft Reply to the speech which His Excellency the Governor delivered at the re-opening of the Legislature.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I regret to say that the Select Committee has not yet reported. I am, therefore, asking leave to postpone this Order.

There being no objection, this Order is postponed.

THE DEPARTMENT OF SCIENCE AND AGRICULTURE (AMENDMENT) ACT.

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 Department of Science and Agriculture Act, 1925.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I ask that the senior member for St. Peter be allowed to take charge of this Order.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—This Bill is a simple matter. It seeks to remove the teaching of Science at Harrison College from the Department of Agriculture and to put it at the proper source, that is, under the Education Department. Accordingly this Bill amends the Department of Science and Agriculture Act and relieves the Director of Science and Agriculture from his statutory responsibility for the teaching of Science. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

On the motion of Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, seconded by Mr. COX, Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clause 1 is read and is agreed to.

Clause 2. Paragraphs (X) and (XI) of section eight of the principal Act shall cease to have effect.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to move that that be Clause 2 of the Bill.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: There is a question I should like to ask in connection with this proposal. Section 8 of the Department of Science and Agriculture Act sets out the duties of the Director of Science and Agriculture and one of his duties is "to submit from time to time to the Education Board as required by that Board, and to carry out as approved by that Board, a scheme or schemes for providing instruction in Natural and Agricultural Sciences of the pupils of Harrison College, for the due examination of these pupils and for the granting of Certificates of Proficiency in Agricultural Science to be signed by the President of the Education Board, the Director of Agriculture, and the Headmaster of Harrison College". I believe I am right in saying that at present they do not hold examinations in Agricultural Science at Harrison College. We all agree to the proposal that the teaching of Science at the College should be undertaken by the masters of that College instead of, as hitherto, by members of the staff of the Department of Science and Agriculture but provision is made in the Act for the teaching of Agricultural Science at the College and I think that this may be an opportune time to find out whether it has been given up. The idea, some years ago, was that it should be given up for a Course in Dairy Science and if it has been given up I hope that the members of this House who are members of the Education Board would reconsider the question as to whether or not there should be instruction at Harrison College with an agricultural bias. I happen to know a great deal about it because I was educated at Harrison College to be a sugar planter and I took that Course and obtained a certificate. It is no use continually stressing that the Colony is an agricultural one if you are going to dispense with the only special Course that you used to have for the teaching of Agricultural Science, and merely rely on a Course in Dairy Science.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: These are matters for the Educational Authorities to deal with and I think that the Educational Authorities would be the competent persons to say whether there should be or should not be such a Course as the honourable member referred to.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I have asked the honourable member to tell us whether or not there is such a Course. If there is not such a Course I want to suggest to members of the Education Board that they consider the question of having it because the Act provides for it. If they have dropped it, as I know they intended to do, it seems farcical in an island such as this. You want to train planters and encourage people to take up Agriculture and at the same time you drop your Agricultural Course. I know that some years ago, the Science Department, —as distinct from the Education Department because the teaching of Science at Harrison College in those days was under the control of the Science Department,—was very keen on dropping the Agricultural Science Course. Agricultural Science is distinct from Dairy Science and I believe they may have succeeded in dropping the former. In the days when I was a pupil at Harrison College there was a special Course in Agricultural Science and one eventually obtained a diploma if one was successful in an examination in Agricultural Science. One who took that Course sucessfully was able to leave the College with an agricultural, scientific training and do Agriculture. I have only asked the honourable member if he knows whether that Course is still being given in accordance with the law as it exists to-day and if it is not then I am appealing to him either to consider the matter or at any rate put forward the views which I have expressed. If it has not been dropped, then my comments are unnecessary.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am not in a position to answer the honourable member's question to-day.

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

On the motion of Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, seconded by Mr. COX, the CHAIRMAN reports the passing of the Bill in Committee.

The House resumes and on the motions of Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, seconded in each case by Mr. COX, the Bill is read a third time and is passed.

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (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 Executive Committee Act, 1891.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I regret that through an oversight on my part this Bill was not dealt with three or four weeks ago. As honourable members will observe, this Bill merely seeks to give the Executive Committee power to let government lands. It is the corollary to the Bill which we

passed a short time ago to give Vestries the power to lease land; that Act is useless without this. The main object of this Bill is to allow the playing-fields project to get ahead. The Government has been advised that the Executive Committee has no power to let government lands; by law, it is the legal possessor of government lands but it really has no power to let those lands. This Bill is merely to give it that power and I beg to move that it be now read a second time.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

Mr. WARD enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. LEWIS: I do not pretend to know all the ramifications of this Bill but I should just like to draw to the attention of the Government that there appear to be very extensive lands — the Dock area, the Garrison Savannah and other areas of that nature — which are leased by the Government and about which very few members of the public seem to know anything. I do not know whether this Bill will empower the Governor-in-Executive Committee to give a 99-year lease in respect of lands of that kind. I do not know if the present members of the Executive Committee are aware that the Government owns the site on which the Empire Theatre is erected. The public would like to know that this is not an attempt now, if these lands are wanted for any special use more serviceable to the people than that to which the present lessees put them, to deprive them of the use of such lands or to lease the lands, say—, at the Garrison for 99 years. As I have said, I do not know how far this goes and I am expecting the Government to enlighten me on the matter, I am only issuing a warning which has been given to me since the provisions of this Bill came to the notice of the public. The Bill is brought forward in a very innocent way but you may find that it is extended to things other than playing fields. I am willing to put a time limit— twenty or ten years — for the lease of government lands or I am willing to exempt certain lands or I am willing to insert "playing fields" in this Bill. I am asking the Government to be very careful to see that through an absolutely innocent project like a playing field it does not play into the hands of certain people. On behalf of the people of Barbados I am voicing this opinion and if it has not been considered by the Executive Committee I suggest that we postpone the further consideration of this Bill, so that the point to which I have drawn their attention and to which certain taxpayers drew my attention may be fully considered.

Mr. ADAMS: I would like to ask the honourable member this question: Who drew to his attention that the present Government is taking part in something clandestinely or with the object of doing something dishonest or contrary to the wishes of the people? If the honourable member had any serious point to raise in connection with this matter, he could have done so without airing it in the House. The whole object of this Bill is to give the Vestries the right to lease areas purely for the purpose of playing fields. If it is possible to lease other lands belonging to the Government for any length of time, then the Governor-in-Executive Committee must be given credit for having the interests of the people as much at heart as anybody else. I am surprised that the honourable member who supports the Government should think that any of its members would play into the hands of any vested interests by giving leases of the sort that exist in respect of certain government properties. The honourable member knows what my views are on this subject. The honourable member knows that there have been leases in the past when certain people's friends were members of the Government and when sites such as the one on which the Empire Theatre is erected were leased for 5/- or 10/- a year. Take the Aquatic Club with its obvious racial discrimination. The honourable member knows what our views are in that respect and that we have no intention of renewing the present leases for a second, let alone 99 years, under the same conditions. Therefore it was quite unnecessary for the honourable member to make the speech he has just made.

Mr. LEWIS: I hope you will allow me, Mr. Speaker, to make an explanation. I never had in mind anything like what the honourable member has said. He particularly mentioned playing fields and I took the opportunity to issue the warning I have issued.

Mr. ALLDER: I agree, Sir, with this present Government having as its intention the changing of Agreements which have been entered into with previous Governments and administered by other persons. But, Sir, I would still like to know by what stretch of the imagination the present Government continues to allow the Agreement for the rental of the Garrison pasture to continue at such a nominal figure. Mr. Speaker, I am told that the Turf Club pays only 2/- per annum as compared with the fees charged to persons who tether their stock on the Garrison pasture. Those people are charged 2/- per month for a cow and 1/6 per month for a sheep or goat or calf. I feel, Sir, that all these things are seemingly wrong; it is outrageous when you compare the charges. It causes one to feel that we need to step faster to remove those evils which have been done in the past. I asked a question on this subject some months ago and the Executive Committee has not seen fit to reply yet but, nevertheless, people who know are discussing the right and wrong of such a lease. Especially in this day when you say that you are trying to assist in the rearing of stock and in helping the underprivileged to gain their footing you still allow them to be forced to pay such exorbitant fees for grazing their stock on the Garrison pasture and at the same time make a Company which makes thousands of dollars, milks the community and exploits everyone who is so weak as to indulge in their trade, pay only 2/- per annum for all the land it leases. If these Agreements were entered into years ago when persons and things were different I do not see the sense in allowing them to continue in this day with a different set-up. I sincerely hope that the Government would be more mindful of what it is doing and would endeavour to give satisfaction to all and sundry in the colony.

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. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clause 1 is read and is agreed to.

Clause 2. For section twelve of the Principal Act, the following section shall be substituted:—

"12. The Executive Committee may let any lands which they may possess for any term and on such conditions as they may think fit."

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I would like to suggest that this is rather twofold in this sense: It would be possible for the Executive Committee, under this Clause, to do the equivalent of disposing of lands by making a long lease. Although I have not come here to-day with any fixed idea I would have thought that

any lease to exceed twenty-one years would require the approval of both Houses of the Legislature. I merely mention it because it is one of those things that slip you and which occurs to you afterwards and further, it gets rid of any danger of any person here or hereafter being able to get away with something that is not intended. If you are going to give a lease for any period beyond twenty-one years it should require the approval of the Legislature. Now, I do not quite understand the senior member for St. John. Did the honourable member say that the Turf Club rents the land at the Garrison Savannah to people who tether their stock on the pasture? Because the Turf Club has nothing to do with that.

Mr. ALLDER: On a point of explanation. I am sorry if the senior member for St. James got that impression from my remarks. What I meant to say is that the Government leases the Garrison pasture to the Turf Club—so I am told—but Government also charges persons who tether their cows or sheep or goats on the pasture 2/- for each cow and 1/6 for each sheep or goat per month. I am told that the Colonial Engineer collects the fees and that it is not a case of the Turf Club imposing those charges. That is the information I have been able to gather from persons who know.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT : I thank the honourable member. The position, I think, is that the Executive Committee keeps complete control of the Garrison Savannah and is entitled at any time to do what it likes with the Savannah. There is a Committee of about five persons, including the Attorney General and the Colonial Engineer, who look after the Garrison Savannah, the control of which has never left the Governor-in-Executive Committee. The Turf Club have erected buildings on the land leased to them and with the permission of the Executive Committee they are allowed to use two tracks—one for the exercise of racehorses and the other for race meetings. You will have noticed that an advertisement appears in the newspapers before each race meeting to the effect that the Garrison Savannah has been rented to the Barbados Turf Club. In the olden days if a person put a carriage on the Garrison Savannah on a race day he had to pay for that carriage but in recent years the Turf Club considered that the intake from paying for these carriages was not worth while and they discontinued the charges. The honourable member will know that the Garrison Committee gives permission to the Regimental Sports Club which really produced Everton Weekes and to the Polo Club to use certain portions of the Savannah. The St. Anns Club used to rent a portion in front of the Grand Stand and the Turf Club used to allow them to use the Grand Stand as a pavilion. The honourable member need not worry about the Turf Club and the Savannah; their hold on it is very precarious and the Executive Committee has never lost control. As a matter of fact the Savannah has to be maintained as an open spot. There is no long lease and the lessees can be turned off at any time.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to refer to the notice which is published in the newspapers before a race meeting. I do not know if it is done as an act of courtesy to the public but I feel that any letting of government lands under this Bill should be notified to the public in the *Official Gazette*. I do not know if the present members of the Executive Committee think that they will be there forever but they should feel that the public is entitled to some information about what is being done with public property. Information to the effect that you intend to enter into an Agreement or you have entered into an Agreement for several years may be useful to the public.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, the CHAIRMAN reports the passing of the Bill in Committee.

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

THE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES PENSION (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 Public Employees Pension Act, 1937.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker,—As honourable members will see from the Objects and Reasons of this Bill, it is intended to bridge a gap which has often been pointed out in this House—in fact it has been pointed out so often that I suppose all Governments are to be blamed for not having introduced this Bill before. Every time a public employee died while in the service of the Government, we have had to come before the House with a Resolution to deal with the individual case and ask the House to grant a gratuity to his legal personal representative who is frequently the widow. There is no provision in the Public Employees Pension Act of 1937 similar to the provision in the Pension Act of 1947 authorising the payment of a gratuity to the legal representative of a public employee and the object of this Bill is to avoid coming to the House with an individual case each time. The amendments are the insertion of the words "or gratuity" after the words "annual pension" in section 12 of the Act and the insertion of the words "or gratuities" after the words "granting of pensions' in the same section of the Act. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. ALLDER: I appreciate the attempt of the Government to make its business less cumbersome but there are a few points which, I think, are necessary to be raised in connection with the Government's pension scheme. When the age limit was reduced some years ago it was lauded by a great section of the public; but, Sir, what I see today has convinced me that the attempt to reduce the age limit has not been as beneficial from the public's point of view as it was hoped to be. What we are getting now in return is a mass resignation of many technical public employees and as a result it has made the running of Government Departments much more difficult. I do not want to suggest that I desire to deprive any individual of his rights but, Sir, I feel that something is wrong with the scheme and I would suggest now to the Government to change the Act. I think it is necessary so to do. We have now to pay three or four persons in respect of one office; that is to say, Mr. A resigns and Mr. B fills his place; Mr. B resigns and Mr. C fills his place. It goes on that way and sometimes you find three persons drawing pensions in respect of one office and a fourth is doing the work and is being paid. I feel that it is burdensome on the taxpayers.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—I would like to draw to your attention that the honourable member cannot debate the Pension Act.

Mr. ALLDER: I do not know how other honourable members view the matter but to me it does not appear to be so good for the colony. I feel that

instead of making it voluntary for a government employee to resign at 55 years of age —

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member must desist from debating the Pension Act.

Mr. ALLDER: I bow to your ruling, Sir, but I still hope that the members of the Government have an insight of what I and other people think about the matter. I think it is something they should reconsider and put back the ages for retirement of public officers to what they were before they were reduced to 55 years voluntarily and 60 years compulsorily. I feel that the same way an officer can resign and do business for a long number of years afterwards, he should be able to serve the public who protected him when probably he could not do it for himself. Often you find men at 60 years of age who are still considered as being energetic and capable of giving more service. As I said I hope that the Government will appreciate the intention of my remarks and will, if it sees fit, send down legislation to change the Act because if you do not revert to the former scheme you are liable to have in the future a community of pensioners without any means of getting the money to pay the pensions.

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. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 are read and are agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, the CHAIRMAN reports the passing of the Bill in Committee.

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

THE HAYNES PENSION BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order is to move the second reading of a Gill to provide for the payment of a pension to Douglas Arden Mottley Haynes, Manager of the Peasants' Loan Bank in this Island.

Mr ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I feel sure that other honourable members of this House will support what I am going to say in respect of this Bill, even though I may be making an implied criticism of some members of the House who are unfortunately not present. This Bill seeks to grant to Mr. Haynes, whom we all know and respect highly, a pension in respect of services. As honourable members know, Mr. Haynes has recently agreed to undertake the duties of administering the Labour Welfare Fund on behalf of the Executive Committee and it has become necessary, therefore, now that his position as a civil servant — using that term in its broadest sense — is changed, to change the position with regard to pension. At the outset I would like to say, in respect of Mr. Haynes's new post this: This Government has been attacked over and over again and notices of Addresses have been given as regards its administering the Labour Welfare Fund. Whoever was in power would have found the same difficulty which this Government found. There has been great difficulty for a long period in getting someone to accept this post. We could not force Mr. Haynes to accept it when we first approached him; we could not force the Director of the Peasants' Loan Bank to force Mr Haynes to give up the post of Manager of the Bank and take on these duties. Barbados being a small place, some honourable members might know that at one time Mr. Jemmott, the late Auditor General, was approached and ask to do this work; with his profound knowledge of figures it was thought that he would do it but he felt that he could not undertake the duties. It is ardous work and we had to try to get somebody to do it. Eventually an agreement suitable to Mr. Haynes and the Executive Committee was made and as the result Mr. Haynes agreed to accept the post. I repeat that it was necessary to enter into an agreement. It was not a simple question of taking a man from any Department of the Civil Service and putting him to do this work. The Government felt that it should get the best man and it always felt that Mr. Haynes was the best man, especially in view of his experience in making loans to peasants. Again, it was the desire to meet Mr. Haynes's wishes that caused the prolongation of these negotiations. Mr. Haynes is perfectly satisfied with the present arrangements. The Government is also satisfied and as a result, this Bill has come before the Assembly. It follows the precedent of the Chase Bill. Honourable members will remember that Mr. Chase, like Mr. Haynes, was one of those persons to whom one's mind inevitably turned when there was some odd job to be done. Mr. Chase's services were used for the taking of the Census, and just as he was chosen for the post of Manager when we launched the Vieux Fort Scheme, so Mr. Haynes was the choice when it came to the issuing of loans from the Labour Welfare Fund. I feel sure that honourable members will join with me in saying how glad we are that Mr. Haynes has been appointed to this office and that arrangements have been made which are satisfactory to all parties. The pension has been calculated on the same basis as we calculated Mr. Chase's pension. The main thing is that the Government is perfectly satisfied that it is fair and Mr. Haynes feels that it is fair. I, therefore, have much pleasure in moving that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clause 1 is read and is agreed to.

Clause 2. Subject to the provisions of this Act the Colonial Treasurer is hereby authorised and required to pay to Douglas Arden Mottley Haynes, Manager of the Peasants' Loan Bank in this Island a pension at the rate of two thousand three hundred and four dollars per annum, or, at the option of the said Douglas Arden Mottley Haynes exercisable not later than the day immediately preceding the date of his retirement from the Office of Manager of the Peasants' Loan Bank, in lieu of such pensions, a reduced pension at the rate of three fourths of such pension together with a gratuity equal to ten times the amount of the reduction so made in the pension.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILKINSON: I would like to ask the senior member for St. Joseph how they arrived at the sum of $2,304 if Mr. Haynes gave only 15 years' service to the Government.

Mr. ADAMS: I have not checked the figures but the amount is supposed to be two-thirds of his salary as Manager of the Peasants' Loan Bank. Using the precedent of the late Mr. Gibbons, the Government has included his years of service with the Parochial Authorities in the parish of St. Thomas. Honourable members will remem-

ber that the late Mr. Gibbons worked with the Sanitary Commissioners of St. Michael and was seconded to the Board of Health and that when the question of computing his pension came up for consideration, the number of years he had worked with the Commissioners of Health of St. Michael was taken into consideration. We have used that case and the case of Rev. Armstrong as precedents. When the Armstrong Pension Bill was before the House, the former senior member for St. George—Mr. H. W. Springer — specifically drew to the attention of the House the case of Mr. Gibbons as a precedent.

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

Clauses 3 to 5 inclusive are read and are agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, the CHAIRMAN reports the passing of the Bill in Committee.

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

Mr. GARNER enters the House and takes his seat.

THE COMBERMERE SCHOOL (SITE) ACT

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, —Second reading of a Bill to authorize the Governor-in-Executive Committee to let certain government lands to the Governing Body of the Combermere School.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, — As honourable members will see from the Objects and Reasons of this Bill, it is proposed to let the Governing Body of Combermere School approximately 14 acres of land at Weymouth, the fee simple of which is vested in the Governor in-Executive Committee. Part of this area, consisting of approximately 10 acres, comprises the existing site of Combermere School and grounds which have not previously been formally leased to the Governing Body. The remainder of the area consists of a plot of about 3 acres adjoining the present Combermere grounds on the South-east side which it is desired to make available to the school as an addition to the existing playing field and of a plot of about 1 acre adjoining the grounds on the North-east side. The latter plot is, however, at present let in tenantry and cannot be made available for playing fields until it becomes vacant. This is a simple Bill and I beg to move that it be now read a second time.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, — While I sympathize with the attempt to help Combermere School to extend its playing field I still must consider the presence of many houses on this land, some of which were there for over 16 years. I have met some of the owners of these houses and they are somewhat perturbed that they are going to be asked to remove their houses shortly if Combermere School gets possession of the land. I hope that the Government will see fit to recommend that the renters of this land be not thrown off suddenly. Some of the houses are in a very bad condition and I do not know how their owners are going to manage to remove them. I also hope that these people will not be asked to remove their houses in a couple of weeks' time but that they be given some time to secure other spots of land, which are very difficult to be had. It would be a good thing if the Government could make provision for them to remove to other government lands at the Bay Estate or the Pine Plantation. The situation with them is very bad and I hope that their case will be considered.

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. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clause 1 is read and passed.

Clause 2. The Governor-in-Executive Committee may let to the Governing Body of Combermere School on such terms and conditions as he shall deem expedient those lands with the buildings thereon shown on the deposited plan.

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

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. ALLDER: I want to hear a member or the members of the Government on the point I raised in case these lands are leased to the Combermere School Authority.

Mr. ADAMS: I am paying the honourable member the compliment of looking through the file to give an answer to the point which he raised.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I have had a look at the plan which is divided into three parts —A, B, and C. Combermere School will have the whole of "A", and "B" represents the 3 acres which, I am told Harrison College has agreed, should be given to Combermere, School and "C" represents the part that is now in tenantry. I am very surprised to hear that Harrison College has agreed to give up that portion which passes through its premises. Some years ago the Football Association tried to get these 3 acres of land to establish a football ground and they refused to let the Association have it. However, it is going to Combermere School but it seems rather peculiar that Harrison College does not want it to add to their portion.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am nothing to do with the plan. I am something to do with what I actually saw. The way in which the land is divided up, it would not be of any assistance to Harrison College if the 3 acres on the South-east side were added to their grounds; it would not extend the College's playing field to the extent that it would make it more useful as a playing field. But Combermere School could make profitable use of it. Honourable members should bear in mind that if Combermere grounds are to be used for the erection of a technical block, you are going to find more boys and even girls up there in subsequent years and there will be the necessity for more playing fields. When it comes to the question of the number of pupils you have to remember that there will always be more pupils at Combermere School than at Harrison College.

Mr. LEWIS: The question which the senior member for St. John has asked may be difficult to answer but I will try to put it this way and hope that the senior member for St. Joseph or the senior member for the City will be able to help me. On behalf of the people who are now tenants of the portion of this land that is on Roebuck Street I would just like to know whether either of those two honourable members would say whether the tenants will become the tenants of the Governing Body of Combermere School or in case they have to remove, whether they would be given consideration similar to that which was given by the Government to the other tenants who had to remove some time ago. I think a statement to that effect would put the people's minds at rest.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I think the people have been given a solatium already. After the flood last year many of the persons that were living there

realized that they had been living in a place that was not suitable for normal business and the erection of houses. Some of them removed their houses voluntarily. Then there came the question as to whether we should force the others to remove. Some of these have been carrying on business there for some years and it was agreed that they should be given 5 or 7 years' notice but that in the event of any tenant removing during that period, no one would be allowed to erect another house on the vacant spot. So it is not a question of no consideration being given to these people; it is because consideration has been given that businesses and houses are still there. The Government feels that the land would add to the amenities of Combermere School and would, at the same time, remove a very serious block, if we should have flood waters again.

Mr. ALLDER: If what the senior member for St. Peter has just said is the decision of the Executive Committee, it should be told to these people because many of them are still running around enquiring what their position will be when this land is given over to the Governing Body of Combermere School. I would like to say that I appreciate the statement which the honourable member has just made, namely, that these tenants would be given the privilege of remaining for 5 or 7 years but I would like to know if that information has been passed on by the Government to the tenants.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: It seems to me that this Bill is not necessary, in view of the Bill which we passed earlier today amending the Executive Committee Act. If this Bill is worth while, we should not have passed that Bill amending the Executive Committee Act.

Mr. ADAMS: I thought of the point that the senior member for St. James has just raised but somebody may take the view which the honourable member expressed when we were discussing the Bill to amend the Executive Committee Act, that is, if a lease of government lands is to be for a period exceeding twenty one years, the approval of the Legislature should be first obtained. It is proposed that the lease of these lands to Combermere School should be for a longer period than twenty-one years.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I never suggested that the Executive Committee should be limited to a period of twenty-one years. I suggested that if anyone wanted to lease land from the Government for a period exceeding twenty-one years, the approval of both Houses of the Legislature should be first obtained. There is no point in stating that the Executive Committee retains the fee simple of this land. The development of these Schools must be on one of two lines: either they go on being supported by government funds and relying on government funds to carry on or they will be taken over entirely by the Government in due course, in which case they will be government schools. If you feel that Combermere School needs this land for the purpose of carrying on their proper duties, why not give it to them out and out and be done with it? What is the use of talking about leasing it to them? You do not intend to take it back and it does seem to me that you should put the matter on its true basis and not bother with the lease at all.

Mr. ADAMS: Speaking for the other members of the Government and myself I think it is a very good thing for a Government who holds property to be as liberal as possible in leasing it but it should not divest itself of that property forever.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, the CHAIRMAN reports the passing of the Bill in Committee.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF RULES 61 (a) AND 61 (b)

On re-assembling,

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

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

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

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

WIDOWS AND ORPHANS PENSION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1950

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day under Government Business stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph—Second reading of a Bill to amend the Widows and Orphans Pension Act, 1928.

Mr. ADAMS: This Bill is a simple one; it is like one or two of those Bills with which we dealt earlier to-day. As honourable members will see from the "Objects and Reasons", and if honourable members will bear with me I will read them, "The subordinate Government offices listed in the Schedule to the Bill became established offices on the 1st April, 1948, as a result of the Civil Establishment (General) Order, 1949, and in consequence the holders of those offices became liable for the first time to contribute to the Widows and Orphans Pension Scheme. It is considered, however, that such officers should not be compelled to contribute to the Scheme unless they wish to do so and accordingly the Bill provides that the Widows and Orphans Pension Act 1928 shall not apply to persons holding scheduled offices if prior to the 1st April, 1948 they were holding corresponding offices and were not then contributing to the Scheme. The Bill provides, however, that they may, if they wish elect to become contributors, in which case they will be required to contribute as from the 1st April, 1948. The Bill also provides that any abatements which have in the meantime been made from the salaries or pensions of persons who are exempted by the Bill shall now be repaid to them." The object of this Bill is clear and I beg to move that the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

The three Clauses of the Bill were read and passed.

The Schedule was read and agreed to.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE BILL, 1950

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph:—Second reading of a Bill to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1901.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,— This is a Bill which one might say is a Bill of very great importance. I think that all honourable members and members of the general public who are not still labouring under the delusion that you can have a democracy and at the same time have limited powers of the expression of will by the people who form that democracy, will agree with a Bill of this sort the chief object of which is to give the right to every adult member of the population to vote for members of the General Assembly. This Bill also seeks to abolish the qualifications for membership of the Assembly—qualifications which were inevitable in days when the franchise was limited to land owners—an anomaly which should now be wiped out. As honourable members will see from the "Objects and Reasons", the objects of this Bill are threefold, the first is to abolish the property qualifications for membership of the General Assembly, the second, to grant adult suffrage and the third, to reduce from 12 to 9 the number of members required to form a quorum of the House. I shall deal with each of these objects separately. To put the position briefly, this Bill merely seeks to do what every democratic country should do, that is to give every adult member of the community the right to vote. I do not wish to give any historical exposition as to what I have said; every reasonable person in the community will agree that adult suffrage is a necessary adjunct of democracy. But just on the off chance that either in this Place or elsewhere there might be adduced some argument for limiting the right of every adult member of the community to vote, I should just like to remind honourable members that our Representation of the People Acts, passed as they have been from time to time, have culminated today in a hotch-potch of anomalous enactments. We have got rid of some anomalies in comparatively recent years, for instance, the qualifications in respect of the possession of a B.A., an M.A., or any other degree of any University of the United Kingdom or a testamur from Codrington College, and other fancy qualifications, as the late Sir Charles Clarke used to call them. We have always to remember that this Assembly has some unique views, some for good and some for evil; its views are unique in the sense that it is one of the oldest Chambers in the British Empire and therefore it bears in its legislation the marks of antiquity, some of which are favourable and some of which are to be eradicated. One can well imagine that when property meant everything, property owners would make sure that only property owners had the right to pass laws; they would also eliminate slaves from voting by putting in an income qualification, and when that was no longer possible they would eliminate them by keeping the franchise so high that very few ex-slaves would have the right to vote. But we have had 300 years of representative institutions, the atmosphere of democracy pervades the western nations and after that I would be labouring unnecessarily my argument that the time has long passed when it is necessary for the protagonists of adult suffrage to defend or explain their position, except to say that this is a democracy. I pause here merely to refer to what I should not hear but which I may hear to-day, that there should be a literary test for voters. I have once said, and it created laughter because it was thought I was not serious, that if a literate person deserves the vote, an illiterate one doubly deserves the vote. People are illiterate today because of sheer necessity, because previous Governments did not see fit to make it possible for their parents to send them to school so that they might become literate. Nine out of every ten illiterate persons in this island are illiterate because their parents had to keep them at home in order to help provide for the family exchequer at an early age. To say that because of the misfortune of your not having a father and mother being able to send you to school you should be deprived of the right to say who is to make laws for you, is something illogical; it is an argument which if put forward in all seriousness proves that the propounders of it have not viewed the matter from every angle. I hope I shall not be called upon to cross swords with the honourable junior member for St. Lucy who used to be very strong in the past on the question of illiteracy. Illiteracy is a misfortune and not a fault; sometimes it may be necessary to deprive of the vote a person who suffers from a misfortune, but the misfortune from which he suffers prevents him from exercising any sort of judgement whatever in casting his vote. I refer to lunacy; it would be preposterous to give a lunatic the vote on the ground of democracy when he cannot use his vote intelligently. But the argument that an illiterate man should not be given the right to cast his vote because he cannot cast it intelligently is used by the Conservatives who are afraid that he will not vote for them; however, it is chiefly an illiterate man who votes for the Conservatives. In the country districts in England the average agricultural labourer is a Conservative because he is accustomed to look to the squire; it is only when he comes in contact with the towns that he becomes a Labourite. In this island it is only that the town has moved to the country and made the labourers Labour minded. When I first went to the country the average labourer was as conservative as those honourable members who adorn that side of the Table; it is only by constantly hammering at the illiterate and the semi- illiterate that they voted in a more liberal way than their fathers voted. I appeal to honourable members to see that you cannot deprive of the vote a person who has been deprived of education because his parents voted for the form of Government which made it impossible for him to have education.

I am asking honourable members however difficult it may be for them to discard their preconceived opinions, to look at the question of the quorum of this House as statesmen and not as Party politicians. I claim on behalf of the Government that this provision in this Bill to reduce the quorum of this House from 12 members to 9 members has nothing to do with Party politics from our angle; if we were an Opposition we would vote for it. Need I tell honourable members over and over again that this House meets very seldom and when important measures have had to be dealt with, honourable members have found themselves not being able to sit because in the Act itself we are told that no business can be transacted unless there is a quorum of twelve members? I ask honourable members—I ask the honourable junior member for St. James who in his life must have sat as a member of more Boards than all the rest of us have sat or will sit as members; has he ever heard of anybody in any

part of the world—company, association or whatever you like—with a quorum composed of 50% of its members? I have tried to discover any sort of body of which a quorum is 50% of its members and I have failed to do so. It is a contradiction in terms—the very word "quorum" means a small part of a larger body to which is entrusted the work of the larger body which for one reason or another cannot assemble to carry on business. The only reason why this Government is asking the House to reduce the quorum from 12 members to nine—we would have asked for it if we were only ten in number—is due to the fact that over and over again we have seen how this hard Mede and Persian law prevents us from transacting business when it should be transacted. I ask honourable members not to take notice of some newspaper articles which have appeared in connection with this matter; it has been said that this Government proposes to substitute the rule of the nine for that of the twelve, but the same writer forgot that everything we do in this House is subject to the approval of the Other Place, and that in the Other Place two or three can form a quorum and they can throw out legislation which comes from this Place. This Government has made this proposal as regards the quorum of this House, and if it is viewed calmly and dispassionately it can only lead to the more urgent transaction of public business; that can be the only result. There will be less danger of meetings being abortive than in the past. As soon as this proposal is put forward you hear that we have some ulterior motive for reducing the quorum of the House. I hope that some honourable member will move that this provision be eliminated altogether from the Act. The quorum should be set out by the Rules of the Assembly, but we have it in the Act and therefore we cannot move to rescind or postpone the operation of any Rule dealing with the quorum. Need I remind honourable members of what most of us or all of us know that the operation of this provision in respect of the quorum is such that we have had to stop a debate? Only two weeks ago I was present in the House of Commons and the House was filled for a division to be taken. Over 400 members attended and as soon the division was taken and some honourable member started on a private affair, 19 members remained in the House and the debate continued. The quorum there is 49 members out of 600, and the debate continued with 12 members of the Government and 7 of the Opposition. If anybody had drawn to the attention of the House that there were only 19 members present, 49 would have to form a quorum and perhaps they would go out again and the debate would have to be stopped. Nothing is to be gained in any Parliamentary Assembly by having an absolute Rule that such a big number must form a quorum and thus cause the postponement of the work which the Assembly should do. I hope that honourable members will gradually see their way to sit from day to day for a limited period and have a recess at Easter, Whitsuntide and Christmas and do not sit during the hot months. But until we come to that, do not let us put shackles on ourselves by sticking to this quorum of 50% of members—a thing unheard of in any other Assembly. I say that there should be a sufficient number of members present to see that public business is not transacted by a handful of people; the quorum should not be three or four out of twenty-four and there should be sufficient responsibility of members not to try to rush important matters through the House in the absence of sufficient members to give those matters thorough study. How often do we find in respect of Statutory Boards that a question of great importance comes up and there are only one or two members wh tribute to the matter under discussion by are united how often do we find that the consideration ovement particular question is postponed until there is efore House? That happens every day; it happens with the Housing Board and with other Boards as well. I appeal to honourable members to agree to that portion of this Bill which deals with the reduction of the quorum from 12 members to 9; I assure honourable members that the object of this provision is to make it impossible for us to have constant abortive meetings. The provision of a quorum of 12 members might have been necessary 300 years ago when it took the progenitors of the honourable senior member for St. Lucy six hours to get to Bridgetown and you had to make sure that those who lived near Bridgetown did not pass something which those in St. Lucy did not hear about; but it is now necessary to have this anomalous provision of a quorum of 12 out of 24 members off the Statute Book. As I have already said, I hope that some honourable member will move for the elimination of this provision altogether and leave it to be made by the Rules of the House. I hope, too, that the House will see that the provision that a quorum must be present by 12.15 o'clock should be changed; even the question of the time as to when the House should sit is too inelastic. You cannot do public business in the year 1950 as it was done in the year 1650. excellent as it might have been done then.

The first object of this Bill as set out in the "Objects and Reasons" is to abolish the property qualifications for membership of the General Assembly; if people do not agree today that in a democratic Assembly there should be no property qualifications for membership and there should be no property qualifications for the right to vote, they will never agree and it is of no use arguing with them. I do not propose to argue to-day what is a very profitable occupation among adolescents; every school boy or school girl debating society will argue that if you are democratic you believe in adult suffrage. You either agree that every member of the community should have the right to a seat in this House or you do not; if you have given any thought to the subject and cannot be persuaded to-day then you will not be persuaded. I suggest that honourable members should express their views on this Bill by all means but give their votes for the business of the House being conducted expeditiously and remove the accusation that you are an undemocratic set-up in that there are still large numbers of people who are deprived of the right to vote and equally large numbers who are deprived of the right to be elected to seats in the House. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Messrs. BRANCKER and CRAWFORD entered the House and took their seats whilst Mr. ADAMS was speaking.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: It is a pleasure for me to second the motion for the second reading of this Bill. I feel that this Bill will bring to an end the matter of people who want to come into this Assembly but who are deprived from doing so. This Bill is about 10 years overdue. The question of the qualification for membership of this House is a serious one; there are some honourable members who do not want every man to have the right to be a member of this House, but we want to make the snobbish realise that this is the age of the common man and not of snobbery. Every man should have the right to be a member of this House as long as he feels that he is fit to be here. Too many people have been exercising snobbery for too many years and too many

el that theirs is a God-given right to
his age should be an indication to every
r who has that feeling that membership
a this Assembly is not the God-given or sole right of a few, but it is the right of every member of the community to add his weight to the community. Even those who have had the privilege of being members of this House who were allowed to represent the people under the Representation of the People Act, only represented a small minority of the people and they must see that times are being changed. A social revolution has taken place in the world and Barbados cannot be left out of the picture: moreover, I feel that broadening the basis for bringing people into this Chamber is the means of maintaining good representation right down the line. I was surprised to hear people speaking of the poor man in such terms that you would believe that the poor man did not exist before, yet there are those who will say that we should not pass measures such as the one before us. For once this Bill will stop the snobbery that existed in this island before in so far as the representation of the people is concerned. It is not a matter of saying that you should make a proper income qualification the criterion or ability to represent people in this House; that is moonshine. As the position now is, because a poor man is out of a job —because he cannot earn $80 a month—he is precluded from membership of this House. I ask honourable members this question; how many independent working-class men in this community can come forward to this Assembly on the qualifications that are set out in the Act?—Very few indeed. If you believe in democracy you must think that people should be given the right to become members of this Chamber without these qualifications . As regards the question of the quorum of the House. it is obvious that if you put a basis on which to elect people to this House there should not be any shackles to prevent them from working. As the honourable mover has said, I defy any honourable member to mention any Assembly in the world where 50% of the members make a quorum. Let us not mind the newspaper which referred to the reduction of the quorum from 12 members to 9 and stated that the Labour Government wants to make a change. We have seen many times that no business could be done in this House because of the absence of a quorum; we have sat in this Chamber and seen a member just outside and he refused to come in and allow the business of the House to be conducted, but as soon as you get a quorum then all the members come in. We must take public business seriously; we want to have in this Chamber members who are really democratic. I tell honourable members that I have no fear of this Bill because if you believe in democracy then you must kill snobbery. Too many people die for democracy and we cannot perpetuate any semblance of snobbery. I doubt very much if any honourable member from the opposite side of the House will oppose this Bill because those honourable members seem to have been converted to the idea that a social revolution has taken place and that every man has the right to be here. Can any honourable member say that it is his wealth and position that make him feel that he is qualified to be here to take the interest which he takes in the people? If he answers that question correctly then he can see no difficulty in making this Bill law. Every time that they lowered the franchise in England it meant that more laws were passed in the interest of the people, because the people, had the opportunity of sending to Parliament people who had been forced to pass laws in the interest of the people. As regards the qualification for voters, we in this colony have come down from the £50 qualification to the £20 qualification and we have seen what has happened: when a member is answerable to more people than before then his conduct will be watched with greater scrutiny. I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. WILKINSON: I am very glad to hear the honourable senior member for St. Joseph say in respect of this Bill that there is no Party question. Indeed this is no Party question; it is a question in connection with which both Parties spoke in favour at the last Election campaign. We believe that there should be adult suffrage and so I am hoping that honourable members will not view this matter as any Party question. We on this side of the Table have agreed between ourselves that we should press for adult suffrage, (Cheers), we believe that everybody who is in his right mind should have the right to vote for whom he wants to represent him in this House. However, I am not quite convinced that there should not be a separate qualification for membership of this House. We are behind some of the big countries and after all we do want the best people in the House to represent the wishes of the people. Everybody will admit that it does require some ability to represent the people in this House and to do what is best for the country. On the question of the quorum of the House I cannot agree with the proposal to reduce the number of members forming it, and at this stage I do not propose to speak at any length on this question. I will just say that I do not agree with the honourable senior member for St. Joseph that this is a question of percentages only. The question is: what is the minimum number of members required for making the laws of the country? In the reduction of the quorum of the House to 9 members I see this danger: you will always have the Party in power with a small majority. It means that if you make the quorum 9 members and only 9 members turn up, five people can make laws for the country. With five members out of 23 making laws for the country, I do not think it would be wise to reduce the quorum to such a low figure. I know that we are all standing for the good government of this country: I have spoken with the honourable senior member for St. Joseph in connection with the reduction of the quorum—I think it was last June or July before I went away—and I told him—the honourable member will remember—that I was very doubtful that it would be to the benefit of good government to reduce the quorum of the House from 12 members to 9. When we go into Committee on the Bill we can argue all these points out; but I want to assure the honourable senior member for St. Joseph that we on this side of the Table are in favour of two of the three principles set out in this Bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I think it is unnecessary in a Chamber constituted as this is at present and at this time in our history to labour the desirability of granting adult suffrage. It is now more or less generally conceded by the people in this island who are in line with general democratic thought that every single taxpayer whether he or she pays direct or indirect taxation is entitled to some say in the election of people to control the affairs of the colony. Therefore there need not be any undue discussion on the necessity for supporting that phase of the Bill which deals with the removal of all qualifications for voting for members of the General Assembly. Similarly, it is almost a natural corollary that there should be sim-

ultaneously the removal of the qualifications for membership of the Assembly itself. As a matter of fact, it is now close on two years since I introduced into this Assembly a Bill which sought to remove all qualifications for voters or to grant adult suffrage. This present Bill goes a little further than mine in that it proposes to remove the property qualifications for membership of the House and reduce the number of members necessary for forming a quorum from 12 to 9. I regret that this Bill does not pay due attention to another matter of some importance with regard to the representation of the people of this country: and that is with regard to the present number of constituencies and the manner in which the colony is divided for the purpose of electing members to the General Assembly. I do feel that the time has come when the parish of St. Michael should have at least two more seats in this Assembly. In other words, the present division of twelve constituencies is, in my opinion, insufficient to give adequate representation to the colony as a whole, and more adequate representation would be secured by the addition of two seats for the parish of St. Michael. I am therefore suggesting to honourable members to agree with me that no harm can be done and a very useful purpose would be served by according to the parish of St. Michael two more seats in the General Assembly. I therefore intend to propose later on that the island should be divided into 26 constituencies, four being in respect of the parish of St. Michael and the others being allowed to remain as they are at present. If for any reason it is found practically impossible now to support an amendment of this sort, I think that no harm can be done if the further consideration of the Bill is postponed for a week or two in order to give effect to the recommendation which I have proposed. The General Elections are yet some time off and there is no point in tinkering with a Bill of this sort or making several bites at the same cherry when we can with a very short delay provide the necessary amendment to the Bill and at the same time secure the objects which the Bill seeks to achieve. There is one further point which I wish to make and it is with regard to the proposal that the number of members forming a quorum of the House should be reduced to 9. I am willing to concede that the present number of members for forming a quorum might appear to be high, but all things being considered, it is not. The comparison that a very small percentage of the House of Commons forms a quorum and similarly with the Jamaica or Trinidad Assembly, cannot be applied from every single point of view to this colony, and I submit, Sir, that there are strong reasons why we should not be prepared at the present moment to reduce the number of members for forming a quorum from 12 to 9. Therefore while I propose to support the other parts of the Bill and to make the amendment which I suggested earlier, I cannot at the moment see my way to support that Clause of the Bill which seeks to give nine members the authority to conduct the affairs of this House.

Mr. MAPP: I think it is fitting that the Leader of the House who for the past decade has perhaps fought more than anybody else in this island for constitutional changes and improvements in this colony is the same person to move the passing of this Bill to-day. I am happy to see that the members of the Opposition, whatever they may feel in their minds about this Bill, are yet giving it their blessing and support. It is not my intention to prolong the discussion on this Bill, because as civilisation moves on, ideas which govern the people and actions of bodies such as this Assembly also move on, and we a
here to-day in welcoming such a great m
in the cause of the people. It is not the
necessary for me to repeat what has been said i
connection with this Bill. There is one thing I would like to mention and it is that I would welcome a move to stop certain malpractices on the part of wealthy people—malpractices which usually accompany extensions of this kind. We know that when the franchise was extended in England wholesale corruption and bribery took place on the part of the wealthy classes, and the Government in process of time had to take steps to put an end to such corruption and bribery. I am therefore issuing the warning that unless steps are taken to prevent it, the same thing is likely to happen here. We know that in England there were those who were politically bought by wealthy people and the Government had to limit the actions which candidates could take in influencing people to vote for them. There is a law which limits in some way the actions of candidates for the Jamaica House of Representatives and I think it is time that this Government should take similar steps in this island. I feel, and honourable members will agree with me, that the result of such corrupt practices as we see at election time is a deterioration in the morale and order of this colony. I think that most honourable members will agree that these practices go to the entire fabric of this colony and in process of time they will have disastrous effects on the people as a whole. Some time ago a Bill was introduced in this House by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph having for its object the prevention of such practices; I also introduced a Bill having the same object but I was advised to await the action of the Government in this respect. I do hope that in the very near future we shall see a Bill sent down by the Government having the object which I have mentioned. I feel that it would be in the interest of the entire community if we can go to the polls on the next occasion with the assurance that people will be allowed to exercise their ideas freely on the island-wide and current topics at the particular time.

Mr. LEWIS: I think that a Bill of this sort should be passed in this Assembly with a great deal of enthusiasm since it is likely to have a rough passage elsewhere. The members of the Other Place should not be able to say that there was not much enthusiasm in this Place over the passing of this Bill. If this Bill is passed without a great deal of enthusiasm the impression might be created that we do not believe very much in the extension of these democratic rights. With the present qualifications I do not think it can be said that this Assembly savours of being a democratic or representative one; there being a restriction in the choice of members and in the number of voters in respect of the qualifications which we are seeking to abolish. I think that the time has long passed when we should merely pay lipservice to what the Head of the Established Church says it is that matters. The Head of the Established Church says it is the people that matter, but here we say it is property and money that matter. If it is the people that matter these restrictions should not be placed upon them. As far as the matter of the quorum of the House is concerned, there are seldom more than 17 members in this House on the occasion of a division and a majority of 9 can make the laws of this country. My theory is that in reducing the quorum of this House to 9 members, the members of this House are going to come out earlier and in greater numbers (Hear, hear) because they are going to feel that it is easier to get 9 members than to get 12 and they had better be there to

see what is going on. At present some honourable members feel that it is difficult to get 12 members, so they can remain outside until a quorum is formed. I feel that this Amendment will make honourable members realise their responsibility and it will make them out. The number which is now proposed for forming a quorum is not an unreasonably low one otherwise I myself would object to it. As regards the fear of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas I would say that when there are more people from whom votes can be bought there are not many Barbadians who will spend their money in trying to bribe them; the Barbadian voter will get in the habit of knowing that you want him to vote in one way and he might not vote in that way. It is only because people have been allowed to keep too much of the profits of their businesses in their hands that we have corruption. I think that the abolition of these qualifications will redound to the credit of this colony. I will repeat what I said when we reduced the income qualification for voters to £20, and it is that if a man is out of work he will take life more seriously. If a man cannot read or write it is not his fault; it is the fault of the Assembly. The Assembly is older than anybody in this colony and it should have seen to it that illiteracy was abolished. If there is one thing about which I feel very pleased to-day it is that the Opposition, as it is called in this House, is also in favour of granting universal adult suffrage. I would like the members of the Other Place to see that there is enthusiasm in the passing of this Bill and to warn them not to see the writing on the wall only when their backs are against it.

Mr. BRANCKER: I am naturally supporting the motion for the second reading of this Bill and I am in favour of the first and second of its threefold objects. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph referred to a view which I expressed in this Chamber about 10 years ago—I agitated by way of questions and otherwise for universal adult suffrage and I made the one qualification that there should be a moderate test as to literacy. The strongest reason which could be urged for this test as to literacy is simply for dealing with a corrupt sheriff. I have not myself suffered from the actions of a corrupt sheriff—my colleague and I have not been unfortunate so far; but there is no getting away from the fact that if the sheriff has to put the mark he can put it for whomsoever he will. However, despite the possibility of corrupt practices on the part of a sheriff I am prepared after ten years to abandon my opposition in this regard and hope for the best. I am hoping that we will have better sheriffs in the future than we have had in many instances to experience in the past. It is notorious that some years ago in St. Andrew the particular sheriff was a man whom you had to feed with a very long spoon. I do not know if the conditions have improved and if in the recent past they have had a sheriff who could be depended upon to be conscientious and to act as he should act. In this matter of adult suffrage I would be prepared to go even further and instead of limiting persons to the age of 21 years I would propose that the age limit should be 18 years as is the case in Australia; we have a precedent in the British Empire or the Commonwealth of Nations. As regards the quorum of the House, I am not in favour of reducing the number of members forming a quorum from 12 to 9. If you are increasing the salary of a man in the lowest bracket by 20% and that of a man in highest bracket by 10%, we know how unreasonably that works out. In the House of Commons there are 600 members and between 40 and 50 are required to form a quorum; but that percentage is nothing like what we require here. If we want to ensure that members are always present in the House except when they are precluded from being present either on account of absence from the island on business of the State or through indisposition—if they are absent for other reasons then their salary should be stopped and that should have a very salutary effect on them. (Cheers). I suggest that if members are absent except for any unavoidable cause, the £ s. d. aspect should be dealt with. I recommend that some means of ensuring the attendance of members at the House should be adopted other than by reducing the quorum. I support the motion for the second reading of this Bill because I am definitely in favour of manhood and womanhood suffrage and the abolition of the property qualifications for membership of the House; but in so far as the reduction in respect of the quorum is concerned I cannot support that.

Mr. GARNER: I am very glad to have the privilege of being able to speak on this occasion. I think that the granting of adult suffrage is long overdue. To have a qualification which will entitle you to vote is a relic of slavery and as somebody has said quite correctly, we are moving forward in a democratic way. As to how far we have reached, I am not quite sure, I am afraid that we are still very near to tyranny. Democracy, I am afraid, is not really far removed from tyranny. Until people's minds are really free, until people are truly converted, you can get nothing by calling a rose by another name. You claim to be a democrat but you practice tyrannical methods. Be that as it may, I am very glad that this Bill has been brought down because whoever lives in this island directly or indirectly contributes to the welfare of the island; he eats, drinks and wears and pays money to the Customs. Each one is a unit of the whole and this is our island; it is not so much mine although I was born here. That was an accident; but since I have a right to be here I say that this is our island, home and we are going to see to it while we have any power, that democratic rule is carried on in this island. Looking over the past, I can well understand why this Chamber was dominated by wealthy people; it was because of ignorance on the part of the people. We have not got too far from that; I want honourable members to bear in mind that they cannot build their castles too high on the mere changing of an Act. This is no magic wand; the mere changing of an Act does not change anybody. What we really want to do is to eradicate illiteracy from among the masses of the people in this colony, and you can only do that by teaching in schools. Not so long ago I stated emphatically on the floor of this House that we need a change in our school life. School life as it is to-day has become monotonous for our boys and girls. I was taken to task by certain individuals and a section of the Press about my remarks, I can well understand that a good friend of mine for whom I hold no animosity, Mr. Norman Wood, drew a caricature depicting what would be the best for the people whom I described in my Address. That shows the mentality of a certain section of people who, although they talk about being democratic, really in their heart of hearts, they have got tyranny. I made particular reference to the educational qualifications of our boys and girls when they have left school, and all of us or most of us are agreed that the position is not what it should be. We have a number of complete illiterates in this colony. We could have compulsory education and we could impose a fine on employers who employ children when the school doors are open. We have reached the stage when there should not be any employer who employs children of school age when the school doors are

open. I maintain that such an employer is a beast; he is a criminal and he is not worthy to live. The employment of children of school age is one of the things to which this Government must pay attention at once. Human beings, like plants, need cultivation and this Government must see that education is made more accessible to the people of this colony. You do not want merely to teach children Latin and other things which some of them do not apply to their daily lives; that is the mistake which the Director of Education is making now. He wants children to be taught Spanish and we have no Spanish masters. We want people to be able to read and write well; we want them to be able to speak and write their language well. The mere amendment to this Act does not bring about the change which I would like to see.

Some honourable member referred to sheriffs. Good luck for me I have had good sheriffs and I feel very sorry that a way has not been made for them to be paid. The people who work under them are paid but they themselves are not paid. I can speak well for those sheriffs with whom I have come in contact; they have given every latitude as far as the law is concerned. That is the way in which they have impressed me. As far as the quorum of this House is concerned. I came in here with an open mind; I was more against the proposal to reduce the quorum than I was for it. I have spoken with the Leader of the House who has put certain points to me and I am voting for the reduction of the number of members required to form a quorum now. Again I am telling the honourable member that this is not the solution to the problem although it may be the means of getting work done more expeditiously. It may be that if some honourable members are tired and the Leader of the House wants to carry on, he will be able to do so. Be that as it may, the honourable member has put forward some very good points and I am voting for the reduction in the number of members required to form a quorum. As regards the income qualification for membership of the House, every right-thinking person should know that that is a relic of the past, and it is only because of war conditions that certain people can earn $80 a month. Eighty dollars a month was a lot of money at one time and you can see that this income qualification was put in the law for a certain group. Labourites could never subscribe to that. Sometimes when I read about Dr. Milan's laws I would like to send an atomic bomb and wipe them out. There are those who will run and hunt at the same time; everything takes time to be done and when the question was put to the Good Master, He said that the tares and the wheat must grow together. It is up to the people to know who is interested in them; if a man changes his ways and goes to Tarshish instead of Ninevah you can change him, but you cannot prevent people from sending whom they like to the House. If we allow these things to remain on the Statute Book, we are no better than Dr. Milan in South Africa. (A MEMBER: What about Smuts?) He is dying. I cannot speak as plainly as I would like to speak, but I am voting for this Bill because I realise that there are still some handicaps which have not been overcome; there are in this colony some very important matters which have not been tackled by the present Government. While it is true that I am willing to go along with them and help them in carrying on their work, yet I must remind them that I am a man of action. It is not tomorrow but now: to-day is the day of salvation. When you continually put off things you forget that you have something to do; procrastination is the thief of time. Illiteracy cannot always be thrown at us. Not long ago somebody was heard to say: "They carry a lot of things to the House but they cannot deal with them." You want to make education a commonplace thing in this island; if there is one big item to be dealt with, it is education. You set people free as soon as you begin to educate them. Look at the stalwarts and historians! Do you think they were nincompoops? They had a sound education. I am not saying that people with commonsense have not worked their way up but it would have been better for them if they had a certain amount of education. We cannot look at money in the Treasury as against bringing up a race of people with education—people who are able to think and read. I thank God for the little bit of education which I have got; I study the lives of great men and I know them. I have a little bit of education and I know what is needed. God made distinct races in the world and each race has to look after its own interest. Man is now trying to come; only now the veil is being taken off his face. This is a solemn moment; this Bill is one which will go down in history as an act to give freedom to some people to whom freedom was denied. We are far removed from the days of slavery; we have a serious task to do. Our ancestors worked for nothing and we are putting an end to that state of affairs. We have got to give to our children the right to sit in responsible places where they can tell the world how they feel. There are those who, because of economic conditions, become fearful; but there are also those who are fearless and who will speak their minds so as to bring about better conditions among the people and you have to make your choice. You cannot extend the life of the House for any longer period because we are passing from one period to the other and if you have a representative who is no good and he remains in this House for a longer period than that for which we are here now, he might impede the progress of this colony. These things I have spoken over and over again. I am not unmindful of the fact that, strange as it might seem, we are doing just what our ancestors would love to get a peep at. If some of them could only get a glance here to-day they would feel relieved; and if some of the wealthy ones could just get a glance here to-day as well, they would say that somebody has committed sacrilege. What has happened to this Chamber? But you cannot turn back the hands of the clock, nobody can do that. Time marches on and time as I understand it means God. Only God can rule time and stop it. I am closing now but I am leaving this small warning with the Labour Government which has brought forward this Amendment to-day; they are bringing forward measures in respect of the middle but what about the corners? There are still many slack things, there are still many loopholes, there are things which need to be tackled at once. First things must come first and the first thing to be dealt with is our educational system. I want to see a law made that while school doors are open no child of school age is allowed to be employed, and there are many other things which we need to do if we are to show ourselves as responsible as we claim to be. I hope that this Bill when implemented will cause a greater amount of democracy to be exhibited in this colony than before although I am very fearful about that, because every change brings about some new problem and while everybody is saying "Hallelujah! I ascend," it might be the downfall of some. (Laughter). In every joy there is a little sorrow, in every good there is a little evil and I understand that there can be no good without evil—so the philosophers say. Therefore if we make merry to-day in that

we are doing a good work, we still have to take a retrospective look to see if we have cleared up all the mess before we can sit down and say that all is well. I am glad to be associated with this Bill and people should be jubilant in having others to sit around this table and set their brethren free to choose their representatives. I feel honoured—I am not a haughty person but I feel honoured to be associated with this Bill; and if I had my way I would try to get certain things done. This is no mean task here to-day; this is a good job and I take it that some honourable members have not taken the job as seriously as they should take it. This move to give everybody the opportunity of sending his representative to the House is a good one. I came in here not willing to vote for the third object of this Bill but since I have had a conversation with the Leader of the House, I am inclined to vote for that object which is the reduction of the quorum from 12 members to 9. There are some busy members who serve on Boards, perhaps, for instance, last Tuesday as much as I would have liked to have been here I could not get here at the particular hour because I was engaged at a Board meeting. It was only five minutes after I got in Bridgetown that I heard there was no quorum. If you can get 9 members to start business and I cannot get here, then the business can go on until I arrive. I am very glad that this Bill is before us to-day and I hope that more useful Bills will be brought forward. Bills which will make people feel like men and make them know that God is the Father of us all and that colour means nothing. I could talk on this Bill for a year, but I will not do that. There has been the question of one race going ahead and keeping down the other; it is up to us to shake off the shackles and the other people will not be vexed with us either because they have a conscience. The rule has always been the survival of the fittest group; you always have to fight and people will always admire fighters. I will go down fighting rather than be an apologist. I have no respect for a person who is an idler; I have no respect at all for a person who is afraid to speak his opinion conscientiously. I do not care what you say about me I will speak my conviction whenever the time arises; no man is big enough to stop me from doing that. I do not care if you kill me. I respect the brotherhood of man; I know nothing about colour. We are all God's children and when I die I will walk all over God's Heaven. We want to be as free as air and the truth will set you as free as air. We are not teaching our children that; that is what I want this Government to awake and do. We want to let everybody know that we are all God's children and that God is no respecter of persons. If you feel that you are superior to me because you have more money than I have, that is flying into God's face and, Oh proud man, God will bring you down.

Mr. Speaker, this is a big subject for debate in this House and I cannot stretch the latitude which has been given to me. I am very glad for the course which is being taken to-day because it is a particle of freedom which is being given to people. I appreciate it and again I warn this Government to see that children are given education. When I see children going on like sheep and goats I ask: Is that the way you are civilised? We must have schools and teachers and we must spend money in educating children. Do you think the nations became great by just wishing to be great? No, they studied. Time meant something to them; they read about great minds and they were inspired to do likewise. It is seldom that I read about a martyr and do not shed a tear. It inspires me to read about martyrs and to think of what I would do to really liberate people. It is dreadful to read of conditions at home and I wonder why people fool themselves. You cannot fool God; He will call you to reckoning some day. Let everybody be complacent about what he is doing. You cannot fool God; time will overtake you. We have to pray that God in His mighty power will bring about justice and fairplay. I hope that the remarks which I have used will fall on good ears, that something will be done for the poor children of this colony and that the number of illiterates will be considerably reduced. What has been countenanced in the past cannot be countenaced today because the world has no place for fools; and if we are going to contribute to the welfare of the colony we have got to see to it that we give the children an ample amount of education that will fit them for the battle of life. (Cheers).

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I would just like to say a few words and to draw to the attention of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph something which has been drawn to his attention already. The qualification for members of the Vestries are contained in the Representation of the People Act and it is a question as to whether it is the policy of the Government to make the change as it is now being made or to await the implementation of the Maude Report in some larger Act. Of course there is a section of this Bill which allows the Governor to bring the Act into effect by means of proclamation, and that does not mean that the Act has to come into effect forthwith. A consideration that must apply to this Bill is that the moment you grant adult suffrage you have to make complete changes in the arrangements for voters to vote. If the change is going to be made in respect of the Vestries it will mean that you will have about five or six months to arrange for the changeover which must be made; but as regards the House there will be a year or such time as the Governor may be advised by the members of the Executive Committee. I merely draw those points to the attention of the House. As regards other points, the honourable junior member for St. James has already spoken on behalf of members on this side of the House. It has been realised that we were bound to grant adult suffrage and it was only a matter of progress and not a question as to whether adult suffrage should be granted or not. I think you will find that in 1928 I said that the income qualification for voters should be £30 and for some time we realised that we must have adult suffrage. In so far as the qualifications for membership of the House are concerned,I agree with my colleague that there is more danger there than there is in the other respect. A country always gets what it deserves and far be it from me to suggest that it will choose irresponsible people so long as responsible people are prepared to carry out their duties. I think we recognise that if 80,000 of the inhabitants of the island are congregated in the parish of St. Michael and in the City of Bridgetown, it would be unfair to give these two constituencies only four members as against twenty members representing the other constituencies; it must be realised that the town over-balances the country districts. In 1943 when we changed the Act the point was raised as to whether the constituencies should be divided into wards or not. I am not saying that as a matter of keeping back this Bill but I hope that the Government will come out in one way or another in connection with this matter and not leave it undone. With 80,000 people in the parish of St. Michael, that does seem to call for a re-division of seats and the best way to deal with this question is to allow four seats for this parish. I have held that opinion for some time. Relative to

the quorum of the House, the question is whether it should be formed by 12 members or 9 members, and many of us think that it should be formed by 12 members. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has dealt with this question on a percentage basis, but I do not think that that is the correct way of dealing with it. Where you have a Board comprised of five members and three form a quorum, that is 60% of the members of the Board. There are arguments on every side but I do not think that any honourable member would be induced to vote against the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: I could not be silent after hearing the honourable senior member for St. Philip, and I wish to congratulate him on the high level of his speech. We would be failing in our duty as a Government if we did not, with improved machinery, do our utmost really to make this country a democracy and not appear to make it a democracy because we have passed a Bill to grant adult suffrage. I agree with what the honourable member has said; one of the reasons why I am in my place today and not somewhere else is the consciousness of the immense task which lies before us now in trying to undo the work of years, and in trying to get something on the Statute Book during the life of this Parliament. I am aghast at the list of things which we have in Executive Committee—things of A-1 priorty but which will take ages to get through if we have abortive meetings and unnecessary debate. I say that in deference to all members of the House; we have got to school ourselves to act differently as regards our parliamentary duties in the future. It is a matter for honourable members to make their private arrangements to suit meetings of the House. I hope that honourable members will fall in with the suggestion to meet at frequent intervals and have breaks; we can have recess in the months of August and September. As regards this Bill, I am honestly disappointed at the lack of arguments on the question of the quorum of the House. I want to say here and now that I take at face value remarks from members of the Electors' Association that they desire to co-operate with us. I know that many people think I am childish to believe many of the things that come from that Association. I try to believe that they do not differ from us in the main things that lie before us except on the question of nationalisation. I ask those honourable members to look at the Act and see that it prevents us from proceeding with work without a quorum of 12 members although a minute after the House is adjourned for want of a quorum 13 members may be standing up outside. It is preposterous to allow a thing like that to continue. The honourable junior member for St. James says that a quorum of 9 members means that 5 members can pass laws; but surely a quorum of 12 members means that 7 can pass laws. I am sure the honourable member is sorry that he used that argument. The honourable junior member for St. Lucy says that you can ensure the attendance of members in another way and that is that you should nat pay them if they are absent except through illness or State business; he has relapsed into the business style. Again I congratulate the honourable senior member for St. Philip on his speech and I hope that his remarks have fallen deeply into the hearts of all of us. We have a lot of serious work to do for the next year and we want to get down to business and do it. I note that members on the other side of the House also draw their salaries. (Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Do you want us to give them to you?) There are in England some members who do not draw their salaries; and here in the West Indies there is one man who does not draw his salary and he is not as wealthy as some people who draw theirs. I am glad to see that the members on the other side have been converted to see that granting adult suffrage is necessary. The temptation to remind them that it is through force of circumstances that they dare not vote against it is so great that I will do so. I should like to remind the honourable senior member for St. James that when I introduced a Bill for adult suffrage he was against it; he was still in favour of the £30 qualification. If this Government has forced the members on that side to pass Bills whether they like them or not because they dare not reject them with the voters outside listening, then we have done our work. (Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: We forced you to bring them down.) For years we have been trying to pass laws and the passing of this Bill today will allow us to do the work much faster. I hope that we will drop these Party politics and put our shoulders to the wheels and get something done. I have been told that there was some public meeting at which it was thrown at the Government that we have extended our life for three years. That was dishonest; the honourable member who made that statement knows quite well how frustrating it is to sit solemnly and prepare a Bill and then through lack of time you have to start all over again. In making a jibe of that kind—well, it was expected of that honourable member———

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Surely the honourable member is not allowed to do that. The jibe is that you apply something to the present session as against a future session; but the honourable member is not allowed to do that in here.

Mr. ADAMS: When we come forward with a programme and say that we will vote for the payment of members of the House, what is there dishonest about that? But the honourable member will get to listen to him the kind of people who will listen to him. I trust that this Bill will be passed without amendment and I commend it to the House with confidence.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clause 1 was read as follows:—

1. This Act may be cited as the Representation of the People Act, 1950, and shall be construed as one with the Representation of the People Act, 1901 (hereinafter referred to as the principal Act) and any enactment amending that Act.

Mr. ADAMS: With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I want to reply to the honourable senior member for St. James as regards the Vestries Act. If the worst comes it is easy to amend the Act. If the Bill takes a long time to come before the House we can amend the Act so as to deal with the qualifications. I now beg to move that Clause 1 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: The arrangements which you have to make for universal franchise are many, and if you cannot get through with them in time it will mean that some delay will have to take place.

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

Clause 2 was read as follows:—

2. Section two of the principal Act as amended by the Representation of the People Act, 1950, shall have effect as if the words "who shall be any one of the qualifications below" were omitted, and as if all the words after the words "Assembly of this Island" to the end of the section were omitted.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: In so far as this Clause is concerned, it will be recalled that I mentioned in my speech on the second reading of this Bill that I favoured the reduction of the qualifying age from 21 years to 18 years. This would be the appropriate time to deal with this amendment because, as honourable members know, it is Clause 2 of the Principal Act and Clause 2 of this amending Bill which deals with the qualifications of members. Clause 2 of the Principal Act deals also with the question of the age limit and it would be appropriate to make the amendment to this Clause. However, I appreciate it might be held that an amendment to this Clause would constitute a charge on the Government since there would be an increase in the number of potential voters by the reduction of the qualifying age from 21 years to 18 years. There would be more expense in the provision of forms and so on, therefore I will not make the amendment now. The matter can be dealt with by way of an Address asking that the qualifying age be reduced from 21 years to 18 years, thus bringing us into line with other places. In this colony people are mentally equipped to exercise their votes intelligently at the age of 18.

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

Clause 3 was read and passed.

Clause 4 was read as follows:—

4. Section fifty-three of the principal Act shall have effect as if the words "Nine" and "nine" were substituted for the words "Twelve" and "twelve" respectively in lines one and eight.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: The honourable senior member for St Joseph says that he was surprised at the feebleness of the arguments from this side of the Table relative to this matter. It is now proposed to reduce the number of members required to form a quorum of the House from 12 to 9. The honourable member can make a check and see how many meetings were held last year; I think he will find that there were 50. I am inclined to agree about getting more work done but the honourable member will see that there has never been an abortive meeting when something of importance is to take place. The honourable member may have some measures to bring forward, but he will agree that for the last six months there were a few matters of importance dealt with and the others were just formalities. I repeat that whenever there has been something of importance there has always been a quorum to deal with it. In one instance I asked the honourable member to postpone a matter until my colleague returned to the colony; the honourable member could not accommodate me and the matter went through. The fact is that the House has never been prevented from doing its work when there is anything of importance to be considered. The question of the quorum of the House is never dealt with on a percentage basis; the honourable member will see that if the quorum is 12 members 7 will be a majority whereas in the case of the quorum being 9 members only 5 could be a majority. The point is: What is the minimum number of members which you should have for passing legislation in this House? We still feel that this is not a Party question; and the number of measures which have been passed still make us feel that the number of members for forming a quorum should be 12.

The question that Clause 4 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative, the following division being taken:—

Ayes: Mr. SPEAKER, Messrs. FOSTER, ALLDER, MILLER, LEWIS, BRYAN, MAPP, COX, F. L. WALCOTT, ADAMS and GARNER—11.

Noes: Messrs. CRAWFORD, BRANCKER, MOTTLEY, GODDARD, BETHELL, GILL, E. K. WALCOTT, WILKINSON and WARD——9.

The remaining three Clauses of the Bill were read and passed.

Mr. CRAWFORD: During the course of my remarks earlier I suggested that we might utilise this opportunity to increase the number of constituencies. I should like your ruling, Mr. Chairman, as to whether or not the amendment which I suggested would constitute a charge on the Treasury and whether I should make the amendment here.

Mr. ADAMS: Does the honourable member seriously ask that question? If we put in any amendment which would be an addition to the 24 members of the House that would be a charge on the Treasury. It would mean £500 a year more to provide for two more seats.

The Schedule was read and agreed to.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

CULTIVATION OF TREES BILL, 1950.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph:—Second reading of a Bill for promoting the cultivation of trees and for purposes in connection therewith.

Mr. ADAMS: I suggest that we can be very brief in connection with this Bill. This Bill has already been passed by this House but it was not passed by the Other Place because it was suggested that the subsidy payment of six cents for each newly-planted tree was too small. Honourable members will remember that there was a tax contribution payment and a subsidy payment. I am instructed that the opinion was expressed that the subsidy payment of six cents was too small and that the amount should be fifteen cents. The Executive Committee agrees with that and this new Bill before us is the same as that which we have already passed with the exception of the substitution of fifteen cents instead of six cents as the subsidy payment for each newly-planted tree. In Clause 5 there is a proviso that no subsidy payment shall be made unless the Director of Agriculture certifies that the newly-planted trees are satisfactorily established. That is the only amendment to the Bill as already passed by the House. I suggest that in Committee the Clerk should just call the number of the Clauses without reading them through and hon-

ourable members will be at liberty to comment on any Clause. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

Mr. ALLDER: When this Bill was last discussed in this House I suggested that, as it was, the scheme would terminate in a failure. Honourable members have seen fit to make the amount of the subsidy payment for each newly-planted tree 15 cents, but I am still saying that the scheme will fail. If you pay a landowner 15 cents for the first year for every tree he plants that is not going to be considered as being sufficient incentive for him to employ a workman to purchase a tree and then plant it. What I do know would be a successful scheme is if the Government had made it compulsory for the landowners to plant whatever trees are wanted to be planted by the Government. There is much rab land of which no use is made; I know that the gullies and rab lands were once used by the plantation owners for grazing their oxen, but since the mechanization of the sugar industry these gullies and rab lands are not used and they just lie there unused. The plantation owner can get the assistance of the Department of Agriculture which will supply him with free advice and with some of the seeds to be planted in the gullies; and if you compel him to plant trees without compensation that will not be inflicting any hardship on him or doing him any wrong, because when the trees grow up he will reap the benefits from them. You would be surprised to know that there are mahogany trees which, when the owners sell them, they get about $400 or $500 for them; therefore you can easily see that the landowners are going to benefit from the sale of these trees. We know that this colony spends thousands of pounds in the importation of fuel from other West Indian colonies, nothing to do with the thousands of pounds which are spent on the importation of fresh fruit and canned vegetables from far afield, and in going into this question it does give one the impression that sufficient thought was not applied to the real situation as regards the economy of the colony. It must be realised that there is no inalienable right of a large landowner to keep and control large tracts of land without properly utilising them for the benefit of the colony; it is a fact that those who own and control the land are obligated, not as a question of charity, but there is a legal and moral obligation on them to plant food and other things which go to maintain a healthy state of the population. Even if it costs a landowner more than 15 cents to plant a tree it does not mean that the hardship is so great on him that the Government must subsidize the scheme, because the Agricultural Department is run at a very high cost to the colony. The Agricultural Department has been giving its services free to the planters and that has resulted in a very successful sugar industry; it has resulted in an acre of canes producing sometimes more than double the amount of sugar which it used to produce. That is why I feel that it can be considered as a very negligible demand if the Government were to say to the plantation owners: "You have rab land and gullies; you can have them planted and we are going to assist you with the technical staff from the Department of Science and Agriculture." It makes me feel vex when matters of this sort are so lightly gone into, and it further causes me some embarrassment as a member of the Party which supports the Government to see that on the last occasion when this Bill was discussed this amount of 6 cents as subsidy payment was in it, various suggestions were made and yet the Bill was passed. The suggestion came from the Opposition that the amount of the subsidy payment should be increased to 15 cents, and when the Bill went to the Other Place an amendment was made increasing the amount to 15 cents and the Government has seen fit to accept such an increase. It causes me to feel that it is a waste of time when we have an opinion about a Bill and we pass it, then it comes back from the Other Place with an amendment which is accepted. The landowners with their cohorts in that Place have gained the victory over us with this Bill and they will continue to gain victories until we become strong enough to say what we mean and do it. All over the world to-day Governments are making regulations regardless of how hard they may seem so long as the majority of people benefit; Governments are making regulations to see that the economy of their countries becomes more stable and that the majority of underprivileged people are provided with a greater supply of this world's goods. We will have to go far to follow in the footsteps of those countries, and I must say that I regret very much that this Bill has come back before us in its present form. I also regret that there are not sufficient members in this House who are sufficiently interested in the general economy of the colony as to weigh these matters carefully, and after doing so, to see that no measure passes this House unless their constructive opinions are carried to the councils of Government for their execution. When you compare the measures adopted by even smaller West Indian colonies than ourselves with those adopted here, it seems that there is a careless disregard for the real position of the colony. Even when suggestions are made by persons who have taken the time and the trouble to think of those suggestions and throw them out to the Government, there is that callousness and that unmannerly attitude on the part of those who are responsible to the Government and the people not to pay any attention to the views and opinions not only of members of this House but also of the public generally. I would like to know the reason why the Government should be so reluctant in making it compulsory on the landowners to plant trees and to stipulate that some of the trees be such as would help to produce some of the food which is imported and which the people of the colony have to purchase. I notice that a Clause of the Bill sets out that the Director of Agriculture has the right to recommend that a certain species of trees be planted and I notice that mahogany and casuarina trees are stipulated. I want to know if you stipulate these two kinds of trees why do you have to leave other species of trees so vague and not stipulated? Why should you give such wide and discretionary powers to the Director of Agriculture if you really want to have other trees in the scheme? Is it safer for such a decision to be left in the hands of the Director of Agriculture? Or is it better for the Government, knowing what is required for the betterment of the colony, to say that you must plant this tree or you must not plant that one. I am afraid that this scheme is not going to meet with any success because there is not that amount of incentive which would cause a landowner to plant these trees. As I said on the last occasion, the scheme is going to be a failure and we can only be satisfied with the situation if we merely intend to have fancy Acts on the Statute Book without their ever bringing us the success which they should bring.

I think I have threshed out some of the points which I wanted to thresh out, but although I have done so I shall sit down with regret as I have

seen that the Bill will be passed in its present form because of certain circumstances which are beyond a single member's control. I am still going to say that the future will show the wisdom and deep interest of individuals and Governments of the past. I do not want to hide my strong feelings in this matter; I still feel that a deeper interest should have been taken in it. It is a fact that in His Excellency's Speech at the re-opening of the Legislature there are certain suggestions and points raised, suggestions and points which are in accordance with the views expressed by many sections of the public. At a time when this colony is passing through a very difficult and adverse economic stage, such things as have been mentioned in that Speech were mentioned at the appropriate time, and it was hoped that some of the suggestions would have been considered for implementation; but instead of that you find that a Bill comes down here for the passing of what might or might not be a tidy sum from the Treasury. If some landowners are tricky enough they can go around, pull a few shrubs from here and there, plant them on their lands, collect 15 cents per tree, let them die off and you will find in the end that you have acted wrongly. Some landowners are not sufficiently interested in cultivating the necessary amount of foodstuffs for the population, and it was a marked example of their intention when a member of the Opposition suggested that it does not pay them to plant a tree of any sort much less a fruit tree because it costs them $1.00 for planting a tree. Not only that; the landowners are saying that when trees are planted in the gullies and rab lands, that prevents the growth of grass. Grass was an important item of animal food when they depended upon animals in carrying on the sugar industry; but now that this industry is mechanized there is not that necessity for the production of grass as there used to be. What is being done with the grass which grows on the plantations? It is just used for trashing the fields. To show how far they have gone from considering the general needs of the community I will say that they do not worry to take up the canetops because they find it necessary to allow them to remain on the ground and trash other fields. All the time the price of fodder is still high; small dairymen still find it difficult to get cheap fodder to feed their animals and thus assist in the production of milk. The mighty inflict injury for a time and the same means which they adopt for the destruction of others they in turn use to destroy themselves. Sometimes it causes me to wonder if people are the same when their position is changed. I feel that the same opinions expressed on platforms at mass meetings——

Mr. SPEAKER: What is expressed at mass meetings does not concern the subject-matter of this Bill; the honourable member is completely out of order.

Mr. ALLDER: I am sorry if I have caused your ire, Mr. Speaker; but I cannot help expressing myself in the manner in which I have done so. I feel that the subject at issue is very important to this colony and I am trying to awaken the interest of this House in this Bill which we are discussing. If I try several means to awaken that interest I hope that you will use the sympathy which I know you have and you will not take it that I am trying to sidestep the issue. I am speaking because I am acquainted with the real conditions of the people and some honourable members seem not to know or to care about them. It is only a question of taking advantage of the position of a certain section of the electors who are inarticulate. I feel that if a member has certain obligations he should be honest enough to carry them out in the interest of the community.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is chastising somebody rather than speaking on the merits of this Bill.

Mr. ALLDER: I will try to do anything to get honourable members to——

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot do anything.

Mr. ALLDER: What I mean to say is that I will try to do anything parliamentary to get honourable members to become interested and I will continue to speak until somebody other than myself takes an interest in what I feel is a matter of great concern. If a Bill of this nature implemented in the way it should be implemented, would help to bring about that condition of things which you say you want, should you not, as representatives of the people, implement it in that way? I know it might be thought that a hardship would be created on this or that person; but if by creating a few hardships you get better results for the community generally, then the strong and powerful and wealthy will be able to bear the hardships. You are in truth and in fact saying that you are not going to compel the landowners, some of whom individually own 2,000 acres, to plant the necessary trees which would help in bringing down the high cost of living for the poor people; but we must continue to buy charcoal from British Guiana, St. Lucia and other colonies whose resources are a thousand times better than ours and therefore their people can live without as much shame and misery as we have here. No compromising attitude is going to pull this colony out of the present economic condition. You are not saying that the landowners should be compelled to plant things which the community needs, but you will tell people that you must continue to buy these things from other colonies. Any Government can do what it likes so long as any action which it takes stands to benefit the majority and prevent people from dying from malnutrition and exposure. When the British Government had to fight the War they went to people and said: "You have to get out from here by such and such a time; we want these places because the conflict is on." But you are not asking people who are able to pull their weight to do so. The kind of system which we had in the past three hundred years is so entrenched that although its supporters are out of the House, their influence still carry a lot of weight. How then do you expect to make your period of ruling a successful one unless you use a strong hand as every other Government has had to use in the past if the people must be relieved of the evils that were carried on? Do you expect that any relief is going to come to you unless you fight for it? It is a joke and I am not so foolish as not to realize that you are aware of those conditions. Well, then, why not take action? What is the cause of the reluctance? Why this compromise and back-scratching weakness which is so apparent? It is time, Mr. Speaker, that the Government has to be one thing or the other. It has to state its policy but it not only has to put that policy on paper so as to be able to say "we have that too". Where are the successes? I have heard it mentioned on many occasions by those same landowners that they prefer to buy a pint of milk than to keep a cow and that they prefer to drive to town and buy a fruit than to plant a fruit tree. Yet they have land. Are we aware of what are the aims and objects of Governments which really want to bring their Countries out of the mire? It is no question of satisfying every mind;

you cannot; you must hurt a few but you do see today that by hurting a few you help the majority. If you make a regulation which demands that all plantation owners must plant every possible space which they have in whatever you like, the trouble is finished; they do it or the penalty is there. You tell people "Keep from the "Square" ', and and although that is not injurious to the welfare of the state, the Police have a plan for going into the "Square." The trouble is finished; you do not have to put 10 or 12 watchmen to watch the people going into the "square." But with this Bill you have to put your stipulations. Although land in this Country carries a large value according to the present market and although we suffer from a redundancy of population and although we cry out from day to day, yet you still see large tracts lying idle. A wise Government would say "Look, unless those open spots are made use of, their taxation would be carried up several times their actual value." That is all you have to do, if you think that with the population increasing every year and the unemployment list expanding — and the future offers no hope at all — you are going to get your problem solved by sitting down and using nice sounding terms and even passing certain Acts — which may taken by the thirsty individual as socialistic legislation — then the colony will continue to go from worse to worst. You must not only have legislation on the statute books of the colony but, you must see to it that that legislation benefits the people. Mr. Speaker. I have discussed this point at length and I must say again that I regret very much the slight and indiscreet way in which honourable members have been looking at it. I am going to sit down with the express hope that somebody will not have to pay for the commitments which they break. There is a natural law of the Universe, namely, that Cause brings its Effect and History has repeated itself on many occasions in the past. We have read in History that mountains fall and if mountains fall anything can happen.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I am sorry if anything I say is going to hurt the feelings of the honourable member because my remarks are not intended to hurt his feelings. But it is obvious that the honourable member is sensitive when he talks about honourable members on his left speaking while he is talking; the honourable member should realize that it is their bad luck because they miss something when they do not listen to his speech. I am going to give him a little advice, being an older member of this House than he is, and it is this: Shouting at other honourable members do not make them listen; they laugh and continue to talk among themselves. People do not listen to you when you tire them with long speeches and my further bit of advice to the honourable member is to make his speech short and crisp and other honourable members will listen to him. There was an honourable member of this House for many years—he is still alive—who never got one soul to listen to him because he spoke on every subject under the Sun and he was equally emphatic in every speech he made. Eventually whenever he got up to speak every other honourable member would say "Here is now a gush of words," although he used to make some good points. The senior member for St. John, in the course of his remarks, was trying to suggest that the Government, in this respect and in others, is blind to the needs of the poor people. When one talks so long and so warmly trying to hit somebody, one will contradict oneself as the honourable member did. Let me give a further bit of advice to the honourable member and I mean it purely as advice because we all take off our hats to the honourable member who has read and read and developed himself until he has found himself full of knowledge, more than ordinary education would give him. Like the senior member for St. Philip he reads the life history of people of his Races and other Races. But one of the things which a speaker must do is to train himself in such a way that when he has prepared a speech for an occasion and finds that it is not necessary to deliver that speech on that particular occasion he should change it. The last time this Bill was before the House the honourable member made the only point he has made to-day. He asked "why subsidize the planting of only casuarina and mahogany trees and not fruit trees as well ?" and I answered him. I told him that they are two different things altogether and that the Government was not shutting its eyes to the production of food and fruit. In 1907 an Act to consolidate the Acts of this Island relating to the Cultivation and Preservation of Trees was passed. The object of that Act is to encourage people to grow more trees and in November, 1948, a Committee of Seasonal Unemployment, of which Sir John Saint was Chairman and the junior member for St. Philip and myself were members recommended that the Act should be amended so as to give further encouragement to the planting and cultivation of trees in the island. The Committee, in their Report, stated *inter alia* :—"As the result of the War and the difficulty of importing firewood, the Government introduced a scheme for the free distribution of casuarina seedlings to anyone who was prepared to grow trees. Many owners of land have availed themselves of the opportunity to obtain free the planting material and a large number of casuarina trees has been grown. Your Committee considers that the Government should give further encouragement to the planting of trees in 'rab' land, particularly of trees such as mahogany which will eventually yield wood for the making of furniture. All owners of land could be encouraged to plant such trees through sour grass meadows and elsewhere by suitable amendments to the Preservation of Trees Act, 1907-10. Exemption from taxes could be given to other areas of land where trees are growing at spacings of up to 20 feet apart and such exemption should be continued after the felling of the trees; provided re-planting is carried out as soon as possible after the trees are felled. A further encouragement would be to alter section 5 of the Act, in order to permit the owner or attorney of land to submit to the Parochial Treasurer a sworn statement of the acreage of land on which trees are grown instead of a 'correct plot of land.' Consideration could be given to the granting of a bonus of, say, 15 cents per tree to cover the cost of planting and this bonus could be made repayable when the trees are felled." All that I stated last time in reply to the honourable member's speech but he got up to-day and made the same speech again. This Bill has nothing to do with food production or fruit production and the honourable member knows it because I told him so a few weeks ago. I told him that the Government is working on the intense production of food in this island. This Bill is intended for the planting of "rab" land and this Bill is to try to make more productive an Act that has been on the Statute Book for over 40 years and that was neglected to a great extent. The object of this Bill is to produce more firewood and the Unemployment Committee suggested that it would be a means of finding employment for people. When the honourable member talks about this Government being afraid to hit at big people or compel them to

do certain things, the absurdity of that statement is obvious. He went on to contradict himself by saying that the Director of Agriculture has too much power. We are giving the Director of Agriculture a big stick to enable him to inspect land on which the trees will be planted and to see that the Government is not wasting its money, yet the honourable member complains that the Director is being given too much power; that we would be wasting Government's money and that we are afraid to force big people to do certain things. I have told him, as a member of the Labour Party and as a member of the House supporting the government group, that the Government has under consideration food production and the intensification of it. He knows that this Government would not hesitate to tell every plantation owner to plant 40 per cent. of his land in food crops and see that they do it. It is very difficult for one to see, if one spends one's lifetime in opposition, that instead of building up one is destroying by one's opposition. I appeal to the honourable member to see that by chucking bricks he is not building up. Now, Sir, let me give the honourable member one or two facts to show whether or not we are trying to help poor people. The Director of Agriculture envisages the planting of 50,000 of these seedlings if there is enough rainfall during the months of October and November every year and provision is being made for a sum of money to extend the preparation work at Codrington. I mention that to let the honourable member see that it is something extensive that will be undertaken and that it will be a long term policy because no casuarina tree that is planted under this scheme will be cut down before six years have elapsed. Before I sit, if there is anything I have forgotten and the honourable member needs a specific reply I shall be glad to give it to him. But I do assure him that the Government is aware of all that he has said about the necessity of helping the poor; the Government is aware of all that he has said about the necessity of planting fruit trees. It has been the policy of previous Governments to distribute fruit trees to peasants and the honourable member must have seen fruit trees that were not here 10 or 15 years ago. I assure him again that as regards food production, both in a general way and on specific government lands, such as Dodds and Seawell, the Government is working out a scheme for the purpose. I hope that the honourable member in future would reserve his heavy artillery for something that is deserving of being shot at and not shoot at imaginary things. A stranger to Barbados listening to the honourable member would be impressed that the present Government is unmindful of the poor people in this island.

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. COX, Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 4 are called and are agreed to.

Clause 5. Where any approved trees growing on land in respect of which a tax contribution payment is payable under the provisions of the last preceding section have been planted during the accounting year to which the tax contribution payment relates, the owner of such land shall be entitled to receive at the end of the accounting year next following the year in which they were planted an additional payment (hereinafter referred to as a "subsidy payment") at the rate of fifteen cents for every tree so planted as aforesaid:

Provided that no owner shall be entitled to receive a subsidy payment under this subsection unless the Director of Agriculture issues a certificate to the effect that the trees are satisfactorily established.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—The members of the Government have to make a confession in respect of a strange oversight. The Executive Committee accepted the reccommendation of the Unemployment Committee that the subsidy payment should be fifteen cents but for some reason or other "six cents" was inserted in the Bill that was before the House on the last occasion and none of us saw the mistake. The Other Place is not forcing our hands by changing the subsidy payment to fifteen instead of six cents as we passed the Bill on the last occasion. It was always intended that it should be fifteen cents. I beg to move that Clause 5 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

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. COX, the CHAIRMAN reports the passing of the Bill in Committee.

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

THE ADJOURNMENT.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. COX, the House is adjourned to meet on Tuesday, 13th June, 1950, at 3 o'clock p.m.