

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1950—51

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 24th October, 1950.

Pursuant to adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 3 o'clock p.m. on the abovementioned date.

Present:

His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS (*Deputy Speaker*), Mr. L. E. SMITH (*Chairman of Committees*), Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Messrs. D. A. FOSTER, O. T. ALLDER, F. E. MILLER, R. G. MAPP, T. O. BRYAN, M. E. COX, F. L. WALCOTT, G. H. ADAMS, B.A., H. A. DOWDING, F. C. GODDARD, and J. H. WILKINSON, O.B.E.

Prayers are read.

Messrs. BRANCKER and MOTTLEY enter the House and take their seats.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 10th October, 1950, having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

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

Statement showing the Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for five months ended 31st August, 1950.

Report of the Registrar on the Vital Statistics for the year 1947.

Mr. CRAWFORD enters the House and takes his seat.

NOTICES

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$34,541 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1950—51, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1950—51, No. 27, which form the schedule to this Resolution.

In view of the urgency of one of the items in this Resolution I propose to ask leave to deal with the Resolution to-day. I shall explain fuller later.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$2,920 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. 28, which form the schedule to this Resolution.

This is a Resolution for a sum of money to make alterations to the New Steamers' Warehouse in order that the congestion in the Parcel Post Department of the General Post Office may be relieved.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to grant the sum of \$14,400 from the Public Treasury (to be subsequently refunded as a free grant under the provisions of the Colonial Development and Welfare Act on the terms and conditions stated in the Message from the House of Assembly to His Excellency the Governor, dated the 14th day of December, 1943) to be placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1950—51, Part II, Capital, as set out in the Supplementary Estimates 1950—51, No. 29, which form the schedule to this Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Of my intention to move the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 later in the day to deal with the first two Resolutions of which I gave notice to-day.

Mr. ADAMS: Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at the next meeting to deal with the third Resolution of which I gave notice earlier.

Dr. CUMMINS: Bill to make provision for holidays with pay for employees.

Mr. BRANCKER gave notice of the following Address:—

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency The Governor

The House of Assembly beg to draw to the attention of His Excellency the Governor the fact that acute colour and racial discrimination not only exist in the Union of South Africa but receive official approbation, and in fact the blessing of the Union Government and the majority of the population.

2. This House view such discrimination with profound abhorrence, and respectfully request that

Your Excellency take cognisance of their view of this matter.

3. The House feel that, under the circumstances, instructions should immediately be issued to the Control Board to refuse to grant Import Licenses in respect of South African goods.

4. His Excellency is invited to take such steps as are requisite to ensure that the Government of the Union of South Africa is fully apprised of the sentiment of the People of this Island towards the discriminatory policy adopted by that Government; and further His Excellency is requested to submit a copy of this Address to His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies with a request that same be transmitted to the Government of the Union of South Africa.

QUESTIONS

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

In view of:

- (a) The fact that the retiring age for Civil Servants has been appreciably reduced, making retirement with pension compulsory at 60 and optional at 55
 - (b) The fact that the qualifying age for receipt of an Old Age Pension in Barbados (68) is one of the highest in the B.W.I.
 - (c) The general enervating effect of working under tropical climatic conditions.
- will the Government take early steps either
- (a) To reduce the qualifying age for receipt of the Old Age Pension
 - (b) or to abolish the Means Test or vary it upwards.
 - (c) or to amend the Act to permit the Old Age pensioner to work for wages up to a stated maximum.
 - (d) or to establish a contributory pension scheme for agricultural workers.
 - (e) or to initiate a comprehensive Social Security Scheme for the entire island?

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

Has the attention of the Government been drawn to the following facts:—

- (a) That the colony's annual consumption of flour is now well over 22,400,000 lbs.
 - (b) That the subsidization of imported flour and balanced animal feed cost the colony in excess of \$673,000 annually.
 - (c) That there has been a considerable increase within the past few years in the cost of imported wheaten flour?
2. In view of
- (a) The Report released in March, 1950, by Mr. Heesterman, Consultant for Industrial Development to the Caribbean Commission, on the manufacture of flour in the British Caribbean area from imported wheat, to the effect that it would be quite economical for one British Caribbean colony to establish a flour mill to produce as little as 20,000 lbs. daily,—working for 250—300 days a year;
 - (b) the desirability of being able to make available locally different grades of super-quality, including whole-wheaten flour;

- (c) the opportunity provided of obtaining bran, a highly nutritious product for feeding dairy cattle and pigs;
- (d) the general advantages concomitant upon the establishment of a new industry;

will the Government reconsider its decision as expressed in a Reply to Questions asked in July of 1949, with reference to the practicability of manufacturing flour locally from imported wheat?

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

Will the Government introduce legislation making it compulsory for sugar plantations to provide

- (a) facilities for the making of pure drinking water available in the fields to workers.
- (b) sheds for shelter in case of sudden downpours of rain?

BILL READ A FIRST TIME.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, a Bill to make provision for holidays with pay for employees is read a first time.

SUSPENSION OF RULES 88 AND 89.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker: I beg to move that Rules 88 and 89 be now suspended.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I understand that one of the Resolutions of which notice was given earlier today is to provide funds for alterations to the New Steamers' Warehouse to remove the Parcel Post Department from its present position in the General Post Office. I happened to visit the Parcel Post Department quite recently and I can vouch for the necessity to endeavour to make that change as quickly as possible. But I did not hear the senior member for St. Joseph say what the other Resolution with which he desires to deal today is for and I should be glad if he would let us know. I quite agree that it is absolutely necessary to remove the Parcel Post Department as soon as possible.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am going to register my disapproval to the suspension of these Rules in order to deal with these Resolutions today for the simple reason that it is felt throughout this country that the Opposition is a sort of figure head. At every meeting of the House the senior member for St. Joseph moves for the suspension of one or both of these Rules because some measure should be dealt with immediately. The Leader of the Opposition has stated that he knows that the Resolution for the removal of the Parcel Post Department of the Post Office is a dire necessity but I know nothing about it. Surely, Mr. Deputy Speaker, something should be done to get copies of proposals in the hands of members before they come to this House. This is put in my hands today and you ask me to read it and contribute to the debate on it today. I do not think that that is fair to honourable members. The Government must have known before last Tuesday that there is necessity for the removal of the Parcel Post Department because it is a subject that has been discussed in the newspapers for some time now; no one can say that he has not heard about the congestion in the Parcel Post Department. It is true that the Resolution will be passed because the Government has the majority in this House and its supporters will say "Aye" like sheep but I am opposing it be-

cause I should be given time to consider the proposal. The people in this country do not elect one set of people; if they did, it would be a dictatorship. This is going too far. Nearly every meeting the honourable member comes to this House with some measure and says that he is going to ask for the suspension of these Rules in order to deal with it the same day. I am not voting for the suspension of these Rules.

Mr. ADAMS: When I gave notice of the Resolution for the sum of \$34,541, I distinctly said that there was one item in it that is of the utmost urgency. Read the note to item 20, Fire Fighting and Crash Equipment, under Head, Airport. It says: "The Airport Manager has reported that the fire fighting equipment at present in use at Seawell Airport is totally inadequate for the crash, fire and rescue services which are required at the Airport in accordance with the standards set by the International Civil Aviation Organisation. Complaints against the inadequacy of this equipment have also been received from Airlines Companies which use the Airport.... Enquiries from the Crown Agents for the Colonies reveal that a suitable Fire and Crash Tender is at present available at approximately \$23,160. Additional Crash equipment and chemical recharges will also be necessary but quotations for these have not yet been received.... To secure the Tender the order must be placed at once. As funds will not be required to pay for the equipment until after the end of the present financial year, token provision only is now required, and the necessary provision will be included in the Estimates of Expenditure for the next financial year...." All the other items in the Resolution have actually been passed because we have approved of them. If honourable members like, I would take the item relating to the Fire Fighting and Crash Equipment at Airport and deal with that first. It is no pleasure to the Government to come in here and ask that proposals be dealt with hurriedly. Sometimes I too query the absolute necessity of rushing a proposal through; so that I hope the honourable member, when he cools down, will realise that he went a bit too far in thinking that the Government has followers who are not equally as critical as he is. The honourable member, in calling honourable members on my right "sheep", seems not realize that he has colleagues who are "goats" and I am sure that he regrets now that he has made that statement. The House has agreed to the employment of these additional cooks at the Hospital and the longer this Resolution is postponed, the longer it will be before the additional cooks are employed. If the honourable member for the City agrees to the Resolution relating to the alteration to the New Steamers' Warehouse being dealt with today, while that is being considered, the honourable member would be able, by means of his mental agility, to gather from the notes to the other Resolution what it is all about. apologise for having to rush these proposals through the House but the Government has been presented with the necessity for getting these things through immediately.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—Being one of the "goats" and not one of the "sheep" I feel that I must support the objection of the honourable senior member for the City. This, Sir, is a well-known habit of the senior member for St. Joseph. If the Records were perused, I think I can safely say that it would be found that at least one out of every three meetings of this House, some matter has been rushed through without honourable members having been given the opportunity to study it beforehand. I have on several occasions, stated in no uncertain terms my objection to this manner of doing the business of this

colony; it is a haphazard manner and should not be encouraged by any member of this House. The senior member for the City is absolutely correct in his objection to these Resolutions being dealt with to-day. Unfortunately I cannot be very strong in my support because at the present moment I am under doctor's orders but I can assure honourable members that although my voice and my words may not be so strong today, I strongly object, and I call upon other honourable members to strongly object, to the way in which this Government's business is being run. This occurs meeting after meeting of this House and I appeal to the senior member for St. Joseph to try to cease this way of doing the Government's business in this House in the incorrect way.

Mr. GODDARD: Like the two previous speakers I must protest against the bringing of Resolutions to this House and asking us to consider them on the same day. I am willing at any time to assist the Government with any Resolution that is urgent but I should be given the opportunity to study beforehand proposals that are put before me in this House. If only token provision is now required for the Fire Fighting and Crash Equipment at the Airport I would appeal to the honourable member to take out that item, deal with it today and give us the opportunity to study the other items in the Resolution. I am sure that he would realize the reasonableness of our request and accede to it.

The question that Rules 88 and 89 be now suspended is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

MR. ADAMS REFUTES STATEMENTS IN THE PRESS BY MR. MACINTYRE

Mr. ADAMS: Before the business of the day is entered upon, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is a matter which I should like to draw to the attention of the House. I have not given sufficient attention as to whether it is a matter of privilege nor have I made investigation either through the Official Reporter or through files in the Secretariat. I am referring to a letter that appears in the Advocate newspaper. I did not see a copy of this issue of that newspaper until this afternoon, inasmuch as my newspapers are delivered at my house and I am not at present at home. I am sorry that I do not have all the facts at my finger-tips in order to be able to reply to these libellous, damnable statements. I am accused by Mr. Macintyre of making inaccurate statements in this House and I propose to get all the documents to which I referred at the last meeting of this House before I make a full official reply.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will ask the honourable member not to read the letter in the newspaper.

Mr. ADAMS: I am accused of making inaccurate statements—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the honourable member just let me make my position clear? The Rules of this House will not permit the honourable member to read from a newspaper. If the honourable member wants the House to take the matter up and not deal with it privately I would ask him to put in the whole newspaper and ask for the appointment of a Select Committee to investigate it, particularly as he himself has said that he had not had time to do so.

Mr. ADAMS: It is for Your Honour to rule, but I take it that the Rule relating to the use of newspapers does not apply in this case.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable member prepared to help me, as to whether at this stage I should consider it a matter for the House to

deal with or whether it should be dealt with privately?

Mr. ADAMS: I do not say that the House should deal with it. I am prepared to make an explanation now. I am not sheltering behind any parliamentary privilege. I have been accused of making inaccurate statements. I have not even discussed the matter with my colleagues on the Executive Committee but I cannot let a moment pass without giving a full refutation to this accusation. I am not saying anything offensive of the "Advocate" or any other newspaper because it is difficult to take down what we say in this House and it is even more difficult for any newspaper to find space to report all of what we say here. If I make any suggestion that I was badly reported it is not any reflection on the Reporters because the newspaper that supports the Government has the worst account of the debate that took place on this subject on Tuesday last. I am accused of an inaccurate statement in saying that the negotiations between the Government and the British Union Oil Company broke down as a result of the demand of the Company that they be given the sole right to sell gas within the radius of $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles of their existing pipe lines.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am accepting what the honourable member is saying now as a personal explanation.

Mr. ADAMS: I am saying that I am making a personal explanation. I am going to advise that there should be an official explanation on the floor of the House when the actual documents are available to the House. What I said was that there were a series of negotiations and that finally those negotiations broke down after the Government had, as far as possible, attempted to arrive at a solution based on the Government's intention to put the Company back in the same position it would be in if the Petroleum Act was not passed; that when this demand was asked, the Government could not give way to them. The accusation is that that is an inaccuracy. It is stated that that proposition was put up as a basis for negotiations—that is one of the most inaccurate statements, "as a basis for negotiations," that could be possible made—and that what actually happened was that when the Company asked for protection for their reservoir of gas, the Government was unwilling to give that protection and that that caused the breakdown in the negotiations. I am not going to mince my language; that is a damnable lie. That is not a reckless misstatement; that is saying something that you know to be untrue. I have seen correspondence from the time that the Government was dealing with the question of licences to bore for petroleum. We have remained quiet so far but judged from this correspondence, Mr. Macintyre is a pathological prevaricator. People sometimes lie to save themselves. We can forgive even the committing of perjury sometimes to save oneself or save someone near to oneself but when a man says something that can be mathematically proved to be untrue you can only say that his position is pathological. I digress for a moment to say that the word "nationalization" is used as if we are now nationalizing whereas we nationalized natural gas by the passing of the Petroleum Bill last April. With this part of Macintyre's letter I shall deal after I have seen the actual words reported by the Official Reporter.

I read to the House a portion of the Solicitors' letter but what I have not told the House, and I will tell it now to show whether this rejoinder has an atom of truth in it, is this: The Company wanted not only protection of the 100 acres nearest to their wells but also the sole right to sell gas within a radius of $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles alongside their pipe line, and this is what I have not told the House: Their Solicitors'

letter states: "Even if you grant us No. 1 and protect our reservoir it is useless to us without No. 2. What is the good of having the gas if we have no customers to sell it to?" That, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is why negotiations broke down, and then Mr. Macintyre comes with this letter and wants to tell the public that I am lying. I am going to call him a liar outside this House, so that he should not think that I am sheltering under parliamentary privilege. And I am going to take care that that letter of the Solicitors is made available to the House to see the whole action of the Company and the emphasis that "without the monopoly it would be of no use to us." I apologize to the House for taking up so much time but this is a matter that affects not only myself but also the Government and I, as the mouthpiece of the Government, am putting forward the Government's case. I thank the House for its indulgence in listening to me.

Mr. GILL entered the House while Mr. ADAMS was speaking and took his seat.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 60

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Rule 60 is suspended.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I beg to move that Order No. 5 be taken as the first Order of the day.

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

The question that Order No. 5 be taken as the first Order is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The first Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph,—To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Government.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply and that it be an instruction to the Committee of Supply when the House is in Committee of Supply, to consider the money Resolutions for \$34,541 and \$2,920 respectively, of which I gave notice to-day.

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

The question that Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction to the Committee of Supply, when the House is in Committee of Supply, to consider the money Resolutions for \$34,541 and \$2,920, respectively, of which notice is given to-day is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

RESOLUTION TO MEET EXPENSES *re* ALTERATIONS TO NEW STEAMERS' WAREHOUSE

ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—The first Resolution, I propose to take, is for the sum of \$2,920 to meet expenses in connection with the alterations to the New Steamers' Warehouse. The addendum to the Resolution states:—"Owing to the congested state of the parcel post branch of the General Post Office, it has been necessary for the Colonial Postmaster to take over the ground floor of the New Steamers' Warehouse on the Wharf as a Parcel Post Office. Before this space can be used, however, it will be

necessary to make certain alterations and to provide fixtures which are estimated to cost \$2,920." I just want to remove any impression that the Government would not have done anything in this matter if a row had not taken place at the Chamber of Commerce. I regret that the member of the Chamber of Commerce who raised the question at a meeting of that body did not go and see the Colonial Postmaster. If he had done so, he would have known some of the things that Mr. Lucie-Smith told the Chamber and something more. The volume of parcels has increased considerably and the congestion is due partly to the increased volume of trade through the parcel post and partly to the fact that when parcels arrive traders would not take them out in time. The Government has been dealing with the situation for some time and it agrees with its greatest critics that the conditions should not be allowed to remain as they are; that is why I am asking this Committee to deal with this Resolution forthwith. The Control Board has had notice to move; the question of shifting the Savings Bank is becoming pressing; even this House is beginning to think of the possibility of its Clerk being in a less congested area. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to second that motion. There is only one addition I would like to make so that honourable members may realize the urgency of this matter. Da Costa & Co. Ltd. are now calling for the top floor of their building which is occupied by the Control Board and the Government is in the invidious position that the Controller of Supplies and his staff must get out of that building by the 1st December. Again, we may be forced very soon to come back to acquire more accommodation in the City for the Post Office.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman,—I happened to be at the New Steamers' Warehouse when the Colonial Postmaster was making arrangements for the removal of the Parcel Post Department to that building and he was questioning whether he should occupy a portion of the bottom floor or the whole of it. I suggested to him to occupy the whole of it because in a couple of months he would need more space if he occupied only a portion. It will be adequate space for the Parcel Post Department. The business of that Department, both in-coming and outgoing, has increased considerably and there is not sufficient protection at present for the parcels that are received by it. Messrs. Da Costa & Co. Ltd. have called upon the Government to give up that part of their building which is occupied by the Controller of Supplies and his staff because they want the necessary space to store their goods. It is to be noted that the part of the building from which the Parcel Post is being removed will be vacant but presumably the Postmaster will need the space for elbow room in other departments of the Post Office. I do hope that when the time comes to find a place for the Controller of Supplies they will not put him too far from Bridgetown proper. I think that Roebuck Street is a very suitable locality because he has to do business with the traders in Roebuck Street more than with traders in any other part of the City. The necessity for this Resolution is urgent and I hope that the changes will be made in time for the Christmas rush which is just around the corner.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am supporting this Resolution because I think it is necessary and should be passed to-day. We can quite appreciate the excuse which the honourable Leader has given for rushing this Resolution through today but the same excuse cannot be accepted in respect of the other Resolu-

tion. As regards this Resolution and the alterations to be made, no one is questioning the amount because the work is being done by the Colonial Engineer.

Mr. WILKINSON: I have said on previous occasions that I object to measures being rushed through the House but, as I said earlier to-day, I intend to vote for this Resolution because I know the necessity for it. I can tell the honourable senior member for St. Joseph that whoever is looking after the matter, had at least 2½ months to get this Resolution ready. At least a month's notice has been given in respect of the tenancy with Da Costa & Co. Ltd. and it is nearly the end of October; so that I do think that this Resolution could have been before this House at least on last Tuesday. I have visited the Post Office and the Colonial Postmaster took me around and showed me the congestion in the Parcel Post department. It is disgraceful. How they manage to carry on beats me entirely. The honourable introducer of the Resolution said that the congestion is due to the fact that many traders in Bridgetown order goods through the Parcel Post and when those goods arrive they do not take them out in time. That may be true to a certain extent but I think that the real reason is that the package tax has increased to such an extent that people find it cheaper to order parcels in smaller packages; also there is a large quantity of sugar that is shipped from this island every week to the United Kingdom through the Parcel Post. What has persuaded me to vote for this Resolution to-day is what has been mentioned by one of the speakers, that is, the Christmas season is very close and we are sure to have an influx of parcels in the coming weeks. I do hope that every effort will be made to get the work done quickly and shift the Parcel Post department over to the New Steamers' Warehouse on the Wharf.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY VOTES FOR DEPARTMENTS.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—Despite the intimation of certain honourable members I am still asking the Committee to deal with the other Resolution for \$34,511. I do not suppose I can feel as indignant as the honourable members of the Opposition but I ask them to believe me when I say that all these proposals are passed by us, members of the Executive Committee, who have to get up at a moment's notice sometimes to answer questions, and to that extent we know all about them. I give honourable members my solemn assurance that for the future I will not even handle anything, the urgency of which could not have been foreseen. As the junior member for St. James said, if a matter has been in the hands of the Government for some weeks, the Government could discover whether or not it is a matter of urgency and I give the Opposition the assurance that matters that can remain over will be allowed to remain over. The only reason why I ask honourable members to deal with this Resolution to-day is because all these items have been approved of, except No. 1 which is something that could not be foreseen. As regards the Hospital the number of patients being treated with these new expensive drugs has increased and the money which was provided in the Estimates for that purpose has run out; that is the reason why we have come for this additional \$25,000. I am always very chary about touching requests from the Hospital. When I was in the opposition I always used to ask "What has happened

to the Surgeons' instruments and the Surgeons' gloves? That was two years ago and I have not got the reply yet. However, I am asking honourable members to see that this is nothing over which they need to have long consideration.

Mr. WILKINSON: On a point of order. We, on this side of the table distinctly understood that the honourable member would deal with the item, Fire Fighting and Crash Equipment, for the Airport only and it was with that understanding that we voted for the suspension of Rules 88 and 89, as far as this Resolution is concerned. If the honourable member persists in dealing with all the items in this Resolution to-day I shall ask my Party to leave the House.

Mr. ADAMS: If I gave an undertaking and went back on my word the honourable members would really be goats if they did not leave the House. I particularly used the phrase "mental agility" in my opening remarks and said that I had no doubt that while we were considering the other Resolution honourable members would by means of their mental agility find out what the other items in this Resolution are about from the notes. I said that the urgent item in the Resolution was the fire Fighting and Crash Equipment for the Airport. I never said that I would deal with that alone and postpone the others. I said that I would deal with that first. The junior member for St. James has put me in an awkward position because if I were to give way it would appear that I am moved by his threat to walk out. I am not. If honourable members say, even now, that there is not enough time for them to consider or to remember what they have already agreed to, such as the giving of additional staff to the Hospital, and that they want more time I am perfectly prepared to give more time. But I do resent the suggestion that I have got honourable members on my left to agree to the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 on a wrong premise.

Mr. WILKINSON: It seems to me that there is an unfortunate misunderstanding somewhere. We, on this side of the table definitely understood that the honourable member would deal with the item, Fire Fighting and Crash Equipment for the Airport only and I repeat that it was with that understanding that we voted for the suspension of Rules 88 and 89.

Mr. ADAMS: I promise the honourable member now that I shall deal with the item in respect of the Airport only. The senior member for St. Thomas is not likely to return to-day and, frankly, he should deal with the items relating to the Hospital. I suggest that we vote this dollar for the Fire Fighting and Crash Equipment for the Airport, so that the Crown Agents can go ahead and secure it, and postpone the consideration of the other items. I ask leave to amend the Resolution by deleting the words "thirty-four thousand five hundred and forty one dollars" and substituting therefor the words "one dollar."

There being no objection the leave is granted the honourable member and the Resolution is amended accordingly.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that the Resolution as amended, do now pass.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: In support of this Resolution I want to ask whether the Government owns the goats that are to be seen on the air base at times.

Mr. ADAMS: The Government owns no goats at least not at Seawell. The Government may own some goats at one of the Agricultural Stations. The

Government has been informed that the Regulations which the House recently passed are sufficiently comprehensive to remove the danger of straying animals—four-legged or otherwise—from the air base.

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

RESOLUTION TO PURCHASE PLAYGROUND FOR ST. CHRISTOPHER'S GIRLS' SCHOOL

Mr. ADAMS: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is for the sum of \$377 to purchase land as a playground for St. Christopher's Girls' School. I may say that this is not one of the schemes foreshadowed in the Estimates. This has arisen since but it is an urgent matter,—urgent in the sense that we can get the land now,—and the Government feels it should come with this separately, even though it has a scheme of a comprehensive nature. I feel sure that the senior member for Christ Church will get up before the junior member for Christ Church and say what a wonderful thing it is that the Government has managed on this occasion to get land comparatively cheap as a playground for the school I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. GODDARD: I do commend the Government (Hear, hear,) on this occasion on seeing the necessity of having available space for the school-children of that particular area. I hope that the Government will approve of my suggestion that a large sum be included in the Estimates to provide playgrounds for all the schools in the island and not only those in Christ Church. I commend the Government on getting land in Christ Church for this purpose at so reasonable a price. My calculation of the price works out at a little over 1d. a square foot for this land and I am wondering who the vendor is (Smiles).

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. Cox, the CHAIRMAN reports the passing of three Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

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

THE BARBADOS FANCY MOLASSES PRODUCTION AND EXPORT (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS

Mr. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I ask that Order No. 6 be taken as the next Order.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Michael,—To move the passing of a Resolution to approve Regulations made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee under section 6 of the Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export Act, 1937 (1937-14).

Mr. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—Regulation 5 of the Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export Regulations says:—"No person shall export fancy molasses during any crop year unless he shall first satisfy the Comptroller of Customs that the producer has been paid therefor at a rate not less than that which shall be fixed by the Governor-in-

Executive Committee on the advice of the Board and approved by both Houses of the Legislature." These amending Regulations seek to permit the exportation of fancy molasses by any person or persons between the commencement of the crop year and the time when the price to the producer for such molasses has been fixed. In other words, these amending Regulations will give the exporter the right to export fancy molasses before paying the producer. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

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

THE BARBADOS FANCY MOLASSES PRODUCTION AND EXPORT (AMENDMENT)
BILL, 1950, NO. 2

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Michael—Second reading of a Bill to amend the Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export Act, 1937—No. 2.

Mr. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—As will be seen from the "Objects and Reasons," this Bill seeks to permit the sale and exportation of fancy molasses in containers of 10 wine gallons each in order to encourage the canning of such molasses and to establish a market therefor. I think that honourable members are aware of the fact that there are at present in this island certain producers who can molasses in 2-lb tins and export it. This Bill seeks to allow the canning and the exportation of fancy molasses in containers of 10 wine gallons each. It has been explained to me that the object of this is to encourage these producers to can molasses and build up a market for it. I do not think that I need say much more. If there is anything which any honourable member wants to know I shall be only too willing to give him such information as I have before me. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 1 and 2 inclusive are read and are agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. Cox, 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. Cox, seconded in each case by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, the Bill is read a third time and is passed.

AN ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I think it is time now for us to adjourn. On the last occasion the senior member for St. Joseph promised that we would meet only for a short period to-day and I personally have made an appointment for later this afternoon. I am suggesting to him that we adjourn now until this day fortnight; for, believe me, I am just as anxious to get the Select Committee's Report on the Public Utilities Bill before this House as he is. It has just been brought to my notice that the Resolution relating to the requirements for the Hospital is urgent; therefore, Sir, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day week, Tuesday, 31st October, at 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

Mr. ADAMS: I would like to remind the honourable member and other honourable members that we voted ourselves a sum of money to do work. If we have got through Government's Business by 5 p.m., there is no reason why we should not do some Private Members' Business after tea. Of course, it is a matter for honourable members. Complaints are made that the Government's Business takes up all the time of the House and that honourable members cannot get any private work done. We have the opportunity now, let us do some Private Members' Business. I sympathize with the junior member for St. James if he is not feeling fit but there is no reason why others should follow him, in this respect. I understand that there is at least one honourable member who is willing to continue a debate on certain questions asked by him and, therefore, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am seconding the motion of the junior member for St. James. I should be the last honourable member to move the adjournment of the House when there is business to be done. The Leader of the House has admitted that there is no more Government Business to be done to-day. The first Order under Private Members' Business is in the name of the senior member for St. George and his absence shows that he has no intention of going on with it to-day. I am sorry to say this but it is true: if you go through the Order Paper you will realize what an absolute waste of time—and also money—there is. You will discover that nearly all the members of the Party supporting the Government are flooding the Order Paper with Addresses, the subject matter of which the leaders of their Party who are members of the Government pledged that they would bring down to this House—

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable member is out of order. He cannot make a reflection like that on members of the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I repeat that the Members of the Government pledged themselves all over the island to bring down legislation to effect all the social reforms to which these Addresses on the Order Paper refer—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member must be careful because he is criticizing items on the Order Paper which have been already approved by the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I may be out of order but my criticism is true. When I first came into the House I did all these things too but experience has shown me that it is a waste of time and money. If the Government convinces me that it has something to do I will stay here until 10 o'clock to-night and assist in doing it. I see nothing wrong in the idea that the House should be adjourned at this stage for a week.

The question that this House do now adjourn for half an hour is put and resolved in the affirmative, the division being as follows:—

Ayes. Messrs. SMITH, FOSTER, MILLER, ALLDER, MAPP, BRYAN, COX, F. L. WALCOTT, and ADAMS—9.

Noes. Messrs. MOTTLEY, DOWDING, GODDARD, GILL, and WILKINSON—5.

The House is accordingly adjourned until 5.30 p.m.

REPLIES LAID

On re-assembling.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to lay on the Table the Replies to Questions No. 11, standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. John, relative to the supply of fresh cow's milk to Elementary Schools;

the Reply to Question No. 42, standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy, relative to the granting of a Bank Holiday in honour of the victorious West Indian Cricketers; the Replies to Questions No. 25, standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. John relative to wood ants at St. Margaret's School; and the Reply to Question No. 38 standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas relative to latrine accommodation at Police Courts.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: On behalf of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas, I beg to lay the Replies to Questions No. 10, standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas; and the Replies to Questions No. 40, standing in the name of the same honourable member.

Mr. COX: I beg to lay the Replies to Questions No. 17, standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Philip; and the Replies to Questions No. 41, standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Joseph.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. WILKINSON: I beg to move that Order No. 41 standing in my name be taken as the first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg second that.

The question that Order No. 41 be taken as the first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

VESTRIES (AMENDMENT) BILL 1950

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business now stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. James—Second reading of a Bill to amend the Vestries Act, 1911.

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker.—This is a Bill with which I think all honourable members will agree; it affects all Vestries. In 1911 the Vestries Act was passed stating that owners of houses of a value smaller than £7. 10s. per annum or \$3 a month must not be rated. My experience as a Vestry man both in St. Michael and in St. James has been that in recent years we always have to give relief to owners of houses of a value of less than \$8.00 a month. At present a lot of extra work has to be done; the Assessor has to go around and assess every house even if it is only worth \$3.00 a month, and that causes a lot of expense and a lot of annoyance to householders who afterwards fill in forms for tax relief to be placed before the Vestry. I think that people who own houses of a value of less than \$8. a month should not be rated. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. GILL: I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for the second reading of this Bill. In my opinion, this amendment is long overdue. As far back as 1911 when the Vestries Act was enacted it was laid down that persons owning houses of a smaller annual value than £7. 10s. were exempt from taxation. People who owned houses of the annual value of £7. 10s. had to pay taxes. In those days it was reasonable to exempt from taxation owners of houses of a smaller annual value than £7. 10s. or \$3 a month; but to-day more or less any chattel house would fetch \$3 a month and an extreme hardship is created on those persons who have to pay these taxes. I know that relief has been granted by some Vestries but unfortunately it has not been granted in every

case. Again I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. SMITH: I am very glad that this Bill is before us this afternoon, and honourable members will remember that I tabled an Address relative to the rating of these small houses. It really creates a hardship on those poor people who have to pay taxes on their small chattel houses. In the days when this law was enacted you would have to own a mansion so as to realise \$3.00 a month; but nowadays a fowl's coop is valued at more than \$3.00 a month. As long as the price of lumber continues to increase these small houses will be rated. I know that in some districts there are some very unscrupulous assessors; in my parish there are those who have to be rated on their houses but they are definitely not in a position to pay. When they go to the Tax Relief Committee they are told: "We have not made the law, go to Mr. Adams and Mr. Smith." When this law was being made, I do not know for Mr. Adams, but I am sure that Mr. Smith was not yet born. (Laughter). I am only too glad that the honourable junior member for St. James has brought forward this Bill this afternoon in order to get the Act amended; I am sorry that he did not see his way to put the figure up to £30. Next year the same people whom we are now trying to relieve will be back in the same position according to the rise in the price of lumber. I compliment the honourable junior member for St. James on having got the chance before me to bring forward this Bill. I brought up this matter by way of an Address, but the honourable member who is an older politician than I am, has brought it up by way of a Bill. The honourable member has brought forward this Bill but he still has to rely on other honourable members for support. I am very glad that the poor people in the country districts will be relieved of this taxation; small houses should not be affected by this Act being on the Statute Book. I know a man who offered to sell his house and rent one because he says that he is not in a position to pay taxes on it. I had to try and persuade that man not to sell his house. I repeat that I am glad that this Bill is before the House this afternoon.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is expected by honourable members that I would add my quota to this Bill; I do not think it is necessary for me to say that this Bill will always have my blessing. In St. Michael we have not got any unscrupulous assessors, but if you were to keep to the letter of the law in the assessment of chattel property which is worth \$3.00 a month, with the increased cost of living and the increase in rents, there would hardly be a house in St. Michael which would not be worth 75 cents a week. Those of us who are humane and considerate fully realise that the rating of these small houses would not be in keeping with the spirit of the law. I fully appreciate that the spirit of the law was not to rate people who will be rated today. In St. Michael there are thousands of houses and although Vestrymen by law could not tell the assessors at what figure they should rate those houses, in conference with the assessors it was felt that in view of the rise in the standard of living and the cheapness of money a direction should still be given to the assessors in order to assist them in their duties. It was suggested that the assessors should not rate those people who would come in for being rated by the letter of the law. If you take the Bay Estate with the several hundred houses there, 99.9% of those houses would be rated according to the letter of the law; but if you were to peruse the Rate Book of the parish you will find that about 10% of these houses are rated. I am very glad to see that the honourable junior member for St. James has

brought forward this amendment and it will cause many people in St. James to pay higher taxes. As soon as you increase the exemption, if the necessary money must be raised for carrying out social improvements, the rates of other taxpayers will be raised; but the honourable member is mindful of the small taxpayer. I would remind honourable members that Highway and Police taxes which are supposed to be laid by the Vestry as laid down by the law, are only applicable to people, who own real property. I rose strongly to support the motion for the second reading of this Bill, because even in St. Michael although Vestrymen have been rather considerate, and do not tell assessors what they should do, many people feel that Vestrymen are responsible for the rates fixed on houses. If it is felt that this Bill has been brought in respect of the parish of St. James, any honourable member has the right to move an amendment. We in St. Michael will be only too willing to relieve certain sections of the community who otherwise must apply for tax relief, which is not a very nice thing to do. I have much pleasure in supporting this Bill and I do not anticipate that it will meet with any opposition. With the exemption being increased and with the Occupancy Tax having been abolished people will be called upon to pay a greater amount of taxes; but the poor will always be with us and it is our duty to relieve them.

Mr. ADAMS: Every member of this House is glad to see the poor people relieved; it is all very well to bring forward these matters, but they are all provided for in the Maude Report which is to a certain extent being held up only through the printing. I do not want honourable members to feel that the Government has not taken steps to remove these anomalies, I am only pointing out that this is only one of the anomalies to be removed. Another anomaly to be removed is that of a trader telling a Vestry: "You have to accept the amount which I send in." Nothing could be worse than that. I am sorry that the honourable junior member for St. James has not taken the opportunity of going down to posterity and undoing what previous merchants have done for the benefit of themselves and their fellow merchants. To put a section like that on the Statute Book—(Mr. MOTTLEY: There is no such section) — the honourable member will get an explanation from the honourable member on his right (Mr. REECE) who will tell him what the law is. Nobody wants to detract from the good which the honourable member is doing by drawing attention to this matter, but that is only one thing which has to be taken up in the Vestries Act in view of the Maude Report. This whole question as to how rating should be done has given the Government, and I believe, Sir John Maude, more trouble than anything else; I did not meet Sir John Maude in Barbados but I met him in England, and he said that he would give his views on the question of rating. We want to arrive at a solution which is fair to traders and at the same time reasonable sums must be raised. It is admirable to pick off these little things but I hope that when the Government is ready with the Bill which deals with these little things, honourable members will have everything at their finger tips so that we will get through with the Bill. I hope that honourable members will remember all these anomalies and be in position to deal with the Bill without its being referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the Bill to implement the Maude Report be printed before it is actually introduced in the House?

Mr. ADAMS: I cannot answer that question at the present moment; because of the length of that

Bill there was a suggestion made that for the benefit of honourable members it might be possible to get it set up and brought before the House. It was difficult to get people doing their ordinary work to type this Bill which is comprised of 230 sections and about 16 or 17 schedules; it is nearly three times as long as the Public Health Bill which we had before us. It is not that the Government has forgotten all these points, but the Bill is a very lengthy one and that has caused us to be behind hand in bringing it before the House.

Mr. FOSTER: I would like to point out that under the Act as it is at present, the owners of these small houses are rateable. The Vestry, being administrators of the law, are bound to rate the owners of these small houses, and there is where I differ from the honourable member on my right (Mr. SMITH). It is not, as some people think, that the Vestry take advantage of the poor taxpayers; the law is there and the Vestry have to carry it out. The honourable senior member for the City spoke about the St. Michael's Vestry instructing the assessors—

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. I said that the Vestry cannot tell the assessors what to do; the Vestry appoint the assessors and they have no further say with them. I further said that in case you have a wide-awake Vestry and you saw the standard of living going up and the value of money going down, you could have a conference with the assessors.

Mr. FOSTER: I regret that I misquoted the honourable member. However, the law is there and I repeat that it is not that the Vestry take advantage of the poor taxpayers. The law as it stands does create a hardship on the poor people and I heartily support the motion for the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. GODDARD: I commend this Bill to honourable members, and like the honourable senior member for St. Andrew, I feel that it is long overdue. If in 1911 the owners of houses of a smaller annual value than \$3.00 a month were exempted, it is quite reasonable that today owners of houses of a smaller annual value than \$8.00 a month should be exempted. In St. Michael when laying the rates we have to put in an estimate for tax relief. Until the abolition of the Occupancy Tax the amount which we remitted to the poor was in the vicinity of \$30,000; when we abolished the Occupancy Tax that amount was reduced and I think the amount is now in the vicinity of \$24,000 which is remitted to the poor in the form of tax relief. There are stacks of applications for tax relief which we have to go through periodically and they run from June to December. We give relief to pensioners but as the law stands at present they must be rated. This Bill will relieve Vestrymen of much work and it will relieve the work of having to bill people who cannot afford to pay the taxes which they are now called upon to pay. In Christ Church we remit about \$3,000 and this Bill will obviate the necessity for having to assist the poor people whom we now have to assist.

Mr. REECE: It seems to me that this Bill has not been carried far enough. If you look at the Vestries Act, Section 53 (2) you will see that persons who derive a net annual profit of £5 in respect of trade are liable to be taxed thereon. That is an extremely low figure and I regret that the honourable junior member for St. James in introducing this amendment had not seen fit also to increase the exemption in respect of traders. The arguments of my colleague, the honourable senior member for Christ Church, are equally applicable to traders. It seems to me to be a complete waste of good time to be

sending tax bills to small traders who will send in applications for relief and those applications will be granted; it is a waste of time to have to go through this long procedure instead of putting an Act on the Statute Book to exempt these people from taxation. Be that as it may, I am perfectly sure that the owners of chattel houses of the annual value of £7. 10s. per annum will be exceedingly grateful for the present amendment introduced by the honourable junior member for St. James. There can be no doubt that every chattel building in the island must be worth more than £7. 10s. per annum, and particularly in Christ Church where rooms in some houses are let to separate tenants, it is arguable whether each of those tenants was not rateable in respect of occupancy which we are pleased to see is no longer the law of the country because of Your Honour's activities; but even rooms in houses are today valued at more than £7. 10s. rent per annum, to say nothing about the houses themselves, so that this amendment will give relief to a large number of persons, who owing to the rising cost of living, can ill afford to pay this taxation. The point which has been taken by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph should be noted; under Section 8 of the Act in case there is a disagreement between a trader and the Vestry the Vestry have the right to appoint an auditor to go into the business, but then the auditor can only function with the approval of the trader. I would like to say from my experience as a lawyer, that I have seen not only big traders but small traders take advantage of the word "approve", and as a result Vestries find great difficulty in arriving at the proper figure at which those traders should be assessed. If that word were taken out of the Act, the owners of businesses would have no say by way of objection to an auditor going into those businesses. I know that this Bill will give relief to a large number of owners of houses who cannot afford to pay taxation, but at the same time I regret that it has gone further to include owners of small businesses who also find it difficult to pay taxation.

Mr. MAPP: I did not expect that this Bill would be considered this afternoon and I did not take the opportunity to look up the law in this respect. I have noted the arguments of honourable members and it seems that there is a consensus of opinion that the figure should be made even more than £20. It is considered that owing to the high cost of living people owning small houses will be saddled with a burden if the exemption were allowed to remain where it is; but it would be well for the House to consider that part of Section 53 of the Act where persons carrying on trade and earning a net annual profit of £5 are liable to be rated. Surely if you are going to raise the amount in respect of persons owning small houses, it would be only fair to raise the amount in respect of persons carrying on trade. If the figure of £5 in respect of taxation was fair in 1911 or even in 1939, no one could say that it is fair today with the cost of living being what it is and with smaller profits earned. I think that persons carrying on trade should also be assisted by putting the exemption at a higher figure. When we go into Committee on this Bill I shall move an amendment that the figure in respect of the exemption where persons carrying on business are concerned be changed to a higher figure unless the honourable introducer will move the amendment himself.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I should like to point out that there is a principle involved in this matter; this Bill has been published in the *Official Gazette* and no doubt vestrymen all over the island have read

it. I should also like to point out that there is a difference between giving an exemption in respect of the annual rental value of houses and giving an exemption on declared profits after expenses have been taken out.

Mr. MAPP: I am not clear if Your Honour is giving a ruling or giving reasons why the amendment should not be made.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am pointing out that there is a difference in principle.

Mr. MAPP: I shall be moving an amendment to this Bill as I have suggested.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: My ruling would be that such an amendment would be out of order.

Mr. MAPP: I quite gather the force of Your Honour's ruling, that people who will be affected will have been forewarned.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am drawing to the honourable member's attention that there is a difference in principle in allowing an exemption on houses and allowing an exemption on profits. A trader might be carrying on business on which he makes a net profit of £5 or £10 per annum in a building which is already exempted under this Act.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: This amendment which the honourable junior member for St. James has moved is something which the Government is considering, as the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said, and it is regrettable that the honourable junior member for St. James is dealing with this matter in a one-sided way. If you read the Act carefully you will see that the honourable member is only dealing with part of a section which deals with the way of assessing people. This Bill deals with the question of assessing owners of chattel houses, and the honourable junior member for Christ Church has raised the question of assessing people who are carrying on trade. There are numbers of small people in the country areas whose main income is derived from little businesses which they carry on, and when this Act was put on the Statute Book in 1911 a man whose net profit was £5 per annum or \$2.00 a month was liable to be rated. To-day if a man is making a profit of \$2.00 a month out of his business that is where you begin to rate him, but that is below the figure at which he should be rated.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: In declaring a profit a man must deduct certain expenses for the management of the business.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: My contention is that you cannot take the figure of £5 today and say that that is where you should begin to rate a man who is carrying on a little business. I have had the experience that many a small shopkeeper in the rural areas is just eking out an existence and an assessor says that he is bound to be making a profit of \$2.00 a month out of the business; that is to say, he is taking out everything for the shopkeeper and leaving him with a profit of \$2.00. That is one of the things which would have to be amended, but it cannot be done in this Bill. It is true that the hon. junior member for St. James gave notice of this Bill in July this year, and while I have not heard any hon. member say anything against raising the figure in respect of chattel houses from £7 10s. to £20, I do not know if that proposed increased figure is going to be a true assessment of present-day values. What we want to do is to free from taxation the same people who were always exempt from it. I believe that the price of lumber has gone up more than 300% since 1911 and I want to know that this proposed increase in the exemption is adequate. I do not intend to place on the Statute Book an amendment which places owners of chattel houses in a position where they would

have to pay taxation whereas originally they were not called upon to pay any taxation at all. In 1948 a body of Vestrymen started a campaign and showed what they could do and they called upon many people to pay taxes, people who had never paid any taxes before; the value of lumber went up and it was said that the value of houses also went up. If the value of houses has increased, the question is whether this proposed increased figure will free the same people who did not have to pay any taxes originally. Many poor people in this colony cannot afford to pay taxes on the little shacks in which they live; some people live in places where the drainage is bad, but because of the pressure of land and population they have to live under conditions which they do not like. In respect of the Bill which the Government has under consideration opportunity might be found to elaborate on that point when the Bill comes before the House. I hope that hon. members have addressed their minds to that aspect of the question to which I have called attention because it has something to do with the economic position of the colony. The question is whether this proposed increased figure is in keeping with what we have in mind.

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. WILKINSON, seconded by Mr. GILL, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

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

Clause 2 was read as follows:—

2. Section fifty-three sub-section (2) (a) of Principal Act is hereby amended by deleting the words "seven pounds ten shillings" in lines two and three thereof and substituting therefor the words "twenty pounds."

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

Mr. GILL: I beg to second that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to move that the word "twenty" occurring in line 4 be deleted and the word "thirty" be inserted in place thereof. I would like hon. members to bear in mind that a man who owns a house which is valued at a rental of 8s a week owns a house with one room with a shed roof attached. If you put some galvanized sheets and a little boat paint on the house the rent goes up. The hon. junior member for St. James has brought forward this Bill and I do not want to ask for any postponement of it; but this is a Measure which, if it is put on the Statute Book, must have an economic effect on this colony. I am asking hon. members if they think that sufficient consideration has been given to this Bill. We are amending the Act so as to place the owner of a chattel house in the position in which he was in 1911; we want to exempt from taxation the same people who were exempted from it in 1911 and if we are not doing that we are not carrying out what is intended to be carried out by this amendment. From what I know about the rent charged for houses situated in gaps I say that the problem of taxation in respect of houses has become a very difficult one indeed. I want to make sure that this amendment substituting the words "twenty pounds" for the words "seven pounds ten shillings" will meet what is required. I say that the figure should be £30 because I want to place the owners of small chattel houses in the position in which they were in 1911. As regards the traders, they would also have to be considered and all these matters will have to be dealt with in the Bill which is coming before the House. I know that if we were dealing with this amendment in the Maude Report the hon. senior for the City would be one of those hon. members who would debate the matter for

weeks. I repeat: I want to know if hon. members think that sufficient consideration has been given to this Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: I am saying very little on this matter; I find it very difficult to vote on this Bill and it looks as if I leave the House there will not be any quorum remaining. I was considering whether this increase in the figure up to £20 is not too high, and now I hear the hon. senior member for St. Peter say that that figure is too low. When these rates are taken off, with the Occupancy Tax having been abolished, the rates on people owning half an acre of land will go up; landowners should not be taxed at all, not the half-acre man anyhow. I was glad to hear the suggestion of a postponement made in respect of this Bill, not because we want to kill the Bill or anything of that sort, but in helping one man you may kill another. The suggestion has been made that in respect of the net annual profit of £5 on which traders are rateable, that figure should also be increased and I remind hon. members that the taxes will have to come from somewhere. I do not think that we should hurry with this proposed amendment without seeing all the implications and I suggest to the hon. junior member for St. James that with his experience as a Vestryman and having heard the suggestions made by honourable members, he should sit down and calculate. If you increase the figure in respect of owners of houses to £20, you will want to know how much you are losing and how much must be added to other ratepayers to make up for the loss. We are anxious to help people but in helping them we may hurt others; I make these points so that the honourable junior member for St. James might consider them.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not see the necessity for postponing the further consideration of this Bill, and I would never think of doing what the hon. senior member for St. Peter has mentioned. As the law stands today money must be raised by the Vestries for carrying on the work of the various parishes, and you have the heads under which you raise money, namely, land on which the rate is fixed per acre; real property which is comprised of house and land; chattel ownership and trade. I am not only mindful of the half-acre man; it is a fact that if you amend this Act to increase the exemption in respect of the owners of these small houses, you will relieve a hardship which people are now suffering, people who actually rent rooms. In St. James and other parishes too there are people who own houses which are worth 75 cents a week rent and they are taxed. The value of money today is not what it was years ago, and all this Bill seeks to do is to exempt from taxation owners of houses which are worth \$3.00 a month rent, houses which were really worth 12 cents a week years ago. The house which is worth \$5.00 a month rent today was worth a shilling a week years ago, and this Bill seeks to protect the owners of such houses; it is a Bill with which every hon. member will agree. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph spoke about the half-acre man but that man is not the only one to be considered; there are those who own $\frac{1}{8}$ of an acre and $\frac{1}{4}$ acre lots. I do not agree that the figure should be increased to £30 per annum or \$12.00 a month; I consider the figure of £20 per annum or \$8.00 a month reasonable, and I would like to point out that there are cases where land is of so little value that the owners qualify for the receipt of Old Age Pensions. If you put the figure up to \$12.00 a month a greater burden will be put on other taxpayers; do you not see the harm which will be done if you exempt from taxation a man who owns a house which is worth less than \$12.00 a month rent but you say that the small man who owns $\frac{1}{2}$ acre or $\frac{1}{4}$ acre must pay taxation? I am pointing out that if you

were to exempt from taxation people all over the island who own houses which are worth less than \$12.00 a month, and call upon people who own $\frac{1}{4}$ acre or $\frac{1}{2}$ acre of land to pay taxation, that would create a hardship on those people. The hon. senior member for St. Peter is asking us to say whether we think the figure of \$8.00 would meet the situation or whether the figure should be \$12.00 a month. Like the hon. senior member for St. Joseph I think that even the figure of \$8.00 a month seems to be high, but the hon. junior member for St. James must have studied the matter. In St. Joseph a man might get away with a reasonable house for \$8.00 a month, but in St. James rents are high and the hon. member has brought forward this Bill so as to relieve the owners of small houses. In St. Michael a man who owns a house which is worth \$8.00 a month rent should be exempt from taxation, but do not let us think that people who should contribute something to the parish to assist in carrying out sanitation, social services and poor relief, should be relieved of their responsibility. There are more people who are rated on property than those who are rated on land; but there are hundreds of people who own small lots of land. I appeal to the hon. senior member for St. Peter to see the wisdom of accepting the Bill as it has been introduced by the hon. junior member for St. James and not to press his amendment because, as the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has pointed out, you might be helping some people and creating a hardship on others inasmuch as they will have to bear the necessary taxation which will be required for running the parishes.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I did not think that this Bill would have provoked all this argument. The honourable senior member for the City has referred to what the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said, but the honourable senior member for St. Joseph used his argument from the point of view of having an over-all assessment. A man who owns half an acre of land should not go in the middle of his land and erect a cow-pen; and I would like to point out that a man who owns a quarter of an acre of land may be living in a house which is worth a lot of money. I agree that when you make an assessment in one respect you are not sure as to what you will do in another respect; therefore let us make a full assessment. The honourable senior member for the City has said that money has been devalued and the cost of living has increased; therefore while I do not want to be dogmatic that my figure is the correct one, the honourable member cannot say the figure proposed in this Bill is the correct one either. If you arrive at this figure of £20 you must bring forward some facts to convince me that at this figure you will be exempting from taxation the owners of houses who were always exempt from taxation; I must be clear in my mind that that is going to be the case before I agree to this proposed figure. If the value of chattel houses has gone up four times what it was, how much has the other buildings gone up? It is unfortunate that the majority of these parochial bodies have not got with them any person who can really sit down and work out the assessment of property on a scientific basis. Even the Vestry of St. Michael have not had a proper assessment made of property and trade in the parish for donkey years.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. Less than five years ago properties in St. Michael have been re-assessed.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am talking about a proper assessment of what property is really worth; they have no person who is capable of doing that. Too many of these Vestries have no expert to make a proper valuation of property and then make a

proper assessment; they have *ad hoc* methods of dealing with these matters and it is fortunate for them that with a redundant population they get something from other heads. Sooner or later the honourable member will realise that whenever you come to the question of taxation you have to make a proper assessment. Honourable members must be aware of the serious implications of this Bill, otherwise we will be just passing it and within the next couple of months we will find that what we passed was not what we intended to pass. I want honourable members to bear all these points in mind and consider whether they are convinced that this figure of £20 is the correct one to be put in this Bill. I think it is better to have a postponement of this matter and have a proper assessment made than to work on an improper basis.

Mr. MILLER: I am to some extent in favour of this Bill since it seeks to bring relief to owners of small chattel houses; however I would like the honourable junior member for St. James to consider a postponement of the Bill because I think it is a dangerous thing to press for having it passed tonight. We have not got any proper figures and there is the possibility that while you are relieving the small taxpayer, you are placing a greater burden on others who cannot bear it. I am asking the honourable junior member for St. James to agree to postpone the consideration of this Bill and let us get some proper figures. This Bill might create a type of landlordism which is unknown to us and I again ask the honourable junior member for St. James to agree to a postponement of it.

Mr. MAPP: I am not in favour of postponing the consideration of this Bill at all. When the extra rates are to be found we all know who will have to bear the burden. (A MEMBER: Who?) The small landowner. I am not an expert on Vestry matters, but I have listened to two experts on these matters and I am convinced that the sooner a complete change is made in the system of taxation, the better it will be. If you look at Sub-section (2) (e) of this same Section 53 of the Act, you will see that included in the exemption from liability for rates are persons owning or occupying sugar factories or other sugar works and the machinery therein in respect of ownership or occupancy of buildings and machinery. You cannot tax the machinery; the factories return no profit and therefore there is no taxation. How can you tax the small people and then say that the factories are exempt? That is not fair; I do not think that anybody could feel otherwise than that the entire system of taxation calls for a radical change. I repeat: we all know that when these persons are exempt from taxation the burden will fall on the peasant owner mainly. I should like to say that some of the arguments used by the honourable senior member for the City in support of this amount of £20 could be used in support of the motion made by the honourable senior member for St. Peter for raising the amount to £30. We know that Vestries have their own valuation; if in St. James it is found necessary to increase the figure to \$8.00 a month, surely in other parishes the figure should be \$12.00 a month. Obviously a house which would be worth \$8.00 a month in one parish might be worth \$6.00 a month in another parish. But these figures are worked out arbitrarily; in one parish the figure which would help the persons whom the honourable junior member for St. James has in mind might be £30, in another parish it might be £20 and in another it might be £18, but the principle is that we are trying to exempt from the burden of taxation people who are affected by it, people who own small houses which are now of greater

value than when the Act was passed, and I am in favour of that. I cannot see the wisdom of postponing the consideration of this Bill unless the Government is bringing down the Bill implementing the Maude Report very shortly, and we are making a comprehensive change and we are assured that the burden of taxation will not fall on the small people. In the absence of these things, I am voting for this Bill; nevertheless I am bringing forward another amendment to the Act. If we pass this Clause as it is I cannot see that any burden should fall on the small people in the various parishes; the extra rates should fall on the big factory owners and an increase of half cent in the rates per acre would not mean much to them. I beg to second the motion made by the honourable senior member for St. Peter for the deletion of the word "twenty" and the insertion of the word "thirty" in place thereof. If we accept the argument that the valuation in St. James is different from that of some other parishes, then I feel that what would be adequate for St. James might be inadequate for another parish.

Mr. WILKINSON: I am really surprised that there has been so much discussion over what I consider to be a very simple Bill which is for the purpose of meeting a pressing need. We are all aware—and the Leader of the House has told us—that the Executive Committee is very carefully considering the Maude Report, and the Bill implementing that Report is a very long one. We all know that this Bill is coming down to the House shortly; I know that every honourable member will endeavour to study amendments to the Act very carefully, but to do that will take some time. This Bill is a simple Bill to relieve a very pressing need temporarily. It must be remembered that our assessors are starting to do their work from next month; they have to start early in order to get through by the 24th March, and I think that the passing of this Bill will temporarily relieve the owners of small houses until total amendments to the Act have been considered and passed by this House. I am amazed that all this argument has taken place. I am speaking for the parish of St. James and when we consider the amount of tax relief which we give to people, the amount which will be taken off by the passing of this Bill does not affect the parish very much; but the passing of this Bill will relieve the Assessor of a tremendous amount of work and then there is the question of poor people making applications for tax relief. It is extraordinary that some honourable members should ask that the consideration of this Bill be postponed; I shall take the advice of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph in the same manner as he takes advice from me, and that is, I am going to ignore it.

Mr. FOSTER: If we postpone the consideration of this Bill until next year at this same time we will never get any further, because you will never get taxation equitable. I own over 100 acres of land and I have to pay taxes per acre on all of it whether it is arable or not. I repeat that taxation is inequitable. I am supporting this Bill since a poor man would rather pay taxes on his land than on his house, because he gets nothing out of the house. I am quite willing to pay my taxes and I am also willing to relieve the poor people. I am prepared to vote for this Clause.

The question that the word proposed to be deleted stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative, the CHAIRMAN declaring, "I think the 'Ayes' have it."

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

On the motion of Mr. WILKINSON seconded by Mr. GILL, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

CHRIST CHURCH PARISH LOAN BILL, 1950

Mr. REECE: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I beg to move that Order No. 47 on the Order Paper be taken as the next Order of the Day, under Private Members' Business.

Mr. GODDARD seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable junior member for Christ Church:—Second reading of a Bill to authorise the Vestry of Christ Church to raise a loan of £1,950.

Mr. REECE: The purpose of this Bill is to authorise the Vestry of Christ Church to raise a loan not exceeding £1,950 to be placed at the disposal of the Commissioners of Health of that parish to be used by them in purchasing an additional motor refuse collector and providing a garage for the same, and in erecting stone enclosures to certain public standpipes in the parish. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. GODDARD: 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.

Mr. REECE: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill, and that it be an instruction to the Committee when the House is in Committee that the Clauses be taken as read on the numbers being called.

Mr. GODDARD seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

On the motion of Mr. REECE, seconded by Mr. GODDARD, the Preamble was postponed.

Clause 1, the title Clause, was called and passed. Clause 2 was called as follows:—

2. It shall be lawful for the Vestry of the parish of Christ Church and they are hereby authorised from time to time as they require the same to borrow from any person or persons body or bodies politic or corporate willing to lend them the same, a sum or sums of money not exceeding in the aggregate the sum of One thousand nine hundred and fifty Pounds to be placed by them at the disposal of the Commissioners of Health for the parish of Christ Church for use (a) as to One thousand one hundred and fifty Pounds in the purchase of an additional Motor Refuse collector for the said parish and the provision of a garage for the same either by altering an existing building or erecting a new building and (b) as to Eight hundred Pounds in the erection of stone enclosures to certain public standpipes in the said parish, and the sum or sums so borrowed, with interest thereon at a rate not exceeding four Pounds per centum per annum shall be a charge on the rates of the said parish of Christ Church until paid.

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

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

Mr. MAPP: It is set out in this Clause that the sum of £1,150 is required for the purchase of an additional motor refuse collector for the said parish and the provision of a garage for the same either by altering an existing building or erecting a new building. If you erect a new building that would cost more than if you are only making alterations. I think it should be definitely stated whether they are making alterations to an existing building or erecting a new building in which case the amount required would be a bigger one.

Mr. REECE: The present garage is a building situated near to the sea and it might be more advisable to remove it to a different site than to extend it on the present site. We have to make provision against the encroaching sea and that means more expense. The Vestry are purchasing a new vehicle and they want to see whether it would be possible to make alterations to the present garage or remove it to a site further inland.

Mr. MAPP: The honourable member has been a member of this House for a long time. I am drawing attention to the wording of this Clause; we should be specifically told what the Vestry are doing. They cannot estimate for doing either this or that; they should know whether they are doing one thing or the other.

Mr. ADAMS: Most of these private Bills are passed after dinner when we are very sleepy or we are in a good mood and are willing to help honourable members who have brought forward these Bills to get them through. That could be the only reason for bringing this Bill before the House with this Clause phrased as it is. Some solicitor has drafted this Bill and I can only imagine that he drafted it on instructions which were given him, and those instructions were given him by a member of the Christ Church Vestry who said that the House would pass it. I have never seen any Bill drafted in this way; that you are asking for permission to do something and you put it in an alternative way like this. An existing building might be anything; this Clause does not set out where the building is or give any indication as to whether it is an existing building which can be easily converted. I suggest that the honourable member telephone and find out which of these alternatives the Vestry want. I am told that this building is somewhere near the sea and I would like to know how near to the sea-shore it is. The mere fact that you have to come to the Legislature in a matter of this sort shows that there has been laid on us the duty of seeing that people are protected against any hurried action on the part of a Vestry. It might appear that we are trying to delay this matter, but there is a legal point in what I have said. We want to know what the existing building to be altered is, and why is it necessary to put in this Clause this alternative; "either by altering an existing building or erecting a new building?"

Mr. REECE: To say that this Bill is not a good one because it has an alternative in it is something which the honourable member should know could not be so. We all know what an alternative is. This is a simple Bill and as I have said, the existing garage is near the sea. What happened is that this new refuse collector is being imported and the garage which houses the present motor vehicle is too small to accommodate the new refuse collector. The idea is that the Vestry will decide whether they will extend the existing garage or build a new garage. I know that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph is serious at times; he knows that certain parts

of Christ Church are very near to the sea and that the sea encroaches on the land. The question is whether the Vestry should extend the present building or erect a sea wall or build a new building. Any of those things will cost money to carry it out. This matter is the concern of each and every member of this House and the honourable member is perfectly within his right to ask for information on this simple matter. From the explanation I have given it will be seen why this Clause has been worded in this way.

Mr. ADAMS: In passing the law that these matters have to be brought before the House, the Legislature foreshadowed the possibility of Vestrymen involving the ratepayers in having to pay additional rates even without the ratepayers knowing about it beforehand. In these parochial matters the Legislature will have the chance of seeing that the Vestries do not fritter about with the taxpayers' money. I hope that I shall not give offence to the Vestry of Christ Church when I say that from what has happened in Christ Church, this provision in the law is a very wise one. If it were stated that the money was required for the purchase of an additional motor refuse collector for the parish and the provision of a garage for the same, then a discretion would be given to the Legislature; but when it goes on to say "either by altering an existing building or erecting a new building", the Vestry can take St. Bartholomew's Vicarage and say that they are going to alter that building and convert it to be used as a garage. I think it should be stated what the existing building is or that they are going to erect a new building; they ought to be more specific in this Bill. I am surprised that the honourable junior member for Christ Church who is being instructed by the honourable senior member for St. Andrew has not seen that point before. When we ask the House to vote money honourable members are told how it is to be spent.

Mr. MAPP: I view this matter as a matter of commonsense. Surely if you want to borrow money you must have in mind the purposes for which you want to borrow it. In this case the Vestry want to borrow money to purchase an additional motor refuse collector and to provide a garage for the same either by altering an existing building or erecting a new building. If they are going to alter an existing building, that would not require as much money as if they are erecting a new building. What are they going to do? That must be specifically stated in the Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable senior member for the City will appreciate what I am about to say now, and I should have stressed the point before. Our recent experience in respect of parochial buildings is such that we ought to be careful in getting estimates, we should know whether the Vestry are going to alter a building or erect a new one. When some of these things go wrong, the Government will get the blame for what are entirely parochial matters. What is the estimate for converting the sea-side garage and what is the estimate for building a new garage? We are entitled to know these figures.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The honourable member referred to our recent experience as regards parochial buildings; but what is our recent experience as regards Government buildings? This Bill seeks to authorise the Vestry of Christ Church to borrow a certain amount of money, and the Vestry say that they may be able to repair this building and that will cost less money; in any event they are not borrowing more than a certain amount of money. Let us be serious about this matter; the position of the Vestry is that they are either going to repair a building or they are going to build a new one. If they can repair the existing building that will cost

less money than if they have to erect a new building, and they will not borrow money for the latter purpose. In the case of the Vestry of St. Philip they found that they could repair the roof of the Church instead of putting on a new roof and therefore they did not borrow the money for putting on a new roof. The Vestry of Christ Church are saying: "Give us permission to borrow a certain amount of money; we are going to purchase a new motor refuse collector and repair a building or erect a new one in which to house it."

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable member is off the point. Our point is that those two things might be poles apart. What is the point in saying that if you are not going to spend the money you will not borrow it? Suppose the Christ Church Vestry have a friend to help them build the garage and he gets £200; we will be responsible for not questioning the matter.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Then you can say that an architect without the knowledge of the Government can give out a contract and somebody gets £200 as well.

Mr. ADAMS: I agree with what the honourable member has said. We got the blame in connection with Mr. Crowe and I will question the spending of every half cent in this island if we have anything to do with it. We know what has happened as regards Mr. Crowe and the Princess Alice Playing Field, therefore we are going to see that proper estimates are given and that a proper check is made in connection with the spending of money from week to week instead of waiting until the architect goes away and then we have to come to the House for twice the amount of money for doing the work. Let us assume that the Vestry of Christ Church will see that things are done well; on the other hand, in view of recent history, we must be careful that we are given sufficient facts as to make us feel that this is an above-board proposition. We know that the honourable members for Christ Church are zealous for their parish, they are too innocent to suspect that anything will go wrong and their faith in human nature might be greater than ours; but our point of view is that unless you watch with lynx's eyes you may discover that you have been too generous in your attitude in so far as human beings are concerned, and some day you will get the kicks for not having asked questions. What I do feel is that we should have queried from week to week as to how much money had been spent and Mr. Crowe would not have left us asking for more money to do work. Having been given the warning, whether the spending is Government or parochial, let us watch our spending in the future. I ask what will be the cost of altering the garage and what will be the cost of building a new one.

Mr. GODDARD: We already have a refuse collector and we are again leading the other parishes. This additional refuse collector will cost \$4,600 and if you make a deduction you will see how much it is intended to spend on the garage. We have a garage for the present refuse collector, but we have not decided whether we will alter that garage or erect another one on the same land, that is, on parochial lands in the vicinity of the Almshouse. If you question how much is to be spent on the garage you may as well question how much is to be spent on these eight standpipes. Are we being asked to give estimates in detail of everything we are going to do? I think that honourable members should be satisfied with the explanation which has been given; I hope that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph will continue to give the same scrutiny in connection with all public works.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is—

Mr. MAPP: The honourable junior member for Christ Church is sitting like the wise old owl and

he has not given any defence. I think he should retire gracefully, ask that the further consideration of the Bill be postponed and get the facts. Even now this Clause can be amended by taking out the alternative and that would appeal better to us over here. I hope it is in order to borrow money for the purpose of erecting standpipes; but we are not questioning that: it is only the wording of this Clause which we are questioning.

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable junior member for Christ Church is a Crown Law Officer and if he is satisfied with this draughtsmanship here, it is a matter for him. It is still due to us to be given answers to the questions which we have asked. I, too, have failed to have exact figures before me, but I have always got somebody to telephone and get the exact figures. Suppose this were a Government Measure, suppose the Government had said that they proposed to buy a new motor refuse collector and to build a garage for it; the honourable senior member for Christ Church would ask how big the garage will be and what is the estimate for building it, and if I could not give him the information, or if I could only tell him what he has told us, would the Measure be passed even by the members who support the Government? Cannot the honourable member say that he has not got the estimate for building a new garage and postpone the consideration of this Bill and let us get the information by next Tuesday? I do not intend to let it ever be said that we had a chance of asking questions and preventing people from putting their hands on the taxpayers' money and we allowed things to pass and made it possible for irregularities to take place. I ask if an estimate has been made; in the Petition it was stated that an estimate has been made and if there is no estimate then we begin to question the *bona fides* of the Petition. For the last time I ask the honourable member if he has the figures and if he has not got them let him postpone the further consideration of this Bill.

Mr. REECE: The honourable member is a born oppositionist; if this matter were the other way around, the honourable member would only have to look at the members of his Party and the Measure would go through, but we have not got the voting strength. That is a matter which time alone can rectify. This Bill takes the form of an ordinary Vestry Bill in which the Vestry of Christ Church are asking permission to borrow a sum of money not exceeding a certain amount for certain purposes. I see that a similar Bill was sponsored by the honourable senior member for St. Peter in December, 1949, when the Vestry of St. Peter wanted to borrow a sum of money not exceeding a certain amount. It is not the intention of the Vestry of Christ Church to get rid of the motor refuse collector which they are now using; they will continue to use it but an additional one is necessary in order that the Commissioners of Health might adequately carry on the sanitary work of the parish. There is something in what the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said: I am not in a position myself to give him the exact figures as to the erection of a new building as distinct from the alteration of the existing building. Although the honourable senior member for Christ Church is in a position to give an estimate as to the cost of the motor refuse collector itself, yet the figures as to the erection of a new building and those as to the alteration of the existing building are not available now. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph is quite within his right to be a real watch dog when it comes to the expenditure of funds. The Vestry of Christ Church are asking permission to borrow this money which will be repaid out of the rates and it is not to be expected that the Vestry will lightly spend the money; if they go in for any reckless spending they will

not find their seats at the next Election. I must confess that I agree with the force of the argument of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, and for that reason I am going to move for the postponement of the further consideration of this Bill. (Cheers). Before I do that I would point out that there is a slight amendment which I would like to make, and that is to delete the word "an" occurring in line twelve of this Clause and to substitute therefor the word "the". I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that and I congratulate the honourable member on what he has done. I realise that I have laid myself open to the same sort of watchfulness. Frequently I do not say one half of the things which I should say in presenting a Bill, but I have the facts before me and whenever anything is sprung upon me I send and get the figures. I suggest to honourable members that when they have Vestry Bills to bring forward in future they should come fully prepared to deal with them. It is for the benefit of all of us that we should avoid

the possibility of our being told that we are helping people. Need I remind honourable members of Christ Church or St. Michael for that matter? We as legislators should be even superior to Caesar's wife; we should make enquiries and nobody will be able to say that we are helping people.

The question that the Chairman do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to this day week, the 31st day of October, 1950, at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.