THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1950—51

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 19th September, 1950.

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

Present:

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

Prayers are read.

Mr. GARNER enters the House and takes his seat

LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO THE CLERK.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I understand that the Clerk of the House is ill and cannot attend today's meeting. I, therefore, beg to move that he be granted leave of absence for today.

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

The question that the Clerk of the House be granted leave of absence for today is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING CLERK.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that the Deputy Clerk be appointed to act as Clerk of the House for today.

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

The question that the Deputy Clerk be appointed to act as Clerk of the House for today is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING DEPUTY CLERK.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that Mr. D. A. Banfield be appointed to act as Deputy Clerk of the House for today.

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

The question that Mr. D. A. Banfield be appointed to act as Deputy Clerk of the House for today is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

MINUTES.

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 29th August, 1950, having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT enters the house and takes his seat.

MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a Message from the Honourable the Legislative Council returning the Bill to amend the law relating to the Representation of the People with amendments.

Messrs CRAWFORD and ALLDER enter the House and take their seats.

PAPER LAID.

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

Report of the Harbour and Shipping Department for the year 1949.

PETITION.

Mr. GARNER: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to present a Petition from the Vestry of the Parish of St. Philip praying the House to pass a Bill to authorise them to raise a loan not exceeding £5,000 for the purpose of repairing the Parish Church, Chapels, and parochial buildings. The petition is respectfully worded and I ask that it be taken as read.

The petition is taken as read.

NOTICES.

Notices are given as follows:—

Mr. GARNER: Bill to authorise the Parish of St. Philip to raise a loan not exceeding £5,000 to repair the Parish Church, Chapels, and parochial buildings.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Bill to amend the Jurors Act.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Bill to amend the Vestries Act.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Bill to amend the Poor Relief Act.

Dr. CUMMINS: Of the following Address:—

The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor.

The House of Assembly have the honour to inform Your Excellency that the Speaker of the House of Commons and His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom have honoured this ancient Assembly and the island of Barbados by extending an invitation to His Honour the Speaker and Mrs. Husbands to attend the opening ceremony of the new chamber of the "Mother of Parliaments" on the 26th of October, 1950.

The House are profoundly sensible of the honour done their Speaker and respectfully request that Your Excellency will send down a Resolution for the sum of $4,199.70 to meet the cost of the representation of this colony.

The House also invite Your Excellency to forward to the Speaker of the House of Commons on the eve of the ceremony a telegram expressing their appreciation of the historic occasion and the goodwill of the people of Barbados.

Dr. CUMMINS: Of my intention to ask leave later in the day to deal with the Address of which I have just given notice.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Of the following Address:—

The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor.

The House of Assembly have the honour to inform Your Excellency that the Debates Committee has granted Mr. C. B. Rock, Official Reporter of the Legislative Council, a further three months' leave to the 15th December, 1950.

Mr. Rock has tendered his resignation, which has been accepted, to have effect from the said 15th December.

The Debates Committee has engaged the services of a Reporter for this period at the rate of $80 per month.

The House respectfully request Your Excellency to send down the necessary legislation to give effect to this proposal and to provide a pension for Mr. Rock on the same basis as a Civil Servant retiring at the age of fifty-nine years.

QUESTIONS

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

1. Is it true that prisoners are compelled
   (a) To cart block-stones from Codrington quarry to Glendairy?
   (b) To cart stores from Bridgetown to the Prison?
2. Is the Government aware that the present method of carting by man-power, referred to in questions A & B above, does not conform to modern methods of Prison Reforms?
3. Will the Government consider the advisability of supplying this Department with motorised transport for the purpose of
   (a) Transporting block-stones from Codrington quarry?
   (b) Stores from Bridgetown to the prison, and
   (c) The transportation of prisoners generally?

Mr. WARD enters the House and takes his seat.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. GARNER, seconded by Mr. CRAWFORD, a Bill to authorize the Vestry of the Parish of St. Philip to raise a loan not exceeding £5,000 to repair the Parish Church, Chapels, and parochial buildings is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. GODDARD, A Bill to amend the Vestries Act is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. GODDARD, a Bill to amend the Poor Relief Act is read a first time.

MR. ADAMS UNABLE TO ATTEND EMPIRE PARLIAMENTARY MEETING IN NEW ZEALAND.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,— Before the business of the day begins I should like, with your permission, to make this announcement: The senior member for St. Joseph who was selected to attend the Empire Parliamentary Meeting in New Zealand now finds it inconvenient to go. I received a cable from him yesterday stating that he finds it inconvenient to attend and asking that someone else be selected in his place. In view of that, I have communicated with the President of the Other Place who has appointed Tuesday next at 2.30 p.m. for the selection of someone else to attend the Meeting in New Zealand.

NOTICE

Mr. CRAWFORD gives notice of his intention to ask leave later in the day to deal with the Address of which he gave notice earlier to-day.

ADDRESS *Re* MR. SPEAKER'S INVITATION TO ATTEND OPENING CEREMONY OF THE NEW HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,— In accordance with the notice which I gave earlier I now ask leave to deal with the Address relating to the invitation to Your Honour to attend the opening ceremony of the new House of Commons.

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

Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the DEPUTY SPEAKER takes the Chair.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,— The Address reads as follows:—

The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor

The House of Assembly have the honour to inform Your Excellency that the Speaker of the House of Commons and His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom have honoured this ancient Assembly and the Island of Barbados by extending an invitation to His Honour the Speaker and Mrs. Husbands to attend the opening ceremony of the new chamber of the "Mother of Parliaments" on the 26th October next.

The House are profoundly sensible of the honour done their Speaker and respectfully request Your Excellency to send down a Resolution for the sum of $4,199.70 to meet the cost of the representation of the Colony.

The House also invite Your Excellency to forward to the Speaker of the House of Commons on

the eve of the ceremony a telegram expressing their appreciation of the historic occasion and the goodwill of the people of Barbados.

As regards the amount, Mr. Deputy Speaker, $2,899.20 is for passages and travelling, $144 for a wig—it is true that our Speaker is not in the habit of wearing a wig but from the information given to me a wig is worn by almost every Speaker in the British Commonwealth. In the Legislative Council of Trinidad where the first election since the granting of their new Constitution has just been held, the Speaker who is not elected but is appointed wears a wig; consequently this House could do no less than provide the Speaker with a wig to wear on this historic occasion and be in line with other Speakers of other Parliaments in the Commonwealth. Then there is $144 for a parliamentary gown. The gown which our Speaker wears now is not in very good condition. As an honourable member has said, it is a makeshift for a gown; consequently $144 to furnish our Speaker with a gown worthy of the occasion is not too much to ask this House to vote. Clothing allowance is estimated at $360. Mr. Speaker and his wife will be arriving in England in the month of October when the weather is cold; consequently they would need some clothing to keep them warm while they are there. Finally, there is the sum of $652.50 as an allowance to Mr. and Mrs. Husbands for 29 days at $22.50 per day. I will give honourable members some information about this daily allowance. The Sugar Delegation which recently visited the United Kingdom from the West Indies found that each colony was treating its delegates differently —Barbados was doing one thing, St. Lucia another, Trinidad another and so on. Consequently the delegates held a meeting, decided on a certain figure for the sake of uniformity and recommended it to their respective Governments. The figure was exclusive of hotel and travelling expenses: it was a minimum rate of $15 per day and was accepted by the various Governments in the West Indies. That is the same figure on which the amount of $625.50 is based—$15 per day for the Speaker and half of that amount for his spouse. These amounts, when added together, come to $4,199.70. I understand that the hotel expenses in connection with this visit will be paid by the United Kingdom Government. The Address sets out the position clearly and I beg to move that it do now pass.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker,— It gives me great pleasure to second the motion for the passing of this Address. The suggestion was made to the Deputy Leader to have the House cleared to deal with this matter. From the time I have been a member of this Assembly I have never seen the House cleared to discuss the matter of the Speaker going overseas. I do not know if it is because this Speaker is a Negro that the House is to be cleared. I hope that is not the reason. If honourable members want the House cleared to vote money to send the Speaker somewhere, it is a sad reflection on the Speaker and the House itself. There is only one personal element in this matter and that is the clothing allowance. Anyone who has visited England would know that a decent coat alone costs about £15. I am sure that this amount has been worked out by the Financial Secretary to the limited amount. Honourable members can compare the daily allowance with what they have voted for people like Professor Shephard when he came here to make an inquiry in connection with the sugar industry. As I said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for the passing of this Address.

Dr. CUMMINS: I rise to a point of explanation. In the memorandum which was sent to honourable members it is stated that the amount of $4,199.70 recommended in the Address has been approved by the Acting Financial Secretary; that is a mistake. The Acting Financial Secretary has not approved of any amount; this House has to approve of the amount. The Acting Financial Secretary made the calculations but he has not approved of the amount.

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker,— It is a cause for pride that the British Government has recognized this Assembly, one of the oldest in the British Empire, by inviting our Speaker to be present at the opening ceremony of the new House of Commons next month. We, the Members of this House, fully appreciate the necessity for providing our Speaker with funds, so that he could maintain the dignity of his office. At the same time, Sir, we must not be accused of being over generous. Since this memorandum was circulated on Friday last, there has been a great deal of criticism by members of the public who got to know what is going on, of the expense in regard to the allowance of $22.50 per day for what I might call "extras" because your Honour must remember that the hotel expenses are being generously provided by the British Government. I admit that the Speaker will have to do some entertaining but the amount of $22.50 per day seems to the public to be a bit over-generous. And we are breaking entirely new ground when it comes to the Clothing Allowance — $360.00. The honourable member who introduced this address said that it will be cold weather in England at the time, and that the Speaker might have to purchase underwear to keep him warm and that the same thing applies to his wife. But it does seem to me that $360 is quite a large amount to be spent for that purpose. Then there is the question of the wig. The honourable introducer of the Address said that it is customary for a Speaker to wear a wig in an Assembly but I think that this climate is too hot for that. In England, there is a system by which you can obtain certain things for certain occasions. You rent a morning coat for a special occasion and return it the next day. I remember, when I was in England in 1937, Mr. "Jimmie" Thomas, a former Secretary of State for the Colonies, attending a Parliamentary dinner and everybody wore evening dress except himself; he wore a lounge suit and he said "I apologize for appearing in a lounge suit to-night but when I went to my accustomed place to get an outfit for this occasion, my supplier had already hired out his outfits for the night ." Of course there was much laughter afterwards but it is a common practice in England. I am wondering, Sir, whether a little too much has not been suggested for each of these items —wig, parliamentary gown, clothing allowance and daily allowance—and I think, Sir, that perhaps it would be wise for the House to go into Committee on this Address. I, therefore, beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Address.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

The question that Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Address is put and resolved in the affirmative, the division being as follows:—

Ayes. Messrs FOSTER, CRAWFORD, GARNER MOTTLEY, GILL, GODDARD, BETHELL, E. K. WALCOTT, WILKINSON, and WARD—10.

Noes. Messrs. SMITH, MAPP, BRYAN, COX, F. L. WALCOTT, and Dr. CUMMINS—6.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Speaking for myself, I regard it as very unfortunate that at the time when we accepted this invitation we did not know that we would have been called upon to pay the travelling expenses of the Speaker to attend this cere mony. My impression was that from the manner in which the invitation was extended, all that we would have been called upon to do would be to give a certain amount of money for out-of-pocket expenses to the delegate from this Assembly and his consort. The Speaker himself, I know, has expressed some surprise that we are being called upon to foot the bill for his actually going from, and returning to Barbados and I repeat, Sir, that it is very unfortunate that we were not aware of this fact because I, for one, would never have agreed to the acceptance of the invitation had I known that we would have been called upon to foot the bill for travelling. I can see no earthly reason why we should accept, on these conditions, the invitation to a function of this sort when there is no special honour attached to it; it is merely the open ing of the new House of Commons. It has no practical value to the colony. No discussion will take place, out of which some advantage may redound to Barbados or the West Indies as a whole. It is purely a gesture of having our Speaker present at the opening of the new parliamentary building in London. It does not mean a row of pins to this colony and had I known, I repeat, that we would have been called upon to pay the travelling expenses I would never have voted for this Chamber to accept the invitation. Since we have already gone on record as having accepted the invitation extended to us I suppose that we are going to be compelled to vote the money for the travelling expenses of Mr. Speaker and his wife to and from England. But with regard to some of the other items I am at a loss to think that twenty-four members of this House could be asked to sit here to-day and so wilfully squander public funds. The suggestion was made earlier that the House be cleared before the discussion on this matter started and some previous speaker saw fit to draw the Race Question, like a red herring, across the trail. There is no question of Race in this matter. The question in this matter is whether or not we are justified in putting our hands in the Treasury and spending the money asked for in this Address; that is the question. Why, I believe, the suggestion for clearing the House was made was because nobody wanted a public discussion of this sort in which some unpleasant things might be said which might be thought to be a reflection on the Speaker. If the Speaker was white, black or yellow I would say what I am saying now. I am perfectly in agreement that every discussion in this Chamber should be public; there should be no stifling of discussion in our debates at all but certainly there must be occasions—I admit that they are rare and that this must be one—when debates should take place privately. In the absence of any previous discussion on this matter—it is a matter on which there should have been some previous discussion before it came here—it is not at all an unfair suggestion that the discussion should be private. How in the name of all that is fair and just could we sit here and agree to the expenditure of $144 for a wig which is to be worn for a few months—that is all—and $144 for a parliamentary gown? $360 as an allowance for clothing necessitated by the cold weather is something we could understand. But we must be losing our sense of reasoning. There are not two men in the street who would agree to this and even Members of this Chamber who would sit and vote for this are only stifling their consciences because they know, in their heart of hearts, that they are not in agreement with it. I, Sir, am not for a moment going to agree to anything more than the actual cost of the travelling and the subsistence allowance. If hotel expenses are really being taken care of by the United Kingdom Government, this amount for subsistence is exceedingly generous. This Government sends delegates to important Conferences and gives them an allowance of £4 per day out of which hotel expenses are defrayed. In this case, we have been told—whether true or not I do not know—that hotel expenses are being taken care of and we are making an allowance of $22.50 a day to the Speaker and his wife. Not if it were my last sitting in this Chamber could I sit here and vote for this. I know very well what the public reaction to it will be. In every parish of this island you see hundreds of people—not dozens—walking around unemployed, doing nothing, with no large-scale project being undertaken by the Government to provide work for them. I would not sit and vote for this money; it is an absolute waste of public money—nothing more—which could be spent to better advantage to the people and the colony. Only yesterday I saw a large number of able-bodied men and boys walking about the place with nothing to do. I have already agreed to send the Speaker to the opening ceremony of the new House of Commons. If I had not done that I would not support this Address. All that is necessary to do is on the occasion to send a telegram expressing the best wishes of this Country, congratulating them on getting a new building and adding a rider that we hope to get one soon ourselves because we need one badly. But, Sir, I certainly am unable to appreciate either the necessity for, or the advisability of, this expenditure and nothing I have heard so far could make me change my mind. Everybody who goes to England knows that it is possible to rent special clothes for any special function. To tell me that for one single day on a visit to England we are to spend $648—$144 for a wig, $144 for a parliamentary gown, and $360 for clothing allowance—is one of the most irrational propositions that could ever be made on the floor of this House and I do not think that anything in the nature of a precedent can be quoted for it. If even we are going to suggest, Sir, that on this particular occasion, special considerations may have influenced the decision to spend all this money, certainly the Treasury is not the place to go for any extra money that is wanted for the purpose. None of us were put here by the taxpayers to indulge in such extravagant squandermania and such unnecessary waste of public funds. I am going to move, Sir, that this amount be reduced by $648—$144 for wig, $144 for parliamentary gown, and $360 for clothing allowance. I repeat that I am voting for the other two items purely because we have committed ourselves to the expenditure at a time when we did not know we would have to undertake it ourselves.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT : I would like, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to answer the first bit of inaccuracy in the speech you have just heard. There is one thing we must bear in mind, that is, there is only one Speaker in this Chamber. How could you believe anyone who says that the invitation which came here came with the understanding or belief that the people who issued it were going to pay the passages? Quote an instance where the Speaker of this Chamber was invited to London and paid his passages. Mr. Evelyn was invited and he went. Who paid the passage? Who paid the expenses? This Government paid them. When some honourable members tell you "No, the Government did not pay the expenses", let them go and find out. It happened the year before the last election when Mr. Evelyn said that he was not returning to the House. So that when an honourable

member says that he would not have agreed to the acceptance of this invitation if he knew that we would be called upon to pay the expenses that is all moonshine. The Speaker of the Barbados House of Assembly alone has not been invited to this ceremony. Speakers of Assemblies all over the Commonwealth have been invited. We know that the Speaker is not the type of individual to manoeuvre anybody into sending him somewhere. The Speaker does not wangle to get an Address passed to send him to Brazil, for instance. When you hear honourable members who can least accuse other people of extravagance talk about extravagance where is the extravagance in this matter? Take the wig. The Speaker does not want a wig to be worn on that occasion alone. The Speaker of this Assembly now does not have a decent gown. Ask the barristers what they pay for their gowns and wigs and if this House is to maintain its dignity why should we not provide these things for the Speaker and pay for them? Is this House granting any amounts more than what other Governments of the West Indies have granted? Ask any of the other Governments if when they send away their delegates they do not make proper provision for them? I do not believe the junior member for St. James is really serious when he suggests that the Speaker of the Barbados House of Assembly could leave Barbados and go into Oxford Street in London and rent a suit of clothes. The Speaker could wear the wig when he returns. Why should he not wear it in the House of Assembly? Honourable members say that the subsistence allowance is too much. The $22.50 is being given for the Speaker and his wife and that works out at $11.25 each per day. The Speaker of the Barbados House of Assembly will be the poorest among the invited Speakers and can $11.25 per day be too much for him as a subsistence allowance? If you do not want to send your Speaker, do not send him. Honourable members talked about hotel expenses. When a Government pays hotel expenses they do not include bar expenses; the Government pays for the food the delegate eats. If the delegate chooses to go to the bar, he pays those expenses. If the Speaker invites other Speakers and their wives to the bar in the hotel, he has to pay those expenses. This is a clear indication of how the wind is blowing, as far as some honourable members are concerned. When you feel that other people are getting something that you are not getting, you use the word "extravagance". You have had people come here to do certain things and you have paid their salaries and their hotel expenses. Go and look up the Records and see what you paid Professor Shephard when he came here and stayed at the Ocean View Hotel. Now, this is the first time this House is sending a Speaker away. I have given the Speaker my personal opinion that at any time any person invites him outside the House and he does not have to ask this House for a cent, he will go but whenever it comes to the House paying, he will hear what they have to say; he will hear "I am glad you have the occasion to go but not for this House to send you." "Gown is too dear!" "Wig is too dear!" "And he should go to England and rent a coat!" If you buy a chair in this House of Assembly you are told that that money could have been spent to help the people in the island! But honourable members do not refuse to go to the Treasury to draw their money. This is the first time the House of Assembly ever had to send a Speaker anywhere and it is coincidental that on this first occasion it is suggested that the House should be cleared. In the House of Commons they debate subjects like the Korean War and the Nationalization of Steel and they do not clear the House of Commons but the Barbados House of Assembly must be cleared to debate whether or not a sum of money should be voted to meet the expenses of the Speaker going to England to attend a ceremony. If the Speaker was a man of means he would not ask the House for a cent, and now that you have a poor Speaker you have this spectacle. The Speaker has not asked for this but I know honourable members who have asked other honourable members to pass an Address to give them a trip abroad.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I hope I will never have to ask other honourable members to pass an Address to give me a trip abroad. The honourable member who has just spoken concluded his speech by suggesting that this House is holding the Speaker up to ridicule because he is a poor man. I say that if there is anybody who is holding the Speaker up to ridicule, it is the senior member for St. Peter, his colleague. The honourable member said that someone suggested that the House should be cleared. It was I who made that suggestion and I make no apology for making it because it seemed to me, after privately discussing the matter with some honourable members, that it was going to cause some considerable debate. Finding that out I made the suggestion in the interest of the Speaker. You cannot stifle discussion in this House, no matter if it affects the Speaker or the Governor. We have been elected by the people and it is our duty to discuss, and, if necessary, criticise, all money matters that come before this House and when I discovered that there was going to be a lengthy discussion on this Address I suggested to the Deputy Leader of the House to have the House cleared because certain things might be said which might be embarrassing, as far as the Speaker is concerned. The senior member for St. Peter said something about not wanting to vote this money because the Speaker was a Negro Speaker. Do you think any member of this House could look at me and suggest to me anything about not voting this money because the Speaker is a Negro Speaker. Would you want the lid to be blown off? That is a stupid remark by the honourable member. They know me too well. If the Speaker was blue, black, or white I would discuss the matter. For the honourable member's benefit I will say this: When the Speaker read sometime ago the letter about the invitation, every honourable member got the impression that the passages were being paid and the Speaker himself said so. I stood on the floor of this House and said that the Governor should be asked to send down a Resolution for an appreciable amount as a subsistence allowance. Do you think that I who know about spending money would consider that $652.50 is too much for the Speaker and his wife? How can anyone say that $22 a day is too much for two people's entertainment when tipping, standing drinks and expenses of that nature are taken into consideration? I repeat that when His Honour read from the Chair in this House the invitation which he received, he really said—I believe that he misunderstood—that the passages would be paid. He said so, and let any other honourable member contradict it. I then suggested that the Government should send down a Resolution for an appreciable sum of money to meet out-of-pocket expenses. Incidentally, it is not true to say that the expenses were paid by this House when the last Speaker went away. That, however, would not weigh with me. Whether the last Speaker paid the expenses or not, he is a rich man but I will see that the expenses are paid for His Honour the Speaker. He is a poor man.

The CHAIRMAN: I want to ask honourable members not to stray to anything else more than the Address.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am going to adopt the policy of the senior member for St. Joseph, the Leader of the House and say "I can't do it." Nobody can stifle my discussion. I respect the Chair but if I get named I will have my say on the floor of this House. I may be straying but other honourable members strayed too. When I suggested the clearing of the House I did it in good faith. Honourable members received this Address in which the sum of $4,199.70 is mentioned. A man said to me a day or two ago "I have not seen you pass a Resolution yet for money to send anybody to Canada or somewhere else about Emigration." Of course we have committed ourselves to this but I repeat that there is not one honourable member who did not have the impression that the passages would be paid; hence when one saw that the amount was close on £1,000 one was surprised. I would like to say this: The Opposition is as much part of the running of the Government as anybody else. Because this concerns the Speaker, is no one to question it? Of course, you can question it. Why shouldn't you? The real thing, that is operating in the minds of honourable members is that no one expected that we would have to pay this $2,899.20 for passages and travelling. In the absence of that, I am sure that you would never have heard one word because the wig, the parliamentary gown, the clothing allowance and the subsistence allowance are essentials. Even the junior member for St. Philip has not yet said that the subsistence allowance is too much. How can he say it? I repeat that when the Speaker read that letter to this House I got up—I thought I spoke for this Party over here—and said that we would be prepared to give a poor man like His Honour the Speaker an appreciable allowance to meet out-of-pocket expenses. The senior member for St. Peter comes in here and talks about our discussing this matter as we are discussing it because the Speaker is a Negro Speaker. I may not have the honourable member's political views but I have some racial pride. What do I look like? I say that that is absolute nonsense. As far as the passages are concerned, every honourable member was misled; they thought that the passages would be paid. I do not mean to infer that His Honour has misled us because I have been reliably informed that His Honour himself has been misled. The senior member for St. Peter suggested that we should know that the Speaker has to pay the passages. If the honourable member should know and the Speaker should know and they do not know, how could we know that the passages would have to be paid by the Speaker? The Opposition having stated that they would be willing to give the necessary assistance to His Honour the Speaker, how could you suggest that the Opposition want to boycott this? When I read that this amount of $4,199.70 was approved by the Acting Financial Secretary I was amused. Stop doing that nonsense. I am glad that the senior member for St. Thomas explained that. What Financial Secretary, acting or otherwise, can approve of the spending of this money? This House must approve of it. This is the sort of thing that aggravates members of this House. It would look as if the Government feels that it has people whom it would follow blindly, whom it would follow like parrots and we must do the same thing. I say that this debate could have been saved if the Deputy Leader had merely discussed the matter beforehand in a friendly way. This is one of those debates which can be very embarrassing if they take place publicly. Do not, I repeat, tell the Opposition that the Financial Secretary approves of this or that. The Deputy Leader is not in the habit of doing it but the Leader of the House has continually said that the Financial Secretary approved of so and so. It is not that we are going to oppose the Resolution when it comes down, but no time is ever wasted in this House when honourable members get on their feet and criticize any money matter. It is common parliamentary procedure. You can talk all around a circle when you are dealing with a money matter; that was the first thing I was taught before coming to this House. I repeat that I do not feel that His Honour misinformed us because he himself was misinformed and there is no honourable member who could sit here and vote money practically every week to send somebody away when there is so much unemployment in this Country. We are bound to face that criticism.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I would like to suggest that all we take off is the $360, that is, the clothing allowance. The wig and the gown will become our property and the allowance is to enable him to conduct himself in proper style in the matter of entertainment. Clothing allowance is new to me and I think it is new to this colony. The clothing allowance is for oneself; it amounts to asking the Government to clothe you and as I said, it is new to me. I am moving that the amount $4,199.70 be deleted and the amount $3,839.70 substituted therefor; this includes everything except the clothing allowance. With regard to the remarks of the senior member for St. Peter as to whether or not under Rule 43 this matter should be debated in private I want to support very strongly what has been said by the senior member for the City. I want to even go further than that and say this: If among ourselves there is not a sense of honour, if as persons doing business together we were not able to have in private a debate which we do not want to be made public, then we would be in a sad position. It is what we lawyers call "tacenda"—things that must be kept quiet. If I did not believe that remarks passed between myself and the senior member for St. Thomas would remain private I would not utter them to him. When an honourable member suggests under Rule 43 that a debate should be private and another honourable member gets up and makes the suggestion public, then we are reaching the position of not being able to trust one another. Thank God, it does not appertain to the Deputy Leader or the Leader of the House! The reason is so obvious. Whenever one has to discuss an internal matter it has always been the custom to talk it over in the lobby before we come into the House. You do not stifle discussion but you obviously avoid making remarks which must hurt and hurt unnecessarily. We are placed in this position to-day: Any of us who object to any of these items are liable to make remarks which may hurt our esteemed Speaker and his wife in the circumstances; that may cause us to let the discussion go by entirely and in that case we would be failing in our duty. This is one of the occasions on which that Rule should be invoked. The washing of our dirty linen is never done in public. The attempt to besmirch members who happen to have a different complexion from His Honour the Speaker failed because the honourable member who made the remark has the same complexion as that of the Speaker; if it had been otherwise it would have something in it and it is bound to hurt the Speaker and the person who said it too. I have taken the opportunity time and time again to compliment the senior member for St. Thomas because time and time again he has made remarks to us and we have made remarks to him and never have I known that he has made public those remarks. I do not want

to say more, except this: Undoubtedly people have spoken to me and others have rung me up with regard to this amount. I have made a comment and my comment is just what I made here to-day, that is, we must provide the necessary expenditure. To me, the clothing allowance is a novel idea. I do not think it is a correct idea. It will mean that when the trip is over, we will have provided the person with clothing which he would be using in other circumstances and I do not believe that anybody would care to accept a vote in circumstances such as these. It is regrettable that we did not have the opportunity of discussing this matter beforehand. If one had come to the House with the knowledge that the members of the Sugar Delegation had received a clothing allowance perhaps one would not have come to this House so prejudiced against the idea of including a clothing allowance in this amount. The two previous Speakers who went abroad were persons of sufficient means to be able to pay all their expenses but I agree with the senior member for the City that that has nothing to do with this. The Speaker is not going to represent himself; he is going to represent us. When I first saw the allowance of $22.50 per day I misread it. But after I re-read it I think it is all right. If it had been a case of $22.50 per day each I think it would be too much. It is not made up on the basis of $11.25 per day each but it is made up on the basis of $15 per day for the Speaker and $7.50 per day for his wife. I beg to move that the amount $4,199.70 be deleted from the Address and the amount $3,839.70 substituted therefor.

Mr. MAPP: I am going to speak before that motion is seconded. It is apparent that members of the opposite Party mean to carry that motion. Just as the last honourable member has tried to bring this debate down from the "raucous" level it has attained to the degree of calm procedure I will try to keep it at such a level. I regret very much that this debate has been occasioned. I feel that if honourable members could have foreseen this state of affairs they would have, at the time of accepting the invitation, proposed that the Government find out an estimate of what it would cost and let the House know before it accepted the invitation. I feel that the members of this House are in duty bound to accept the terms of this Address. I agree with the last speaker that we might have met in conference and discussed the matter and I did suggest to the senior member for St. Thomas that we should adjourn for a minute and lobby it. I regret that we should have any public discussion of this sort. Let me say at once that I cannot agree that the senior member for St. Peter was not justifiably moved in the manner in which he was, especially from the way the junior member for St. Philip attacked the amount. Had the junior member for St. Philip questioned the amounts of some of these items in the same way as the last honourable member did one could agree with him, but to call this a reckless squandering of public funds is to intimate that the Speaker and the Members of the Government have colluded to spend this money in this way.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I want the honourable member to explain for my own benefit what part of my remarks could lead him to the conclusion that the Government and His Honour the Speaker colluded to initiate this waste of public funds.

Mr. MAPP: The honourable member said that this is a reckless waste of public funds. By that, what are we to assume but that the body who is going to send the Resolution and the person who is going to be affected by it had colluded to spend this money?

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. I object to these mental aberrations on the part of the junior member for St. Thomas. I said nothing about people colluding. I said distinctly that the Speaker himself had the impression, when he got the invitation, that the passages would be paid by the British Government. How then could he collude with others?

Mr. MAPP: I did not say that the honourable member said that the Speaker had colluded with others. I said that the honourable member's remarks intimated that the Speaker had colluded with others and if I were a member of the Government I would take the same attitude that the senior member for St. Peter took. Mr. Chairman, at this stage I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

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

The CHAIRMAN reports and the House resumes.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, the House is adjourned for half an hour.

ADDRESS *Re* REPRESENTATION OF BARBADOS AT THE OPENING CEREMONY OF "MOTHER OF PARLIAMENTS."

On re-assembling,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the adjournment the Chairman of Committees had reported progress in Committee on an Address relative to the invitation of His Honour the Speaker and Mrs. Husbands to attend the opening ceremony of the new chamber of the "Mother of Parliaments" on the 26th October next, and that the Committee had asked for leave to sit again.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House resumed Committee on the Address, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House was in Committee on this Address before the adjournment, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas was speaking.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Chairman,— I had dealt with the tenor of the debate regretting that the debate had taken that turn, and I will now deal with certain specific questions and matters which have been raised by honourable members on the other side. I will repeat that in the first place this House accepted the invitation for His Honour the Speaker to attend this ceremony and this House regarded it as an honour paid to the people of this colony that this invitation had been sent to us. If this House want to be properly represented at this ceremony and to pay due regard to our parliamentary position—the Bahamas, Bermuda and other colonies will be represented in the procession which is going to take place—we should ask ourselves whether or not we are going to yield to feelings which might arise in a small colony like this with regard to the amount of money which we are asked to vote. I have heard certain remarks made by an experienced parliamentarian—the honourable senior member for St. James—remarks which he would not have made if he had not been guided by certain preconceived ideas. He says that this amount is too much; I would like to say that the wig which the Speaker will be wearing is our property, and if the Speaker of the Bahamas and other Speakers will be wearing proper wigs and gowns how would this House feel to have its Speaker at this ceremony going bareheaded and in an old, tattered gown as he wears at

present? Are we quibbling over the provision of this wig and parliamentary gown which will adorn any Speaker? We are accustomed to seeing small amounts and this amount of $4,199.70 looks like a big amount. We passed a Resolution to provide a training course for a member of the Labour Department and an Officer of the Police Force—this is where I join issue with the honourable senior member for St. James—and included in that Resolution were amounts for warm clothing allowances and uniform. If the honourable member had not yielded to the old prejudice and preconceived ideas he would have remembered his facts and he would not have tried to impress the members of this Committee that this is a novel idea. These amounts for warm clothing were given at a time when the climate in Britain was warm—and I know the honourable member will say that part of the expenses was paid by the Colonial Development and Welfare Organisation. The Speaker of this House is the traditional Head of this Department; he is looked upon with respect and dignity and there should not be any quibbing over this amount which is asked for so that he can properly represent this colony at this ceremony. The Speaker of this House represents Barbados just as much as the Governor represents the colony; he represents everything in the way of representative institution and let us go forward in a responsible way if we are talking about responsible Government. Now that these facts have been brought to the honourable member's remembrance, does he not see that he is merely quibbling? Will the honourable member still proceed with his motion? I am not moved by sentiment or Party feelings I feel that we should hold dear our highest traditions as a representative institution. I am moved by that consideration. I think that now the honourable member is reminded of the facts he will agree that if the Colonial Development and Welfare Organization found it necessary to pay our representatives the courtesy of giving them a grant for warm clothing, it would come with bad grace if we did not provide a warm clothing allowance for the Speaker. It would be beneath our dignity to object to providing an allowance of this sort for the Speaker. If honourable members felt that the British Government would be paying these expenses, it has turned out that they are not paying them, and we either want the Speaker to attend this ceremony or we do not want him to do so. If we want him to attend this ceremony we should grant him the courtesy which distinguished officers should receive. I hope that honourable members will not entertain any notion of reducing this amount.

Mr. GARNER: I am sorry that I have to speak on this Address because I realise that it is somewhat embarrassing to the Speaker and therefore I do not care to say very much. I do not agree with everything which the last speaker has said because I do not hold any British institution or tradition so very dear to me. I want to build my own tradition. I am fed up with British tradition; it is because of that tradition that we are so poverty-stricken and backward. I am voting for all of these items here or I am not voting for any of them, and that is the way in which honourable members should vote. We either want the Speaker to attend this ceremony or we do not want him to attend it. Personally, I feel that he should not go because it means nothing to us. The Speaker is going there socially and there is no real representation for us; this is merely a tradition—British high-falutinism— that is all. If honourable members do not want to vote the money, that is nothing against the Speaker; if everybody felt like me these allowances would not be passed. I am not sure if all the colonies will be represented, but if the British Government wanted these poverty-stricken colonies to help celebrate this re-opening ceremony, it would be an easy thing for them to send down a warship and take all the representatives up. Princess Alice and her husband came out here on a warship and we spent a lot of money to entertain them. I say; let them collect all the dignatories in a warship and carry them up to have a spree in England. I think that this voting of money for such occasions will soon be stopped; I am sorry that the Speaker had not refused to go. All these social parties are merely to fool the West Indies or the Commonwealth; until we break away from this custom and tradition and begin to stand up and think like men, the whole world will make a laughing stock of us. You will find people in the street thinking differently from us to-day. My mother nurtured me and if I am to have a Mother Country she must do the same thing —she must not exploit me. I counsel honourable members not to censure the Speaker; it would be really undignified to do that. It is not the Speaker's fault if he is not a rich man; when the wealthy people were here they could do everything because taxation was not high and they controlled the profits. We are now organizing on a different line and we must get people from among the people to represent us if we are going ahead. The Speaker is not a wealthy man; we know that and therefore if we decide to send him to this ceremony we must outfit him. As for me, I would not send him and if they took that as a slight, that would be their business: the old 300-year tradition which we are maintaining is what is keeping the weight around our neck. I ask honourable members to send the Speaker to this ceremony without a grudge if we are committed to expending this money; we are going to spend more than this amount in a more frivolous manner. The Speaker's wife is as dignified as any white lady and if she is attending this ceremony she must do so as dignified as anybody else. I have a quarrel with the British people because I want them to relieve my people; until they do that I will have a quarrel with them. I will be with anybody who breaks down their tradition because they are keeping the weight around my neck. I may be witty enough to keep out of the track but other people may not be so witty. Only yesterday I was reading something about Hitler; he had a conversation with a black man and he told that man some truthful things which I would be glad for all the countries of the world to tell black people, because it would embarrass them to the extent that they will stop hiding under the wings of somebody else; it will make them get up and do something for posterity. So long as you go to the beck and call of Britain you will get nowhere. We are not obligated to send the Speaker to this ceremony, but if we are going to send him I will vote all the money, otherwise it will be an act of censure on him. The Speaker is not a wealthy man; most of the members of the Labour Party are men who are trying to put things together. In this matter we have to do the right thing; we either do not want the Speaker to go up or we want to send him up. If we want to send him up we must send him up in the right way. I counsel honourable members once again that since we have already intimated that we are going to send the Speaker to this ceremony let us not censure him now by deleting any of these items. On another occasion I will not wait until we have committed ourselves to anything and then speak; I say that we have to stop doing these things. This is all camouflage

and it must come to an end. We shall have to spend money but it will be a question as to how we are spending it; if we go on as we are going on to-day, in a year from now the complexion of this House will be changed entirely. We shall have to bring about schemes; sending a specialist here and there will not satisfy the ordinary Barbadian outlook, and my advice is that we get together and devise schemes.

I think I have said enough and I will again ask honourable members not to censure the Speaker. The Speaker is such an affable person that I would hate to touch his tender feelings. He tries to co-operate with the Opposition and gives them more latitude than he gives most of us. (A MEMBER: He gives you more latitude than he gives some of us). He does not try to take advantage of us and on that account I am asking honourable members to vote for this amount. Let us be on the look-out for the next invitation and before we agree to do anything let us find out how much money will be involved; let us find out exactly what the British Government is going to pay and what we will have to pay. I am not voting for any reduction of this amount on this occasion.

Mr. COX: Only last week we were discussing a Resolution in this House and I said I was sorry that honourable members had not discussed it in the lobby before coming into the House. To-day we are dealing with an Address relative to a vote for the Speaker and I feel in the first place that the debate should have been conducted on a very much higher level. The honourable junior member for St. James in leading off the discussion said that the public were worried over the amount which we are asked to vote for the Speaker so that he can attend this ceremony. It is difficult to understand how the honourable member could make that statement. It was only on Friday that we were privately circularised with copies of this Address and it is only to-day that the Address is being debated. It is therefore difficult to understand how the public could express an opinion, particularly an adverse opinion, on a question which had not been brought to their notice. I have always felt that if there was a member of this House who was maintaining the dignity of the House, that member was the honourable junior member for St. James. With the exception of one or two cases the honourable member has kept matters on a high level; but it is regrettable today to find that the honourable member in dealing with the question of clothing in this Address, almost intimated that the Speaker might be able to rent some costume when he reaches England. I would like to say that it is very difficult to get me to fit into other people's clothing and I feel the same thing as regards the Speaker. The Speaker is regarded as the first Commoner of the land; with the exception of the Governor there is nobody who is regarded like the Speaker of the House, and to ask him to go to England and fit himself into some old, condemned clothing is really to lower not only his dignity but the dignity of any Speaker. The honourable member went on to speak about allowances and about taking a few drinks; but surely we cannot bring this question down to one of taking a few drinks. I would like to refer to a debate which took place in this House on a Resolution on the 19th August, 1947, when we were sending delegates to the Monteg Bay Conference. The honourable Leader of the House in moving the passing of the Resolution pointed out that an allowance of 30/- per day for a delegate was very inadequate and honourable members including the honourable junior member for St. James, the honourable senior member for St. Lucy, the honourable senior member for the City, the then hon. senior member for St. Peter and the then honourable junior member for St. Michael—all spoke in terms similar to those in which the honourable Leader of the House had spoken. This is what the honourable junior member for St. James said:—

"Mr. Chairman,—I have had the honour to be a member of one or two delegations from this island and I quite agree with the senior member for St. Joseph when he points out that as a rule delegates are out of pocket when they return to Barbados; it is a very uncomfortable position in which delegates find themselves. I do not know what allowance it is proposed to give to the delegates to Jamaica, but if it is, as I understand the senior member for St. Joseph to say, 30/- per day each then that is totally inadequate. A delegate cannot live in Jamaica, I am sure, on $7.20 a day. Every member of this Committee would like our representatives not to be worried over the financial end of their visit while they are representing us in Jamaica. I do not know what the rate is but while I do not want to be overgenerous I want to be liberal. I do not want our delegates to have to put their hands in their own pockets every time they want a drink in Jamaica."

Surely that also applies to England and more so inasmuch as Jamaica is a West Indian colony. I am not in a position to say what the cost of living in England is as compared with Jamaica, but surely if you feel that 30/- per day is an inadequate allowance for a delegate who is attending a Conference in Jamaica, how much more is that so when the Speaker is going to attend a ceremony of such importance as the re-opening of the House of Commons? Mr. Chairman, it does not speak well for members of this Committee when they try more or less to show that they can break every fraction of a cent and they know how much it takes to maintain an individual. Such a thing shows that they are not living up to the traditional dignity of this House. The Speaker of this House has accepted the invitation to be present at this ceremony and we should think of sending him and treating him in the best way we can. We should not be quibbling and saying that this amount is too much when we have passed a Resolution to send out people and gave them an allowance for warm clothing. I am not worried as to whether the Speaker is a poor man or a rich man; I say that he is the Speaker of this House and we would like His Honour and his wife to attend this ceremony looking worthy of the respect of any dignified colony.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: It is wonderful how mistakes will guide people if they do not know about them. With regard to the allowance which was given to the delegates to the Montego Bay Conference the discussion was on the basis of the delegates having to pay their own hotel fees; and it was felt that you could not go to Jamaica and pay your own hotel fees on an allowance of 30/- a day. The fees charged at the Myrtle Bank Hotel is £3 a day, but this allowance which we have before us has nothing to do with that; the argument of the honourable senior member for St. Michael is totally the opposite to the facts of this situation. The Resolution to which the honourable junior member for St. Thomas referred is a Resolution in respect of the Colonial Development and Welfare Organization; do not let us talk about that because this Organisation is a charitable Organization and it does not have to correlate any expenditure or anything like that. In addition to that, in that Resolution you were helping the officers to undergo a course of training and such officers are always given an allowance for their

uniform. So far as I know when we sent out delegates we have never given them a lumpsum for a clothing allowance and we never had to do that in respect of previous Speakers. I object to this lumpsum in respect of a clothing allowance; I never felt happy about this allowance at all. It is regrettable that we had discuss this matter in public; we might have been able to save a very unhappy discussion. In objecting to this clothing allowance, it might appear to be censuring, as the honourable senior member for St. Philip has said; however you have to take the stand which you take as far as you can. One would like to know the reasons which induced the persons who made up these amounts to be put before the House, to include in these items this amount for clothing allowance. This is no censure of the Speaker at all; it is only that some of us have voiced our objection to this amount for clothing allowance.

Mr. COX: The honourable member could tell the Committee that the Government is more or less caretaker of the money supplied by the Colonial Development and Welfare Organization, and when proposals come before the House, it is left to the House to say whether they approve of them or not. If any member of the House wanted to object to the clothing allowance which was granted when the House passed that Resolution to which I referred, he could have objected to it. When the Resolution was being dealt with, nobody thought of interfering with the clothing allowance because it was thought to be an absolute necessity. We accepted the principle of giving a clothing allowance; because the money is not directly ours we cannot say that we will spend it anyhow. I know that people are placed in a position of responsibility and they try to take care of everything as if it was theirs. The point which the honourable member has raised relative to that Resolution is not good enough because the House had the power and the privilege of cutting out the clothing allowance.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I repeat that none of the previous officers ever had any clothing allowance. In so far as funds supplied by the Colonial Development and Welfare Organization are concerned the allocation to this colony is £800,000—one million odd dollars is in respect of Seawell—and the running of the colony is the Government's concern. The money is put in the Estimates and if I am wrong I shall be glad to be corrected.

Mr. WARD: I never intended to say anything at all on this Resolution; it is regrettable that we should have all this discussion in respect of this provision for the Speaker. I feel that it is undignified and I regret that the debate has gone so far. The Speaker of this House is one who is recognised by every individual as a fair-minded man and I feel that a great amount of this debate could have been avoided if this Address had been discussed beforehand by the different Parties. When we receive an Address of this kind and we come straight in the House to debate it, we must get into corners and one impression after another must be created. When I first entered the House today I must say that I was not in favour of voting this $4,000 because I felt that if the Speaker of this House was asked to attend a function in England it was the duty of the British Government to pay his passage there. If they were so anxious to have the Speaker there, they should see that his passage was paid knowing that he is not in a very wealthy position and that this island is dependent upon England for financial assistance. Simply paying the Speaker's hotel Bill is not sufficient. Knowing that the Speaker in not in a position to bear the expenses for himself and his wife I feel that this House should re-consider the attitude which it has adopted this afternoon. If we are sending the Speaker to this ceremony we must send him feeling like a man among other men in the United Kingdom; we should do all in our power to make him happy while he is in England with his wife. It will be a proud and happy sight for coloured West Indians to see the various colonies represented by their Speakers and we want to have our Speaker walking as a man among other men and not walking in any back road. I feel that it is our duty to send up our Speaker, if we are sending him, as equipped as Australia or Canada would send their Speaker. It is not the Speaker's fault that he is not in a position to spend money as some other people might be able to do, and we must try and help him in this matter. It is the dignity of the office which we must consider; the Speaker of this House represents this island and it is our duty to help him to attend this ceremony.

I want the Government to know that I am not acceding to any requests made in this haphazard way in the future. I feel that this Address should have been worded differently; clothing allowance should not have been put in this Address at all and some other term should have been used. In my opinion to put in a clothing allowance for the Speaker is undignified; I would be ashamed to allow a Resolution to come down to this House with an amount for clothing included in the items. I want the Government to realise that they must cut out the idea of providing any clothing allowance. We want to see Resolutions coming to this House in respect of things which are really useful to the people; we are going to spend $4,000 to send one individual and his wife out of this island for a spree and there are many people who find it difficult to get work and we cannot find any work for them. I feel that the public are considering these things even if they are not saying anything. We cannot go on hoodwinking people; the day is not far off when we will have to adopt some definite scheme so as to relieve the situation in this island, and I hope that the Government will be in a position to put their hands on the money as easily as they are doing it in connection with this matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD: There is just one final word which I would like to add. It is a peculiar state of affairs that a poor colony as we are, an object of charity on the part of the British Government, should be expected to make a show in England just as the self-governing Dominions who are so well off that they make gifts to the British Government. Comparisons can always be made to prove a point but in this matter all sorts of unsuitable comparisons have been brought in. The main point in this debate is that if this particular trip were of some practical value to the colony, then of course we would be justified in undertaking the expenditure. For instance, if you send out an Officer from the Labour Department or from the Police Department for training, that would be of some value to the colony; but to send a delegate from this colony merely to take part in the pomp and ceremony of the opening of the new Parliamentary Chamber in England will not be of any benefit to this colony, and we are justified in being as economical as we can be if we find it necessary to undertake any expenditure in this matter. People who do not know what they are talking about brought in the matter of the delegates attending the Montego Bay Conference, but the delegates attended that Conference with the idea of doing something of practical value for the West Indies; and the delegates from Barbados could not stay at the same hotels at which other delegates stayed. With the amount of money given by the Gov-

ernment of this colony the Barbados delegates had to stay at second-rate hotels in Jamaica. Nobody wants this colony to follow other colonies blindly. It has been said that delegates to the Sugar Conference were given a clothing allowance; if delegates from Trinidad and other colonies were given a clothing allowance to attend this Conference in England, the people at the head are only too willing to allow these colonies to squander their money so that they cannot balance their budget and they will always have to remain under those who are at the head. British Guiana could not subsidize foodstuffs for the population and yet she could do favourite things now and again. My position in this matter as I said earlier is this; we have unfortunately committed ourselves to sending a delegate to take part in this ceremony, the colony cannot afford it and Great Britain knowing that she is giving us help through the Colonial Development and Welfare Organization, would not be surprised if we had said that we cannot send a delegate to this ceremony and if you want him you will have to pay the cost of getting him there. If we want to vie with delegates from the Dominions, then we are not a poor colony any longer. We look to Great Britain for everything we want, and yet in a meaningless celebration—something which is of no value at all to this colony—we are being told that we must follow the example set by the Dominions, otherwise we will not be regarded. That is the position as far as I see it; the last speakers, although they have expressed support in this matter, still took the opportunity to express sentiments which I am sure must make the proponents of this Resolution sit up and think. If they think that the people of this colony are unmindful of all the stupidity we are doing here, then I say that they are living in a fool's paradise. From the beginning I said that I was not minded to embarrass the Speaker and I said last week that in any parliamentary institution which is being properly conducted the proper procedure in this matter would have been to have a meeting of some members of the Assembly and get an expression of an opinion so as not to embarrass the Speaker or allow any discordant note to creep into the discussion today. As a matter of fact, that information was sent to the members of the Government—and they must have got it—that this matter should have been discussed before the House met. But if they feel that they are running the country and we must support what they want done without any discussion, and they must get things done, they are only fooling themselves. If this Address is passed it is passed purely because honourable members do not want any reflection to be cast on the Speaker.

Dr. CUMMINS: I do not propose to say very much in replying to honourable members. The burden of objection in this matter seems to be in respect of the question of the clothing allowance. I suppose if we had used the term "warm clothing" the question would have been solved. Everybody knows that in Britain the Speaker would not want the type of clothing that is worn in Barbados; he would want warm clothing; I do not see how anybody could construe the word "clothing" to mean something other than warm clothing. I have mentioned before how this question of a clothing allowance came about, and for the benefit of honourable members I will repeat that when the delegates went up to the Sugar Conference it was discovered that some colonies provided their delegates with a warm clothing allowance —they were given that allowance so that they could have warm clothing to protect them from the cold. Barbados did not give that allowance but almost every other colony gave it. Mr. Gomes, who is a member of the Trinidad Legislative Council, told me that he was given money with which to provide himself with warm clothing, and so it was in the case of the delegates from Antigua and St. Kitts. Recommendations were made to the various Governments and one of them was that the delegates to the Sugar Conference should be provided with warm clothing and the delegates were given money with which to purchase it. The Speaker of this House and his wife are proceeding to England and they will need warm clothing. I recommended this $360 for the provision of warm clothing and as long as I happen to be a member of the Government and any delegate is going to England I will recommend that he be provided with an allowance for warm clothing. I will always recommend that. It is a matter for this Committee whether we want the Speaker to attend this ceremony or not. With regard to having a discussion with members of the other Parties before bringing down this Address, we did not think it necessary to do that; we would only have done that if we were not sure about what we were doing. It was not a question of bargaining or compromise; the items were all set out and there was no necessity for any discussion among the Parties because we were not groping in the dark and wondering what we are going to do. I am not going to allow honourable members to be under any misapprehension at all; as long as I have a recommendation to make for people going to England it will be that they be given an allowance for warm clothing. I had to purchase my warm clothing.

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

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. COX the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Address in Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

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

Dr. CUMMINS: As Your Honour pleases.

ADDRESS *RE* PENSION FOR THE OFFICIAL REPORTER OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that the Address of which I gave notice earlier this afternoon be considered as the next Order of the Day. It is an Address relating to the provision for the services of a Reporter for the Other Place and asking that provision be made for a pension for the retiring Reporter.

Mr. WILKINSON 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 St. Philip:—To move the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor relating to the provision for the services of a Reporter for the Other Place and for a pension for the retiring Reporter.

Mr. CRAWFORD: This Address sets out three important points. The first is that Mr. C. B. Rock Official Reporter of the Other Place, has been granted

a further three months leave to the 15th December, 1950; the second is that Mr. Rock has tendered his resignation which has been accepted, and the third is that the Debates Committee has engaged the services of a Reporter for the period up to the 15th December at the rate of $80 per month. There is also a request in the Address and it is that the Government is being asked to provide a pension for Mr. Rock on the same basis as a Civil Servant who retires at the age of 59 years.

Mr. Rock has given fairly long and faithful service to the Government and he has been unfortunate in having a serious attack of ill-health during the latter part of last year, which has incapacitated him for further service to the Government. I am sure the House would like to place itself on record as being appreciative of Mr. Rock's service to the Other Place and to the colony, and to express its regret that he has had to tender his resignation on account of ill-health and also its hope that he might long be spared to enjoy his years of retirement. I feel sure that the House will support the proposal of the Debates Committee and accord Mr. Rock a further three months' pre-retirement leave. Mr. Rock has already had six months' sick leave and following the example set by every Department, the Debates Committee felt that it would not be unreasonable to grant him a further three months' leave which is more or less in the nature of pre-retirement leave. We are sorry to have to accept Mr. Rock's resignation but his health allowed no alternative course, and we have had to engage the services of another Reporter to carry on until such time as the vacancy has been filled. As I have already said, the Address also asks the Government to send down the necessary legislation to provide for the payment of a pension to Mr. Rock based on the usual principle as obtains in the Government Service. I have much pleasure in moving the passing of the Address and I express my own regret at the circumstances which made it necessary to bring forward this Address, those circumstances being Mr. Rock's ill-health. This Address reads as follows:—

The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor

The House of Assembly have the honour to inform Your Excellency that the Debates Committee has granted Mr. C. B. Rock, Official Reporter of the Legislative Council, a further three months' leave to the 15th December, 1950.

Mr. Rock has tendered his resignation, which has been accepted, to have effect from the said 15th December.

The Debates Committee has engaged the services of a Reporter for this period at the rate of $80.00 per month.

The House respectfully request Your Excellency to send down the necessary legislation to give effect to this proposal and to provide a pension for Mr. Rock on the same basis as a Civil Servant retiring at the age of fifty-nine years.

I beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Mr. ALLDER: In seconding the motion I beg to endorse all the remarks which the honourable member has made on behalf of Mr. Rock and his usefulness to the Legislature.

Dr. CUMMINS: I, too, want to support the remarks which have been made on Mr. Rock's behalf Mr. Rock has been a very good Reporter—I understand that he was one of the best Reporters which we have had in this island—and he has given good service to the colony; he is deserving of any amount which the Government might send down by way of a pension for him. I think that the honourable junior member for St. Philip made a mistake in asking that a pension be provided for Mr. Rock befitting a person of 59 years of age. It is a question of the length of service, not the age.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: In support of what the Deputy Leader of the House has said, this Address mentions that Mr. Rock has retired at the age of 59 years; but a man can retire at that age and he might have given 25 or 30 years' service. What should have been put in the Address is the number of years' service which Mr. Rock has given; it is a question of the length of service and not so much the age.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I think I am correct in saying that the Debates Committee does attach some importance to Mr. Rock's age and it wants the conditions of his service and retirement to be taken into consideration by the Government when it comes to consider the matter. The wording of this Address is not accidental; the Address was purposely worded in that way. Mr. Rock has given 15 years' service to the Government and during those years he rendered meritorious service. He has never had any leave and when he broke down at a meeting of the Other Place he had actually asked for leave; if that leave had been given him he might have been saved from that breakdown. That and other considerations will concern us if and when the provision of the pension for Mr. Rock comes before us. The Debates Committee hopes that the Government will take all these special conditions into account when it comes to consider the matter and that is why the final paragraph of this Address reads as it does.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: As Your Honour pleases

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. GILL: I beg to move that this House do now proceed with the consideration of Private Members' Business.

Mr. GODDARD seconded the motion which was agreed to.

ST. ANDREW'S PARISH (BARBADOS) LOAN BILL, 1950

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Andrew:—Second reading of a Bill to authorise the Vestry of Saint Andrew to borrow a sum not exceeding £1,000 for completing the new roof of the parish Church and for other matters.

Mr. GILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—This is a Bill which seeks to authorise the Vestry of the parish of St. Andrew to raise a loan not exceeding £1,000 to complete the repairs to the roof of the parish Church and provide pews for the recently-erected Chapel at St. Simons. Honourable members will remember that last year a Bill somewhat similar to this one was passed by this House authorising the loan of £1,000 for the repairs to the roof of the parish Church, but that sum has been found to be inadequate to complete the repairs to the roof of the Church and provide the necessary pews at St. Simons. This Bill merely seeks to implement what has already been passed. The Bill authorises the Vestry to lay a rate of £50

a year to repay this loan over a period of 20 years with interest not exceeding 4% per annum. I do not think that there is anything controversial about this Bill and I beg to move that it 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.

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

On a similar motion the Preamble was postponed.

The twelve Clauses of the Bill were read and passed, the word "October" being inserted in the blank in Clause 4.

The two Schedules were read and passed and the Preamble was read and agreed to.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

SYNAGOGUE BURIAL GROUNDS COMMITTEE BILL, 1950

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. James: Second reading of a Bill to incorporate The Synagogue Burial Grounds Committee.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker,— The Preamble to this Bill explains the whole idea. This Bill merely seeks to allow certain gentlemen of the Jewish Faith resident in this Island along with Mr. Shilstone representing the Barbados Museum and Historical Society to become the first members of a Committee to be known as the Synagogue Burial Grounds Committee. The reason for that is that the present owner of the Synagogue Burial Grounds has made a promise to these gentlemen to vest the Synagogue Burial Grounds in them to be used as Burial Grounds subject to certain terms and conditions, and a Bill of this kind has to be approved so as to pass the ownership. This matter is one of long standing; it was on the Order Paper during the last session but it never came up for discussion. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

Mr. MAPP: I do not suppose that there will be any disagreement with the idea of persons of the Jewish Faith having a place set apart for the burial of their dead, but you must wonder why they cannot mix their dead with other Christian dead at the Westbury Cemetery. I see that one of the names mentioned in the Preamble of this Bill is that of Mr. Shilstone representing the Barbados Museum and Historical Society, and I am wondering if the honourable member can tell me what this Society has to do with this matter. What is the reason for a person from this Society being associated with these separate Burial Grounds? This Society lives and has its being through funds part of which is given by the Government. This is the Barbados Museum, it is not the Jewish Museum; Barbados is comprised of Christians mainly and they do not like to feel that they are set apart from anybody else. I should like to know how the Barbados Museum and Historical Society comes into this matter.

Mr. ALLDER: I, too, am somewhat doubtful about a Bill of this sort. I believe in giving everybody the right to practise his religion, but I still cannot avoid having the feeling that Barbados should be for the Barbadians. When it comes to a question of giving the right to any foreign body to own and possess property in this island for perpetuity, I am fearful that we in this small colony might be faced with things similar to those with which larger countries are faced, that is to say, influential bodies coming in and expanding their community at the expense of the local bodies. I am quite sympathetic with the few Jews who are here at present, but one does not know how great their expansion might be in the not distant future. I am therefore asking this Government to be fairly cautious in giving foreign bodies permission to build their own separate and distinct society inside the one which we have. We have an example of what is happening at present in other West Indian Colonies; there is an influx of what I call strangers in Trinidad and British Guiana. They enter the colonies in small groups and they expand themselves to such an extent that the local population has become a minority group when compared with the strangers. Every now and then a Bill of this sort is brought before this House and unlike larger countries I feel that we might not be in a position to remove the injury which might be inflicted if we allow these foreign communities to be founded. A few strangers being here might be all right, but there is a kind of international community being set up with the idea of dominating not merely the commercial, but also the economic set-up. Regardless of whatever might be said about the number of Barbadians who are in other countries, we are too small a colony to disregard the question of giving foreigners the power to expand themselves in our midst.

There is another point which I would like to stress and it is this; we are about to put into effect some sort of town and country planning. I do not know how soon the scheme is going to be brought about but I am wondering if permission were to be given to these Jews to re-establish burial grounds in the heart of the City, if you would not find at some time to come that those burial grounds would interfere with the scheme which you intend to carry out, relative to reconstructing and re-planning the City. I am serious about the statement which I am making. We are a small community and for the past two years we have found that many people of foreign nationality have been coming into this colony and expanding themselves and adding to the problems which we have. It is very striking that in every street you enter you find that every house is occupied by dozens of families not only of the Jewish nationality but also of Indian nationality.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not want to interrupt the honourable member, but I am wondering whether the point he is now making is not something to do with the immigration authorities rather than vesting property in people who are already in the island.

Mr. ALLDER: I thought I would take this opportunity to draw to the attention of the Government mistakes which, if they are not remedied now, might become too great in the near future to be handled at all. If this Jewish body must have a burial ground at all, there are large strips of land in the open spaces in this colony to which they can go and provide their burial grounds or build their churches, if this House feels that they should have such a privilege. As far as I am concerned I will continue to contend that we are too small to permit the

infiltration of people who are capable of causing an upheaval in our social and economic structure. Those are the points which I wanted to make and I hope that they will not fall on deaf ears. We have seen the problems which are at present thrust on colonies which are not too far from us and therefore we should beware of such a dangerous infiltration of people who have been causing problems all over the world for generations.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: The history in connection with this matter is a long one and we want to prevent it from being said that we are again vesting this property in the Jews. In reply to the honourable junior member for St. Thomas, I should like to say that Mr. Shilstone who is interested in historical matters agreed to join this Committee. The previous history of this matter is that the Jews sold the Synagogue including the Burial Grounds to the late Mr. Graham Yearwood, the idea being that a Law Library should be established there; but the Law Library never came about and the Synagogue is what it is today. The matter is nothing to do with immigration at all; the Jews were interested in the fact that these Burial Grounds should properly be looked after by Jews and not by Gentiles. They therefore asked the late Mr. Hutchinson who purchased the property from Mr. Graham Yearwood if he would be willing to vest the property back in them so that they could look after their dead. It is within my knowledge that the burial of Jews still continued to take place at these Burial Grounds but the permission of Mr. Hutchinson had to be obtained in each case. Mr. Hutchinson said that he would be willing to let the Jews have the Burial Grounds, but the one thing which he was not prepared to do was to let them have the property so that they could sell it again because the land is valuable land. He said that he would allow them to have the property under certain terms and conditions, those terms and conditions being that they must form themselves in a body, and that is the whole object of this Bill. As is set out in the Preamble of the Bill, "It is deemed advisable in order to ensure the convenient holding of the said burial grounds and any other real or personal property that may hereafter be acquired by them for the benefit of persons of the Jewish Faith in this Island and also to ensure the effective administration of such property and the general conduct of their affairs that the said persons should be incorporated under the name of "The Synagogue Burial Grounds Committee,." The owner of this property insisted that these persons must be incorporated into a body so that that body cannot die and Clause 9 of the Bill states that the objects of the Committee shall be religious and charitable only and the Committee shall not engage in trade or commerce. It was said that the Jews may be leaving Barbados and they may try to sell the property, and the desire was expressed that they should have associated with them somebody who belongs to us entirely and who would be interested in the Burial Grounds. Mr. Shilstone shows himself to be particularly interested in these Burial Grounds; he copies inscriptions from the tombstones and it was thought that he should represent the Society on this Committee. That is the whole story; the owner of the property said that there must be an incorporated body and the moment these persons become such a body with proper succession he is prepared to hand them over the property and charge them nothing, but they cannot sell the property again. If a statute is ever passed for improving Bridgetown that will not affect the position: this Bill merely seeks to vest the ownership of these Burial Grounds in the Jews.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I cannot follow the same historical trend. I believe that we are evolving a West Indian Society in this area, and I object to people coming into this area and do not want to enter this Society. I have strong objection to any minority groups coming into this area and do not want to be incorporated in the Society. According to the local statute these people have the right to bury their dead, but it is a pity that that cannot be taken away and let everybody have the right to be buried at the Westbury Cemetery. If the Jews want to live in the West Indies they have to be incorporated in the West Indian Society and be content to live in this Society; and when we go to Palestine or Jerusalem we have to assume that we are Jews or Arabs and be contented. I think the time has come when these Jews should be told: "We admit you in this place but you must not try to make us uncomfortable." It is a difficult matter to incorporate people where religion is concerned. I feel that we are all God's children and I do not like the idea of a society of human beings thinking that they are different from anybody else.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am wondering if that is not both a racial and religious question: there are other religious bodies who have their private burial grounds in this island.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: My point is in respect of people being incorporated in a society separate and distinct from any other society. If you continue to have these minority groups—if there are minority groups in a particular society—they will not feel that they are part of the whole society and that they share the interest of that society.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will grant the honourable member in charge of this Bill permission to clarify the point made by the honourable senior member for St. Peter as regards the racial and religious question.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: That is nothing to do with the Jews owning their burial grounds. The Jews are being buried at the Synagogue Burial Grounds now. There are a few places left and the owner of the Burial Grounds is not prepared to hand the property over to these Jews unless they are a statutory incorporated body. This Bill will incorporate them; all we are doing is to incorporate them so that they will not be able to dispose of the property. There is nothing to prevent the owner of this property from vesting it in these people. The Jews have been advised that the owner of the property was not going to vest it in them unless they were not merely incorporated but also had along with them some person like Mr. Shilstone, and they could not dispose of the property. We can pass this Bill today making these persons an incorporated body and tomorrow the owner of the property may say: "I will not give you the Burial Grounds." But whether we are Jews or Gentiles we respect where we bury our dead, and what happens now is that people drive their cars over the tombstones in these Burial Grounds. These Jews simply want the right to respect their dead; they cannot trade with this property because it shall be used for religious and charitable purposes only. As to the question of the Barbados Museum being brought into this matter, Mr. Shilstone is interested in it, and he would not be using money in respect of the Museum in looking after this matter. The property will be looked after by the Jews and the owner says that they must be an incorporated body. We do not want them to go away like the last Jews without our having any say in this matter.

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. E. K. WALCOTT, seconded by Mr. GODDARD, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

On a similar motion the Preamble was postponed.

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

Clause 2 was read as follows:—

2. Oscar Pillersdorf, Lazar Spira, Srul Jacob Bernstein, Peltyel Pasternak, Harry Burak and Jacob Hersch Altman, persons of the Jewish Faith resident in this island and Eustace Maxwell Shilstone representing for the purposes of this Act The Barbados Museum and Historical Society shall be the first members of the Synagogue Burial Grounds Committee and they are hereby declared to be one body corporate and politic by the name of The Synagogue Burial Grounds Committee (hereinafter called "The Committee") with perpetual succession and a common Seal.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Chairman,—I heard the explanation given by the honourable member concerning the name of Mr. Shilstone as representing the Barbados Museum and Historical Society; the honourable member explained that these people will not be given any power to do anything more than to continue to hold this property and it is not a question of engaging in any trade or commerce. However you will come to a Clause later on in this Bill, which gives this Committee power from time to time to sell or let or otherwise dispose of the whole or any part of such property.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Which Clause is that?

Mr. MAPP: Clause 4. This Clause says that this Committee shall have power to dispose of property subject to any specific conditions tha may be attached to the acquisition of such property. I do not know what conditions are attached to the acquisition of property, but it is obvious that if they are given power to dispose of property they would be engaging in trade or commerce. Why should we allow the Barbados Museum and Historical Society to be mixed up in this matter? It is not a question of Mr. Shilstone being among this group of persons holding this property; he is representing the Barbados Museum and Historical Society. I say that this Committee can dispose of this property subject to conditions which we know nothing about. I do not think that we should condone a thing like this and say that there is nothing in it. There is something in it. I beg to move that the words "representing for the purposes of this Act The Barbados Museum and Historical Society" be deleted.

Mr. ALLDER: I beg to second that. What I want to know is this: why should the Barbados Museum and Historical Society be associated with this private Jewish Synagogue through its Officer? If the Museum is being run with Government Funds I cannot see why, through a private Bill or through the activities of the Society's Officer, these two things should be associated. I am confused over this matter and I am still hoping that the honourable senior member for St. James will try and enlighten me on it. I cannot see why the Barbados Museum should be included in a Bill of this sort.

The question that the words proposed to be deleted stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative, the following division being taken:

Ayes: Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. COX, GARNER, MOTTLEY, BETHELL, WARD, E. K. WALCOTT, WILKINSON, GODDARD and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER—10.

Noes: Messrs. MAPP, ALLDER, and F. L. WALCOTT.—3.

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

Clause 3 was read and passed.

Clause 4 was read as follows:—

4. The Committee shall be capable of acquiring and holding real and personal property of whatever nature and description and shall have power from time to time to sell or let or otherwise dispose of the whole or any part of such property (but subject to any specific conditions that may be attached to the acquisition of such property).

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I beg to move that Clause 4 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

Mr. MAPP: I really am a bit worried about the effects of this Clause. The honourable member has assured us that the objects of this Committee shall be religious and charitable and the Committee shall not engage in trade or commerce; but this Clause states that this Committee can sell or let or otherwise dispose of property subject to specific conditions. It is all very well to make that provision in connection with the disposal of property, but we do not know what those conditions are; those conditions may be changed at any time. What is the sense of telling us that this Committee shall not engage in trade or commerce and yet you give them power to dispose of property? I would like the honourable member to tell me what is the effect of the wording of this Clause, that "The Committee shall be capable of acquiring and holding real and personal property of whatever nature and description and shall have power from time to time to sell or let or otherwise dispose of the whole or any part of such property". Surely this Clause should be specifically worded to apply to this colony. I think that the honourable member should explain this Clause for the benefit of honourable members; these people are given power to hold property anywhere at all. I cannot see how such a general Clause could apply to a specific object; that beats me.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I do not mind repeating what I have already said. A person is a legal entity by himself and a group of persons may make a covenant or agreement to buy or possess something. You can also incorporate persons by passing an Act, which is a statutory incorporation and in this case you give these persons power which is limited. I would like to say here that the Executive Committee would do well to consider their power because I hear that they are selling oil and they have no power to do that. You are limited under a statutory body only to do what that statutory body allows you to do by its terms. If you do not have the power to own and dispose of, you would not have any power at all. I have already said that this Bill gives these persons the right to hold property; these general terms are used because the Government might want to acquire something and they cannot act contrary to what is stipulated in respect of the acquisition of property. If these persons went to some other place and held property they are only holding it as a Committee and they are limited by Clause 9 of this Bill. In every parish the burial ground is limited to the people of the parish and strangers cannot be buried in a parish without permission being given for that. These persons are limited by Clause 9 of this Bill; they can only hold property for reli-

gious and charitable purposes and they cannot engage in trade or commerce.

Mr. MAPP: The honourable member has given a lucid explanation but he has gone all around what I want to know. I want to know the effect of these words in this Clause: "The Committee shall be capable of acquiring and holding real and personal property of whatever nature and description". Are we dealing with these Burial Grounds being held by the Jews or are we allowing them to hold property like the Church? A lot of things are carried on in the name of religion; all I take this Clause to mean is that land can be bought by these people in every parish and you can do nothing with them so long as a lawyer can say that the land is for religious or charitable purposes. I am not satisfied with the explanation which the honourable member has given.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The honourable member in charge of this Bill gave the impression from the Preamble that this Committee was being given the right to own this property in Synagogue Lane and it will not be given to them unless they form this Committee. Now there is something in the Bill which goes further than that. The honourable member's explanation was that we should give these people the right to hold this property, but this Bill says that these people can hold land otherwise. How can the honourable member reconcile that statement with the first one?

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: The honourable member was probably not listening to me. I actually read from the Preamble of the Bill to show that the object of the Bill is to vest these Burial Grounds in these persons to be used as Burial Grounds, for persons of the Jewish Faith in this Island subject to the terms and conditions covenants reservations and stipulations to be contained and set out in the deed vesting the same in them: and further that it is deemed advisable in order to ensure the convenient holding of the said Burial Grounds and any other real or personal property that may hereafter be acquired by them for the benefit of persons of the Jewish Faith in this Island and also to ensure the effective administration of such property and the general conduct of their affairs that the said persons should be incorporated under the name of "The Synagogue Burial Grounds Committee."

I explained that all of that was controlled by Clause 9 of the Bill which says: "The objects of the Committee shall be religious and charitable only and the Committee shall not engage in trade or commerce." Jews might buy land in Barbados to-day and hold it for any purpose, but in this case so as to be able to get the control of the Burial Grounds, they had to form this Burial Grounds Committee and agree to be bound under Clause 9. In addition to that they had to get some local person such as Mr. Shilstone who is interested in historical matters to be associated with them; and if he dies or is unable to serve, the President can nominate somebody else to fill the vacancy. Before this Bill could be brought here, these persons had to obtain the consent of the owner of the property. You are bound to give them the power which the individual is given, but they are subject to Clause 9 and the specific conditions that may be attached to the acquisition of any property.

Mr. MAPP: This Bill was brought down for a specific purpose but if we pass Clause 4 as it is, the Jews will stop at nothing. If they are going to make money, they will do anything to make it. This question of acquiring property will leave us open to a lot of hardships; the Government might want to buy cheap land in any parish and the Jews might not want them to have it. Then this state of affairs will be brought to an end. I beg to move that the words "of whatever nature and description" be deleted. If the sole object of this Bill is to enable these people to hold property for Burial Grounds, let it be limited to that object alone. The term which is used in this Clause is very wide; Clause 9 limits this Committee to religious and charitable objects, but that does not mean anything because lots of things can be done under those headings. You can say that a thing is for a charitable purpose when in fact it is a matter of trading. I hope that hon. members will realise the significance of this Clause now and not wait until later on to do so; it is up to them. The general nature of this Clause is opposite to the specific purpose of the Bill, and it opens the way to a multitude of sins. In my opinion, it arouses suspicion.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

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

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

The question that Clause 4 stand part of the Bill half an hour was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

THE SYNAGOGUE BURIAL GROUNDS COMMITTEE BILL

On resumption.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When the adjournment took place the House was in Committee on the Bill to incorporate the Synagague Burial Grounds Committee.

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

THE CHAIRMAN: When the House was last in Committee on this Bill, Clause 4 was under consideration.

The question that this House do now adjourn for is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 5 to 8 inclusive are read and are agreed to.

Clause 9. The objects of the Committee shall be religious and charitable only and the Committee shall not engage in trade or commerce.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I beg to move that that be Clause 9 of the Bill.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

Mr. ALDER: Since the senior member for St. James thinks that our feelings are changed in respect of certain parts of this Bill I would like him to know that it is only a question of expediency but I still have my apprehensions as regards giving these foreign bodies permission to hold unlimited property in this country in perpetuity.

The question that Clause 9 stand part of the Bill is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 10 is read and is agreed to.

The Preamble is read and is agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. E. K. WALCOTT, seconded by Mr. GODDARD the CHAIRMAN reports the passing of the Bill in Committee.

The House resumes and on the motions of Mr. E. K. WALCOTT, seconded by Mr. GODDARD, the Bill is read a third time and is passed.

HOUSE REVERTS TO GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. Cox, the House reverts to Government Business.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The first Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas,—To move the House into Cmomittee of Supply to cnsider the grant of a sum of money for the service of the Government.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. Cox, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

RESOLUTION TO SUPPLEMENT CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman,—The Resolution is for $3,805 made up as follows:—$2,400 to provide accommodation for stud animals at District Agricultural Stations, $41 to meet expenses incurred by the Ceramist in excess of the grant made under Colonial Development and Welfare Scheme R. 72 during his term of service with this Government which expired in December, 1944, and $1,364, a revote of the unexpended balance of the free grant made under the same scheme, which was included in the Estimates for 1949—50, for the engagement on contract of a Ceramist. The use of the stud animals has increased. People are taking advantage of their services and the money is wanted to increase the number of the animals. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,—I notice that provision is being made at the district agricultural stations for additional bulls and I am hoping that when these bulls are added, the service will be cheaper than it has been in the past. Another point is this. It is a waste of money if these animals are purchased and then you allow the calves to be butchered indiscriminately as is done nowadays. I take it that the purpose of these stud animals is to replenish the supply of stock in the island but as it is, the fees are too high to the peasants and the young animals are slaughtered all over the villages without any proper control. Unless the young animal is tested and declared to be of no use for breeding it should not be permitted to be killed. I feel that those are things that should be looked into because we are really suffering from a shortage of meat in the island and have to depend on the high-priced imported article.

Mr. COX: I would like to inform the honourable member that the fee at the country stations is 5/- per service and I do not think that he can consider that exorbitant.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It does appear, Sir, that we might as well consider the use of artificial semination What I mean is this: We are voting now £500 for additional accommodation and from time to time we are going to have to provide more money for this purpose. I am not going to dilate on the point now because it is late but it does appear to me that the Department of Agriculture would be well advised to adopt artificial semination as is adopted in some o the other countries. One bull may cause the impreg nation of as many as 300 or 400 cows a year and I want to suggest seriously that the time has com when we should consider adopting the practice a these stations.

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

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. Cox, the CHAIRMAN reports the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply and asks leave to sit again.

The House resumes and on the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. Cox, the Resolution is read a first and a second time and is agreed to.

RESOLUTION FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF AN ANAESTHETIST AT THE GENERAL HOSPITAL

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,— I ask that Order No. 7 be taken as the next Order.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St Thomas,—To move the passing of a Resolution to authorize the Government to enter into an agreement with a person to serve in the Barbados General Hospital as an Anaesthetist.

Dr. CUMMINS: I ask leave to amend the schedule to the Resolution by deleting the first paragraph and substituting therefor the following:—

> "The salary of the person so engaged shall be on the scale of $4,800 x 240 to $5,760 and the point of entry into the scale shall be such as the Governor may determine in accordance with the experience and qualifications of the person concerned."

The reason for that is this: The post of Anaesthetist was first fixed on a pensionable basis and it is rather difficult to get someone to come on a pensionable basis. We are more likely to get one to come on contract and that will mean an addition in salary. I beg to move that this Resolution, as amended, do now pass.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION TO FIX THE AIRMAIL POSTAGE ON LETTERS, POSTCARDS AND AIR-LETTER FORMS

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to take Order No. 8 as the next Order.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Michael. —To move the passing of a Resolution to fix, with effect from the 1st October, 1950, the airmail postage on letters, postcards, and air-letter forms addressed to any destination set out in column one of the schedule hereto, at the rate set out immediately opposite such destination in column two of the said schedule.

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker,—This Resolution seeks to increase the airmail rates to various destinations. The addendum is quite full and I feel sure that honourable members have read it. The most important changes by way of increase are in respect of the rates to Great Britain, Canada, United States of America, British Honduras, and Jamaica. On the other hand there are reductions in respect of the rates to Australia, British Guiana, Canal Zone, Dutch West Indies, French West Indies, Leeward Islands, Trinidad, and the Windward Islands. The Colonial Postmaster, for some time now, has represented to Government the necessity for those increases which have been proposed while at the same time the rate to places in the British West Indies has been reduced from 8

cents to 6 cents. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION TO FIX THE AIR MAIL POSTAGE ON PRINTED MATTER

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to take Order No. 9 as the next Order.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Michael,—To move the passing of a Resolution to fix, with effect from the 1st October, 1950, the airmail postage rate on printed matter (including books, commercial papers and newspapers) addressed to Great Britain.

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker,—This Resolution seeks authority to increase the rate on second class mail to Great Britain from 9 cents to 12 cents per half ounce. This is necessary consequent on the increase in the conveyance charges for this class of mail which became effective on the 4th August, 1950. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

The House is, on the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, adjourned to the 3rd October, 1950, at 3 o'clock p.m.