

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1950—51

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 7th August, 1951

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Messrs. G. H. ADAMS, B.A., E. L. WARD, Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., Messrs. M. E. COX, F. L. WALCOTT, H. A. DOWDING, E. K. WALCOTT, K.C., O. T. ALLDER, F. E. MILLER and J. A. HAYNES, B.A.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the 24th July, 1951, having been circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

MESSAGES FROM THE LEGISLATIVE

COUNCIL

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received Messages from the Honourable the Legislative Council returning the Bill to make provision for holidays with pay for employees, with amendments; and the Bill to amend the Vestries (Cost of Living Bonus to Employees) Act, 1947—6.

MESSAGES FROM THE GOVERNOR

Mr. ADAMS: Speaker, — I have the honour to present from His Excellency the Governor Messages as follows:—

Message No. 23/1951 from His Excellency the Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly informing the Honourable House on certain Acts which have been assented to in the name and on behalf of His Majesty the King.

MESSAGE NO. 24/1951

*His Excellency The Governor
To*

The Honourable the House of Assembly

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that on the 7th July a serious cash shortage in the Treasury was discovered. The amount involved was \$14,000. A sealed bundle purporting to contain 1,000

\$5 notes was withdrawn from the vault to supplement the counter cash. On breaking the seal and tapes the bundle was found to contain \$2 notes and not \$5 notes. Thus instead of an amount of \$5,000 the bundle contained only \$2,000 representing a shortage of \$3,000.

2. The remaining sealed bundles in the Treasury vault were immediately examined and it was found that a further two bundles had been similarly treated, and another bundle purporting to contain \$5 notes was made up of pieces of blank paper cut to the size of a currency note.

3. The \$5 notes which the labels on the bundles alleged were contained in the bundles were issued to Commercial Banks in the Island from the Currency Department on the following dates—20th December, 1943, 6th September, 1945, (two bundles) and the 24th November, 1949. While the bundles of two dollar notes which were substituted for \$5 notes were issued from the Currency Department on the following dates: 5th April, 1945, 19th December, 1946, and 23rd November, 1950.

4. There is no record in the Treasury regarding the date or the serial number of any bundle of \$5 notes received from the Banks nor have the Banks any record of the issue of the \$5 and \$2 notes concerned.

5. Boards of Survey which checked the Treasury cash on the 5th April and the 17th May, 1951, accepted the bundles as containing the number and value of notes as stated on the labels. The seals were not broken and the notes were not checked.

6. Immediately the shortage was discovered the Police were called in to investigate. Notwithstanding the most exhaustive examination both departmentally and by the Police there is as yet no conclusive evidence as to the identity of the culprit or culprits. Enquiries are proceeding.

7. The complete stock of the Currency Department has been checked in detail by the Auditor General and found correct. As regards the two remaining sealed bundles in the Treasury vault, however, a shortage of \$475 was discovered on the 13th July. Each of these bundles purported to contain 1,000 \$5 notes but the first had only 951 notes and the second 954. Thus the total shortage is \$14,475.

ALFRED SAVAGE,
Governor.

Government House,
Barbados.
31st July, 1951.

In connection with this Message I ask leave to say that there has not been any intentional slighting of this House, as there might appear to be, in sending this Message to the Other Place first. This Message was to have been sent down to this House two meetings ago, but it was pointed out that if it was sent down then, the Other Place would not have been meeting on that particular day, and it might have been felt that the Message was being sent to us before it was sent to them. This Message was held over for a week and we sat on a Monday and not on our usual meeting day which is Tuesday. Thinking that both Houses of the Legislature were meeting last Tuesday, the Secretary brought the Message here and also to the Other Place; in consequence the Other Place received the Message last Tuesday when we did not meet. I repeat that there was no intention of slighting this House inasmuch as, unknown to the Secretary, we held a meeting on Monday instead of Tuesday and the Message was not delivered to us although it was brought over to the office of this House. I have to say that because it might appear somewhat strange to the public that the Other Place got this Message first.

MESSAGE NO. 25/1951

*His Excellency the Governor
To
The Honourable the House of Assembly*

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that under Article IV of the Mutual Defence Assistance Agreement between His Majesty's Government and the Government of the United States (Cmd. 7894) the provisions of Article V of the Economic Co-operation Agreement are to be regarded as an integral part of the Mutual Defence Agreement. Article V of the Economic Co-operation Agreement reads as follows:—

"1. The Government of the United Kingdom will facilitate the transfer to the United States of America, for stockpiling or other purposes, of materials originating in the United Kingdom which are required by the United States of America as a result of deficiencies or potential deficiencies in its own resources, upon such reasonable terms of sale, exchange, barter or otherwise, and in such quantities, and for such period of time, as may be agreed to between the Governments of the United States of America and the United Kingdom after due regard for the reasonable requirements of the United Kingdom for domestic use and commercial export of such materials. The Government of the United Kingdom will take such specific measures as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this paragraph, including the promotion of the increased production of such materials within the United Kingdom, and the removal of any hindrances to the transfer of such materials to the United States of America. The Government of the United Kingdom will, when so requested by the Government of the United States of America, enter into negotiations for detailed arrangements necessary to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.

2. Recognising the principle of equity in respect to the drain upon the natural resources of the United States of America and of the participating countries, the Government of the United Kingdom will, when so requested by the Government of the United States of America, negotiate where applicable (a) a future schedule

of minimum availabilities to the United States of America for future purchase and delivery of a fair share of materials originating in the United Kingdom which are required by the United States of America as a result of deficiencies or potential deficiencies in its own resources at world market prices so as to protect the access of United States industry to an equitable share of such materials either in percentages of production or in absolute quantities from the United Kingdom, (b) arrangements providing suitable protection for the right of access for any citizen of the United States of America or any corporation, partnership, or other association created under the laws of the United States of America, or of any State or Territory thereof and substantially beneficially owned by citizens of the United States of America, in the development of such materials on terms of treatment equivalent to those afforded to the nationals of the United Kingdom, and, (c) an agreed schedule of increased production of such materials where practicable in the United Kingdom and for delivery of an agreed percentage of such increased production to be transferred to the United States of America on a long-term basis in consideration of assistance furnished by the United States of America under this Agreement.

3. The Government of the United Kingdom, when so requested by the Government of the United States of America, will co-operate, wherever appropriate, to further the objectives of paragraphs 1 and 2 of this Article in respect of materials originating outside the United Kingdom."

2. His Majesty's Government has undertaken to consult the Governments of the Territories to which the Economic Co-operation Agreement has been extended "with a view to securing their consent to the continued extension to those territories of Article V of the Economic Co-operation Agreement so long as those provisions remain an integral part of the Mutual Defence Assistance Agreement."

3. His Excellency is of the view that Agreement on the part of the Government of Barbados would have no more effect than to indicate a willingness to assist in the continued provision of such materials of a strategic value as may be required from time to time by the United States subject to the adequate safeguards already provided by the wording of Article V of the Economic Co-operation Agreement.

4. His Excellency would be grateful to learn at an early date whether in accordance with the general spirit of the Mutual Defence Assistance Agreement the Honourable the House of Assembly would be willing to agree to the extension as above.

ALFRED SAVAGE,
Governor.

Government House,
Barbados.
31st July, 1951.

PAPERS LAID

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

Report of the Harbour and Shipping Department for the year 1950.

Report of the Comptroller of Customs on the Customs Revenue Trade, Shipping and Excise for the Island for the year 1950.

Annual Report of the Barbados Publicity Committee for the year ending 31st March, 1951.

NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution to approve the number of Bursaries which the Board of Industrial Training may award annually to suitable candidates.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Resolution to authorise the Governor to enter into an agreement with a person to serve in the Department of Science and Agriculture in the office of Government Analyst.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Resolution to place the sum of \$19,469 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1951-52, Part II, Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1951-52, No. 17 which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: A Bill intituled an Act to amend the Naturalization Act, 1915.

Mr. ADAMS: Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at the next meeting in order to consider the money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

Messrs. GILL and MAPP entered the House and took their seats.

QUESTION

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

1. Will Government state if arrangement has been made to train any of the present staff at Bowmanston to handle the new electrical pumping equipment?

2. If no arrangement has been contemplated, will the Government make provision for some of the present staff to be trained in the handling of this machinery?

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the Bill to amend the Naturalization Act, 1915, was read a first time.

ORDERS POSTPONED

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker — I ask leave to postpone the first six Orders and that Order No. 7 be taken as the first Order of the Day.

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

Mr. LEWIS entered the House and took his seat.

APPOINTMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker — Before you proceed to call the Orders of the Day, I am asking leave for Your Honour to appoint a Select Committee to reply to His Excellency's Message No 19/1951 relating to the Economic Co-operation Agreement between the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of the United States of America.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that a Select Committee be appointed to reply to His Excellency's Message No. 19/1951.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that a Select Committee be appointed to reply to His Excellency's Message No. 19/1951. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it. Subject to the approval of the House, I appoint the

following honourable members as the members of such Select Committee:—The honourable senior member for St. Lucy (Mr. Ward) the hon. senior member for St. James (Mr. E. K. Walcott) the honourable senior member for St. Andrew (Mr. GILL) the honourable senior member for St. Michael (Mr. Cox) the honourable junior member for St. Thomas (Mr. MAPP) the honourable senior member for St. George (Mr. MILLER) and the honourable senior member for St. Thomas (Dr. CUMMINS).

ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Mr. ADAMS: I understand that the Chairman of Committees is not likely to be present at today's meeting, and I therefore beg to move that the honourable junior member for the City be appointed as Chairman of Committees for to-day's sitting.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Messrs. MOTTLEY, BRYAN and CRAWFORD entered the House took their seats.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first order of the Day now stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph:—To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider to grant of sums of money for the service of the Colony.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply. Mr. LEWIS being in the Chair.

Mr. BRANCKER came into the Committee and took his seat.

SUPPLEMENTARY VOTE RE CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

Dr. CUMMINS: The first Resolution Mr. Chairman, is one for \$17,400. In connection with this Resolution, honourable members will remember that it was being considered a few weeks ago and for one reason and another it was decided to postpone its consideration. This money is for the purpose of improving conditions in relation to the disposal of manure at the Pine Plantation and for the purchase of land adjoining Shrewsbury Boys' School. The amount of \$17,000 is required in respect of the Pine Plantation and \$400 in respect of the purchase of the land adjoining Shrewsbury Boys' School. This Resolution was very much debated on the last occasion when honourable members expressed their views in connection with it and I do not think that there is any need to say anything more about the Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: This Resolution is one to which we gave some previous consideration and in it is included an amount for the purpose of buying a farmyard manure loader and spreader for use at the Pine Plantation. On the occasion when this matter was previously discussed I expressed a certain amount of opposition to it and today I am even more uncompromising in my attitude of opposition to this expenditure. I have already pointed out that we have to consider the question of contributing to the unemployment of the colony, and I have found on a personal visit to the Central Livestock Station at the Pine that there are other matters which demand more attention, and on which this money should be spent, than this particular matter which we are considering. For instance, I find that there is the need for better sheep pens and there is a demand for young pigs which cannot be supplied for the reason that accommodation is needed for the rearing of a greater number of pigs. Bearing in mind the serious meat situation in this colony the Government should concentrate on providing accom-

modation for rearing more sheep and supplying more pigs of the breed which is kept at the Plantation. I am told on good authority that the number of pigs which can be supplied is less than one-third of the orders which are received at the Pine. It seems to me as if the Government is more anxious to remedy a situation which will contribute materially to the unemployment situation of the colony than to remedy the situation which I have just mentioned at the Pine—a situation which, if improved, must be of more general benefit to the community. I am therefore going to move that the amount of this Resolution be reduced by \$2,000, the amount which is for the purchase of this farmyard manure loader and spreader. I am sure that the acquisition of this machine will not be in the best interests either of the promotion of the agricultural interests in the island or in helping us to find work for the thousands of people who now find themselves unemployed through no fault of their own. I beg to move that the amount of this Resolution be reduced by \$2,000.

Mr. ALLDER: I am seconding that motion. On the last occasion when we discussed this Resolution I listened very carefully to the various points raised by honourable members; I gathered from the honourable junior member for St. George that there is only one manure loader and spreader in the colony, and if the Government were to purchase this one now, we will have only two of these machines in the colony. Personally, I feel that the amount of manure turned out at this Government Experimental Station at the Pine does not merit the acquisition of this machine up there and I cannot refrain from giving consideration to the number of able-bodied men who now walk up and down the island daily in search of employment. The point has been raised about people being reluctant to do the work of throwing out manure nowadays, but I notice that private dairies which do not have manure loaders and spreaders for the disposal of manure have to depend upon manual labour to dispose of it; I have not been able to hear that these dairies meet with any difficulty whatever in this matter. My primary motive is to make sure that the Government does not introduce any labour saving device which will put people out of work: while it is true that just a few people might be needed for the disposal of this manure, you must consider that if the presence of this manure loader and spreader puts too many people out of work, it will be doing harm. The unemployment situation in this island is definitely too great and whenever there is the possibility of leaving the door open for a man to get a job, you should do that. While one man may be deprived of getting a job you might be making things difficult for one who has a wife and children, to say nothing of the other dependants on his earnings for their maintenance.

I remember that sometime ago when there was a scheme for the mechanization of the sugar industry there were several persons including politicians who agitated against it; they have not succeeded in preventing the introduction of these labour-saving devices because they were under the control of private enterprise. This particular case which is now before us is one in which the Government now has it within its power to say whether it will continue to fight against the tendency to introduce the means whereby fewer persons will obtain employment. I have been trying on the last occasion to draw to the attention of the Government that they should not join people in bringing about machinery which will result in putting some people out of work. I am still trying to remind the Government that it should not be their duty to

encourage such a situation, they should not mechanize any industry where such mechanization will have the tendency of unreasonably putting people out of work. I have visited the Experimental Station at the Pine and I have noticed that they do not have sufficient stock up there from which you might feel that they have so much manure that it takes too many persons to remove it. According to my reckoning I hardly think they have over 100 head of stock up there: I think I have only seen 18 head of cattle, a couple of sheep, goats and pigs and that will show that the manure could not have been accumulating to that extent as to cause them to feel that the only way they could get rid of it is by the introduction of this farmyard manure loader and spreader.

It has been said that the Head of the Department has suggested that such machinery be purchased; well, the Head of the Department is only responsible for the running of his Department, but the members of this House have to think further than that. We have to consider ways and means by which the population can get the means of a reasonable existence, we have to see that work is provided for people. In a matter of this sort we seem to be forgetting our responsibility to assist people who might be put out of employment by the introduction of this manure loader and spreader; other dairies may be following the Government in installing this machinery at their premises. If that is done, one can readily imagine what the position will be when dozens of persons who are now employed at the dairies in the removal of manure, are put out of employment. Some honourable members do not seem to realise the immensity of the unemployment problem; I am hoping they will see that if the tendency is to put more and more people out of employment, that will result in a greater measure of hardship and confusion in the colony. It is a waste of time for us to do things which will cause us to lose much of the usefulness of our manpower; too many able-bodied men walk the streets daily in search of employment and if they do not get any employment they resort to committing crimes, because when hunger faces people they will follow the line of least resistance. While the introduction of this mechanical device at this Agricultural Station may only deprive a couple of persons of employment, nevertheless these persons could be employed in the disposal of this manure. Our responsibility is greater than that of any Head of a Department; while he might want to see certain improvements at his particular Department, yet we have to see that no wrong is done as far as the introduction of this kind of machinery to put people out of work is concerned.

Messrs. GARNER and GODDARD came into the Committee and took their seats while Mr. ALLDER was speaking.

The question that the amount of this Resolution be reduced by \$2,000 was put and resolved in the negative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. ALLDER, and CRAWFORD—2.

Noes: Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. MILLER, BRYAN, COX, MAPP, ADAMS, GARNER, MOTTLEY, E. K. WALCOTT, DOWDING, GODDARD and WARD—12.

The question that the amount of this Resolution was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

RESOLUTION FURTHER POSTPONED

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, — I ask leave further to postpone the next Resolution — A Resolution that the sum of \$480 be advanced from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the purpose of making a loan to Mr. A. L. King, an Elementary School Teacher

who is now in the United Kingdom, to cover the cost of his passage from the U.K., to Barbados.

There being no objection the honourable member was granted leave.

COST OF EQUIPMENT FOR SEAWELL AIRPORT

Dr. CUMMINS: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is one to place the sum of one hundred and eighteen thousand six hundred and fifty dollars (\$118,650) at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1951-52 Part II—Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1951-52, No. 14, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

This expenditure is in respect of Seawell Airport. I believe that it is the desire of every member of this community including the Government to bring Seawell Airport up to date as a modern Airport and from time to time this House has been called upon to vote money for that purpose. Recently the Airport Committee has forwarded a Report to the effect that certain things should be done, such as supplying new electrical installations, making new roads, parking spaces, and so on, in order that the object of having an up-to-date airport might be achieved. As honourable members will see from the Addendum, this Resolution deals with the following items: (1) Supply of electricity, \$29,200; (2) Airfield Control, \$11,200; (3) Airfield Equipment, \$11,100; (4) Buildings and Roads, \$93,000 and (5) Grounds, \$2,400, making a total amount of \$146,900. It will also be seen from the addendum that of this \$146,900, the sum of \$29,000 has been included in the Capital Estimates, Head VI, Item 9, and an additional \$200 is now necessary to bring this provision up to that recommended under item (1) above. Further, that "additional provision of \$117,700 is necessary to meet the balance. It has however, been learnt that since the report was prepared the cost of an item of equipment made under (2) above has increased by \$750. Supplementary provision for \$118,450 is therefore required to implement the Report of the Seawell Airport Committee."

We are hoping that when this work has been completed, Seawell Airport will provide the necessary accommodation for aircraft calling at Barbados during the day or night. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

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

COST OF PREPARATION OF LAND AT SEAWELL PLANTATION

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is one to place the sum of \$1,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1951-52, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1951-52, No. 15, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

This money is required in connection with the preparation of 29 acres of land at Seawell Plantation to be rented to small holders there. Honourable members will remember that some months ago this matter was raised in this House and it was stated that it is the Government's intention to lease his land at Seawell instead of using it as an estate on which to put small houses. The Government has reached a decision on that basis which will form the nucleus of a miniature co-operative scheme in the agricultural development of this island. It is hoped that the Government and the people of Barbados will gain some practical experience along these lines, and future schemes such as co-operative marketing schemes, may be established when there are indications among the peasants as to

where the general trends in agriculture will lead. This is an effort which is not such an easy one in Barbados where land is not available to the Crown at cheap rates; but in this instance the Crown owns this land and found it was economic to run it from an estate point of view, but it can be made of greater use to small holders. It is with that point in view that the Government has decided to send down this Resolution to embark on this project. Honourable members are aware of the fact that efforts have been made to train some of the Officers in the Agricultural Department in co-operatives and I feel that, with the proposal before us, we will be able to give a lead in this matter. I doubt that any honourable member will oppose this Resolution which is for the preparation of this land for the purpose I have stated. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Before you put the question Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that the significant thing about this Resolution is that the Government has not been moved to make this land available to small holders as a result of any policy of land reform or of any desire to make more of the arable land in the colony available to a greater number of people but purely because it has been found to be uneconomic to continue to run this acreage as a plantation. That is a very important point of which we should take notice. In a colony like Barbados where the distribution of land is so uneven and where more than two-thirds of the total acreage is in the hands of a few hundred people, it is highly desirable that steps should be taken to place more of the land at the disposal of the people in the colony. One would have expected that a Government which professes to have socialist tendencies, would have, before now, initiated some proper policy of land reform rather than being compelled to distribute a few acres of land to people purely because it has been found that it is uneconomic to run the acreage as a plantation as it was formerly run. The fact that there are no Crown lands in Barbados which the Government could acquire is not of importance in this issue, because there are other colonies in the Caribbean area in which the same situation obtains and the Governments of those colonies have found it desirable to acquire land for the purpose of distributing it on some basis among the landless people. With regard to this land at Seawell, the proposal is to divide 29 acres in four-acre units, which means that, roughly speaking, about seven people will be settled on this land. Early this year a number of tenants at Seawell sent a petition to the Governor-in-Executive Committee pointing out that the land which they were then renting would soon be withdrawn from the possession, and asking the Government to consider them as tenants for this land at Seawell. I do not remember off-hand how many people signed that petition, but I know that if the proposal to rent this land to seven people is carried through, there will be a lot of disappointment to people in the area. It may be all well and good merely to have the idea of putting agricultural theories into practice and making certain experiments in dividing this land into four-acre lots, but what is just as important as testing agricultural theories in a colony like this, is making some effort to ensure that a greater number of people are settled on the land. We have already made a number of experiments with regard to 10-acre and 12-acre lots and in some cases 18-acre lots, and the results from these experiments have been to some extent, successful; but I am of opinion that we can also make other experiments which will turn out to be as successful, we can also contribute in a far greater measure to the economy of the country if we divide this land among a greater number of people.

There has been much dissatisfaction at Seawell over the proposal being made known that only seven people would benefit from the 29 acres of land. There are a greater number of people who rent land and who expect to be dispossessed of it, and the fact that these seven people may make a highly successful hand of their lots will be of small consolation to person who finds nowhere to put his house, having been deprived of the small holding which he had leased from some plantation owner. I am inclined to the view that instead of dividing this land between seven people we should divide it between 29 people, and we will afford greater satisfaction to people. On this acreage at Seawell with an abundant sheet water supply which lends itself to irrigation, you can settle 29 people, with proper irrigation facilities you develop 29 small holdings and you could have vegetable farming which would be a pleasure to the colony and to the people who run it. I am sure that the honourable senior member for Christ Church has had his attention drawn to this matter as mine has been drawn to it, and I expect that he will support my suggestion that further consideration of this matter be postponed. Since February these people at Seawell sent a petition to the Governor-in-Executive Committee asking that this land be rented to them, and the Government could easily find out by a visit to the spot, the feeling of the people up there. An acre of land means a lot to the average landless person in this island; an acre of land cultivated under the supervision and direct control of the Agricultural Department with the Inspectors paying constant visits and giving advice will mean a lot to the people who are fortunate enough as to be able to settle on this land. Although this matter has been delayed long enough already, I am moving that the further consideration of it be postponed for the special purpose of the Government paying attention to the suggestion I have made.

Mr. WARD: I feel that in entering upon a venture of this sort one must bear in mind the circumstances in which the experiment is being tried. What we must decide is whether we are setting up a unit which will supply a family or whether we are giving land to people who will probably put houses on it as they do at the moment. It seems to me that we must decide whether we are going to have an economic unit or whether we are going to carry out the idea of having an acre of land to be dealt with on a small system. With conditions as they are, I agree with the honourable junior member for St. Philip that it would be a little hard on people in this particular area who are willing to have land, to know that one individual is given 4 acres and 10 or 12 other people in the same area who are land hungry are left out. I believe that the Government would be putting themselves in an awkward position in that way, and I think they should review their policy and divide the land into one-acre lots so that help would be afforded to more people. As the honourable junior member for St. Philip has said, I feel that there is an abundance of sheet water around that area, and if the land is divided into acre lots and irrigation is used, that would probably be making 29 families more happy than they are today. Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable member seconding the motion for postponement? Yes, Sir. We see for ourselves that people with one acre of land have made themselves a little more independent than those who do not have any land at all, and I feel that the Government's policy should be that of benefiting more than a few individuals. I feel, as the honourable member has said, that more people can be settled on this land with sheet water available. I know what the honourable introducer of this Resolution has in mind; I remember that at the last Caribbean Conference the question of people having land as economic units was mooted and it was sug-

gested that you should not try to cut up land in parcels which, in the opinion of the various Governments, were not economic units. An economic unit in one island might be 10 acres, in another island it might be four and in yet another island it might be 20 acres; I feel therefore that the Government should work on the minimum on which they can work as far as this system is concerned. I feel that if we work on the acre basis many more people will be served and they will have irrigation facilities at their disposal. I am supporting the idea that the Government should consider changing their proposal from dividing this land into 4-acre lots to dividing it into 1-acre lots. If you give one man four acres of land he will employ people and sit back. That is another thing which will probably cause dissatisfaction to other people in the area; and we do not want to be preaching one thing and doing something else. I feel that there is some wisdom in what the honourable junior member for St. Philip has said: I think that the Government should reconsider their decision in this matter so as to bring more happiness to the people in this area.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I forgot to mention just now that in the petition which was sent to the Governor-in-Executive Committee in February it was actually mentioned that the people would be glad if the land were divided even into half-acre lots. They are so anxious to get a small piece of land that they will accept even half an acre.

Mr. GARNER: I agree that in this matter the greatest number of people should be served; I do not agree with the proposal which is now before us. I take it that we want to help agricultural labourers to get small portions of land so as to make themselves more independent, and the Government has to embark on that scheme. The question of land settlement or profit-sharing farms would have to be on a bigger scale. I think it would be far better to give this land to as many people as you can, rather than give it to seven people; if you give an acre of land to a person he would be able to work that unit; if you give one man four acres he will have to get assistance in working it and he will become a peasant. In this land-hungry colony we should try to help the greatest number of people to get land; it is my conviction that 29 people should be served with this land rather than seven people. This is not being co-operative in any sense of the word. Paragraph 2 of the addendum to this Resolution says this:

"Tenants will be encouraged to co-operate whenever economic or social advantage can be derived therefrom."

I take it that co-operative societies should be worked on a different basis; I take it that a better foundation than this will have to be laid in that case. All along I am in favour of allowing 29 persons each to have one acre of this land rather than allowing six or seven persons to have four acres. I feel that what my colleague has said is quite practicable and I am voting for the postponement because I should like the Government to give greater consideration to this matter.

Mr. REECE came into the Committee and took his seat while Mr. GARNER was speaking.

Mr. ADAMS: I am sorry that I have not heard all the speeches which have been made; I have only heard accounts of what honourable members have said. There have been times when I have differed from the advice given to the Government; but when everything has been taken into consideration I wish to assure the Committee that this scheme is the best possible scheme for the moment. Honourable members will remember that earlier this year the honourable senior member for St. Philip spoke about giving bonus to the workers at Dodds Plantation and I said

the Government was embarking on a system of profit sharing, and I went on to say that it was the intention of the Government to purchase plantations as that was a part of its programme for a number of years. It is not to say that the Government was not considering this question before this year; we were considering it. I want to tell honourable members that this is nothing new, nothing which has not been given careful consideration. I have never met in the West Indies anybody who is better qualified than Mr. Girvan of Jamaica on the question of co-operatives; people have the highest opinion of him as far as his knowledge, theoretical and practical, of co-operatives is concerned. The Government told Mr. Girvan about Seawell and he has given us advice about running co-operatives. As a result of years of experience in the running of co-operatives in Jamaica Mr. Girvan has given us advice which we are adopting, and that advice is not cutting up the land into small lots. If we have no expert knowledge of this matter and we approach somebody who has that knowledge and we are told that the present proposal is likely to succeed, that we should not do what we have been thinking of doing what else can we do but accept that advice? We have been advised by one who has been running co-operatives in Jamaica and we are following his advice. Anybody who knows anything about co-operatives in the West Indies knows that Mr. Girvan is in a class by himself; there is nobody in the West Indies who is in a class with him. I am not just using that as an argument that we must follow Mr. Girvan blindly; we have had the advice of the Attorney at Seawell, we have had the advice of different planters and when all the advice is put together the scheme before us is the best one. I have differed from some of the advice which has been given but when we have the advice of people who have run co-operatives, what are we to do? We must admit that we do not know as much as those people. This is nothing haphazard; the Government has given great attention to this matter, it has got the best advice it could get, and this is something which I commend to the Committee on the ground that it results from the best advice we could get. We have had numerous applications some in the handwriting of distinguished members of this House—we have had one the handwriting of which resembles that of the honourable junior member for Christ Church—in respect of the lease of certain lands, and there are those who are anxious to lease some of this land at Seawell. I am appealing to the Committee; our individual judgment might tell us to try the division of this land into acre lots, but we are following the expert advice which we have been given. If I were not a member of the Government and knew what has happened, I myself would have asked that this land be divided into half acre or acre lots. I will go a little further and say that when it comes to the question of working on a co-operative basis, we have got to remember the success of the Barbados Workers' Union and I cannot refrain from saying that it is one of the greatest things done in any part of the country. We know that the average Barbadian is accustomed to doing a thing in a particular way and he does not want to combine; but the workers in this colony have combined and made the Barbados Workers' Union a success. It is difficult to get Barbadians to combine and that has been one of the greatest difficulties with co-operatives in this island. Nobody can say that the Barbadian is like the Jamaican when it comes to being co-operative; people in a district will help "A" to build his house one afternoon, and then "A" will join with others to build "B's" house. That spirit does not exist in Barbados. The planters would know better than I know, but I am told that you cannot get in Barbadians the

co-operative spirit—the spirit of getting together, buying manures and marketing together; the most they will do is to combine and send 50 tons of canes to a factory in order to get the same price as the plantation. Unless you get a voluntary desire to be co-operative it is of no use forcing this business of co-operatives.

The best we can do is to work on the basis of four-acre units on the advice which we have been given that a four acre unit is economic, but not less. The co-operative spirit will come about some day. I am asking honourable members to accept the advice which we have got from people who have made a study of these matters rather than use our individual judgments. I may say finally that in the last two or three days I have refreshed my memory as regards the experience of Puerto Rico in these matters. Puerto Rico seems to be more fortunate than we are where the co-operative spirit is concerned; but Puerto Rico had a lot of trouble in this matter of working on a co-operative basis and it is far better to try something which is not ideal in the hope that it will work, than to try something which is ideal but something which is not likely to work. I appeal to honourable members to vote for this Resolution; we feel that we should try this proposal with this land, but as soon as we can get a plantation and run the proportionate profit system, we will do so. I suggest that we try the methods which have been tried in the West Indies; any system is an experiment, but let us try this system. I do not agree that we should postpone this matter; I appeal to honourable members to try this system. No human being can say that it is bound to be a success; the most we can say is that this system is more likely to be a success than any scheme of which we can think.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I do not know whether or not there has been laid on the table of the House any regulations or rules concerning the lease of the land; (A MEMBER: Not so far) then that is a very good reason for postponing this Resolution. One would like to know what are the conditions that will be laid down both for the conservation of the soil and the maintenance of fertility. I raise that question because it is set out in the addendum that this land is to be rented in four-acre units under conditions laid down by the Department of Agriculture for the conservation of the soil and the maintenance of its fertility. We are passing something in principle and it is most important to know what regulations or rules will be laid down by the Department for ensuring that the soil is in such and such a condition. I hope that the Government will be prepared to give us more information on the subject because this is a new principle and a new idea. For years and years the Government has been trying to find some system under which the peasant or agricultural labourer could share without at the same time impairing the economic sufficiency of the island. I agree with all that; but although I am willing to be convinced, I am yet to be convinced that this proposal could be in the interest of the man who is tilling the soil; you are making a man sweat his labour to keep something which you own and in which you are getting more benefit than he would be getting. This is not a case in which seven families will own the land; at the end of their toil and sweat the Government will have done well and we do not know until we see the conditions, how well they will have done. I am quite open to persuasion because I can see that the Government has considered the matter and considered it from the point of view of the interest of the island. I agree that a four-acre unit is more economic than a one-acre unit; there is a unit which is not economic at all, but what that unit is I am not in a position to say.

When you have the four-acre unit there is the question of the co-operative system which you are

not likely to get in the near future. The man with a four-acre unit is a type of peasant proprietor and he will employ people to cultivate the land for him; you have a type of peasant proprietor as distinct from the co-operative system. What is before us now is not the co-operative system, it is not the system which I have heard argued for time and again in this House. I am prepared to vote for the postponement of this Resolution and I want to hear more about the matter. I do not regard this proposal to be necessarily right unless there will be some substantial fruits of people's labours. I am not really opposing the Resolution to-day in the true sense of opposing it; I am voting for the postponement because I should like to have some fuller information.

Mr. ADAMS: I merely want to make two points in respect of the honourable member's remarks. He is asking for more information and if the object of the postponement is merely to get rules or regulations as to the conservation of the soil, what sense is that? Surely the Department of Agriculture will send down the regulations. This Government has never objected to people owning land; we feel that the ordinary man who toils from the cradle to the grave should himself own land. I have said over and over again in this House that the Government should own land which could be leased on a long-term basis; we have never departed from that. In this case is it not proper for the Government to own the land and make sure that people comply with the regulations as to the conservation of the soil? The only way to make sure that a man cultivates the land for the benefit of the community is for the Government to own it and say; "You are there forever provided that you till that land properly." I am therefore asking honourable members not to vote for the postponement or to turn down this Resolution. Some years ago when the honourable senior member for St. James was standing here, we went to Vieux Fort and we owned land which we let out for expressly the same purpose for which we are letting out this land; we were told that this Government should own the land and that Mr. Chase should see that the scheme was run properly. We are doing here exactly the same thing as we did at Vieux Fort, and if the honourable member were in my place he would probably say the same thing I am saying. We have been advised to keep the land in our possession so that we can make people cultivate it properly, and that a unit of four acres is a reasonable economic unit. Why should we postpone this matter? People have been appealing to us to let them go on this land; they are very anxious to go on it. Regulations for the proper cultivation of the land have been drafted, they will be laid on the Table of this House and there is no necessity to postpone this Resolution. Let us pass this Resolution and ask the Government to hurry up with the regulations and have them placed on the Table of the House. I will endeavour to get those Regulations laid on the Table of the House by next Tuesday, meanwhile let us get on with this matter which we have been told is a pressing one. We want to get this matter through the Legislature immediately so as to make use of the rainy season.

Mr. CRAWFORD: None of us would challenge Mr. Girvan's knowledge of running co-operatives but we have to bear two things in mind. One is that this colony is not Nova Scotia where you can have many acres with which to play; we have not got those broad acres which they have there. Another thing is that this is not the case of the Government having a Land Settlement Board with a capital of £50,000 to buy estates with C.D. & W. funds and settle people. If you want to see how it is possible to make a half-acre lot an economic one just go down to Goodland; there you will find dozens of small holders of quarter of an acre units and making them pay. Mr. Girvan knows

about Jamaica and Nova Scotia; but let him go down to Goodland and he will learn something. There you will find that people will no longer work at their trades but they are living off their quarter of an acre lots which they cultivate properly. It is not true to say that the people of this colony are not co-operative, or that they do not work together in order to achieve certain ends; the honourable senior member for St. Joseph should know that in his own constituency the fishermen join together and haul up each other's boats. The friendly societies provide a splendid example of how people can work together; if you want to know how people join together and what they have been able to achieve by so doing, you can ask the honourable senior member for the City to tell you something about the Civic Friendly Society.

In so far as this matter which is before us is concerned, earlier in the year and again to-day it was emphatically stated that it was not economical to run Seawell as a plantation, and therefore they are going to have it divided among seven people in four-acre lots and they will experiment on that basis. There can be nothing in the regulations for maintaining the fertility and conservation of the soil, which seven people can comply with and with which 29 people cannot comply. If these holdings are to be economic it will be necessary to provide irrigation facilities, otherwise people will not be able to obtain a living from them; and if you are going to provide irrigation for the four-acre units to make them economic, you can also provide irrigation in respect of the acre units. I am submitting that with irrigation a man can make a living out of an acre unit at Seawell. Everybody knows that we have not got the vast areas with which we can experiment as in some other places, and since we have to use what we have, the correct position is to supply the greatest number with the available portions of land under the most satisfactory conditions. Whatever conditions may be regarded as being satisfactory at Seawell, people can be settled there on acre lots. We can make comparisons with what is being done elsewhere in the West Indies and what it is proposed to do here; but we have to work along the lines which our peculiar conditions make imperative.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: We should know what the conditions in respect of the lease of this land are. Are the conditions going to be such that you take a peppercorn rent and eventually the land or the house will be the property of the man who rented it? That was the idea with which we originally started: where you are breaking new ground you should have your regulations and say what the conditions are. When I was one of the advisers to the Government we got information as to the experiments which had been tried in St. Vincent, and we tried not to attach conditions to the sale of land, we tried not to have restricted covenants which would produce certain difficulties. Then we had the St. Lucia scheme which failed for various reasons. As far as I remember about the Vieux Fort scheme, advances were made by the Government and the land was either under a long lease or there was an agreement that we would eventually own it. A company was formed and the Government took shares in it and provided a manager, but the idea was to get the benefit of the land. We were advised particularly because the experiment was tried in St. Vincent, that it would be better to lease the land on a long-term basis and the result would be the equivalent of a sale. I repeat that we should know what the terms will be in this case.

Mr. ADAMS: I was not in the Vieux Fort business; I was a member of the Opposition in those days. As far as I can see there was never any suggestion at any time from anybody that the Vieux Fort land should be sold; and there was never any suggestion, from the time the decision was made about

the Deacons Road or Belfield schemes that the land as distinct from the house should be sold. If people misbehave themselves you could give them notice to leave the premises. We have been congratulated on being the first part of the Empire to combine the desire for ownership with the necessity for keeping control; we are the only place which has the hire-purchase system in respect of a house and at the same time controlling ownership of the land by renting it. When you sell anybody land you cannot tell him how he should cultivate it; he can turn it into rab land or do anything else he likes with it. As far as this matter is concerned, the Director of Agriculture has implored us to get it through hurriedly because of the rains and the necessity for getting people on the land to cultivate it at the proper time. We have had expert advice that the four-acre unit is an economic unit, and because a member of the Opposition says one acre, not four, is an economic unit must we go against all the experts? I am appealing to honourable members to forget that they are members of the Opposition. Sir John Saint took years and years before he could get people to use fertilisers; year after year he said that fertilisers, sulphate of ammonia and so on, should be used and the super-experts like the hon. junior member for St. Andrew used to say: "You do not know anything about the matter." But today do they not accept blindly what Sir John Saint says? It has taken years for that stage to be reached. What are we to do? We get expert advice and just because honourable members are in the Opposition they want to postpone this matter! I have done all I can on behalf of the Government and I am appealing to honourable members to see that if they postpone this matter we will come back next week and tell them exactly the same thing.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: This is not a matter of getting the Opposition to vote for anything; people are eager to utilise this land and the question is; how should this land be utilised by the people and what unit should be used? Some honourable members do not seem to rely on accuracy especially when they accuse the Government of things. One honourable member has said that this matter has been brought down by the Government because it was uneconomic to run Seawell as a plantation; but when the honourable senior member for St. Philip made his speech at Christmas time in connection with the workers at Dodds not sharing in the bonus, he was told that apart from the workers sharing in the bonus, the Government had plans for running Dodds on a co-operative basis and the workers would share in the profits accruing from the plantation. In respect of this 29 acres of land at Seawell, the Government could have decided other than what it has decided; how can any honourable member accuse the Government of not seeing after the needs of the people? Nobody could accuse the Government of putting this land into the hands of seven special people. We are not parcelling out land into housepots; we want to get the best use made of the land. If you divide this land into 29 one-acre lots, can that produce any economic result? Would it not be better to divide this land into four-acre lots rather divide it into one-acre lots? Could anybody at Goodland give up working for \$2.50 per day to cultivate an eighth of an acre of land as a means of obtaining a living?

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of explanation. I said that people at Goodland are cultivating their gardens and they are making a highly successful living out of them.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The honourable member spoke of people giving up their jobs and living on their eighth of an acre lot of land. The honourable member is famous for making statements and then

challenging people as to their accuracy of repeating what he has said. We have been advised as to how to utilise this land but some people have a disdain for experts. In some other places you have six acre and ten-acre lots; there is no question of one-acre lots because the idea is to make people independent. I have given some study to this matter; I did not say that what is before us is a co-operative scheme; I said that it would be a sort of a beginning towards a co-operative scheme. Here the Government is maintaining control of the land; I am hoping that the Government will come down with a scheme whereby the land will be owned by the people and I hope we will not get any opposition from that side of the House.

There are various co-operative schemes. Sweden is different from Denmark and England is different from Canada and in the Colonies we must have our own pattern. The proposal here is to have four-acre units; we have this scheme before us and honourable members who are opposing it, are not saying that it is not in the best interest of the people; they are saying that in giving this land to seven people we are not doing as much as if we give it to 29 people. Well, seven people are not as many as twenty-nine; but we not only have to look at the number of people whom we are serving, we also have to see that we are doing something which is in the best interest of the community. Honourable members have to please their constituents; but I say that membership of the House is not my only aim in life. We are not giving this land to people with broad acres; we are trying to give it to people who do not have any land and the Agricultural Department will maintain control over the land, which will be for the benefit of the people who are occupying it. The Government has not dealt with the question of irrigation because the cost of testing the wells will be something like \$2,000 and the Government did not want to impose any hardship upon anybody. We want to see the day when the profits from the land will be divided among the people who work the land; that is what we would like to see. When we have been given expert advice it is not for any honourable member to say that a four-acre unit cannot work in the interest of the people. Members of the Government do not pretend to be agricultural experts, but we have commonsense, and we know that you cannot get the best out of an acre of land as against four acres. This scheme will be on such a basis that the Agricultural Department will be in control and see that the people cultivate the land properly; these people will be assisted with the use of modern implements and in the marketing of their crops. Honourable members will know that sometimes there is a glut of some things in one parish when people cannot get these things in other parishes; we want a Department which sees about the question of marketing crops. I hope that the people will show that they can assist in this matter of co-operation; it is in debates like this that co-operation is made very difficult to be obtained in Barbados.

At this stage, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. ALLDER seconded the motion which was agreed to.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House for half an hour.

On re-assembling:

Dr. CUMMINS tabled replies to the following questions:—

Question No. 83 by Mr. Brancker.

Question No. 85 by Mr. Mapp.

Question No. 90 by Mr. Bryan.

Question No. 91 by Mr. Crawford.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT tabled a reply to Question No 87 by Mr. Haynes.

DEBATE RESUMED ON SEAWELL PLANTATION RESOLUTION

Mr. SPEAKER: At the adjournment the House was in Committee of Supply.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House adjourned the honourable junior member for St. George was about to address the Committee on the Resolution for \$1,000.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman—I think it is time that this debate swung itself around to view the basic facts rather than the discussion of high-sounding ideologies. The question that we have before us is one which deals not with the economy of Jamaica or Puerto Rico or of anywhere else in the world. As I see it, we have to pay attention to the present economic set-up of Barbados and the present trends here. Even in that vast country of China they have become convinced that the larger area is more economical. That would make it appear as if I am going to argue that four acres is more economical than one. But I am not. This is not the kind of economy which will come to the rescue of this island. This island has always been, and will be for a long time, dependent on sugar, until we get an industrial programme set up. An honourable member has asked me how do I know that. Well, Sir, I can only say that I know it by facing the facts that are here for us to see to-day, and by looking into the past. Up to now the Gulf Oil Company has been shaking the island, but they have not found any oil yet. This island depends for its economy on the plantation system. But it is but right that every effort should be made so that the people may be able to get a portion of land on which to place their houses and add to their wages, whether they be agricultural workers, fishermen, carpenters or of any other trade. If we look at the economic problem of this island from that angle, it becomes obvious that every effort should be made to supply the greatest number of people with land for the purpose that I have just mentioned. An acre of land is definitely an economic unit under the present economic system in Barbados. I am not for one minute suggesting that a man can live on an acre purely and simply and earn enough money to keep himself and family on it. I am not here purely for the sake of opposition as the honourable senior member for St. Peter seems to think. What I mean is that a carpenter or fisherman etc., who may be enjoying gainful employment with which to keep himself and family may find that at some times he will have to rely on that acre of land to produce cane or food for sale, and also to be a guarantee that he has some food in that land for his own purposes. That is the basis of my argument. For anyone to say that an acre of land is not an economical proposition in this island is in my opinion, nonsensical. I have had vast experience for the past 20 years in purchasing land for peasants, and their aim has always been to acquire an acre of land. The honourable member is saying that they must purchase an acre if they cannot purchase anymore. But these peasants are sensible people who do not bite off more than they can chew. They purchase an acre and they work it, and when eventually they see that they can purchase more they do so. I can quote hundreds

f instances in which that principle was followed. With the problem as it stands in Barbados, for us to say that it is better to give 29 acres to four people than to 29 people is in my view a wrong approach to the question. Anyone with a knowledge of agriculture will tell you that if a man is going to cultivate four acres he will have to employ labour. It will not be possible for himself and his family to cultivate it. The honourable member keeps harping on the one acre lots and the cutting up of the island into one acre lots; but that is not my proposition at all. What I am saying is that the plantation system has proved its worth for hundred of years, at times when other islands in the West Indies could not produce enough sugar; and in my view, the more people you can get owning an acre of land which will stand by them in their troubles, the better it will be for the island. Regardless of whether this resolution is postponed, or whether it is brought here again, I will not vote for it as it stands.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman—It is not right to vote for or against a resolution in this Chamber without giving your reasons for doing so. I suppose it is well known that we in the Opposition do not vote against a motion simply because we are in the Opposition. We usually give our reasons, and the reasons that we give we believe in. Now I have heard a lot of argument from the Government as to why we should vote for this resolution. It is a resolution asking the House to vote a thousand dollars. It sets out in the Addendum that there are 29 acres of land at Seawell to be let out to smallholders in four-acre lots. My first approach to the question is this: I do not pretend to know anything about co-operatives, nor am I acquainted with the various authorities as the honourable introducer of this resolution. But from what little I do know I am still prepared to argue with him. He has shown me nothing in this resolution to indicate that it is anything at all to do with co-operatives.

THE CHAIRMAN: Read paragraph 2.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have read it. It says that the peasants will be "encouraged" to form a co-operative. But the introducer of the resolution has stressed the point about co-operatives. In my opinion, the first real approach to this problem is the question of supply and demand. I am not prepared to say that the authorities whom the Government quoted were wrong when they recommended the letting of this land in four-acre lots. Those authorities must be men of some experience. If you are working land on a co-operative basis, then four-acre lots will be more economical than one-acre ones. But all that the resolution says is that it is proposed to rent 29 acres of arable land at Seawell Plantation in four-acre lots under conditions laid down by the Department of Agriculture and the possibility of irrigating the land is being examined. Now, Sir, I have never owned land for the purpose of working. As I have said, Sir, I think that the correct approach to this question is supply and demand.

This land is 29 acres. It must be recognised that you have a land-hungry peasantry. Your agricultural workers are land hungry. If the Government is making a start with 29 acres, I think that it would be much better to rent it out to 29 people rather than to seven people. Therefore, I am going to vote for the postponement of the Resolution. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has distinctly said that it does not matter if we vote for the resolution or against it; the Government will bring it back the same way. I am not saying that the expert opinion given to the Government that four-acre lots are not more economical than one-acre lots if you are working it on a co-operative

basis. But this is not a co-operative undertaking. This is a question of the Government having 29 acres of land to rent out with about 500 people wanting it. It strikes me that it would be better to let 29 people have it than seven. I have had 20 years' experience in selling land, and knowing how people pay for it. As soon as you talk about irrigation, it seems that you are going to encourage market gardening. If you rent an agricultural labourer four acres of land he will have to employ people to aid him with the cultivation of it. I hope that the Government will not rent this land to people who already have a lot of land, or who already have land working. I assume that it will be rented to people of the labouring type. I am prepared at any time to take the honourable senior member for St. Peter and show him people with one acre of land irrigated, and who manage to live on it. I am not saying that they live well; but they make a better living than an agricultural labourer on a plantation. If the land is on the rock at Chancery Lane, naturally you will not get anything out of it. I am talking about fertile land. People who irrigate an acre of such land have actually got to hire people to help them with it. I know people right here at Kensington who rent land in lots of half an acre. I know people who are on lots of one acre and they have to hire help, and they have to work on it from five or six o'clock in the morning. If you are going to plant canes, you do not have to get help. But if you are going to plant seasoning, tomatoes, eschalots, etc., you will have to hire labour. That is my considered opinion. As I said before, we have a land-hungry people, and this question is one of supply and demand. I will vote to postpone this resolution today, despite the fact that the honourable leader of the House says that the Government will bring it back the same way.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman—I am sorry to interrupt the honourable member. When I said that I forget whether the honourable member for St. James had yet made the proposition about bringing down regulations for soil conservation. This is a horse of a different colour. If that is what the honourable member for St. James and his party would like to see, is there any reason why the Government should vote for the postponement of this in order to do that?

Mr. MOTTLEY: No one can pin me down to vote for something that is against my conscience. I am not talking about conservation of the soil. That is not my reason for wanting this postponed. The Government have told us that they want \$1,000 to allow seven people to get 29 acres of land. I would prefer to see you use this money to allow 29 people to have the land rather than seven people. That is my reason for wanting it postponed. The Opposition cannot always be wrong. Government cannot always be right. To say that the expert on Co-operatives does not know what he is saying is nonsense. That is not the question at all. The question is that we feel it would be better to rent this land to 29 people, and we want an opportunity for the House to discuss the matter further.

Mr. ADAMS: I was not persuaded that we should postpone it. As Leader of the Government I am now persuaded. Is there any reason to go on talking?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I will not say another word. The honourable member could have said that ever since.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman—I have heard all the arguments. The Government is allocating this 29 acres of land to seven people. In view of

the fact that we are suffering from a bad policy of land distribution, this is what I want to say: I think the point of view we should consider this from is to see whether we can accommodate as many families as possible. Today we have a situation where many labourers are asked to get off estate land at the short notice of 14 days. In the parish of St. John about six persons were treated that way last week. Many of them were born on the plantation, and many of them have worked there for the past 30 years. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph is President of the Barbados Workers' Union and that organisation had to send one of its representatives to deal with these cases. All these things show the necessity of making as much land as possible available to the people. I believe, sir, in giving to the greatest number. While it might be argued that to give this land in four-acre lots would be more economical, you must not forget that the Agricultural Bank will not accept an application from a person who does not show that he is working four acres. A person who will have the means of paying for the working of four acres will not be the kind of person who is in dire need of this land mentioned in the resolution. Therefore you are proposing to help people who can help themselves instead of those people who do not have an opportunity to do so. You cannot get a happy people without giving them security. There is no greater security than the holding of land, either by common ownership, or if you believe in it, by private ownership. I believe in common ownership. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph is Chairman of the Housing Board. Just a couple of days ago we saw where the Secretary of the Housing Board said that people, because their landlords were pushing them off the land, were offering bribes to get spots at the Pine and the Bay Estate. That will show you how land hungry the people are. They do not have the means to buy land, and even if they had the means, they cannot get the land. Government should do all it can to stop people from living in a state of servitude. Government has quoted the opinion of an expert who probably knows about the set-up in Jamaica. I am sure that he does not know about the land situation in Barbados, and how difficult it is for people to get even a few square feet of land to put their houses on. When you visit certain areas and see the appalling conditions that exist, when you see one person's privy at the window of someone else, you must become convinced of the necessity of dividing spots of land so well that as many people as possible will be able to benefit from the couple of acres at your disposal. You do not then need an expert to tell you what you should do. We have a tendency to believe in all these experts and to close our eyes to the realities that exist in the colony. What I am going to say now is that it seems that the present measure which the Government is putting before us seems to have only come as a result of their not being able to run Seawell Plantation as economically as they would like to. That plantation has lost money in spite of there having been a good crop, and if it is continued to be run as a plantation, Government will have to pay a manager, bookkeeper etc. So they are loosing it on the heads of a few unfortunate peasants.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: When the honourable member makes the statement that he has just made, it seems that he forgets that Dodd's Plantation is not run at a loss, and yet there is a land letting project there. In spite of that the honourable member is talking about loosing something on the people. He has been loosed on the people already.

Mr. ALLDER: It is a fortunate evil. I wish that circumstances would force a couple more resolutions such as this. In accordance with the expansion of the population you should make it possible to release more land to the people. As a Labourite, the honourable senior member for St. Peter should believe in that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The honourable member does not know what I believe in. He is incapable of understanding what he himself believes in.

Mr. ALLDER: I am not out to waste time with the honourable member. I will go on to strengthen my argument. Here we have the Government asking peasants to pay \$20.00 per acre per annum for this land. Within the past couple of months I have had to make out forms for labourers from the country who wanted to get loans from the Labour Welfare Fund. On those forms you have to state the size of the plot that you are renting from the plantation, and I have found labourers paying as low as 18 cents a week for three quarters of an acre of land. That is what plantation owners are charging. I also know that some of them have as much as 40 tenants to the acre. I know a tenancy with 45 tenants to the acre. That is only to show you. If honourable members quibble over my statement that the Government is proposing to charge these peasants more than estate owners are charging, I will go further and compare the price mentioned in this resolution with the 2/- a year charged the Turf Club for 20 acres at the Garrison—the Turf Club which makes thousands of pounds a year. I will also draw attention to the pepper corn rental which the Aquatic Club was paying. They also make thousands per annum. If as you say you are going to make it possible for new industries to start without paying income tax and customs duties for a couple of years, why do you not say that you will rent this land to these peasants at a nominal rate for the first few years? You should remember that when they take over this land they will have to work it for a year before they get results. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that with the desire of the people to get into any avenue from which they can earn a livelihood, you should allow 29 householders to enjoy this 29 acres rather than seven householders. Take the people at the Belfield Housing Scheme. You will see every square foot of the land occupied by them planted in cabbages, or lettuce or beets.

Dr. CUMMINS: That is a housing scheme. Seawell is not a housing scheme. The honourable member does not seem to understand that.

Mr. ALLDER: I know that. I am only trying to draw attention to what goes on at Belfield. If these people without the necessary accommodation are willing to make their house spots as productive as possible, I do not think we should fear what they would do if given an acre. The honourable senior Member for St. Joseph made a point just now about people having already made applications for this land. But what is going to happen? You will find that a couple of influential peasants are going to make applications, and the people who really need assistance are not going to get that assistance. Mr. Chairman, I am going even further than the suggestion that 29 families should benefit from this scheme. I feel that 58 people should benefit from it. If you take a family of four as an average, and multiply four by 58, you will see how many people will be able to feel that they are free from landlordism. To-day we find in this particular matter that the honourable members on the other side of the table are arguing that the Government should release land to as many people as possible. Even they are beginning to see the wisdom of changing their former policy. Why does not the Government see

fit to make it possible for land to be released according to the increase in the population? Honourable members on the other side have not been in favour hitherto of the Government buying up land, unless it was land like the Central Foundry site that would sell for several pounds per square foot. If Government really wants to help the peasants with co-operatives they should make land available all through the colony. They should organise these people. But to say that they are using this as a means of starting off a co-operative scheme without making land available to as many families as possible is something that I cannot agree with. This resolution deals with Seawell. There is another one to deal with cutting up land at Dodd's Plantation to accommodate labourers there, so that the Government can be assured of constant labour at that plantation. That shows that the Government is convinced that there is a necessity to release land for the accommodation of the population. I am hoping that this resolution is not representative of the land policy which the Government will adopt. It seems to me that this has come about, not because of the sense of responsibility of the Government, but because those in charge of these estates have made these recommendations purely for the better running of these estates. I hope that the Government will realise that instead of cutting up five acres at Dodd's in St. Philip and releasing 29 acres at Seawell in Christ Church, that they should at least acquire 500 acres in other parishes so as to accommodate the people of those parishes. Too many people are being forced to live in gullies and in the back of cane fields without being able to come to the front and enjoy some of the social amenities which are enjoyed by those who are not forced to live in such isolated places. Compared with these conditions, we have people with 2,000 acres. We call ourselves Socialists, and yet we believe in private ownership. I call that wasting time. Look all around, in Trinidad, St. Lucia, Antigua etc., where there are Crown lands, and you will see that people do not have to live in the state of servitude in which the Barbadian worker has to live. It is appalling to hear a person tell you that a manager of a plantation has given him 14 days' notice to move his house. The honourable senior member for St. Peter claims to be Minister for Agriculture and General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union. He should be the last person to oppose anything which would bring about the emancipation of the people whom he represents. He knows that too. He has to run up and down daily, begging managers to give people a chance to stay on the land. If the Socialist Government were to make provision in every parish to make available an eighth, a quarter, a half of an acre etc. for the emancipation of the people, the latter would be given the assurance that their votes have not been wasted. It would put them in a position of greater independence. You will find a manager who has been at a particular estate only six months ordering off people some of whom have been there from their youth, and the people have no alternative but to go about and cry. Does not the Government want people to be free in mind? You might not have land to accommodate all the population; but you should aid those who are pressed. If you have 29 acres in Christ Church now, you should make sure that as many people in that parish as possible are assisted. You are showing that you still believe in the policy of land monopolisation for the benefit of the few—giving four acres to one person while hundreds of people in Christ Church will still be chased off the estates, and their so-called representatives on the Executive and in the Union are not sufficiently interested in them

to use the means at their disposal to help them. We do not want experts to advise us on everything. This is a small colony, and all of us have commonsense. Just because an expert recommends four acres per person, it is stupid for us to say that that is the best for the colony. I am supporting the motion for the postponement of this resolution because I feel that the Administration should have time to change up the whole thing and make it possible for more householders to enjoy the 29 acres with which the resolution deals. While I am supporting the motion made by the honourable junior member for St. Philip, I am sorry that he did not suggest the dividing of this land in half-acre lots so that more people could enjoy it.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Chairman,— This debate has been a long one, and some of the theories which have been expressed can only be described as strange ideas as to what Socialism is, especially when translated into terms of owning or renting land. The most socialist state in the world has forced peasants into collective schemes because they found that single units were too small to be productive, or to be what I would call economically productive for the purpose of the state. It is therefore ridiculous to suggest that because you profess Socialism this land should be divided into half acre, quarter acre or eighth of an acre lots. At one time it used to be held by members on the other side and people who thought like them that it was not economical to divide land into ten-acre lots; that if you took a plantation and divided it into lots of 50 acres that it was bad for the island. Now we hear them saying that land should be divided into one-acre lots. These are the strange theories that I have been hearing all night, and I have either to destroy them or to support them. To carry them to their logical conclusion as the honourable member on my right is trying to do, you will say that it is better to divide the land among 58 or perhaps 100 people. We should not accept the opinion of Dr. Newmark, nor that of Dr. Lewis who said that what is wrong with the West Indian economy is that there are a lot of peasants with uneconomical units who still depend on the plantations to lend them money. It is absolute nonsense to say that one acre is good enough for a man. As I said, we should discard the opinions of Dr. Newmark and Dr. Lewis, and accept those of honourable members who might be trying to please certain people. It is fantastic to say that we should change this resolution by dividing the land into one-acre lots so that more people would get. Is it better to put 29 people to fail on 29 acres of land than to put seven people to succeed? This is not a big land settlement scheme. Government is renting out 29 acres of land in plots of a size that would be economical and at a price which small people can afford. Every now and then we are told that we should follow the example of Jamaica; and the people who work co-operative schemes tell us that the best units are four and five-acre ones. I think we are carrying this thing too far. I think that honourable members should realise that this scheme is an experimental one. It is time to give the Government a trial in schemes such as this, and then they can work on a bigger land settlement scheme. You have peasants who tell you that they cannot make a living out of one-acre lots. You have the opinion of experts who tell you that two and three-acre lots are not economical. What is the use of coming and giving your individual theories? Let the Government have a chance to test this scheme. I can see no useful purpose in postponing this resolution.

Mr. COX: Mr. Chairman — Judging from the speeches that I have heard from the honourable senior member for St. John and the honourable

senior member for the City, it does appear that they have lost sight completely of the purpose of the scheme. It appears on the one hand that they are mixing it up with a housing scheme and on the other hand with a big land settlement scheme.

Mr. ALLDER: On a point of explanation, sir. I was aware of the purpose of the scheme. I know what is an agricultural co-operative scheme.

Mr. COX: I am glad to hear that the honourable member was not mixing up these schemes. The position is that it has been suggested that instead of seven people having four acres each of these 29 acres, that 29 people should have one acre each. That would reduce the acreage. It would reduce the acreage below an acre per family. When you take into consideration the roads of the sites you will see that neither family will be holding as much as an acre. That being so, one-acre lots would be more fitting for a housing scheme than for a scheme of this sort. If you are prepared to carry out an agricultural scheme for peasants, you will have to give each individual enough land from which to eke out a livelihood. I know there is an agriculturist who says that the least amount of land on which an individual can live in fairly comfortable condition is a ten-acre lot. To reduce the lots that you are offering in the case under debate would be a waste of time. The honourable senior member for St. John rambled in his speech and went out of his way to talk about the Turf Club and things of that sort. But he knows that racing is so popular, that he would become most unpopular if he attacked racing. The Turf Club does not rent the whole area of land for 2s. a year. They pay that sum so that they can have control of it on race days.

Mr. ALLDER: I have made special investigations. The honourable member is talking about paying 2s a year so as to have control of the pasture on racing days. But the Turf Club controls the whole place all the year round. They have to build a lot of stalls. There is another thing. They are permitted to take advantage of the people who put their stock on the pasture to graze. Those people have to pay 3s per head per month, and they cannot put their stock there on race days.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member rose to a point of explanation.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The honourable member knows better. He knows as the honourable Senior Member for St. Michael has pointed out that if you divide this 29 acres among 29 families that it would not be 29 acres anymore. You will not be putting down rocks; you will be putting down houses. There will have to be roads and divisions between the houses. This is not a housing scheme. Are roads arable land? If it were a housing scheme we would try to get as many families as possible on it. The honourable member has talked about the price charged by estates to labourers living on their land. The estates give those labourers the privilege of renting that land because they work on the estates. But the holdings which this resolution is dealing with are independent holdings. The honourable member makes speeches on all points. He has to be a genius. The honourable member has no love for experts. In his view we should disregard all expert opinion. But the members of the Government are not so wise as to be able to do that. The scheme does not envisage that this land will be rented to tailors or carpenters etc. but to people who will give it their whole time attention. Anyone will see that if you proposed to give 29 people this 29 acres it would be a housing scheme and not a land settlement scheme.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman—I would not have risen again, because the honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph seemed to have assured us that he would accept the motion for the postponement of the resolution. But what the honourable senior member for St. Peter has said seems to be contrary to my elementary knowledge of arithmetic. I am always willing to learn. But I do know that I do not see anything in this resolution telling me of a housing scheme or anything of the sort. I cannot imagine that if you take 29 acres of land and get a surveyor and asked him to put down some landmarks and divide it into one-acre lots how you would not get 29 lots. The resolution says that this land is 29 acres. I do not know about any roads. If he is talking about houses, Government will be acting *ultra vires* because you have your Public Health Act. I have not considered the question of houses at all. The honourable member really should not split hairs. You cannot take out an acre for roads out of 29; it will be out of proportion. The honourable member should appreciate what I mean when I said give an acre each to 29 people. Why split hairs. Because he does not happen to be a back-bencher does he think that someone with my knowledge and experience would be so foolish as to think that if you have 29 acres and you take off one for roads that you would be able to give 29 people an acre each out of 28 acres? The honourable member has spoken absolute nonsense. If you are establishing a plantation where you mark out your land by having a surveyor put down landmarks that is one thing. Otherwise you will have to comply with the Public Health Act. Even the Housing Board has to comply with that Act. I just got up, Mr. Chairman, to let the honourable member know that although I am not a member of the Government or do not possess his ability, my knowledge of elementary arithmetic is not so bad. Although he may not think so, I can still divide 29 into 29. Even if you take off two acres for roads, my point is that you should give the remaining 27 to 27 people. I do not hold myself to be the honourable member's authority. I have been trying to make my living. I have not altogether succeeded, but I have succeeded sufficiently to understand what I am talking about. I do not know if you are going to put such roads between each spot as to reduce 29 acres to such an extent that you will have to give it to seven people. You can say what you like. This land should be given to more than seven people. I am not challenging any expert on co-operatives. But I am saying that in this country where the demand for land exceeds the supply, you cannot say that it is better to rent 29 acres to seven people than to 20. I have heard so much about this democracy. It is not always true. It is not always that what the majority says goes. An avowed Socialist has said to me that it is not the opinion of the majority that should be heard, but the enlightened opinion of the majority. I repeat that if you are talking about houses you will have to comply with the Public Health Act, and that makes it all the more necessary to postpone it.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman—The honourable member said he was surprised to hear us on this side say that a one-acre lot is more economical. I did not say that a one-acre lot is more economical. I did not say. I said that a four-acre lot is more economical than a one-acre lot. Let us go back a little. It was recommended once that land should be leased in economic lots. It was said by the experts at that time that an economic lot in one island might not be an economic lot in another. They felt that each island would have to adapt itself to the

conditions of that particular island. I do not feel in this instance that the Government is embarking on the correct scheme. In the first place you are starting off with a plantation that has been losing money. You cannot therefore guarantee that you will make these units economic units. When Government is proposing to take such a plantation and cut it into smaller units, I see where they will fail right away. Now why do I recommend one-acre lots? At the present moment Seawell employs a certain number of people. The moment you split this land among seven families the others will not be able to find employment there. If Government was really embarking on a co-operative scheme they should use a bigger area and split it into five-acre lots. It will be easier to get a small number of people to co-operate than a hundred one-acre people. It would take a long time for any Co-operative Officer or any Government to tell an individual how he should spend his money. If you go into the country you will see that many people who own acre lots, and who also work on estates are better off financially than the person who only owns a house spot. That is so because when these people come home from work they will spend a little time working on their own lot. At the end of the year they are still working on the estate and they can still go on their own lot and reap ten or twelve tons of canes and sell them at the rate of twenty or thirty dollars a ton. During the preparation period they can plant yams, potatoes and corn, and meanwhile they are still working on the estate. I feel that at the present moment, if the Government has in mind the carrying on of the plantation system, the only thing to do is to cut the land in acre-lots give it to the people, and let them go on working where they feel like working. I want the Government to realise that although we are postponing this resolution, I will not vote for it when it comes back down unless it provides for cutting up this land in lots of less than four acres.

Mr. REECE: Mr. Chairman—I am yet to see in this resolution anything about a scheme. It is not a Housing Scheme, and where is any mention made of an Agricultural Scheme? If there was any such idea, I think that the first thing the Government should have done was to send the scheme down and let us see the terms and conditions under which the scheme would work. This land is not being rented under the provisions of the Public Health Act. Government does not have to pay any regard to the provisions of that Act.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking subject to correction, but I think that the Government Housing Schemes come under that Act and have to be passed by the Board of Health.

Mr. REECE: I am submitting, sir, that there is nothing in the law which compels Government when they are renting out land for agricultural purposes to put a scheme before the Board of Health. As I was saying, this Resolution does not mention any scheme. It says that the Government has some land to rent out. It does not say that the land is to be rented subject to terms and conditions set out before the Legislature. Another thing that I want to say is that you will notice that a sum of \$1,000 is required for the purposes set out. If you are going to build roads a much larger sum than \$1,000 will be required. The honourable senior member for St. Peter says that the area of the land will be decreased by the laying down of roads; but that argument is not borne out by the Addendum; except the cart roads and tracks are going to be repaired. The Addendum mentions 29 acres of arable land. It says nothing about any roads. It will be clearly seen that no consideration has really been given to the question of roads. Now, if I were to follow the argu-

ments of some honourable members it would mean that we would have no small lots in this country, and we would all aim at big units of 100 acres or perhaps more. There can be no doubt that the greater the unit the less are the overhead expenses, and the unit will be more economic. But good an argument as that may be, when we take into consideration the fact that we have under 70,000 acres of arable land in this island to a population of 100,000. It needs no great mathematical ability to make the necessary calculations and to see that if we split up the land into large units a small proportion of the population will benefit. Taking that fact into consideration, and paying regard to the lucid argument of the honourable senior member for St. Lucy who is an expert in these matters, we will see that you will have to provide land for the greatest number of people. As has been pointed out, it is physically impossible for one man, even with the help of his family, to do all the work necessary for the cultivation of four acres. When you give a man one acre, although his economic condition may not be so good, yet he will be able to manage his unit during his spare time. He has outside employment, but during his spare time he can cultivate that plot for the benefit of himself and his family. I think that that is the right way to approach this question. There are large numbers of people in Christ Church and throughout the island who are only too willing to get a piece of land. It is to be regretted that this area now available is only 29 acres. In my view, therefore, it should be rented to as many people as possible, so as to give them that sense of security which a Barbadian gets from the working of the land. I think that if we adopt the course of giving the greatest number the opportunity of living upon this land and making the best of their individual abilities, we will be doing the proper thing. I am greatly disappointed in not hearing more about this scheme. Let us know about it. If it is necessary for the Government to send down regulations or a Bill or to impose any conditions, I say, Mr. Chairman, that we should know. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has promised that if there is a postponement he will tell the House the terms and conditions of the scheme. I think we would be well advised to await those statements from the Honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph said something St. Joseph, and I am going to vote for the postponement of this Resolution.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman,—The Honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph said something in connection with the Vieux Fort Scheme.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I do not think that the honourable member is serious when he says that he scheme are. The addendum shows that the land is does not know what the terms and conditions of this to be leased for five years in four-acre lots. It is for agricultural purposes—mixed farming and a sugar cane cash crop. The lease is on a five-year basis. The Honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph never said that it was a 99-year lease. He said specifically that the scheme is an experiment. What have we to gain by getting the House to pass this resolution under a false impression?

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT. Mr. Chairman—The honourable member is continually making a big mistake. We have never said that our opponents had anything to gain. We are saying that they do not have the wisdom and experience to know what to do. They do now know what they are doing, and the little bit they are trying to do is wrong. Although the honourable senior member for St. Joseph did not specifically say that the lease was for 99 years, he said you could lease for 99 years or 999. This question of five years is entirely new. If you

are experiencing, make the less shorter. I do not like the five-year period. The question of \$20.00 a year came after. Even so, their just telling us these things does not bind them. They will only be bound when they put it in the form of something that has to obtain our sanction. Nor does a little bit of writing by an expert bind them. We want something more hard and fast. Let us have the scheme, and then we can decide on it one way or the other. We will be bound by having passed it that way.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman,—I am glad that this resolution is to be postponed. I know that there are many people in that district who would like to get the chance at this land, and I think it should be divided into 29 lots. This is not a large area like Dodds where four acres or more would not be considered economic. In this area one acre is not too small to be economic especially if Government contemplates putting in irrigation. As soon as irrigation goes in, you will have garden crops, and that will necessitate more labour. I am glad that the Resolution is being postponed for further consideration by the Executive. The final decision may be for two-acre lots. We want as many people as possible to have a chance at that land.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman,—The honourable junior member for Christ Church talked about there not being any scheme. Some people like too much scheming. The honourable senior member for St. James says that we do very little, and the little that we do is not so good. But when he was here he did not even try to do so much. However, Mr. Chairman, this is something that the Government has brought down with a due sense of responsibility and after a lot of consideration. If the House postpones the matter I cannot give any assurance that this Resolution will be changed. When it is brought back to the House honourable members can do as they think fit. All of us are elected.

On the motion being put that further consideration of the Resolution be postponed the question was resolved in the affirmative the Committee dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. ALLDER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. MOTTLEY, Mr. GARNER, Mr. GODDARD, Mr. DOWDING, Mr. HAYNES, Mr. GILL, Mr. E. K. WALCOTT, Mr. WARD and Mr. REECE.—(11).

Noes: Mr. MAPP, Mr. Cox, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT and Dr. CUMMINS—(4).

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Mr. Cox the Chairman reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply and the postponement of two Resolutions and asked for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

On separate motions of Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT the Resolutions passed in Committee of Supply were read a first and second time and agreed to.

BILL TO AMEND VESTRIES ACT

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker,—I am asking leave to take Orders Nos. 55 and 56 standing in my name under Private Members' Business as the next Orders of the Day.

There being no objection leave was granted.

On the order being called for Mr. DOWDING to move the second reading of the Bill to amend the Vestries Act, 1911 (1911—5).

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker,—This Bill seeks to reduce the rate of commission paid to the Parochial Treasurer of St. George from 6 per cent to four per cent. With a new Parochial Treasurer now to be appointed, the Vestry has decided that this is an opportune time to make this reduction. I move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker,—I am going to oppose the motion for the second reading of this Bill. In the first place, all that the introducer has told us is that a new man is to be appointed, and it logically follows that this new man should not receive six per cent commission. From what I have heard it is likely that a coloured man may be appointed to this post. I have heard quite a lot of things about this appointment, and we know that quite a lot of canvassing is going on. That being the case, this Bill is brought before us under the pretext that a young man is to be appointed, and asking us to reduce the percentage at a time like this when the cost of living is going higher and higher. This man who may get the job has a family like anyone else, a family which looks to him for their livelihood. Now that everyone is asking for an increase in salary or wages—and justifiably so—I see no reason why a Bill of this sort should come before the House. What I would like to see is a Bill coming before this House fixing the salaries of all these Parochial Treasurers in the same way that the salary of the Parochial Treasurer of St. Michael has been fixed. If those salaries were fixed, there would be no reason for coming before the House with a Bill of this sort. It is unfortunate that there should be this attempt to reduce the commission at a time like this when there is a likelihood of a coloured man being appointed. I am saying here and now that where any sort of job is concerned, no consideration should be given to any question of race or colour. What you should consider is what the post is worth.

Mr. SPEAKER: I found some difficulty in hearing the honourable member just now. I would ask honourable members to allow the debate to proceed in an orderly manner.

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker,—I said that where the filling of a post is concerned the question of race or colour should not be taken into consideration. If an individual is qualified for the post, he is qualified. As soon as you decide that he is qualified, you should decide how much the post is worth. When an old man was doing this job, his family was all grown up and his responsibilities were lessened. When a young man is appointed, he will be a man who has a family to look after. He should be paid a reasonable salary to allow him to educate his children, see after his family property, and live a decent life. As I said before, Sir, it is likely that a coloured man is likely to be appointed, and that is why this Bill is before us, tonight. If this commission was justifiable last year or the year before, it is more so today. The intention of the Bill is to reduce the percentage from six per cent to four per cent. I would have thought that there was a case for an increase rather than a reduction. You are reducing it almost by half. I say that that is unkind and unfair.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker,—I also want to object to the second reading of this Bill. But I am speaking from a slightly different angle. I think that with the Bill to implement the Maude Report expected to come before the House next year, bringing the present Bill before us is a joke. What I do not agree with is bringing this Bill before the House knowing that the Government is going to change the Vestry set-up soon. It is true to say that the taxes in the parish are higher. Six per cent will give a greater yield in commission. I know that in St. George the Parochial Treasurer has to pay an assistant. As I have said, I do not see why you should change the rate of commission from six per cent to four per cent, because a new man is coming in. You will want a man of responsibility and experience. You will want a man capable of collecting the taxes of the parish. It is true that six per cent this year was more

than it has ever been; but the Parochial Treasurer has to be a man of responsibility, and I am not in favour of the reduction. I am appealing to the mover of this Bill to refrain from pressing it, or I will have to vote against it. As a previous speaker has said, the cost of living is higher. The time must come when the new holder will have to provide himself with an office. If you put him in an isolated place you will work a hardship on the people who have to come to pay their taxes.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker,—I have to disagree with the last two honourable members who spoke. I have no particular interest in what is done by the Vestry of that Parish. But we all know that more taxes have been collected within the past couple of years than were collected when the present Parochial Treasurer got the post. The number of vehicles has increased and the amount of trade has increased tremendously, and it follows that more money is being collected by the Parochial Treasurer. If the Parochial Treasurer now collects very much more money than he did when the Vestry agreed to pay him six per cent commission, the only logical step that I see should be taken is to reduce in the interest of the poor taxpayers the rate of commission and leave it at a rate which will ensure the Parochial Treasurer a reasonable salary. It is not logical to say that because the Vestry is changing the rate now that a new man is coming in that they have waited until too late. The powers that be do not always like to change such things during the time that an already appointed man is holding office. It does not matter who gets the post. The point is that taxation has been increased. What the two last speakers seem to suggest is that the Vestry should make it possible for the taxes that the small land owner and the small trader have to pay to go much higher. I am told that the present rate of commission nets the Parochial Treasurer a salary of five hundred or six hundred dollars a month. I hope that the other parishes will follow the example of the parish of St. George.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—It is a pity that this Bill should cause fools to rush so madly——

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not appreciate the tone in which the honourable member has begun his speech. I must object to the honourable senior member for the City referring to other honourable members as fools.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, what have I done?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not like the tone of the honourable members' speech. He began by saying that it is a pity that fools were rushing so madly. If he means to refer to the honourable members who have already spoken as fools, then I warn him to walk warily.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What have I done? I think that I have enough knowledge and experience to cause me to conduct myself with dignity and respect towards the Chair. I think that I have always conducted myself thus.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have made no reference to the past conduct of the honourable member. I only warned him to walk warily.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I say, Mr. Speaker, that I will appreciate your cautioning when it is deserved. But if a member stands and speaks in a perfectly parliamentary way, I do not think it is fair to anticipate that he is going to say something unbecoming. I do not appreciate what I consider an attack like this.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the honourable member does not appreciate my warning, I will not warn him again.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I repeat, sir, that I do not consider that it is unparliamentary to say that it is a pity that fools rush so madly where even angels

fear to tread. This Bill which the honourable junior member for St. George brought in is one which I thought that every honourable member would welcome. Some years ago, it was seen by the Vestry of St. Michael that property values had so increased, and so many new properties had come into the parish that the salary of the Parochial Treasurer, based as it was on this commission from taxation, was no longer in keeping with the salary of the Colonial Treasurer, the salaries of Medical Officers of Health and those of other Government Officials. As a result of that, the Vestry of St. Michael decided to ask for an abolition of this commission basis, and put it on the basis of a fixed salary. The argument used was that it was not right that a Parochial Treasurer should draw more money than an officer doing similar work for the Central Government, especially when the former was not responsible for half the amount of money for which the latter was responsible. It was felt that you should strike some proper balance. During your time as Speaker, this House amended the Vestries Act, allowing the Vestry of St. Michael to put the emoluments of the Parochial Treasurer on the fixed salary basis. Right after that it was put to the fixed amount of £750, and from time to time with war bonus it went to £950. I recall well that when a Parochial Treasurer of Christ Church had to retire and the gentleman who is now Clerk of the House was the member of this House representing Christ Church, he introduced a Bill asking the Legislature to amend the law so as to pay the Parochial Treasurer of Christ Church less money. That was done because his salary, based on commission, was out of all proportion to the salaries drawn by Government Officers, and the salary drawn by the Parochial Treasurer of St. Michael, and was not in keeping with the office. In the past when Parochial Treasurers had to furnish their offices, land values were down. However well the honourable senior member for St. George may mean, I have never heard him talk more utter nonsense than he has talked this evening. I do not attribute it to his being anti-vestry. The honourable junior member for St. George introduced this Bill. He has made no lengthy speech. What is the position? In the parish of St. George you appoint a Parochial Treasurer, and the law of this country allows him six per cent commission on the taxation that he collects. The Parochial Treasurer of that parish is also Vestry Clerk and Clerk to the Commissioners of Health and for those extra duties he receives extra salary. The present commission which the officer gets is £1,400 a year. Those are the facts. Add to that another £150 per annum. How can you ask us to pay the Parochial Treasurer of St. George £1,550 per annum, which is more than the Accountant General gets. The honourable senior member for St. George says that it should have been brought in before. The present holder of the post was appointed 30 or 40 years ago. What Legislature would pass a Bill to reduce his salary six months before he retires. You could not do that to a man. What has been done, therefore? A reasonable Bill has been brought in asking us to reduce the commission now that a new man is coming in. Even with this reduction the officer will still draw \$400.00 a month apart from his salary as Clerk of the Vestry, Clerk to the Churchwarden and Clerk to the Commissioners of Health. If the honourable senior member for St. George really and truly thought in terms of his constituency he would be obliged to see that the only right thing to do is to reduce this commission. Is it right that as a result of the fact that land values are sky-rocketing the Parochial Treasurer of a small parish should draw

more salary than the Accountant General? The accusation by the honourable senior member for St. Michael that the Vestry is seeking to reduce the commission because a Negro man is going to get the job is utter nonsense. Only a mentality like that of the honourable member could think that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would be glad if you would not refer to the mentality of the honourable senior member for St. Michael.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I can quite appreciate what you mean, sir. To refer to his mentality is not in keeping with the dignity of the House. As I was saying, I want to bring it to the attention of the House that when the honourable member says that the Vestry of St. George has brought down this Bill because a Negro may get the job, he knows more than anyone else. There is nothing to tell you that Mr. X or Mr. Y is next in line for the job. The Vestry of St. George is composed of ten men, of whom seven are white. It is only the crass ignorance of the honourable member that caused him to get up and say that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I want to draw to the attention of the honourable member Rule 129 which says that no member may use offensive or unbecoming words with reference to an honourable member of the House. The honourable member has referred to the crass ignorance of the honourable senior member for St. Michael. I do not think that that is becoming to the honourable member. I will again caution the honourable senior member for the City, and I do so with the best intentions. I hope that I will not have to caution him again.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I would like to get this straight, sir. What is there unparliamentary or undignified in referring to the ignorance of the honourable senior member for St. Michael about any particular subject?

Mr. SPEAKER: I consider it unbecoming. The rule says that no member may use offensive or unbecoming words with reference to another honourable member. I think it is rather humiliating to the honourable senior member for St. Michael to be referred to as "crassly ignorant" in the presence of strangers here.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker—I hate to have to do this. But I have often in the House heard the Honourable Leader, who is one of the most dignified members of this House, when replying to an honourable member's criticism, refer to him as being ignorant of a particular subject. I have heard that done before you, sir, this very session, and I have never heard the slightest intimation that it was unbecoming. Anyhow, I will go on, sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: If previous Speakers have allowed it, I intend to put my foot on it. If I were in the position of the honourable senior member for St. Michael I would feel myself humiliated by being referred to "crassly ignorant." I make no apologies for taking such a stand.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I can understand your not asking for apology. But you cannot humiliate some people at all. I will go on to say, sir, that as far as this question of the Parochial Treasurer is concerned, this Bill has not been brought because it is thought that a Negro will get the job.

Mr. COX: On a point of explanation, sir. I did not say that it was felt that a Negro would get the job. I used the word "likely".

Mr. MOTTLEY: My memory is far from being bad. The honourable member said from the floor of this House that the reason this Bill was sent down was because a negro was likely to get the job. Dealing with a Vestry like this where there is no laid down law, where there is no question of promotion of any

particular officer to this post, the honourable member gets up and says that because a coloured man is likely to get the job the Vestry has sent down this Bill. I am saying that if there was anything that would spoil the particular man's chance of getting this post it would be the speech of the honourable senior member for St. Michael. I think that I have convinced even the honourable senior member for St. George.

Mr. MILLER: I cannot reply. I will have to wait until the House goes into committee on the Bill. The honourable senior member for the City has quoted me as saying—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member did not quote you as saying anything.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have always taken the honourable member as a joke.

Mr. MILLER: I object to that. It is a common trait in human nature that we are apt to judge others exactly by ourselves. If the honourable member takes others as jokes it is because he may be a full grown joke himself.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I still take the honourable member as a joke. Is it my fault if the honourable member thinks that he can even attempt to interpret anything that I have said?

Mr. SPEAKER: This is the third time that I am going to warn the honourable senior member for the City. Again it is my opinion that his remarks are unbecoming. It is the last time that I will caution him. After I have done that I will leave it entirely in the hands of this House, and the House will decide as it thinks fit. I am speaking to the House very, very seriously, and I leave it to them.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I appreciate your position. While I appreciate your position, I also want you to appreciate my right. I know that you will give me my due. I was saying, Sir, that the honourable senior member for St. Michael makes a stupid and wicked remark to the effect that this Bill is before us because it is likely that a coloured man will get this job. I do not think that that is fair to the Vestry of St. George, because I consider that in the interest of the ratepayers of St. George—and the honourable member should appreciate that—we should welcome this proposed reduction. What will be the reaction of the honourable member's speech on the honourable junior member for St. George? I know that he still has the soldier's spirit in him. The salaries of white Parochial Treasurers have been reduced before. If everyone went on the question of race, what would happen. You should appeal to their sense of justice and fair-play. Those are the principles I think about. The honourable senior member for St. Michael is talking about touts. He does not think of pimps. Perhaps Your Honour has convenient ears.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member challenging me? Is he saying that I heard these asides and refused to exercise my privilege of keeping order in this House? The honourable member was pointing at me and asking if I heard this and that. If the remarks recently made by the honourable senior member for the City can be construed as attacking my position in the Chair, I am asking the House to deal with him. I sat here and heard the honourable member speaking in a loud voice. Asides may have been made which I did not over-hear. Whenever I heard anything which I thought might annoy him, in making his speech, I rapped. If the honourable member is attacking me by saying that I am condoning disorder I appeal to the House to defend me.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I never made any reference to you Sir. I would be the last person to offend your dignity. I am quite serious about this. At times I am jocular. Occasionally in debate I may go offside,

but I quickly come back. I always remember the office which you occupy. I do not know why you should take it this evening that I referred to you as condoning something. I would never attempt to do that. I regret that you should feel that way about it. I have always tried to uphold the traditions of this House. Sometimes it is just as possible for you to overhear asides, as it is for you, at the rate at which I speak, to misconstrue me. I do not think that you need go any further with the matter, Sir, and therefore I want to say finally on this Bill that—

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like an expression of opinion from other honourable members.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—In so far as the honourable senior member for the City's making any remarks not in keeping with the dignity of the Chair is concerned, I am sure that he would not do so with the intention of casting any reflection on you personally or on the Chair. I too wish that the honourable member would listen to me sometimes. I am much older than most of them. Unbecoming remarks do come from honourable members at times, but it is mostly when they forget themselves, and they quickly withdraw those remarks. I hope that Your Honour will be willing to accept that on behalf of the honourable member. The honourable member holds you in high personal esteem even when you are not in the Chair. I am not like the honourable senior member for St. Peter whose name I hear, good at making these speeches that hide things. I am not built that way. As I was saying, Sir, you will always find the honourable senior member for the City will support you on any occasion. He is a most loyal man. There is no doubt about that. As far as the aside of which he complained is concerned, I did hear a rather rude one, but I would have left it at that rather than let it be thought that I was suggesting that Your Honour was condoning conduct of that sort.

Mr. SPEAKER: I appreciate the remarks of the honourable senior member for St. James, an old Parliamentarian, and I would like the issue to lie there.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am through now Sir, and I would only like to say that I hope that honourable members will see the wisdom of passing this Bill to reduce the commission of the Parochial Treasurer from six to four per cent., thereby relieving the taxpayers of the particular parish of £600 per year.

Mr. GARNER: Mr. Speaker,—I am sorry that the debate has taken this twist. It is a Vestry matter. Ten Vestrymen have weighed the pros and cons of the matter and sent this Bill to the House for our approval. They weighed the facts before they sent it here. I think, Sir, that certain remarks which were made this evening were ill-timed. There is a time and place for everything. Much of the discussion on this Bill was heat-engendering and unnecessary. The fact is that the terms of the present holder of the office cannot be changed when he is still in office. What I will say is that if a particular coloured man had a chance of getting this post, his chances have been spoiled. Things have been discussed at the wrong time and in the wrong place. I do not think that there is anyone as racial-minded as I am. But you have to know how and where to discuss certain matters. The man has not got the job yet, and you are making all this row. We know how the Vestry system is worked. If you want a job you go around and ask certain people to support you. But this man's chances have been spoiled this afternoon. This Bill is going to be passed because it is a sensible Bill. The honourable senior member for St. Michael is enthusiastic. But he should base his arguments on facts. If he could show me that by passing this Bill we would be doing

something contrary to legal practice, I would support him. But I cannot support him as the present matter stands. Years ago an acre of land was taxed at \$1.60 per annum. Today it is taxed at \$4.90. That means that at the time when the acre of land was taxed at \$1.60, the Parochial Treasurer got a normal salary. But now that the value of land has trebled you will have to reduce the percentage of his commission, or there will be no limit to the salary that he will get. You will have to reduce it now in the interest of the taxpayers. I will give an example. In St. Philip it used to take \$50,000 a year to do our parochial business. Today we have got to spend anything like \$90,000. If you calculate the Parochial Treasurer's commission on a basis of six per cent. of \$50,000 you will see what he used to get; and if you calculate on the same percentage of \$90,000 you will also see what he will get. The office of Parochial Treasurer is worth so much and no more. Therefore, as taxes go up you will have to reduce the commission. I do not think that that is a personal matter today. In St. Philip we only pay four per cent. I would have been glad if there was an opportunity for a coloured man to get this post, but as I have said I think his chances have been spoiled. I hope that the honourable junior member for St. George will not report all that has been said this evening. I do not make any apology for talking about race, but I think that this evening's talk was ill-timed. If the candidate for the post has tried to canvass politically he has done himself a disservice, and if someone has tried to represent a friend, he has done that friend a disservice. I feel that the Vestry is taking the right step. I am hoping that as good jobs are scarce for certain people around here, this particular candidate will be successful. I also hope that I have convinced the House that the facts of the case are simple, and that unless you keep the Parochial Treasurer's commission within a certain limit, he will be drawing more salary than the post is worth. I could not sit here and allow certain things to be levelled at vestrymen. I am sure that the Vestries are still doing a certain amount of good work in the island. Some people see red each time they hear the word "Vestry", but I think that we should pass this Bill without more ado.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker—I am not a lover of the Vestry system myself. There is much in that system that stinks. There is a lot in the Vestry system that cannot be white washed, and the least the honourable member tries to whitewash them, the better for him. He knows as well as any of us that there is a lot in the Vestry system that should be scrapped. I agree with a lot that he said. Let us examine the structure of the appointment of a Parochial Treasurer. Years ago when taxes were very low you gave him as salary a commission on the taxes collected. Today there is no longer any justification for following that method. Go back for the last five years and see what you have been collecting in rates. I think it is unscientific to put the Parochial Treasurer's salary on this percentage basis. You do not know what it will relate to. The Vestry may have to carry up its rates for its own benefit; but the Parochial Treasurer benefits each time that that is done. I maintain that that system of remunerating the Parochial Treasurer has long outlived its usefulness. That method was followed years ago. I would advise all vestrymen to see that that old method is scrapped. A Parochial Treasurer used to be picked out as a nice person, and was given the post as a matter of prestige. It was not always a question of ability. Today things are different. The honourable senior member for St. Philip has said that you

cannot pay the Parochial Treasurer on the same percentage basis today. If you do so, he may be soon getting more than the Governor of Barbados. There are no particular qualifications for the post. He is a man who must please the majority of people. The Vestries can say to the people that they are going to pay the Parochial Treasurer, say, \$6,000 a year. When that is agreed upon, the Parochial Treasurer does not have to collect taxes. You will have a system for the collection of taxes. I do not know who will get the post in this particular instance, but I challenge any vestryman to say that he can defend the percentage basis system. Why should you pick out one Vestry employee and pay him on that basis? I hope that honourable members will see the point that I am making. The honourable senior member for St. Philip agrees with that. He is an old vestryman, and he should use his influence to see that the vestries come together and set their house in order in that connection.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—In the parish of St. George in the latter years the Parochial Treasurer has been drawing £1,600 and £1,850 a year when such salaries may not be commensurate with the post. In the parishes of St. Philip, Christ Church and St. John the percentage of commission is four per cent. Personally I think that most of us agree that it would be better if a fixed salary was paid. But you would have to do what the Vestries Act of 1911 says. When the Vestry of St. Michael changed their method, it did not make the reduction in the Parochial Treasurer's salary as great as might be thought. What they did do was to provide him with the clerks and servants that he used to provide for himself formerly, as well as an office and office furniture. Whoever gets this appointment in St. George will have to find his own office and pay his clerk and assistant. You will have to take out for all those things. What happens in the country parishes is different from what happens in St. Michael. The Parochial Treasurer in a country parish is really like Matthew. In many cases he is the only one who can collect taxes. He has to go around and gather in those taxes. He does not get paid until he does that. The system in St. Michael was growing too big. I agree, as I have already said, that perhaps it would be better if the system were changed in the country parishes. I do not see any point in arguing about who will get the post. Whoever gets it the position will be the same.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker—I am sorry to say that we have led our caterer and servants to expect that we would take dinner at 8 o'clock and it is now 10 o'clock. You and I are the unfortunate ones. Where this Bill is concerned I want to say that I am not one of those persons who regard these things as being purely parochial. I regret that any suggestion has been made today about who might be appointed. I think too that the honourable junior member for St. George took it for granted that since the percentages in other parishes have been changed he needed not have supplied figures as to the salaries and given other explanations that would have allayed the fears of honourable members. I throw out that as advice for future reference. The percentage system was fixed originally, and we know that today there are Parochial Treasurers who prosecute people who fail to pay their taxes. But I am in agreement with the idea of giving Parochial Treasurers fixed salaries. I would like to know from the honourable junior member for St. George if he thinks that that is a method which would meet with the approval of the Vestry of that parish. I would like to tell him that I do not share the view that this Bill was brought in at an inconvenient time. Other Bills of a similar

nature were brought in when the terms of the then holder of the post could not be altered. I do not feel that it was brought in in a clandestine way, so to speak. I am taking it as a bona fide attempt to do justice to the taxpayers of St. George. But I think that the time has arrived when you should decide on fixing a definite salary. I do not feel that any injustice is being done by reducing this commission. I realise that if taxes have gone up the cost of living has also gone up. But with the rise in taxation this officer's salary has gone up disproportionately. I am willing to support this Bill, therefore, and I would have been more willing to support it if a fixed salary was under consideration.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker—When I craved your indulgence to deal with this Bill I had no idea that there would have been such protracted debate. I apologise to you if your patience has been tried during the last hour. I, sir, do not intend to speak at any great length. I would say that at the last meeting of the Vestry I expressed similar views to those expressed by the last honourable member who spoke. But the other members thought, and they convinced me in the end, that the percentage basis in these days provides more incentive for the office. I regret that the honourable senior member for St. Michael, because of his lack of knowledge, or because his source of information misinformed him, should have seen fit at this stage to have made the statements that he did when no applications for the job have even been sent in yet to any member of the Vestry. The honourable senior member for St. Peter says that the Vestry system needs scrapping. That may or may not be so; but there are other systems which at least need a good deal of very hard scrapping.

The question that the Bill be read a second time was put and carried, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. BRYAN, Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. GARNER, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. MOTTLEY, Mr. GODDARD, Mr. DOWDING, Mr. REECE, Mr. HAYNES, Mr. GILL, Mr. E. K. WALCOTT, Mr. WARD and Mr. CRAWFORD.—(15).

Noes: Mr. MILLER and Mr. COX.—(2).

On the motion of Mr. DOWDING seconded by Mr. WARD, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. LEWIS in the Chair.

On the motion of Mr. DOWDING seconded by Mr. WARD the Preamble was postponed.

Clause 1 of the Bill was read.

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

Mr. REECE seconded.

The motion being put was agreed to, the Committee dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. SPEAKER, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. BRYAN, Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. GARNER, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. MOTTLEY, Mr. GODDARD, Mr. DOWDING, Mr. REECE, Mr. GILL, Mr. E. K. WALCOTT and Mr. WARD.—(13).

Noes: Mr. COX.—(1).

Mr. DOWDING: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Mr. REECE seconded.

Mr. COX: Mr. Chairman—This is a clause which in my opinion is controversial. This is the clause which seeks to reduce the commission of percentage paid to the Parochial Treasurer from six per cent to four per cent. As you will remember, sir, when this question was before the House arguments were put forward by the other side, and comparison was made between the parish of St. Michael and the other parishes as a result of the new man coming into St. Michael. I think we all remember what were the circumstances then. The Parochial

Treasurer at that time as in this case, used to collect taxes on a percentage basis and had to provide his own office and pay his own clerk, as the honourable senior member for St. James has told us. The parish of St. Michael did not save much by changing the system because they had to supply the Parochial Treasurer with an office and staff paid for out of Vestry funds. But the Bill which was passed making his salary a fixed one was something quite different from the Bill now being discussed. The question of reducing the commission did not arise where that Bill was concerned. If taxes in St. George go up 25 or 50 per cent tomorrow, the salary of the Parochial Treasurer in that parish will go up accordingly. That is not the case in St. Michael at all.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would regard this section dealing with reduction of the commission as the principle of the Bill which was debated in the second reading. If the honourable member wants to reduce or increase the present percentage I would be willing to hear him on that point. I think that the question of a fixed salary has already been discarded where this Bill is concerned, and reduction of the percentage is the principle of the Bill.

Mr. COX: I was prepared to make a motion that the figure "4" in line 3 as well as in line 4—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The principle of the Bill is reduction of the percentage.

Mr. COX. I am not satisfied that we should reduce this commission to 4%. It is all well and good to come here and put figures before us haphazardly and we have no chance to check them. One has to remember that from this percentage the Parochial Treasurer has to pay his assistants; so that it is not true to say that this 4% or 6% will go exclusively into the hands of the Parochial Treasurer for his personal use. I feel that this is not the time for the reduction; I am contending that while it has been argued that much taxation is being collected it is equally true to say that the cost of living has risen. That is a recognised fact, Mr. Chairman, and I cannot agree to the reduction of this percentage to be paid to the successful holder of this office. It does not worry me one bit when honourable members criticize me for the stand which I am taking; I do not care whether they agree with what I say or not. If I am satisfied that a principle is right, I am prepared to support it; but if I feel it is wrong I will fight against it if I stand alone. The Parochial Treasurer of St. Joseph was appointed not long ago and his percentage has not been reduced. If we want to support the principle of reduction it would be far better to fix salaries for these people. The honourable senior member for St. Peter made a very good point of which no notice was taken. The point was also made about seven white men and three black men sitting down and agreeing to this matter; perhaps I should not pay any attention to that point because the one from whose lips the remarks fell finds it difficult to appreciate anything that is being said. How can we believe that these three coloured men were in agreement with this reduction?

Mr. DOWDING: On a point of explanation The three coloured men were in agreement with it.

Mr. COX: I am glad to hear that from the honourable junior member for St. George; it shows that the ten members are retrogressive rather than progressive in outlook; it shows that they follow each other blindly and whatever the chief puts up, the others agree with it. The cost of living is soaring daily and the argument advanced by the honourable junior member for St. George was only that this individual was a young man; that is his whole argument for reducing this commission.

Dr. CUMMINS: On a point of order. The honourable member is going over the principle of the Bill.

Mr. COX: This not a question of principle. I am using the argument put forward for the reduction of this commission as set out in this Clause. I am using the argument of the honourable junior member for St. George, that the successful holder of this office is a young man and that is why they are reducing the commission.

Mr. DOWDING: Again on a point of explanation. If I used the word "young" I meant that the holder of the office would be young in office, not young in age. I was brief in introducing this Bill because I thought the honourable member wanted to get away from here.

Mr. COX: If a man accepts a post at a low salary because he is young, he will be put on an incremental basis; but that is not the question here. There is absolutely no justification for the reduction of this percentage at this time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member will confine his remarks to the reduction of the commission to 4% I will allow him to go on: but the argument for the reduction of the commission has been accepted as the principle of this Bill. I am not saying that the reduction to 4% has been accepted because that can be changed by the House. The honourable member must speak on the reduction to 4%.

Mr. COX: I am still sticking to my point; despite whatever might be said, I feel that the time is inappropriate for changing this percentage from 6% to 4%. Despite all that might be said, where the question of colour is concerned, I am saying that if it had not been for the fact that applicants have been canvassing the Vestrymen for this job, we would not have had this reduction from 6% to 4%. I regret very much that there are not many honourable members who really see the question of principle in this Bill and who will support my views about this Bill. It is unreasonable to reduce this percentage when the cost of living is soaring; and when the person who will fill this post is confronted with the maintenance of his family and he has to provide an office at his own expense. I think it is grossly unfair and in spite of the attacks which have been made by honourable members upon me, I am prepared to vote against the proposal. If it were a question of paying a fixed salary, that would be all well and good; but I do not agree that at this time we should reduce this percentage from 6% to 4%. Mr. Chairman, I always abide by your rulings, but I was prepared to talk for the whole night if it were not for the fact that you have reminded me that I was attacking the principle of the Bill.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am willing to accept a motion for a reduction or an increase from 4% I cannot accept a motion which would carry the percentage back to 6%.

Mr. COX: I am hoping that in the near future the Maude Bill will be passed and the question of paying the Parochial Treasurers on a percentage basis will be abandoned and their salaries will be fixed just as was done in the case of St. Michael.

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

Mr. DOWDING: In view of advice which I have been given as regards Clause 3 of this Bill

being part of an Act already, there is no necessity to have it in the Bill. I am therefore asking leave to withdraw the Clause.

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

The Preamble was read and agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. DOWDING, seconded by Mr. REECE, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee with an amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

HIGHWAYS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1951

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. George:— To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Highways Act, 1900 (1900—5).

Mr. DOWDING: This Bill is similar to the one which we have just passed. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. REECE: 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. DOWDING, seconded by Mr. REECE, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Lewis being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were read and passed.

Mr. DOWDING: I ask leave to withdraw Clause 3 of the Bill.

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

The Preamble was read and agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. DOWDING, seconded by Mr. REECE, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee with an amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

ORDER NOT PROCEEDED WITH

Mr. HAYNES: I ask leave to take Order No. 58 which is a Vestry Loan Bill, as the next Order of the Day, it is a non-controversial matter.

Dr. CUMMINS: I hate to object, but it is now almost 11 o'clock, we have not had any dinner and it is unfair to keep those who serve dinner remaining here any longer. Whether honourable members want to come back after dinner or not, I do not know. (A MEMBER: Move the adjournment).

THE ADJOURNMENT

Dr. CUMMINS: At this stage, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day week at 3 p.m.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until this day week at 3 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.