

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1950—51

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 14th August, 1951.

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Mr. G. H. ADAMS, B.A., Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., Messrs. M. E. COX, L. E. SMITH (*Chairman of Committees*), R. G. MAPP, T. O. BRYAN, F. E. MILLER and J. A. HAYNES, B.A.

Prayers were read.

MESSRS. ALLDER, F. L. WALCOTT and E. K. WALCOTT entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meeting are not yet ready for confirmation.

MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a Message from the Honourable the Legislative Council returning the Bill to make provision for the direction and supervision of the election of members to serve in the General Assembly of this Island, the procedure at such elections, the expenses at such election and for other purposes in connection therewith, with amendments.

PAPERS LAID

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I am commanded to lay the following Papers:—

Statement of Post Office Advances for payment of Money Orders to 30th June, 1951.

Report on the implementation of the recommendations by Mr. George Roddam, M. Inst. E.E. in his Report on the Ground Water Resources of Barbados.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Resolution to approve of the exchange by the Executive Committee of a parcel of land situate in the City of Bridgetown and vested in them for a parcel of land the property of Mrs. Stella Zephirin.

Mr. COX: Resolution to sanction the Petroleum (Amendment) Regulations, 1951, No. 2 made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee under the provisions of subsection (2) of section 2 of the Customs Tariff Act, 1921 (1921—3).

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$13,792 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. 18, which form the schedule to this Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$2,525 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. 19, which form the schedule to this Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to consider the money Resolutions of which I have just given notice.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S NOTICE

A Private Member's Notice was given as follows:—

Mr. MAPP: Of the following Address:—

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency The Governor

The House of Assembly view with profound regret the action being taken by the Government of Trinidad to prohibit immigrants from sister colonies into Trinidad.

The House beg to record their condemnation of a step which must militate against Federation of the British West Indies to which the Trinidad Legislative Council has agreed.

The House ask that Your Excellency be so good as to communicate the feelings of this House to the Government and Legislative Council of Trinidad, and to draw to their attention that this colony may well consider taking retaliatory measures should the Government of Trinidad proceed with the proposed methods of prohibiting immigrants.

Mr. GODDARD entered the House and took his seat.

QUESTION

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

Will Government consider reviewing the Pension scheme with the view to granting an increase to pensioners in the lower brackets, either by a cost of living bonus, or by an addition to the basic pension?

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE PRESENTED

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to present the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and prepare a Draft Reply to His Excellency's Message No. 19/1951 relating to the Economic Co-operation Agreement between the Governments of the United Kingdom and the U.S.A. I am also giving notice of my intention to move later in the day for the consideration of the Report.

Mr. WARD entered the House and took his seat.

ORDERS POSTPONED

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to postpone Orders Nos. 1 to 6, and that Order No. 7 be taken as the first Order of the Day.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

COST OF PREPARATION OF LAND AT SEAWELL PLANTATION

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the last occasion when the House was in Committee we were considering a Resolution 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.

Mr. ALLDER: I have not heard any mention made about the purpose of this Resolution.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This Resolution is one which was postponed on the last occasion.

Mr. ALLDER: I thought that after such a lengthy debate on this Resolution which was eventually postponed, the Government would have given some consideration to the opinion expressed by a majority of honourable members who voted for the postponement. I cannot find out why the Government has not seen fit to take the expression of opinion of honourable members into consideration; I have not been able to hear any reasons as to why the Government has not seen its way to grant the request of this House in respect of the suggestions made when this Resolution was last under discussion. A lot of argument has been advanced for and against the present scheme and whatever honourable members might think I cannot help stressing that there are too many people who find it difficult to get house-spots and also to get employment all the year round. Today the plantations are only employing workers on an average of two or three days a week and the remaining days of the week are wasted; therefore this land could be better dealt with and in such a way that many people in Christ Church would be able to get a spot of land to cultivate and implement the budget of their house-

holds. While some people feel that you should not reduce the land area fearing that sufficient land would not be devoted to the sugar industry, yet it must be realised that vegetable, poultry and food production schemes could be introduced, which would bring about a means of occupation for the workers. We have always boasted about our intention to adopt a policy which would bring about a redistribution of the landed area in this colony and I was hoping to see that policy implemented; however, instead of that, we fail to take advantage of every opportunity which presents itself to do what we have always hoped to do. I feel that if 29 families were to be prevented from going on this land, that would cause some dissatisfaction among the people in Christ Church, and we should not do anything which will cause people to become dissatisfied. You will get applicants for four acres of land and regardless of how much an agricultural worker knows about the cultivation of land, I am sure that he will not get any consideration in view of the fact that any applicant would have to show the means whereby he is able to cultivate four acres of land. Therefore the only qualified persons would be those who already have the means of providing for themselves and their families. I agree that the Government could not put four acres of land into the hands of an individual who does not have the means of working it: I am sure that if you were to give 29 workers an acre of land each a worker could start off with that skill and energy he has at his disposal, and with the assistance of his family he could get as much out of that acre of land as if it were an acre owned by a plantation. You can see that this scheme as recommended by the Administration is not the best scheme; while we might think in terms of profits, we must also think in terms of the utility value which land can offer not only for purposes of production but also for the accommodation of the people. There is no honourable member here who has not been impressed by the difficulty experienced in getting even house-spots furthermore land for the purpose of cultivation. I know that there are many persons who would be willing to purchase a little agricultural land because that is the only means of independence which an under-privileged man can get; but it is very rarely that you find any large portion of agricultural land for sale. Where any land is for sale you find that somebody who already owns many acres buys it, but the small man is always left in the cold. All these things point to the necessity for changing this Resolution as presented to the House last Tuesday.

I must draw to the attention of the Committee what was said by the Secretary of the Housing Board, who claimed that poor people were even offering bribes so as to get spots of land; these people are so eager to get somewhere to put their houses that they are offering bribes although they can ill afford to do that. Landlords have called for their spots and it was long before people could get any places to which they could remove their houses; in many cases they had to reply on the sympathy of the Police Magistrates before whom they were taken. The landlords also suffer and it is necessary for us to do whatever lies in our power to remove the existing state of affairs. Where there might be land which is not so arable it is in an expensive area where people want to build seaside houses; the price of that land is such that the poor man cannot buy it. Barbados is the only colony which has not got any Crown lands; in the case of some other colonies when it is difficult to get land on which to live, the people can rent land from the Government at a nominal charge, and they get that security which they would not be

able to get if they did not have the means of buying their own spots. I do not know if honourable members have changed their opinions in respect of this matter, but I am appealing to the honourable senior member for Christ Church, seeing that his colleague is not in his place, and I hope he will also appeal to the members of his Party not to allow this Resolution to be passed as it is. People come from the country districts to town every week with the statement that some manager has come to their spots to value the crops and has brought along with him a notice asking them to quit the land in 14 days. You will find that a person has been born on a plantation where his parents worked and he himself reaches the age of 30 also working on that plantation and a manager who comes to the plantation after six months gives that person notice to quit! I think we should adopt some alternative which would be more suitable to help as many people as possible. These 29 acres of land owned by the Government cannot help to any appreciable extent, but at least you can give security for life to 29 people with their families; although that will be a small approach to the problem you will make several lives happy. I do not see why the Government should stick to this Resolution as it came down last Tuesday and there is no logical argument to justify the proposal that these 29 acres of land be divided among seven people. You are saying that you want to maintain the fertility and preservation of the land, but we have seen peasant proprietors with their quarter of an acre of land and they work it so well that they get on the average more out of it than some places where they are hundreds of acres. You have peasant proprietors scattered all over the island and when they get as high as 50 tons to the acre, that is certainly commendable taking into consideration that they do not have the means of buying expensive manures and the use of the plough as obtains with the big plantations.

I hope honourable members will remember the threat used last Tuesday when the appeal was made to the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to change this Resolution so as to give this land to 29 people; the honourable member said that the Resolution would come back down in the same way. If the Head of the particular Department is of the opinion that this land should be given to seven persons instead of 29 persons, while he might be interested in the proper running of the Department, we too are interested in seeing that it is properly run and we are also interested in the happy state of the people. The question arises as to whether the status of members of this House or that of the Head of the Department predominates. It seems that we are too far removed from the people as to be able to do something to ameliorate their condition; instead of being able to do that, we are going on in the same old way. I am hoping that honourable members will show themselves as men and allow 29 families to benefit from this land instead of allowing only seven to benefit from it. I do not see any reason why they should back down from any feeling of sympathy. During the past week this Resolution has been discussed extensively especially in the editorial of the "Advocate" and the public is awaiting the outcome of it, particularly that part of the public which welcomes the opportunity in this scheme. I am hoping that in this issue justice will be done and that the fortunate householders in the parish of Christ Church will be able to benefit at the hands of the Government who, I hope, will make it possible for at least 29 persons each to get a spot of this land on which they will live in security. The reason why our people are so backward is due to the fact that they have been forced into a state of servility; they have had to go

out on mornings and look into the faces of their landlords or employers who had to give them an opportunity either of squatting on their lands or living in tenements and paying high rentals for them; so whenever we can relieve a person or a dozen persons we should do so. If you have a policy which is to give people security, when are you going to do something about it? When you get out of power? Is it not best to do something now so that the people can say; "I have benefited from the security which was given to me by a particular Government?" I express my feeling in this matter because too many people worry you about it from the time you go to the office until when you leave, and you have to wait until night so as to get some respite. Time and again we are asked to vote a lot of money for this, that and the other, and it is only for the benefit of a few persons; but I notice that when something can be done from which several people would benefit, there is always a ding-dong battle over it. That should not be so. I hope that this Committee will not give permission for the passing of this Resolution unless the Government agrees to put the suggestion of the Opposition into operation.

MESSRS. CRAWFORD, BRANCKER and MOTTLEY came into the Committee and took their seats while Mr. ALLDER was speaking.

Mr. GODDARD: This is an opportunity afforded the Government to help many land-hungry people in Christ Church. Although this scheme is an agricultural scheme, it can also be a housing scheme. On many occasions I have asked whether the Government does not intend to carry out some sort of housing scheme in the outlying districts; are these schemes only going to be carried out in St. Michael? I think it is time that housing schemes be carried out in the rural areas; the people in parishes like Christ Church and St. John are just as much entitled to a housing scheme as those in St. Michael. The opportunity is here afforded the Government to combine an agricultural scheme with a housing scheme and 29 people could be put on these 29 acres of land. We have been talking about assisting people in getting land and an acre of land is quite a lot for a person to look after. As to the question of an economic unit, four acres would be a better economic unit than one acre, but that does not mean that in Barbados an acre of land would not raise the economic position of people who have not got a quarter of an acre or half an acre now, I cannot support the Government in using these 29 acres of land for the benefit of only seven people.

Mr. WARD: I cannot vote for this Resolution having regard to the way in which this scheme has been laid out. Last Tuesday I said I felt that the Government could assist more than seven families and I am saying so again to-day. Not long ago the Government purchased a small area of land in St. Lucy for the purpose of setting up a model village, and it was said that this land would be divided, people would be able to put their houses on it and they would have some land to work. We have now 29 acres at Seawell and from my experience I know that one acre of land would be of great assistance to a person. There is no danger about the fragmentation of the land taking place, because certain regulations will be laid down and if any person does not adhere to those regulations, in three months' time the land will be taken away from him. We all know that in travelling through this island we will see people with less than an acre of land and that portion of land makes them and their families much more happy than many other people who have no land at all. These people cultivate their small lots of land, they plant food and canes and at the end of the year the money obtained from the sale of the crops helps them to repair their houses; some of these people's houses are in a bad state of repair and the Govern-

ment cannot help them to put their houses in a proper state of repair. We all know that this island is over-populated and people are not going to be satisfied with seven people being allowed four acres of land each when many others in the particular area would be glad for half an acre. Another point is that the Government has in mind that this land might be irrigated and an acre of land, if it is irrigated, is equal to four acres without irrigation. It is well known that if land is irrigated properly you can get more out of it than if it is not irrigated.

I do not think I can say anything more about this matter; we had a full-dress debate on it last Tuesday and the Government promised to see if they could change the scheme, but they have brought back the scheme to us in the same way. Last week the Government members spoke about a co-operative system; I feel that in a small area like this it would be just as easy to get six people to co-operate as it would be to get more people to co-operate because this land will be rented from the Government and the Government will have certain restrictions as regards the use of the land. I am willing to help the Department of Agriculture with any scheme which is reasonable, but I cannot support it with this scheme; we must adapt ourselves to our present conditions and try and help as many people as possible. If we are going to have a big scheme using 300 acres of land I would agree to making bigger units; but we only have 29 acres and I do not see how much help the proposal in this scheme will be when they are so many people waiting for land on which to put their houses.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The Government did not promise to make any change in this Resolution as the honourable senior member for St. Lucy has said; when honourable members vote against the Resolution the Government is not going to alter it. Honourable members like the honourable senior member for St. Lucy and the honourable senior member for Christ Church had a golden opportunity to help people many years ago and now they are willing to help people more than the Government can help them. When you give this land to 29 people they will still have to look for jobs, but seven people will become independent. The reason why the people are in their present position to-day is because honourable members like the honourable senior member for St. Lucy and the honourable senior member for Christ Church have retained their position and the people have to look to them for jobs. The honourable senior member for St. Lucy spoke about irrigating land; why does he not give people a little of his land and allow them to irrigate it so as to make the island more prosperous? The honourable member says that 29 acres of land would help more than seven people; of course 29 people are more than seven persons.

Now the honourable senior member for Christ Church speaks about a housing scheme, because the Government has promised to carry out a housing scheme; but this is not a housing scheme. The honourable senior member for St. John took nearly an hour to make one point and the threat of honourable members voting against this Resolution will not make any of us back down from this proposal; this is something which has been the policy of this Party for the last 10 years and now we have the opportunity of carrying it out we are doing so. This proposal is in the interest of the island; we are giving this land to people who can benefit from it. This is not a question of land tenancy where, the day you ask for more wages or join a Union, out you will go. The honourable senior member for St. John has appealed to the honourable senior member for Christ Church to come to his rescue;

but God help us if that is the sort of representative we have on behalf of Labour.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I think this Resolution and the scheme which accompanies it, are both evidence of the Government's bankruptcy of ideas with regard to a proper policy for the redistribution of land in this colony. If some attempt were being made at land reform in the colony, one might be inclined to say that we have these 29 acres of land and if the Authorities want to experiment with what in the course of time would become a co-operative, let them experiment. But here the position is entirely different; purely by accident these 29 acres of land is to be distributed among these people. Seawell used to be a plantation the greater portion of which has become the Airport; it is no longer profitable to run the remaining portion of land as a plantation and therefore the proposal is to put some people on it. Since we have not been told of any other scheme for making any other land in the colony available to people who have no land—since the Government has completely refused to prevent a handful of companies or individuals from buying more land—my policy is that the few acres which are available to the people should be distributed among the largest number possible. If the Committee had been given details of a proper policy of agricultural land reform, one might have been inclined to divide 100 acres into four-acre lots for the establishment of co-operatives among people. I could not support any proposal to settle the minimum number of people on these 29 acres of land. It is not true to say that if you divide this land into acre lots with irrigation that the people whom you settle on the land would have to go hat in hand asking plantation owners for work; if you put this land under irrigation a man and his family will require additional help in the cultivation of his lot throughout the year, so that the argument that if this land is divided among the maximum number of people they will be made available to the labour force is pure tomfoolery. If this land were not in an area which lends itself to irrigation, one might be inclined to agree to the division into four-acre lots; but the moment you have irrigation facilities, the argument for the division into four-acre lots is lost. One can see for himself what people with less than an acre of land are doing by means of irrigation.

In the conditions under which the land is to be rented one can see the reactionary policy of the Government. We are told this: "A system of mixed farming must be practised. The system may be based on sugar cane as the main cash crop, but must provide for the cultivation of food and fodder crops and must be conducted on lines recommended by or acceptable to the Department of Agriculture in regard to the nature and area of each crop and number of head of livestock and their method of feeding and management." A four-acre unit is required because sugar cane is to be the main cash crop. If you are going to concentrate on producing food you would not need a four-acre unit; but if you are planting sugar cane you must have four acres, because the greater portion of the land is for sugar cane. In view of the uncertain position with regard to sugar and in view of the high cost of foodstuffs which the colony has to import, the Government's attention should be concentrated to a greater extent on producing more food locally. If honourable members remember what happened with the sugar delegation in England they should appreciate that we will be in a very precarious position after 1953 with regard to our output of sugar. If the lesson from Grenada has been learnt, we should not be attempting to repeat in Barbados the situation which now exists in Grenada. Grenada is a

country in which the percentage of small landowners is perhaps higher than anywhere else in the West Indies with the possible exception of Jamaica and Dominica; yet you have labour troubles there. The number of working-class people in Grenada is infinitely greater than those who own land and in any country where you find a large number of landless people you have highly inflammable material; the minute you allow a man to settle on land in the colony you make him a sober, responsible citizen, and therefore whenever any land is available in the colony, as it is now, it is a social and economic policy to settle on that land as many people as you can, or at least you should see that the profits derived from that land are distributed among the greatest number of people. If Grenada with its comparatively large number of peasant proprietors should have experienced the difficult time which it experienced, how much more should we expect that state of affairs in a colony like Barbados where about 300 people own nearly 80% of the arable land? The remainder of the land is divided between another 20,000 or 23,000 people, therefore you have fully 176,000 who do not own a square inch of land, and a large landless proletariat is an easy prey for the agitator. In this proposal to-day the Government wants to settle a small number of people on this land; it wants to carry on this experiment as a co-operative. Not so long ago in reply to a question asked in this House, the Government said that it saw no reason to acquire land in the colony owned by absentee proprietors; the Government also said that it saw no reason to place any limit on the amount of land owned by individuals in the colony. One man can buy all the land in the colony so long as he has the money to do so; in this colony it is absolutely unreasonable to allow such a condition of affairs to exist; in other Caribbean colonies which found themselves in such a position, steps were taken to have the situation reviewed. In Puerto Rico they had the good sense to realise the necessity of placing a curb on individuals from acquiring land in that colony; that was done nearly 50 years ago, but in 1951 a Government which calls itself a Socialist Government, sees no reason for placing any limit on individual land ownership! The Government of India under Nehru which nobody would call a Socialist Government, saw fit to place a ceiling on land ownership in the country; that was one of the first things it did. I want to make this point; if you compare the distribution of land in this colony with the distribution of land in Grenada, you will find that in even the poorest district in Grenada more people own their own land than those in any parish in this island, and therefore the inference to be drawn is clear. When the time comes for the agitators to start in this colony we are going to be faced with a serious situation. Should anybody sit down in 1951 and think that we are going to be free from agitation of a certain type? If some people feel that the people of this colony are not susceptible to a certain type of agitation, all I tell them is to let them wait and see. Anybody who feels otherwise is living in a fool's paradise; it is therefore our duty, whenever we can, to remove the underlying causes and to endeavour to create satisfactory conditions for the greatest possible number of people. This is no simple matter; it is a very important issue. This is a matter which is, of course, very dear to my own heart, because from the very year I came into this Assembly I have been endeavouring in every possible form to influence the Authorities to make a better distribution of land. As a matter of fact, I believe one of the first Addresses I brought forward was in connection with asking the Government to purchase the Gordon Rose group of estates. An honourable member has

just said *sotto voce* that I once suggested that we should buy a seaside house for the Governor—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not want to hear about purchasing any seaside house for the Governor.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not saying that you want to hear about that. I am only saying that my suggestion in respect of land reform in this colony is based on a sound policy and my suggestion of purchasing a seaside house for the Governor was also based on a sound policy. All I wanted to see is that the Governor did not hob-nob at a place like Sam Lord's Castle; every other colony has seen fit to provide a seaside house for its Governor.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not in this Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If the honourable member wants to be reminiscent as regards the proposal to provide a seaside house for the Governor, he should also want to be reminiscent about the land policy; he should recall that somebody suggested to the Royal Commission that everybody should have half an acre of land. If the suggestion to provide a seaside house for the Governor is fantastic, the suggestion of giving everybody half an acre of land is more fantastic. But to return to the matter before us, about 11 years ago the Government could have bought the Gordon Rose group of estates in this colony; since then I have not lost any opportunity of asking the Government to acquire plantations, whenever they were for sale, for the purpose of either making land available to a greater number of people or the revenue accruing from the land. As a matter of fact, I have for years urged that we should pursue some sort of policy which would permit the nationalisation of the land which would enable the people who grow crops on the land to share in the revenue derived from these crops. In view of the position which I have always taken in this issue, I do not regard it as a slight issue at all. While I appreciate all the arguments about co-operatives and experimenting with agricultural settlements and what not, I also repeat that the peculiar conditions which exist in this colony do not allow us much latitude for experimenting and we have to face realities; with the small amount of land which is available we have to try and put as many people on it in one way or another.

Mr. MAPP: Those honourable members who are opposing this Resolution seem to be sticking to the proposal of dividing this land into one-acre units regardless of whatever arguments are adduced by the Government. The members of the Opposition are in favour of dividing the land into one-acre units because they are piqued by the fact that the Government has insisted on the four-acre units. If that is the attitude of the members of the Opposition they are responsible to the people and they are quite entitled to pursue that course however foolish it might seem. One honourable member said that the reason why the people of this colony are so backward is due to the fact that they have been forced live in a servile state and squat on the land of the big landowners. Well, it has been the policy of landowners to rent out spots of land in half an acre or quarter of an acre or eighth of an acre lots because they know that no man can live on such lots with any form of economic security. A man could exist on a quarter of an acre lot, but he could not live on it and attain that standard of living which we want him to attain. Members of the Opposition think that this land should be divided into one-acre lots instead of four-acre lots so that more people can get it; if they are so wise they must vote against the Resolution. The Government has said it does not agree that an acre unit is an economic unit and nothing that honourable members on this side of the Table can do can make the members of the Opposition change their minds, even although they are profoundly in favour of land set-

ment. The members of the Opposition are free to vote as they please; it seems to me that they are simply playing the game of the child who said: "If I cannot be allowed to bat your ball I will sit down in the middle of the pitch and let play be stopped." When the suggestion was made that the land should be divided into half-acre lots the big planters protested and asked: "How can half an acre of land support anybody?" They called it absolute nonsense. The honourable junior member for St. Philip has said that the Government is not limiting the ownership of land; but the Government is doing that in a more sensible way than how he would do it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. Apparently the honourable member does not appreciate my reference to the limitation of the ownership of land. I referred to the Government's refusal to put a ceiling on the amount of land which any individual could buy, and that was not in reference to this Resolution at all.

Mr. MAPP: It appears that the honourable member was speaking out of order; he was not speaking on this Resolution at all. However, in the conditions relative to the Scheme for the utilisation of this land at Seawell, the Government says this: "The area is to be divided by the Department of Agriculture into four-acre units on the assumption that a unit of this size will afford full-time employment for a man and his family." Could anything be more reasonable and sincere than that? The Government is saying: "We do not want you to squat on an acre lot; we want to afford you full-time employment." The honourable senior member for St. Lucy let the cat out of the bag when he hinted that a man could go to work at a plantation and then come back home and work his acre lot; the honourable member is saying: "Do not make people independent: let them come to him for work." On the other hand the Government proposes to divide this land into four-acre units and with a proper irrigation system, obviously people can plant some of the land in canes and the remainder in food crops. Some time ago this House passed an Address relative to assisting peasants with the use of tractors; do you think the Government would buy a tractor to assist in the preparation of one acre of land? Is it not better to have a tractor to assist in the preparation of four acres? Some honourable members who are opposing this Resolution spoke about Socialism; but the biggest Socialist State on earth found that whenever you cut up an estate into holdings which are too small the production suffered. This is a matter on which we should feel very strongly; we should get away from the poverty-stricken economy under which this island has had to suffer. We have to consider what is an economic unit and in this matter the Government has been guided by one who is highly respected for his opinions. If honourable members of the Opposition choose to persist in their attitude, that is entirely a matter for them; I am sure that the people of this colony will agree with what the Government proposes in this Resolution.

Dr. CUMMINS: 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. F. L. WALCOTT seconded the motion which was agreed to.

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

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

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

On re-assembling:

Mr. ADAMS laid the Reply to Question No. 68, standing in the name of Mr. Mapp.

Mr. Cox laid the Reply to Question No. 93, standing in the name of Mr. Crawford.

Mr. SPEAKER said that on the adjournment the House was in Committee of Supply and left the Chair.

The House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House was last in Committee of Supply the Resolution for "\$1,000.00 (New) Preparation of land at Seawell Plantation" was being debated.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman—I believe that we have all practically expressed our views on this matter last Tuesday. I must confess that I am a bit surprised to see this Resolution come back in the same form that it was in last Tuesday. I believe that I would be the last person that the Government could accuse of not wanting to divide up land. I am only too willing to see land divided up. But it is unfortunate, sir, that our views and those of the Government should clash on this question. The matter is very simple. This is a Resolution for \$1,000 which we are asked to pass. The Government told us last Tuesday and again today, that the area of land is 29 acres, and it is to be divided into four-acre lots. I have not heard one member of the Opposition disagree with the statement that the larger the portion of land you work the more economical it is. We all agreed last Tuesday that four acres, would be more advantageous to a person who settled on it than one acre would be. But we also had another point of view—that in view of the fact that there are so many people in this country who would like a small portion of land to settle on, and in view of the fact that there is a suggestion in this Resolution about the possibility of irrigation, we felt that you should divide this land in one-acre lots, and not in four-acre lots. That seemed to be the opinion of the majority then. There has never been any question at all of someone not wanting to see this land divided. Some honourable members on that side of the table argued that because we did not agree that the land should be divided among 29 people, that we were saying no land should be divided up at all. I think it is unfortunate that that accusation should have been made by supporters of the Government against those on this side of the table who do not support the division of this land among seven people, or who attributed improper motives to those honourable members. Not a single one of us has said that the Government is not acting with the highest motives. I personally believe that four-acre lots are more economical. But it is a fact that there are no Government-owned lands in this island, and since everyone is dependent upon acquiring land for working by purchase or rent, we feel that it would be better to allow the majority to benefit from the division of this area of land. I heard it argued by the honourable senior member for St. Peter and the honourable junior member for St. Thomas that if you put people on four acres they will not have to go back to the plantation to work. But don't care what you do, some will have to go to the plantation. Do not let us despise labour. When you talk about people going back to the plantation, ask yourselves what else can Barbados depend upon at the moment but sugar. If you have to depend on that I do not see how people will not have to work on the plantations. The argument in favour of dividing this land into one-acre lots was used with the highest motives. It was not used because plantation owners want people to have to come to them. I regret very much that that attitude has been adopted. Since I left here last week I have taken this matter up, and I have found that it

is true to say that a person on one acre of irrigated land can be independent. That has been put to me by persons of experience. The honourable senior member for St. Lucy has told us that one acre of irrigated land will produce more than four acres not irrigated. That is an absolute fact. You cannot know that from theory. I always go to the head of the spring for practical experience. Our only reason for saying that these 29 acres should be divided up in one-acre lots is because we know that there are hundreds and hundreds of people who would like to get some of this land. The Government of this country has been commended by people coming from all over the West Indies, and from other parts as well, for the Belfield Scheme. In our last Estimates we put down a token vote of a dollar for the purpose of embarking on a scheme at Clinketts, St. Lucy. One might argue that instead of spending money to buy extra land, the Government could take this 29 acres—I understand that it is not in the gully—and spend \$2,000 instead of \$1,000 and lay out a scheme similar to the one at Belfield. It might appear parochial to some; but it is a good thing that I do not represent an out-of-the-city constituency, or I might talk a long time on this. This is 29 acres of front land. Let us assume that we took four acres off for roads. That would leave 25. If you work according to the Public Health Act you will have enough land for a scheme for four hundred houses. That is not saying that you will be putting four hundred houses and calling it a co-operative unit. I am talking about a scheme like the one at Belfield for which the Housing Board has been complimented by people from England and other places. That is how I feel about it, despite whatever the Government might say, or what anyone might write. I do not think this 29 acres should be used for the benefit of seven people. I repeat: I am not saying that a four-acre lot is not more economical than a one-acre lot. But I am also saying that in view of the need for land in Barbados, you should make this land available to more people than seven, or as an alternative, provide a scheme similar to the one at Belfield. Because we are making those suggestions, it does not mean that we are saying you should not divide land at all. No one knows how the vote on this Resolution will go. The majority vote went last week when it was postponed. Government think that their scheme is the best. We attribute the highest motives to them we do not think that it is the best scheme. Why attribute to us the idea that we want to keep people on the plantations. Whatever scheme you put up you will have to have people doing that kind of work. I am not going to vote for this Resolution for \$1,000 to provide 29 acres of land for seven people. You can accuse me of whatever you like. I have my conscience to satisfy. I want a scheme that will benefit a greater number of people where settling on land is concerned, or I want a scheme similar to the one at Belfield.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman—It seems that last Tuesday when I was unfortunately absent, honourable members have definitely committed themselves one way or another where this Resolution is concerned. I regret very much that this Resolution has either to be passed or rejected, and that it cannot be amended. I am fully convinced that despite whatever opinion has been given to Government in favour of four-acre lots rather than one-acre lots, the division of this land into two-acre lots, even if not one-acre lots is bound to be more beneficial in view of the hunger for land that exists in this country. We know how many thousand acres are owned by a few people—I believe that half of the land is owned by those on the other side of the table—and 20,000 peasants own the remainder of our arable land.

What I feel about the matter is this: if we cannot benefit 29 people, or even 14 people, it is better to allow seven to derive some benefit from this land than that none at all should benefit, remembering that we either have to pass or to reject this Resolution. That is the position, Mr. Chairman, in which we find ourselves. Warning must be sounded to the Government or to the advisers behind whom they are sheltering, that when we have these schemes the principle must be the greatest good for the greatest number. There is the proposal to acquire eight acres of land at Clinketts. When we come to consider that scheme, I do not want to see a provision of two four-acre spots, or four two-acre spots. I want to see the greatest good for the greatest number. If there are only eight acres, at least eight people should derive the greatest possible benefit from it. I am warning the Government before they send down that scheme. If this were British Guiana, you could afford to give four to ten acres to each person to experiment with. But the Government of this island should tell their land policy advisers that the House looks with disfavour upon a scheme such as this which provides benefit for only seven people, when it might provide benefit for 14, if not for 29. If you divide it among 14 people, it would mean that a peasant would have two acres which if properly irrigated, would be worth something to one who is thrifty. That is my opinion, and I am fortified in my opinion by people who know something about land. Anyhow, Sir, the position is that while I agree that dividing it among 29 people would be ideal, or if not among 29, among 14, rather than let none get at all, I will vote for the Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman—I know that nothing I am going to say now will persuade the honourable members on my left. I am sorry that the honourable senior member for the City is not in his place, because his speech was perhaps the most reasoned of all the honourable members on that side of the table. But his speech amounted to this: if we had come down here with a Resolution under Education, and said that we had many projects for modern schools—enlarging Combermere, buying someone's private school, expanding elementary schools etc.—but today we were bringing down a Resolution for expanding Combermere, the honourable member would have said, "why not build elementary schools; the elementary schools programme is the best programme." Now the honourable junior member for St. Philip is in a different category, and I will deal with him later on. For years since Puerto Rico started experiments in land tenure, the Labour Party has been preaching that we should try to adopt Puerto Rico's methods of getting people back to the land; and the honourable junior member for St. Philip has been preaching that too. We preached that and we published it in our side of the Press and in pamphlets. This debate, this whole thing has arisen out of a speech of mine here when the honourable member for St. Philip asked about the people at Dodds not getting bonus. I told him that occasionally it happened that you got an answer before you brought a question, and that was what happened that day. I, or some other member of the Executive brought down that day a Resolution to provide for the payment of bonus to the people working at Dodds. I went on to say—and it was published in the "Advocate"—that the Government were giving this bonus etc., and that it had provided the honourable member with an answer before the question was raised; that it was a matter of public interest, and that the Government was going into the question of the profits made yearly at Dodds with a view to estab-

lishing on a co-operative basis. The honourable junior member for St. Philip could not have wanted a more comprehensive land policy than that foreshadowed there. The honourable member has been preaching that we should follow the Puerto Rico system which provides one whole plantation run as a single unit, while the workers share in the profits just as it is proposed to do on a limited scale in this Resolution. Every man who digs a cane hole puts so much into a reserve fund, and every other cent is shared by the labourers. When we speak of these schemes in Puerto Rico we of course take into consideration the amount of arable land available there and their mechanisation of the industry. Big estates are run as a unit within this method, and in many cases they also lease out to the former owners any excess over 400 or 500 acres. Now along comes this opportunity to try out one of these Puerto Rico schemes at Seawell, and Government says "let us seize the opportunity." We ask the Department of Agriculture in carrying out such a scheme what would be the most economical unit, taking into account the amount of land that we have. They recommend four-acre units. With the greatest respect in the world to the honourable senior member for St. Lucy, I would sooner accept the advice of Sir John Saint, who is at least a disinterested party, than I would accept his. Here we have a chance to take land and do one of the things which the honourable junior member for St. Philip says we should do. There have been meetings in all these islands, meetings of the Caribbean Commission and sometimes sponsored by Colonial Development and Welfare, in which all these land schemes in the Caribbean Area and some South American schemes have been discussed. They think that in an island you should not have one single scheme of any sort, but that you should try out different schemes side by side. Depending on the type of soil, some may be better run as family units, and others on a big scale; but there should be no units below three, four, or five acres. That is common knowledge. Now the Government has come here with all that knowledge and all that advice and said "let us as Labourites put into operation what we have been preaching about Puerto Rico." Night after night we have been telling the electorate to put us in power and we will do what Puerto Rico is doing, and what it said that the rest of the West Indies should do also. Then you find alleged Labourites voting against this Resolution. You find the honourable senior member for St. John voting against it. And the honourable junior member for St. Philip of all people who is ever talking about Puerto Rico we find him against this. Why? Because it has been brought down by the Labour Government of which he is not a member. How else can his actions be interpreted when it is the very thing that he has been preaching—keep the people on the land; give them a sense of security; give them full employment; make them independent; make them self-respecting. And now we find the honourable member going over to the honourable members on the other side and voting as they are voting. I am aware that one can by stretching one's conscience find a reason for doing anything. As far as the other side are concerned, I think that they are still living in the Middle Ages where the ownership of land is concerned. I do not think that they are doing it with the specific purpose of forcing people into the plantation, but it has that effect. The honourable senior member for St. Lucy let it slip out. That is what for 100 years has been the curse of the West Indies—the plantation system whereby people worked for wages, got fired at any time, and

never in the mass getting a chance of feeling that land is theirs either by reason of security of tenure or as long as they would cultivate it properly, or by way of getting enough money to buy their own land. If it is a question of reason, no member can vote against this scheme. If we were to come down with a scheme for making bricks and tell you it is an experiment, what would be the use of saying make it a better scheme by making it one for roasting corn? Of course you might say that this 29 acres would be an admirable site for a secondary school. That could be urged too. When we come here specifically to carry out a reformation in the policy of land holding in this country, imagine finding anyone who even pretends to be a Socialist prepared to vote against this. If the honourable junior member for St. Philip says make it one-acre lots he is bound to eat his word as regards what he says about Puerto Rico because they are endeavouring to create family holdings. At least you should give the Government a chance to try this scheme and see if these people, with proper selection, will be able to do with this scheme what the family scheme has done in Puerto Rico. I got it from the Department of Agriculture in Puerto Rico that the family scheme is only a few years, but already is succeeding. Where the present scheme is concerned, even a layman must see that those who are working this land will have to start with a back prop. When you start with vegetables you start with an uncertainty; because, as conditions are in Barbados, where are you going to market all of them. But if you have some vegetables, and also the certainty of money during the cane reaping season, then you start with a greater sense of security than if you started with vegetables alone. That was the reason that this scheme was selected. I suggest that it is the best scheme, for the reasons that I have given. This is the kind of thing that has been suggested by C.D. & W. and by everyone else since the Moyne Commission; that we should get the people back to the land, but that it should be mixed farming. This is the expressed policy of this Government, and even of previous governments for the past 10 or 12 years. I expect Labourites to vote for this, whatever may be the decision of people who cannot get out of their blood the feudal system that "you can always come and work on my land". When the honourable senior member for Christ Church talks about a chance of helping people, I do not want to be personal the least bit, because maybe he is one of the most charitable people towards his employees in Bridgetown. But I would remind those on the other side that big businesses in the outside world have got on because they themselves have initiated schemes to help their employees. They themselves build houses and play grounds for their employees, and send them away for holidays with pay. A committee of sugar technologists of Barbados went to Puerto Rico—I believe it has happened more than once—and they themselves when they came back, had to say, why does not this Government follow Puerto Rico with these land schemes? That happened to be an enlightened view. Again I say that I do not imagine for one half second that I have persuaded any honourable member not to vote against this. But it is the policy of the Government—a deliberate policy of land reformation—put into operation at this moment because these 29 acres have become available, and it is better to start with this than to start by buying a plantation, not knowing whether the scheme will be successful or not. Of course, it has always got to be remembered that in schemes of this sort, you have to select persons who really intend to

live on the land. I want to refute the suggestion that the Government will initiate a scheme whereby these people will still be going to work on plantations. They will be selected with a view to giving them full time employment, and making them real peasants. There are really few peasants in this island. Of the 18,000 that we hear so much about, the vast majority are given to other occupations. That is the reason for the outcry that the wages which the Union secured for labourers is killing the peasants. It is with the objects of selecting a man who is really determined to be a farmer that the Government is trying out this scheme. I therefore suggest to those members of the House who believe that this is a chance to put into operation some part of our policy, to vote for this Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman—I have listened with extreme care to every single word of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, and I want to tell him now that if he were really following Puerto Rico, he would find me upholding both of his hands and feet, so to speak. But it is because he is not following Puerto Rico that I am opposing him today. Let us consider a few figures. Of the 94,000 arable acres in this island, 77,000 are owned by 336 people. The remaining 17,000 are owned by 23,000 people. In other words you have 175,000 people who own no land at all. Now, a similar situation existed in Puerto Rico; and what did Puerto Rico do? As I said earlier, they had a land law prohibiting the holding of land in excess of 500 acres.

For 50 years that law existed, and was not put into operation. Along came the Democratic Party and decided to apply it. The big land owners fought it before the Supreme Court of America and lost, and immediately the Puerto Rican Government started to expropriate all land holdings above 500 acres. They thus had thousands of acres to use for collective farms, housing development etc. What is the position in Barbados? You have got 29 acres at Seawell which is no longer profitable to be run as a plantation, and we will put seven people on it. If a cheap plantation comes along, we are going to buy it. That is the only scheme we may see in our lifetime. Where will you get a cheap plantation from? Eight acres was just sold in St. George for £7,900. If the honourable senior member for St. Joseph had come here and said, "I am going to follow Puerto Rico; I am going to pass a law to prohibit any local or foreign company from owning more than 500 acres of land, and any land in excess of that we will use for agricultural purposes, then you could have several schemes like the one at Seawell. But he does nothing of the kind. As a matter of fact he sits and sees what we all know—that within the last few years one Roebuck Street merchant has secured for himself over 2,000 acres; he sees that there is an even more intensified attempt on the part of a few to monopolise and grab all the land in the colony. Even to a greater extent than before more of the land is passing into the hands of the few. And he does nothing about it. Now he wants to try to push down our throats that he is following Puerto Rico, merely because the Government has 29 acres at Seawell. The Government has a little monkey scheme that they want to play with at Seawell, and that is all; and therefore, until they come here with a bigger scheme, I am going to see to it as far as I can that the greatest number of people benefit from this small scheme. Witness the policy of the Government. About seven months ago I asked the Government to let us know the total acreage owned by absentee proprietors. I asked that in view of the acute land hunger in the colony they should take

action with a view to the expropriation of land and making it valuable, or to make arrangements for its cultivation under such conditions as would ensure cultivation. I asked them also to prohibit future ownership.

What did the Government say? They replied that they are satisfied that the plantations owned by absentee proprietors are generally well farmed, and provide work for many workers. That means that Government is satisfied with the plantation system. Now the Government wants to tell us that they are not satisfied with the plantation system, that they are following Puerto Rico. They may be following Puerto Rico, but they are following too far behind. As long as the Government is following along so many years behind Puerto Rico, I cannot see my way to support them. Government went on to say in reply to my question that at present they do not contemplate any action with a view to the expropriation of land owned by absentee proprietors. Furthermore there is no need at present, said the Government, to put a limit to the amount of agricultural land which one person or a group of persons might own. So, if Mr. So. and So from Broad Street or Roebuck Street decides to take his money out of commerce and buy all the plantations in the colony, this Government would allow him to do so. It is not a question of whether absentee proprietors farm their land well or pay good wages. I am surprised to think that such a reply could come from a government the spokesman of which has made the speech that he has made today. When the honourable member talks about those on my left trying to perpetuate feudalism to the last, what else is he thinking of? What else is he thinking of when he tells you that the plantation system must remain; even the plantations owned by absentee proprietors. You will remember, sir, that only last week this question was raised by a Labourite in Great Britain, and the Secretary of State for the Colonies, who in the final analysis is an Englishman, sheltered behind the replies given by this Government and said he saw no reason for a revision of the policy laid down by the Barbados Government. When the British were chased out of India, what did Nehru do? He expropriated all the land owned by absentee proprietors. They had to spend something like £308,000,000 to do so, and they did it with the express purpose, as Nehru said, of not perpetuating feudalism. I see no difference between the unexpressed desire to carry on the feudalistic system, and the policy of the Government as expressed in the answer to my question. Either what the Government sends down in a printed document as an answer to a question is not to be regarded as Government policy, or we have to ignore these platitudinous speeches by Government spokesmen in the House, and stick to what is said in the printed document. Which is really the Government's policy. I would like to know where is the Government going to get land from to carry out even half of the schemes that Puerto Rico is carrying out unless they are going to expropriate the land of absentee proprietors.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman—I would like to ask the honourable member if he would expropriate the land of the Panama people.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I say, yes. The honourable member is only trying to draw a red herring across the trail. He knows that if the opportunity comes the Panama people would like to be expropriated. (Laughter) Therefore he is not putting anything on me. Those plantations are not being run properly.

As a matter of fact, I am ashamed to say this, but since the honourable member has seen fit to bring in the Panama plantations, I wonder what kind of Agricultural Department or Executive could tell us that the plantations owned by these absentee proprietors are being well farmed.

Mr. ADAMS: The reply of Government was that they were being "generally well farmed," because we knew that here and there there might not be proper farming. I must emphatically deny, however, that these Panama people want to be expropriated. I have been Counsel for one lot of them, and I know that the contrary is true.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable member knows what he is talking about, and so do I. And I know that the greater number of the shareholders in this Panama Company would like their money back. The honourable member knows that too. There are about 18 estates owned by absentee proprietors. Of these, six are owned by the Panama people, that is, one third. Are you going to tell me that the word "generally" would not apply to one-third of the total number? The honourable member thinks that he is talking to school children. "Generally" would only exclude an estate or two, but not six out of 18. When I saw this reply I wondered how the Government could possibly issue so misleading a statement as to say that the estates owned by absentee proprietors are generally well farmed. Again I ask, where are they going to find the land for agricultural experiments like Puerto Rico when they tell us that all they are going to do is to use this 29 acres at Seawell, and if a cheap plantation comes along, they will buy it. The honourable junior member for St. Thomas asked what is one acre. Imagine anyone asking that in an island where 175,000 people do not own an inch of land, where 300 own 77,000 acres and another 23,000 people own 17,000 acres. He is asking what is one acre, when there are so many people who would like even a half perch. The honourable junior member for St. Lucy has allowed himself to be misled by certain illogical arguments propounded today, arguments to the effect that because we say that more than seven should benefit we did not want anyone to benefit. That was the sort of illogicality propounded by the honourable junior member for St. Thomas. They are arguing that if we do not vote for it as it is, the whole thing will be lost, just as if they are the Medes and Persians. I will take a bet now that it will be changed. I am just as anxious as any, and even more anxious than many to see some sort of land reformation. We have to make the most of what we have, and since we only have this 29 acres today, we should make the greatest use of it, bearing in mind the amount of arable land in this island is small. But if the acreage is small, it is our business to extend the good that we can to the greatest possible number. I am not for one of these one moment suggesting that the man who settles on acres should also go and work on a plantation. I heard the honourable senior member for St. Lucy say that the peasant who settles on one acre can also work on a plantation, so as to supplement his income. I also heard him say that an acre under irrigation cannot be farmed by one man alone. I do not see if you are going to irrigate this acre of land how a man who settles on it will have time to work on a plantation; unless he is going to work day and night. So honourable members need have no fear that if we do not vote for this Resolution as it stands we are keeping people on the land and perpetuating the feudal system. You will be doing no such thing, if the land is irrigated. A man will be as independent with one acre as with four. With 175,000

land hungry people in the island, there can hardly be any justification for helping seven and ignoring others who might also be helped. I want to repeat, that if this land was in another area and it could not be irrigated, it might be a different proposition. But not at Seawell. I know of no land settlement scheme or no proposed agricultural reform in any part of the British Empire with such a limited amount of land available, nor with such limited prospects of getting more in which so unprofitable a venture was attempted.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear the honourable junior member for St. Philip close with those remarks—"no place with such a limited amount of land available"

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of explanation, sir. I added, "and with such limited prospects of getting more."

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Antigua has 166 square miles of land. It is a country much like Barbados, and its prospects of getting more land are no greater. There is a group of people owning more than 50 per cent of the land in Antigua, and they have a scheme of land settlement which provides land in 10 acre lots.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It is fairly simple, what I said. Is the amount of land in Antigua for land settlement purposes 29 acres?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Can you imagine more nonsense? If it were 100 acres you could divide it into lots of 25. The honourable member went to Curacao. He heard Dr. Newmark. Do you think he would have made that speech in Curacao. I have never been to Puerto Rico. What is Puerto Rico to do with this 29-acre scheme at Seawell. And what difference would it make if there was expropriation of land or not? That is only talk—talking about expropriation of land and asking other honourable members on the other side to go along with you. We on this side of the table do not flirt with them when it suits us. That is why we can face the public.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable member please address the Chair?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The honourable member was merely having his talk. The honourable member begins by saying that if the Government had co-ordinated this scheme with a housing scheme it would have been alright. But can you begin an agricultural scheme land settlement by co-ordinating it with a housing scheme? If the Government had done that, they would be asked, why did you not start a housing scheme pure and simple? Talking about, a scheme for full employment, you either have to produce a land settlement scheme that can provide full employment or no scheme at all. If not it will simply be a matter of putting people on land and asking them to exist however they can. I have never yet heard in this age anyone accuse a government of producing a policy for full employment. I thought it was the other way around, and that a government is criticised for not doing so.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Address the Chair.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, it does not matter in which direction I look, I am still addressing the Chair. This scheme has behind it the advice of Sir John Saint. It is not any political question. There has been talk of four acres being too much for one man and his family to work. But what is wrong with an employment policy when you provide employment for a man and he can in turn provide employment for someone else. If you provided a scheme by which a man could not support himself and his family that would be wrong. If you settled a man knowing that because of his requirements he could not be able to give that land his at-

tention for eight hours a day, but would be forced to seek employment elsewhere, that would not be fair. As I have already said, this is not a Housing Scheme. To talk about the greatest good for the greatest number in this case is being unrealistic. If Government followed that narrow policy we would have to refuse to build the deep water harbour. Does the honourable senior member for St. Lucy adopt that policy every time that he brings in a piece of machinery that reduces the number of people he employs? Government is not depriving of this 29 acres of land, people who had it before. If there were 29 people living on this land already it would be different. That is why we say that at Clinketts we do not want to deprive any of the people who live there of land. But we will give some people an opportunity to own what they did not own before. There is no one on this land at Seawell, and therefore we will utilize it. If with this land we can provide full employment for seven people, it is in the interest of the working class people of the community to provide full employment for those people. I say as I have said earlier that the Government has not a qualm of conscience as far as this scheme is concerned, because we are providing full employment where the incidence of casual employment is so high. Every man is entitled to have an opportunity to work. Every man cannot own land. If this land can provide full employment for seven people, what is wrong with that? The honourable junior member for St. Philip seems to be an agricultural expert. He says that an acre of land irrigated can give a man and his family a living. I would like to know what is his idea of living. I am saying that if this scheme can provide seven people with full employment, the House would be taking a grave step to turn it down.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman—The suggestion that we on this side of the table are unwilling to pass this Resolution because we want to perpetuate some system of feudalism, so old that even the oldest grave digger in the island would be unable to find it, could only be a product of the mentality of the honourable senior member for St. Michael.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you right?

Mr. DOWDING: I mean the honourable senior member for the City. No, that is wrong, Mr. Chairman. I am sorry that you interrupted me. I was right in the first place, and would say that it has been reliably reported that seven strong supporters of the Labour Party have been chosen for this scheme. (Shame, shame). Now, sir, on the last occasion that this matter was discussed in this House, I was led to understand that on account of the feeling of the House, the Resolution would be amended from the point of view of the one-acre lot.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, sir. No such undertaking was ever given. I said that I would report the views of honourable members to the Executive Committee, before bringing back the Resolution. We never intended to change this scheme.

Mr. DOWDING: I still say that it was the understanding of the House that there would be a change. We even stopped a lengthy discussion on account of that understanding. But my understanding leads me to understand that even those who were responsible for this scheme in the first place were convinced that you cannot read a co-operative scheme into this. Not even the "Advocate" newspaper which calls it a laudable scheme could read a co-operative scheme into this. I do not see anything laudable in such a scheme, Government would undertake not only this 29 acres, but the whole of Dodds, and the place next to it. They

would come on several occasions with a scheme of this sort, and would buy plantations for the purpose of giving them out into four-acre lots. I challenge anyone to say that a four-acre plot is an economical one in this island. The economy of Barbados is dependent on the plantation system. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph knows that the plantation system is the most economical system in the West Indies. Now, sir, I speak strongly, and if when I am finished the honourable member is still convinced that the four-acre system is economical, let us see several more hundred acres put into four-acre lots. Now one reads in this scheme about a system of mixed farming based on sugar cane. In my view, the most obvious course for any reasonable person to pursue is a system of mixed farming where these plots are used as vegetable gardens—not sugar cane—and then the Government can put in irrigation, and put the man who settles on it in a position to make a profit for himself and his family out of intensive truck gardening as is done in the U.S.A. As I have said, the economy of the island depends on the plantation system, and I think, therefore, that the best we can do is to give every man possible an acre of land so that he will not have to depend entirely on the plantation system, or on carpentry, or painting or on anything else. He will be even independent of his trade union. I repeat, that it is well known that in this island under our present economic system, an acre of land is more economical than four acres. I have been purchasing land for people for a number of years, and I know what I am talking about. Any man who is anxious to start out and acquires one acre seldom goes further than that, because he finds that it is capable of keeping him in security. Anyone with experience in truck gardening will tell you that an acre, particularly under irrigation, is an economic unit. But sir, unless the seven people chosen to carry out this scheme are of some financial standing how are they going to finance this scheme? Take the digging of cane holes alone. They cost 81 cents a hundred. There is the rental of \$20.00 a year. That may sound a small amount; but it is no joke speaking financially, to keep four acres in proper cultivation, and the settler may soon find himself in a position where his four acres will be of no use to him. If he has sickness at home he will not be able to call the doctor and say I have some security. Here is my plot of land under cultivation. There is nothing in this scheme which appeals to me as an agriculturist and a resident of Barbados. I see nothing about how the scheme will be financed. I am sorry, sir, that you are in the Chair, because I am sure that with your knowledge of these matters you would be able to explain to the members of the House the trends of agriculture to-day. As far as I can see, this is just a land settlement scheme as it stands, and not an agricultural co-operative scheme. For the reasons that I have given I am not going to vote for the Resolution. As I have said, the plantation system is the system on which the economy of the island depends; and if it is still a feudal system, then I do not know what to say to the trade unions of this island. At this stage, sir, I move that the Chairman do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. HAYNES: I beg to second that.

Mr. MAPP: Is this adjournment intended for supper, Mr. Chairman?

The motion was put and carried *nem. con.*; the CHAIRMAN reported, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House resume Committee of Supply.

Mr. MAPP: I beg to second that.

The motion was put and carried *nem. con.*; Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that the Chairman do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

The motion was put and carried *nem. con.*; the CHAIRMAN reported, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for three quarters of an hour.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

The motion was put and carried *nem. con.* and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

REPLIES LAID

On re-assembling,

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to lay the Replies to Question No. 88 standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Andrew.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

COST OF PREPARATION OF LAND AT SEAWELL PLANTATION

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House was in Committee of Supply before the adjournment, the Resolution for \$1,000 in connection with the item "Preparation of land at Seawell Plantation was being debated.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman,—I have dealt exhaustively with the Scheme which is before us, but I am afraid I have to go a little further with the matter. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph referred to the feudal plantation system, but what better feudal system could you want than that which is indicated in this Scheme? If any honourable member knows of anything which is more constructive than what is proposed by the Government here, I hope he will speak. Under this Scheme, the lease may be terminated by the Government on three months' notice if the tenant fails to pay rent within six months of the date on which it becomes due; that is one of the conditions under a Scheme initiated by one who says that the feudal system exists among the plantations of this island. There are many plantations which pay the rent for persons employed particularly in their old age. The second condition under which the lease may be terminated on three months' notice is if the tenant fails to cultivate the holding in a manner satisfactory to the Department of Agriculture. Just think of that: In a hard year or in a year in which this island has had a large crop when even the plantations find it difficult to get labour, an Inspector from the Department of Agriculture comes around and says, "This land is not being cultivated properly" and out the tenant goes. That condition seems to be more feudal than what exists today; one has to bear in mind that the past three years were abnormal years, and if you face the facts, is it not obvious that a man who has four acres of land to cultivate both in a hard year or a full year, will have a millstone about his neck? He has no means of removing that millstone; he cannot go to the Peasants' Loan Bank because he has no security to offer. I ask the Government to bring down a Resolution to finance these schemes, but when they are bringing down a

Resolution to finance these schemes, let them remember that the seven chosen people are not the only people in Barbados. The third condition under which a tenant will be penalised is if he fails to reside continuously on the holding. I take it that that means the tenant will have to enter into an agreement with the Government. Let us see what the position is; a tenant is entitled to occupy four acres of land for the remainder of his life, but if he gets an opportunity to go to America or anywhere else so as to improve his position he would have failed to reside on the land. I cannot see anything laudable in this Scheme; I can only see a lamentable future for these seven people unless there are people of financial status. Unless these seven people are able to spend thousands of dollars in cultivating this land—unless they are in a good position financially—the Scheme will be a lamentable one. I sincerely hope that this Committee will see the wisdom of not accepting this Scheme as it stands.

Mr. BETHELL came into the Committee and took his seat while Mr. DOWDING was speaking.

Mr. REECE, Mr. Chairman,—The real question here is what is an economic unit in respect of land in Barbados, and in arriving at that economic unit it is of no use talking about economic units in other parts of the world, particularly in the Caribbean area; what might be an economic unit in Antigua will not necessarily be an economic unit in Barbados. It is impossible to compare conditions in Antigua with conditions in Barbados; we know that Antigua is very thinly populated and therefore what it would be possible to do in that colony it would be impossible to do in Barbados. In the first place, an acre of land in Barbados should never be compared, from the point of view of fertility, with an acre of land in Antigua; with the small population in Antigua, it should be possible to give each person a larger area of land than it would be possible to give him in Barbados. Then it would be very unwise indeed to compare conditions in this island with conditions which obtain in Puerto Rico or in Jamaica both of which are large islands with much land at the disposal of the Government. Anyone who has visited Puerto Rico must have been struck with the large areas of land which are uncultivated and which are likely to remain in that condition for quite a long time. Again, climatic conditions in each colony differ, and although Mr. Girvan may be an expert on agricultural matters, it is my humble opinion that the knowledge which he has acquired of agricultural problems in this island will not be of much value here having regard to the very different climatic conditions which obtain in Barbados; therefore we, in this colony, have got to decide for ourselves what is an economic unit here. I do not pose as an economic expert in the matter of land, but I do know that an acre of land in Barbados can give a tenant a much brighter prospect of success in its cultivation than an acre of land in almost any other part of the Caribbean area. We have been told by honourable members that an acre of land which is used for kitchen garden purposes with proper cultivation and with irrigation is an economic problem; I understand that it is proposed to carry out irrigation on this land, and if what honourable members, particularly those who have a knowledge of agriculture, have said is true, one must be forced to ask the question; "Why make the unit larger than one acre?" I have been discussing this matter with persons other than members of the House, persons who have a knowledge of the cultivation of land, and I have been assured that no man can cultivate four acres of land without aid; it will be absolutely necessary for him to employ people. The position really is that the cultivation of a four-acre lot will necessitate the employment of a considerable number of people to assist the holder of that lot in its cultivation; that means that

the holder must be in a good financial position so as to make the scheme a success. The money will not be paid from any Agricultural Bank because the holder of the lot will not be able to satisfy the Bank; it seems to me that in the absence of a tenant's ability to get assistance from any Agricultural Bank he will be forced to obtain financial assistance from a plantation, which really means that even before his crop is reaped he will be tied hand and foot. Therefore he will not be really economically independent; he will find that when the time comes for reaping his crop he will have to send that crop to a particular place and the amount he owes that place will be deducted from the value of the crop. The result will be far from that man being able to better his position.

Mr. COX: Mr. Chairman,—I rise to make a few remarks more particularly in reply to the speech made by the honourable junior member for St. George. We all will agree that in many instances plantation owners have robbed many third-class boys out of a good education.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us keep to this Resolution.

Mr. COX: I shall endeavour to do that. The honourable member started off by asking where are these people going to get assistance in financing this scheme from? The mere fact that the Government has sent down to this House a Resolution to provide for the preparation of house sites and so on is sufficient to satisfy any intelligent individual that the Government is prepared from a financial point of view and otherwise, to assist these persons whom we are putting on this land so that they may have the maximum produce from the land. I should like the honourable member to know that it is easy in this case to lend these people money; we can amend the Peasants' Loan Bank Act so as to lend them money for the purpose of cultivating their land. Therefore the question as to whether these people will get financial assistance does not arise; it will be given to them. The honourable member criticized the Government saying that it proposed to be harsh with these people if they did not pay the rent within six months of the date on which it becomes due. I would like to tell the honourable member that I know of a case in which a woman who had given a lot of service at the Belle Plantation and who was no longer able to perform her duties at the Plantation, was given notice to quit the premises; she had no where to go and eventually her rent was increased from 6 cents a week, to \$3.00 a week. I had the notice in my hand; it was written by the manager, Mr. Branch. There are cases where the plantations assist some of these labourers in paying their rent; on the other hand there are also cases in which the plantations oppress these people when it suits them to do so. We all know that the practice of giving people seven days' notice to quit still exists, the crops are valued by the plantations to whatever they like and people have to accept the valuation; so that when the honourable member says the Government's proposal is a harsh one, I am sure that no reasonable human being would say it is harsh. I am sure honourable members know by now that the Agricultural Department has to see that these people get the maximum yield from their land and if any individual occupying one of these units does not comply with the advice which is given to him by the Department of Agriculture, in which case he does not get the best out of the land, the lease will be terminated. Nobody could say that there is anything wrong with that principle.

I think it has been pointed out by every member on the side of the Government that this is not a housing scheme or a question of putting as many people as possible on the land; it is rather a question of giving a man sufficient land from which he can eke out a decent livelihood. The object of this scheme

is to prevent these individuals, who will be chosen, from going to work on plantations and coming back home and working until night on their little holdings; its object is to provide full-time employment for an individual and his family out of the land allotted to him. By carrying out scientific instructions an individual will get the maximum yield out of the land and so he will be in a position to keep his family in a much better position than that in which he would be able to keep them if he were allotted an acre of land and had to work at a plantation for a few shillings a day. It has been pointed out that an acre of land is far from being an economic unit; unless you give people not less than four acres, they cannot eke out a proper livelihood, and by this method we are attempting to abolish the old system which has been cherished for all these years. We are hoping to settle seven families on this land and at the same time we are experimenting as to how far we can go in this matter; for that reason this Resolution is before the Committee. If this Resolution is not agreed to we will not lose anything; I know that some honourable members on my left who have spoken against this Resolution would be glad to turn down this scheme in order that some plantation owner would have the opportunity of renting this land and annexing it to his property. We have had expert knowledge as to this matter; we have been told that a four-acre unit is an economic unit and this is an experiment which we hope will succeed. If it is successful we hope to enlarge it in process of time; if this scheme is rejected the time will come when honourable members might be conscious of the fact that the scheme was in the interest of the community rather than against it. There is no earthly reason why this scheme should not be carried out; I am still hoping that honourable members will see the wisdom of this scheme and give it fair trial.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I hope honourable members will not be influenced by the speech made by the honourable junior member for St. George as to the cost of working four acres of land; the honourable member asks how would a man get financial assistance so as to be able to cultivate four acres of land and that is the reason why this Committee should not vote for this scheme. The honourable junior member for Christ Church compared land in this colony with that in other colonies in order to be able to determine whether we should have four-acre units or not; he says that the position in Puerto Rico and Jamaica is different from that in Barbados, but he does not say that a four-acre lot in Barbados would not give a man full employment. I am surprised that the honourable member who is a legally-trained man should be so illogical; the honourable member will admit that his argument was really not a logical one from the point of view that because the population of Antigua is small they could afford larger units than we can afford here. We have proposed four-acre units for Barbados because a four-acre unit will afford a man full employment for himself and his family, we cannot say that one acre can afford that employment. The honourable senior member for St. James says that the addendum to the Resolution does not mean anything; but he was told that we cannot guarantee the scheme until we see it working. The honourable junior member for St. George would like the Committee to take his advice as a plantation owner, but the members of the Government must not take the advice of Sir John Saint. Should we not err with Sir John Saint than with the honourable senior member for St. Lucy, the honourable junior member for St. George or the honourable senior member for Christ Church? We have had the advice of a Barbadian Mr.

Skeete, and it cannot be said that he does not know Barbados and he knows the plantation system. We have had the advice of people who know about this matter and we are now asked to ignore that advice! We have reached the stage where it is clear that as much as you hear people talk about industrialization, they do not mean it; they believe in serfdom and we want to remove people from serfdom. Can you imagine it being said: "Do not give a human being full employment; give him some system where he can only eke out an existence?" In this Order Paper honourable members are asking for the expropriation of land as a means of making it easier for the whole community, so that more land would be put at the disposal of people; it is a question of putting more economic possibilities at the disposal of the people. If therefore this scheme provides seven people with more economic stability and full employment, is that not better for the general economy of this island? In an island like Barbados where the incidence of casual employment is so high and that of unemployment is also high we must aim at the greatest productivity.

If you carry the whole argument of members of the Opposition to its logical conclusion they are saying that we are trying to wreck the position of this island. I know that out of the Rehabilitation Fund many people are improving their factories and what are they going to do with those whom they have put out of employment? For those who have been put out of employment some economic provision would have to be made and it has been made by putting money into a fund. Do not let honourable members think that they are living in Paradise; if the Organisation which I represent want to show that this matter can be like the matter in Grenada a lot of people would not get home. Honourable members talk about serving the greatest number of people, but they have to be very careful as to how they talk; I hope that when we ask that the greatest number of people be served we will not be accused of letting down this colony. I say that because some of us take on a bit of responsibility, not like the honourable senior member for St. John who told people not to cut the canes and then ran over to the Union.

Mr. ALLDER: I object to the honourable member making such an accusation against me whether I did that or not. (Laughter). I do not want any action of mine to cause any honourable member to use any threat so as to get me to vote one way or the other. If the honourable member wants to remind the other side of the gratitude which they might owe him and his colleagues in getting people to work against their will and for a price which they did not want, let him do so; but do not let him call my name.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The honourable member is not capable of being accused. It takes people like the honourable member.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us stick to this Resolution.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: When honourable members talk about serving the greatest number of people this is not a question of serving the greatest number of people; this is a question of desiring the maximum utilisation that can be made of land. This is not a political question; would the four of us be so petty as to look for seven people in the parish of Christ Church and give them this land? It is only a dishonest person who would think that way and if this land were situated in St. Michael or in any other constituency in which this Government has two representatives you would hear the argument that we have picked out the parish in which we have two

seats. Could we not sell this land or lease it to one person? If we were callous about the matter we would not have done anything at all.

Honourable members have been told that we intend to work Dodds Plantation on a profit-sharing basis. I would like to tell honourable members that in every community you have to work out the policy which suits the particular community. Dodds Plantation was there when the Conservatives were in this House, but the plantation was used as a place where they could get cheap labour from the Industrial School. We feel that in the interest of the community we should work this scheme on a system of four acres: we have been advised that that system is the best one and what would the Director of Agriculture gain by giving the Government wrong advice in a matter where his reputation has to be taken account of? If this were a matter of engineering honourable members would never oppose it but they pretend to know something about agriculture. The Government has brought forward this scheme and we are not afraid of defending our policy because of the arguments used by the Opposition.

Mr. MAPP: There are some honourable members who come in very late and talk for a very long time; but if the ship is to go down it is best to let it go down fighting.

Mr. ALLDER: I am moving that the question be now put.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable member take his seat?

Mr. ALLDER: I rise to make a motion.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—You have ruled and the honourable member is absolutely ignoring your ruling; I do not care to what Party we belong order should take place in this Chamber.

Mr. MAPP: I was going to say, Mr. Chairman, that the opponents to this Resolution are apparently divided into two sections; one section is pleading for a land settlement scheme and the other section seems to be pleading that the plantation system is the best system. If you really believe that the plantation system is the best possible system, then obviously you are defending the system under which the greatest amount of land will be used by one man. While the honourable junior member for St. George is defending the plantation system, he says that the land should be divided into half acre or acre lots. Regardless of what honourable members on this side of the House feel, it is our duty to oppose that idea if we go on until midnight. If members of the Opposition do not want to hear us speak what is in our minds, let them rid themselves of this Chamber. They talk about a land settlement scheme! What is a land settlement scheme? Is it not a scheme in which you settle a man and his family on land which is sufficient to afford them a living? The honourable junior member for St. Philip has produced some figures which were absolutely wrong, figures as to the arable acreage in this colony and how many people own it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Since I am wrong the authority can quote the correct figures.

Mr. MAPP: The honourable member said that there are 76,000 arable acres but there are 66,000 arable acres and he said that there are 176,000 land-hungry people; is it not obvious to him that on a one-acre basis you could not satisfy 176,000 people? The question is; what is an economic unit on which to settle a man and his family? Any person approaching this matter from the point of view of reason must agree that a four-acre unit is an economic unit having regard to what is a reasonable standard

of living for a man and his family, now that things are going up all over the world. When the honourable member talks about 176,000 land-hungry people he cannot satisfy all of them.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Nobody expected the honourable member to appreciate the point. I quoted the number of landless people merely to emphasize the maldistribution of land in Barbados. The plantations own so many acres; the peasants own so many and there are so many people who own no land at all; therefore anything we can do to distribute land to a greater number of people, we should do it. Could I expect that every one of these 176,000 people would get some of the land?

Mr. MAPP: You can stretch the argument to whatever you like, but the question to which you have to get back is what is an economic unit. Honourable members on the other side maintain that the plantation system is the best system and at the same time, they advance the argument for a one-acre unit; their argument about distributing this land among 29 persons does not hold water; they are using the argument that if the mother of a family had a lot of children among whom to divide some clothing, rather than see that each one is properly clothed, she gives one a sleeve, she gives another something else and in the end none of them is properly clothed. That is the argument of honourable members. I do not believe that any member of this House is convinced that a man with a family could be settled on a reasonable basis on one acre of land; if he is so convinced it means that reason makes no difference to him.

We have strange bedfellows tonight and while we cannot make any impression on such hard minds, it must appear to us that there is something deeper than what appears on the surface. We have people in fundamentally different camps, one section arguing in favour of land settlement and the other section arguing in favour of the old plantation system, but they are agreeing with each other to throw out this Resolution. It is up to the public to judge how the people in these two different camps must be viewed; obviously there is more than what appears on the surface. Even if you maintain that a four-acre unit is too much, one would hate to use the argument that because the Government has not come back with a scheme in respect of an acre unit you would not pass this Resolution; you would not agree to it since the Government has maintained its stand with regard to the four-acre unit. Are you going to distribute the land of absentee proprietors into eighth of an acre lots? If it were a question of settling crabs in holes that would be all right; but we are settling people with families on land. There are bound to be land-hungry people in Barbados because we have not got sufficient land to distribute among them; whenever you distribute all the land there will still be landless people, and you will have to come back to the fundamental question as to what is an economic unit to distribute among the people who can get land. If any honourable member wants to maintain a family at a reasonable standard of living, he has got to admit that one acre of land is not nearly sufficient on which to do that in Barbados. We have people who tell us that one acre of land is too small for this purpose and when we have that advice it is the duty of the Government to stick to such advice which has been given by people on whom we can really boast when it comes to matters of this sort. Even if I felt that this unit should be two or three acres, I would still vote for this Resolution because it is an experiment in land settlement.

I do not know how serious honourable members are about making it possible for peasants to obtain the use of tractors in the preparation of their

land so as to obtain the maximum results; but in considering how best to raise the standard of living of the people whom it is intended to settle on this land, the Government must consider the question of the modern tillage of the land. If this land is divided into one-acre units I cannot foresee the Government getting tractors to be used on an acre of land; it is obviously better to divide this land into four-acre units. No family can live on cultivating an acre of land; why should we not try and maintain a high standard of agriculture and adopt such methods of production that when economic conditions abroad come down on us we will have a greater measure of production locally, thereby preventing people from suffering from starvation? This is an experimental scheme—a scheme for the purpose of finding out in case of any future land settlement scheme what is the best economic unit on which we can settle people. Even if honourable members differ as to details they should agree to a scheme like this one; it is open to the public to see that those who oppose this Resolution are not really serious when they say that they are in favour of any land settlement scheme. Do those honourable members who are opposing this Resolution expect the Government to go about these matters anyhow? Do they not expect the Government to go about these matters scientifically and in the best possible way?

An honourable member opposed the conditions with regard to the termination of the lease of this land; but could you take any honourable member seriously when he opposes the termination of the lease of this land if a tenant fails to pay rent within six months of the date on which it becomes due? Could you conceive of this rent being paid six months after the date on which it becomes due? I do not think any member should oppose the termination of the lease if a tenant fails to cultivate his holding in a manner satisfactory to the Department of Agriculture. That condition shows that the Department is anxious about the land being put to the best use, and if the land is to be put to the best use it is obvious that the Government would have to be in a position to control the use of it. The last condition with regard to the termination of the lease is if the tenant fails to reside continuously on the land; the honourable member also ranted against that condition, but is it not obvious that he was only arguing according to his conviction that the plantation system is the best system for now and forever? We have to make such conditions but the honourable member would like people to work on a plantation part-time and whole-time somewhere else. We are aware of the tactics of those honourable members who are now aligning themselves against the Government in this scheme.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Chairman—If honourable members are really serious they will see that as soon as they oppose a resolution like this it shows that they are not sincere. This committee and the general public are not convinced that those members who are in favour of the principle of land settlement but do not agree with the details of this Resolution are sincere. You preach the principle of land settlement. Any man who agrees with that principle would try to bring to the notice of the Government that he thinks it should be on the basis of two or three-acre lots; but he would not get up and oppose this Resolution in favour of passing this Resolution to show where their arguments fall to the ground, and where they are only adopting this attitude to-day because that was their attitude last week and they feel that they should stick to that attitude to-day. Do they think they have convinced anyone when in one breath they praise the plantation system, and in the other they want to reduce this scheme to the least acreage possi-

ble? That effect of their argument is, either give this land to 29 people or to none at all. I heard some reply to that which does not even deserve an answer. At one moment they were saying do not mind Jamaica, and at another, follow Puerto Rico. We must follow Puerto Rico—we, a little colony. Because a hundred thousand people are looking for land, you must buy 29 acres and divide it in one acre lots. You cannot satisfy all the people who want land; therefore, in my view, you should divide the land you have into lots that will yield the best results. Even if honourable members do not agree with the size of the lot set out in this Resolution, once they agree with the principle of the division of land they should not oppose this Resolution. Sir, I have spoken a long time. I am sorry that the honourable senior member for Christ Church looks tired. His arguments were very weak to-night. He put up arguments about a housing scheme, but produced nothing to show why he should not vote for this Resolution. He did not say that he was convinced that the one-acre scheme was the best. Some honourable members have said that this plantation was not paying the Government. That is one of the strongest arguments in favour of the Resolution. If 29 acres as one unit did not pay, how will a one-acre unit pay? I say, sir, that it will be a very serious day, not only for the good sense of this House, but also for the future of the community as a whole if this Resolution is turned down. In my view this scheme should be used as a basis for similar schemes. It is time, I think, that honourable members should see the wisdom of starting schemes like this with a view to having greater schemes in the future. Those who believe in the plantation system may in the next 15 years be telling us that the Government should take some such step; because they may well find that fewer and fewer people will be willing to work their plantations for them. If they have any sincerity in their pleas, and they want to see the best possible done for the economy of the island, and the living standards of the people, they will try their best to advance such schemes as this rather than oppose them. Even if they differ as to the details of the scheme, that is nothing to do with the principle. But the whole point of the matter is that honourable members who spoke against this scheme did it in the interest of the plantation system. The honourable junior member for St. George said openly that the plantation system is the best in the West Indies. He may be seeing a different story the next ten years. I say that it is up to those honourable members who believe in land settlement schemes and who want to revolutionise the economy of the island to support schemes like this. If you divide up land for peasant proprietors into one-acre lots, do you not see that your last state will be worse than the first? You will be encouraging an economy that is controlled by those people who own 300 acres. The big planters rejoice to see that the peasants cannot even come together and form an association. In Trinidad you will find peasants who own 20 and 30 acres; and they have an association. In Jamaica where peasants own even more acres, they have come together in an association of responsible people, some of whom know something of higher finance, and can represent the others. In this island you have the mass of peasants with eighth of an acre lots, and they have never been able to get together. That is the sort of thing that appeals to the honourable members on the other side of the table. That is why they want to see such a scheme as this reduced to the smallest possible unit. Bring it down to one acre so that you can perpetuate the old system. I am going to sit now, sir, and leave to the dictates of conscience and good sense the result of this vote. I have spoken a long time, not because I had any hope of

changing the minds of honourable members, but because I, along with other honourable members who support the Government feel that if a scheme like this should fall to the ground, it would be nothing short of a tragedy to those who really believe in land settlement schemes. If you believe in such schemes, then I say it is in the best interests of the island to give the Government a chance to try out this scheme.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman—The honourable junior member for St. Thomas has very kindly left the result of this matter to our consciences. A minute earlier he said that we were voting according to some unholy alliance. In my folly, sir, I have always felt that in this Chamber we did vote according to our consciences. According to the honourable member, those who are in favour of a land settlement scheme, and those who favour the plantation system are in an unholy alliance tonight. He regarded us as strange bed fellows. I do not think it will take a very great effort on the part of his memory to think of other unholy alliances. On my right are people who believe in full employment—finding a full day's work for every member of the community. On my left are people who believe in the plantation system and in mechanisation of the sugar industry. Only about a week ago we saw these two sections in an unholy alliance for the purpose of mechanising the removal and distribution in the field of farm manure.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will ask the honourable member to stick to this Resolution. I am tired of sitting here and hearing all this.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I agree with you, sir. I am only trying to show another unholy alliance.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Stick to the Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am sure that at least on four occasions I heard the honourable junior member for St. Thomas allege that the voting in this House has degenerated into a system of voting by unholy alliance rather than by reason and logic.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Chairman—I did not make any general charge. It would be foolish to make such a general statement. I said that on the particular issue there was a strange alliance. I have a mind of my own.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not saying that the honourable member does not have a mind of his own. But I am convinced that when he comes here on Tuesdays he leaves it outside. We all know that he is a straight party man.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please stick to the Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If we had been asked to divide this land between two or between twenty-two people he would have supported it, purely because his party asked for it. I would like to tell the honourable member something. This scheme has been sent down with the blessing of the Director of Agriculture. The Director of Agriculture is an extremely efficient Civil Servant and is quite successful in the discharge of his duties. But the honourable junior member for St. Thomas must forget—and the Director himself would not disagree with this—that the Director believes most firmly in the plantation system. While the Director has no constituents to satisfy, the honourable members on my left have constituents to satisfy. The Director has put up a scheme which in his opinion will give satisfaction to the people, and would at the same time satisfy his personal belief in the plantation system. In other words, it is wrong for the honourable junior member for St. Thomas or any other honourable member to think that if this scheme had been supported, and to some extent sponsored by an official of a different outlook,

that it might not have been submitted to the House in a different manner. If he takes the trouble to check up on a few things I think that he will appreciate the point. The point of view that even if you do not accept the details of this scheme, you should pass this Resolution once you agree with the principle might be all well for people who are walking on their heads. But people who have to try to maintain a perfect sense of balance will appreciate that in a matter like this, if you lay a bad foundation you will accomplish nothing. Of course everyone in the colony cannot be settled on land. But people who have devoted some time and attention to this matter cannot fail to be surprised at the suggestion which is before the House, that merely because you support the principle of starting a land settlement scheme, you should support any scheme for land settlement that comes before the House. That suggestion is so ludicrous that I do not think it needs any further comment.

On the motion being put that the Resolution do now pass the question was resolved in the negative on a division as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs MAPP, COX, F. L. WALCOTT, Dr. CUMMINS, ADAMS, and BRANCKER—(6).

Noes: Messrs MOTTLEY, AILDEN, CRAWFORD, DOWDING, WARD, HAYNES, E. K. WALCOTT, GODDARD, and REECE.—(9).

RESOLUTION FOR LIGHTING AT SEAWELL

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT asked for and was granted leave to take as the next Order a Resolution that the sum of \$19,469 be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1951-52, Part 2, Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1951-52, No. 17, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman—This Resolution seeks to provide funds for the installation of lighting at Seawell Airport. The Addendum sets out the matter and I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

The motion was put to the Committee and carried *nem. con.*

On the motion of Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded by Mr. Cox the Chairman reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply the postponement of one and the rejection of one.

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

DEBATE ON REJECTED RESOLUTION

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker—I am asking leave to postpone the items on the Order Paper down to No. 14 and that No. 15 be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker—I think that we should follow the custom of withdrawing the rejected Resolution from the Order Paper. The Resolution was rejected in committee. I move that the Resolution which was rejected in committee be removed from the Order Paper.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker—Now that honourable members who pretend to be Socialists see the result of the vote on this Resolution, I wonder if when they have a chance of dealing with it again this session if they are going to play into the hands of

those people who do not want to do the slightest thing to help the poor of this country to live on land as long as they can pin them down to the plantation system. Now that they see what they have done, I wonder if they will vote for the motion now before the House instead of giving us a chance to deal with it again this session. The country will judge them. Everyone expects that the honourable senior member for St. James would do what he has just done.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: If the honourable senior member would be prepared to change the Resolution, merely keeping the same amount of money in it, I would be only too willing to withdraw my motion. If on the other hand he proposes, after this Resolution was rejected by the Committee, to bring it back the same way, that is a different matter. It has always been the custom to take from the Order Paper a Resolution that has been rejected in committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will have to give the honourable senior member for St. Joseph permission to reply.

Mr. ADAMS: Does Your Honour expect me to reply to that? I say I want it to remain on the Order Paper so that further consideration can be given to it this Session. Does the honourable member think that I am three years old?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker—I am surprised to hear the honourable senior member for St. James make this motion when last Tuesday he wanted the Government to bring something down explaining the details of what they were going to do as far as the land settlement scheme at Seawell was concerned. He has not said one word about that to-day, but he has rushed now to have the Resolution removed. He did not have the temerity to speak on it after asking for the details. He is in the position of leading a party that seems to be going down hill, and he does not even have courage. He would like to know under what system you are going to give the people this land. The scheme has been circulated to honourable members and the honourable senior member for St. James has said not one word about it. But he is the first to move that this Resolution be taken from the Order Paper. This is the sort of situation that you have to face. I can sit and smile, however, because when you are playing cards you always keep back some trumps.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker—I merely want to express my objection to the statement made by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph that the honourable senior member for St. John and myself and others who voted against the Resolution did as a result of any unholy alliance.

Mr. ADAMS: I appeal to my worst opponent to say if I have said that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If the Resolution comes back to the House as it stands I will vote against it. He should have told the House whether he intends to bring it back in the same way or not. No one wants the matter to be abandoned if there is a possibility of the Government's changing it. What I personally fear is this: If the same Resolution remains on the Order Paper it is possible that at a subsequent meeting, at midday or midnight, when the introducers of the Resolution have a sufficiently large number of people to support it they will push it through as it stands. If we vote for its removal from the Order Paper we do so because we expect that a changed Resolution will be brought later in the session.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Speaker—When we debated the Resolution last Tuesday the honourable members opposite did not give the impression that they were

telling the Government "either accept our suggestion or we will ask that the Resolution be taken from the Order Paper." This stresses the idea of this one acre lot. None of the honourable members on the other side said that they were going to reject the Resolution. It came as an absolute surprise to us. The impression that those members gave was that if after the Government had considered the matter carefully, they decided not to change the terms of the Resolution, they on the other side would agree to the passing of the Resolution. I do not see how anyone who is in favour of land settlement could vote for removing this Resolution from the Order Paper.

Mr. MOTTLEY : Mr. Speaker, I have been told that if we do not take this Resolution off the Order Paper the Leader of the House can bring it back and pass it when there is a majority in the House in favour of it. I have also been told that he can change the scheme and bring back a Resolution this session for the same amount of money. According to the rules of procedure, it is only for you to rule sir. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph says that he can bring back a resolution for a thousand dollars. For those reasons and because of the views which I have expressed on this matter I will vote for the removal of the Resolution from the Order Paper. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has not yet given an assurance that if the resolution remains on the Order Paper he will come back with an amended scheme. Last week he promised that he would tell the Executive the views of members of the Opposition. If, according to the rules of procedure, this Resolution can be brought back next Tuesday and got through in case there is not a majority of the Opposition present, the Opposition would be the biggest fools in the world not to ask that it be removed from the Order Paper, unless the honourable senior member for St. Joseph promises to bring down a scheme incorporating the views of the Opposition. Any man who voted with the Opposition against this Resolution and is now afraid to vote to have it removed from the Order Paper is no man.

Mr. COX : Mr. Speaker — When the Opposition voted against this scheme I thought it a genuine attempt to get a larger number of people on this plot. But after seeing the attitude of the honourable senior member for St. James who is leading that party, I am satisfied that it was always their intention to kill this scheme. It did appear last Tuesday that the honourable member had no confidence that the Government would circulate the terms of the scheme for their perusal, and he therefore pressed that such a scheme be circulated before agreeing to the Resolution. That scheme was circulated today, and as the honourable senior member for St. Peter has just said, the honourable senior member for St. James did not make one comment upon it. He sat like a wise old owl and said nothing, but in the end he makes a move that is unusual to this House. I have been here since 1944, and I have seen Resolutions that were rejected put at the bottom of the Order Paper. They were not taken off immediately. After getting all the information he wants about the scheme, the only thing that the honourable senior member for St. James can do is to get up quickly and ask that the Resolution be taken off the Order Paper. Some people are never prepared to start any scheme for the benefit of the agricultural workers of this country, and even if someone else starts it, they are the first to kill it. Some honourable members would like to suggest half-acre lots, and then when everything is finished they ask to have it removed from the Order Paper. I am convinced that the Opposition never intended to support this scheme for

the benefit of the peasants and agricultural workers of this island.

Mr. REECE : Mr. Speaker— The mere fact that we have voted against the scheme brought in this Resolution does not mean that we will not vote for another scheme brought in another Resolution. The fact that we are not in favour of dividing this land into four-acre lots does not mean that we will not be in favour of dividing it into one-acre or two-acre lots. Another Resolution can be brought dealing with this matter. The only way that this House can force the Government to bring down another Resolution in keeping with the views of the House is to vote for the removal of this one from the Order Paper.

Motion that the Resolution rejected in committee be removed from the Order Paper was put and decided in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows :—

Ayes : Messrs. Alder, Crawford, Bethell, Dowding, Ward, Haynes, E. K. Walcott, Goddard, Reece and Mottley—(10).

Noes : Messrs. Smith, Miller, Mapp, Bryan, Cox, F. L. Walcott, Dr. Cummins, Adams and Brancker—(9).

BILL TO AMEND INCOME TAX ACT

Dr. CUMMINS : Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 16 as the next Order of the Day.—Bill intituled an Act to amend the Income Tax Act, 1921.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Dr. CUMMINS : Mr. Speaker—The reason why I have asked leave to deal with this Bill is that assessments cannot be sent out until this Bill is dealt with. The Bill itself needs no long explanation. It is in keeping with the decision to change the expressions from sterling to dollars and cents. I move that the Bill be read a second time.

Mr. Cox seconded.

On the motion of Dr. Cummins seconded by Mr. Cox His Honour left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. Smith in the Chair.

The three clauses of the Bill were read and passed.

On motion of Dr. Cummins seconded by Mr. Cox the Chairman reported and Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

On separate motions of Dr. Cummins seconded by Mr. Cox the Bill was read a third time and passed, and the title read and agreed to.

The three Clauses of the Bill were read and passed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS TO THE GOVERNMENT SCHOLARSHIPS AND EXHIBITIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL 1949.

Mr. ADAMS : I ask leave to take Order No. 15 as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. DOWDING : I object. I think we should adjourn at this stage.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT : I appeal to the honourable member to withdraw his objection.

Mr. DOWDING : I beg to withdraw my objection.

Mr. SPEAKER : The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas:—To move the consideration of

the Amendments of the Honourable the Legislative Council to the Bill to amend the Government Scholarships and Exhibitions Act 1949.

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to take charge of this Order.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—The point has been raised as to whether the Other Place was in order in making an amendment to this Bill, an amendment which created a charge on the Treasury. The Other Place is not in order to do that, but this is one of those things which the House might waive and which the House has already waived. There is the most recent case in which an addition was made in the Other Place to the percentage to be paid by the Government in respect of the Natural Gas Corporation; in such cases the practice is that the House realises that there has been a breach of its privileges, but agrees to waive the breach of privilege and accepts the amendment. In this case I may tell honourable members that it was purely a question of an oversight on my part; when the original Resolution came down to the House the date was fixed late in September and I thought it would have covered Barbados Scholars of last year. Those Scholars were not covered and it was the wish of the Executive Committee that the date be altered so as to cover them; the Other Place carried out the wish of the Executive Committee in making that amendment. This is not one of the cases in which the House would be justified in insisting on a breach of its privileges having been committed when that breach of privilege is perfectly in keeping with the intention of the Government when it sent down the original Bill; the Government intended to increase this aid to Barbados Scholars who were just beginning their studies as well as those for the future. I am asking that the House place on record the fact that a breach of privilege has been committed by the Other Place, but waives its right to object to that breach of privilege and to accept the amendment. Before I make any motion I am asking that the intention of the House be signified in order that it might appear in the Minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER: It has been pointed out to me that a breach of privilege has been committed by the Other Place, but that the House waives its right to object to the breach of privilege and desires that its action be put on record.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that the amendments of the Other Place be now read a first time.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

On motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. Cox in each case, the amendments were read a second time and agreed to.

LEASE OF LAND TO LABOURERS AT DODDS PLANTATION

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I ask leave to take Order No. 20 as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day now stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Peter:—To move the passing of the following Resolution:—Resolution to authorize the Governor-in-Executive Committee to lease in small plots to agricultural labourers a parcel of land of an area of approximately five acres forming part of Dodds Plantation situated in the parish of St. Philip.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: This Resolution is nothing to do with the Government's intention to

carry out a profit-sharing system at Dodds, of which we have spoken; this is a case in which some of the workers at this plantation do not get the benefit of living on the plantation and having cheap plots. Some of these workers have approached the Attorney in respect of the privilege of living on the plantation and it has been agreed to give them that privilege. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: This is a matter which has been exercising the minds of the labourers at Dodds Plantation for some time. It was the subject of some Questions which I asked in this House and the Government has taken quite a long time to bring forward this matter. I am sure that the people involved will be very much concerned about this matter now that some action is being taken in connection with it. The manager at Dodds is also the manager at Seawell; he lives at Seawell and finds it difficult to manage Dodds having to live so far away from that plantation, and it has been suggested that a house be built at Dodds for the accommodation of the manager and possibly one for the overseer. There are certain details in connection with the workers at the plantation, which I do not care to expose here tonight. However, it is sincerely to be hoped that the Government will pay immediate attention to this long overdue question of providing suitable accommodation for the manager and possibly the overseer at Dodds Plantation.

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

LEASE OF THE PRINCESS ALICE PLAYING FIELD TO THE VESTRY OF ST. MICHAEL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Peter:—To move the passing of the following Resolution:—Resolution to authorize the Governor-in-Executive Committee to lease to the Vestry of St. Michael that parcel of land known as The Princess Alice Playing Field situated in the parish of St. Michael and containing by admeasurement 6 acres, 3 roods, 32 perches.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Honourable members will remember that some time ago the House passed a Bill giving the Governor-in-Executive Committee authority to lease land to Vestries, and this Resolution seeks to give the Governor-in-Executive Committee authority to lease the Princess Alice Playing Field to the Vestry of St. Michael in accordance with the Executive Committee (Amendment) Act. 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.

RESOLUTION TO AUTHORISE AGREEMENT RE OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT ANALYST

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I ask leave to take Order No. 24 as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Peter:—To move the passing of the following Resolution:—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: This is an important post in the Government Establishment and the Government has been endeavouring since the retirement of Mr. Coppin, to find a suitably qualified person to fill the post. The Government has made many enquiries and has found it extremely difficult to find a person with the qualifications which the law requires. This Resolution is for the purpose of giving authority to the Governor to enter into an agreement with a person to serve in this office, and the Government has been fortunate in getting this person. The salary attached to the post originally was £900 per annum, but it was difficult to get a suitably qualified person at that salary and a salary of £1,250 per annum is now being offered. 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.

LEASE OF LAND TO THE VESTRY OF CHRIST CHURCH

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I ask leave to take Order No. 18 as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I object.

The question that Order No. 18 be taken as the next Order of the Day was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. SMITH, MAPP, BRYAN, COX, F. L. WALCOTT, ADAMS, BRANCKER, WARD, HAYNES, GODDARD and REECE—11.

Noes: Messrs. ALLDER, CRAWFORD, MOTTLEY, E. K. WALCOTT and DOWDING—5.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been decided in the affirmative, eleven honourable members voting "Aye", and five honourable members voting "No". I declare the "Ayes" have it. The next Order therefore also stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Peter:—To move the passing of the following Resolution:—Resolution to make it lawful for the Vestry of Christ Church to lease a parcel of land containing by admeasurement 1 ac. 2 rds. 10 perches, part of Kent Plantation to the Governor-in-Executive Committee for a period not exceeding twenty-one years at a peppercorn rent for the purpose of establishing a Playing Field.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: This is a mere formality; it is one of the schemes in connection with the Labour Welfare Act. 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.

ORDER POSTPONED

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to take Order No. 22 as the next Order of the Day. In connection with this matter, I should like to say that Barbados is lagging behind Jamaica in not having a Bill of this sort, a Pioneer Industries (Encouragement) Bill, on the Statute Book.

Mr. ALLDER: I think it would be unreasonable to deal with a Bill of this sort at this stage. The hour is late, this is an important Bill and I think honourable members should be given the opportunity to discuss this Bill without any inconvenience.

Mr. ADAMS: I am willing to withdraw my motion in favour of the honourable senior member for St. Lucy, in the hope that honourable members on that side of the House will remain to deal with Order No. 22, which is a Bill which has already been

passed by the House. The Bill is the same old one plus the fact that we have put in income tax exemption. However I withdraw my request.

ST. LUCY'S (BARBADOS) LOAN (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1951.

Mr. WARD: I ask leave to take Order No. 57 under Private Members' Business as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Lucy:—To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the St. Lucy's (Barbados) Loan Act, 1949.

Mr. WARD: This Act was passed some time ago, but the Vestry of St. Lucy decided that instead of building a Rectory they would remodel the old Rectory. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. BRANCKER: I beg to second that.

Mr. MAPP: Can the honourable member give the reasons why the Vestry want to change that for which they have already asked?

Mr. WARD: We have changed over to repairing and remodelling the Rectory, but the amount of money has not been changed.

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. WARD, seconded by Mr. BRANCKER, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clause 1 was read and passed.

Clause 2 was read as follows:—

2. Section two of the Saint Lucy's (Barbados) Loan Act 1949 is hereby amended by inserting immediately after the word "parish" occurring in line eight thereof the words "or of remodelling and making extensive repairs to the present Rectory for the said parish."

Mr. WARD: In moving that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill I should like to explain that originally the Vestry had in mind the erection of a new Rectory and a building for the Nurses at the Almshouse, but after considering the matter carefully, the Building Committee decided that it would not be necessary to spend money on the erection of a new Rectory, but that it should be remodelled. The Vestry then decided that they would change over from building a new Rectory to remodelling or repairing the present one, but the amount of £6,000 still remains. We are not spending all this money on the Rectory; there are other buildings which are in need of repair and the Vestry are of the opinion that some of this money should be spent on those other buildings. I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. BRANCKER: I beg to second that.

Mr. MAPP: I think that this is the second Bill of this kind which has been brought before this House. We passed a Bill for a specific purpose; the Petition which was presented to the House asked that a Bill be passed authorising the Vestry to borrow a sum of money not exceeding £6,000 to be applied by them in erecting a new Rectory for the parish and also in providing additional accommodation for the Nursing Staff at the Almshouse. Before I go further I should like to ask the honourable introducer of this Bill whether this alternative is in accordance with the rules of draughtsmanship. Is this a question of erecting a new Rectory or re-

modelling the present one? I cannot support the Bill with this alternative proposal.

Mr. WARD: The Vestry decided to remodel and repair the present Rectory; the Bill itself says what is going to be done.

Mr. MAPP: I suggest to the honourable member that he should postpone the consideration of this Bill until a later date. Perhaps the honourable member might be afraid to answer what I am asking; we have passed a Bill giving the Vestry permission to raise a loan for the purpose of building a new Rectory, now we are passing another Bill giving them permission either to build a new Rectory or to remodel the present one. If they have decided to remodel the present Rectory, it seems to me to be the easiest thing in the world to say so. I suggest that there is more in this Bill than what meets the eye; we have information from members of the Vestry themselves. If the Vestry have made up their minds to remodel the old Rectory, let the honourable member delete the word "build" and leave the word "remodel" in this Bill.

Mr. WARD: When the first Bill was brought before the House, it was agreed—the Petition having been signed by the members of the Vestry—that the Rectory should be re-built. Then it was decided that if the Rectory could be properly repaired, that should be done, and we are only asking for scope enough to say whether we should repair the Rectory or build a new one. All the members of the Vestry signed this new Petition; the honourable member might have got his information from a side Vestry of whom we know nothing.

Mr. ADAMS: I did not read this Bill, I know nothing about it and I am opposing it. I am therefore taking a leaf out of the book of the Opposition. I heard the honourable junior member for St. Thomas say that the word "build" should be taken out and the Bill drafted properly. The Petition which was presented to this House asks that the Vestry be given permission to repair the present Rectory instead of building a new one, but the honourable member is asking us to pass this amendment allowing the Vestry to say that if it is not worth while repairing the Rectory they will build a new one. But how can they do that in respect of this Petition? What the honourable junior member for St. Thomas has said is quite reasonable; I am suggesting that they will have to start afresh, state that it is more economic to rebuild the Rectory on the same site, and then ask the House for permission to do that.

Mr. WARD: The Vestry decided not to rebuild the Rectory if they find that they can repair the present one; the Clause has been worded in this way so that the Vestry would be able either to build a new Rectory or remodel the present one. However, I am asking leave to delete the words "inserting immediately after the word 'parish' occurring in line eight thereof the words or of" occurring in lines 2, 3 and 4 of this Clause in order to insert the words "deleting the words 'erecting a new Rectory'", and to delete the words "for the said parish" occurring at the end of the Clause in order to insert the words "in place thereof."

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

Mr. ADAMS: I suggest that we postpone the consideration of this Bill and give the honourable junior member for St. Andrew a chance to deal with his Bill.

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

Clause 3 was read and passed.

On the motion of Mr. WARD, seconded by Mr. BRANCKER, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee with amendments.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

ST. ANDREW'S PARISH (BARBADOS) LOAN BILL, 1951

Mr. HAYNES: I ask leave to take Order No. 56 under Private Members' Business as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Andrew:— To move the second reading of a Bill to authorise the Vestry of St. Andrew to borrow \$6,000.00 to be applied in erecting suitable quarters for the Nursing Staff at the Almshouse at Belleplaine.

Mr. HAYNES: This is a non-controversial matter. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that it be made a direction to the Committee when the House is in Committee that the Clauses of this Bill be taken as read on their numbers being called.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

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

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

The 12 Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

The two Schedules were called and passed.

The Preamble was called and agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. HAYNES, seconded by Mr. WARD, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

ORDER POSTPONED

Mr. ADAMS: Owing to the lateness of the hour, I am not asking that the Pioneer Industries (Encouragement) Bill be dealt with now. It is an important Bill, but it is only a question of inserting a Clause which was left out on the last occasion.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, the 21st instant, at 3 o'clock p.m.

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