

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1951—54

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, January 27, 1953.

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*), Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., Messrs. A. E. S. LEWIS, (*Deputy Speaker*), M. E. COX, L. E. SMITH (*Chairman of Committees*), F. L. WALCOTT, R. G. MAPP, F. C. GODDARD, F. E. MILLER, J. A. HAYNES, B.A., J. C. MOTTLEY, E. St. A. HOLDER and C. E. TALMA.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meetings of Tuesday 6th January and Tuesday 13th January were taken as read and were confirmed.

Mr. ADAMS entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following from the honourable the Other Place:—

*The Legislative Council
To*

The Honourable The House of Assembly

The Legislative Council have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of the Message, dated the 6th January, from the Honourable House of Assembly, regarding the amendments made by the Legislative Council to the Bill intituled an "Act to make provision for the establishment of a Training Fund for purposes connected with the improvement and efficiency of the Public Services of the Island by means of training" and to inform the Honourable House of Assembly in reply that the Legislative Council have agreed to waive the amendment made by them to the Bill by the deletion of paragraph (e) of Clause 4 and the consequential amendment to paragraph (d) of the same Clause.

2. The Bill will accordingly be submitted for His Excellency the Acting Governor's assent.

J. D. CHANDLER,
President.

I also have the honour to inform the House that I have received notification that the Clerk is indisposed and cannot attend today's meeting.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS the Clerk was granted leave for the day's meeting and Mr. D. A. Banfield was appointed to act as Deputy Clerk for the day.

PAPER LAID

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—I have it in command from His Excellency the Governor to lay the following Paper:—

Report of the Superintendent of the Public Market for the year 1951—52.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT entered the House and took his seat.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Mr. COX: Resolution to place the sum of \$6,488 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1952—53, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1952—53, No. 36, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. COX: Of his intention to ask leave to move the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 to deal with this Resolution today.

Mr. COX: Resolution to approve the Book of Reference and Plan of the proposed alteration to the Waterworks Department in the parish of St. Andrew.

Mr. ADAMS: Bill intituled an Act to amend the Estate and Succession Duties Act, 1941.

QUESTIONS

The following notices of Questions were given:—

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the appropriate Member of the Executive Committee present at next meeting of this House:—

Will Government favourably consider the issuing of instructions to the effect that, on the same dates on which private business places are closing for cricket in this island during the Indian Cricket Tour, that public employees (such as labourers of the Highways and Transport and Public Works Departments) be granted time off to attend Cricket without any stoppages from their pay?

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Appropriate Member of the Executive Committee present at next meeting of this House:—

Is it a fact that the Policemen, being instructed at District "A" in Rifle Drill, are required to be stripped naked to the waist during such exercises?

(2) If the reply is "yes":—(a) Does not the above tend to emphasize the military character of the Force (as deprecated by Superintendent Calver in his Report) to the detriment of its normal and avowed civil character and purpose?

(b) Is it true that the men in question resent being required so to drill, and complain that such is incompatible with normal recognised Police Training outside Nazi countries?

Mr. HAYNES: To enquire of the Appropriate Member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House:—

(1) Is the Government aware that an address *re* the Insuring of Small Houses in the Island was passed unanimously by the House of Assembly at its meeting of August 28th, 1951?

(2) Is the Government aware that no reply to the above address was ever received by the House of Assembly?

(3) Will the Government inform the House what steps, if any, are being taken to implement this Address?

Mr. TALMA: To enquire of the Appropriate Member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House:—

Is the Government aware that the present respective Jurisdictions of The Assistant Court of Appeal and The Petty Debt Courts of this Island are now long outmoded and need immediate revision?

If the answer is in the affirmative, will Government consider revising same in the manner following, that is to say:

Original Legal Jurisdiction from	£ 50 to \$ 500.00
Equitable Jurisdiction from	£500 to \$4,800.00
<i>In the Petty Debt Courts</i>	
In Actions for Debt from	£ 20 to \$ 240.00
In Actions for damages from	£ 10 to \$ 240.00

If the answer is in the negative, will Government please state why?

Mr. HAYNES: To enquire of the Appropriate Member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House:—

1. The total number of Income Taxpayers, who failed to pay their tax for each of the assessable years 1948, 1949, 1950.

2. The tax remaining unpaid at 31st December, 1952 for each of the assessment year 1948, 1949, 1950 and 1951.

3. What steps do Government intend to take to collect those outstanding balances?

Mr. ALLDER entered the House and took his seat.

REPORT

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—The Select Committee appointed to consider and prepare a draft Reply to His Excellency the Governor's Message No. 2/1952 on the subject of British West Indian Federation has completed its labours and I now beg to lay the Final Report.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS the Bill to amend the Estate and Succession Duties Act, 1941, was read a first time.

STATEMENT ON TRAFFIC REGULATIONS

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker,—Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I desire with your permission to make a statement relative to the Motor Vehicle and Road Traffic Regulations which are before the House at present. Government has noted the criticisms that have been made of certain of the Regulations and is prepared to withdraw at the appropriate time the Regulations to which objection has been taken, with a view to deleting these Regulations and making fresh ones with which the House will agree. I would also like to state, Mr. Speaker, that these Regulations are not those which are laid for 40 days before the House. I say that because some honourable members may feel that these are the kind of regulations that are laid for 40 days and if we delete them they will automatically become law. These Regulations must be passed by Resolution rather than by being laid for 40 days.

The criticisms that have been made by honourable members have been taken to the proper quarters and we are hoping to have them amended and brought before the House next Tuesday. Therefore, honourable members can rest assured that it is not the Government's desire to push anything down anyone's throat. While I am on this, I want to thank the honourable senior member for St. Lucy for his assistance in pointing out the Regulations which are considered offensive. I regret that many other honourable members did not do the same thing.

RULES SUSPENDED

On the motion of Mr. Cox seconded by Dr. CUMMINS Rules 88 and 89 were suspended in order to deal with the Resolution for \$6,488 of which notice was given earlier.

On the motion of Mr. Cox seconded by Dr. CUMMINS Rule 60 was suspended.

On the motion of Mr. Cox seconded by Dr. CUMMINS His Honour the Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH in the Chair, with an instruction while in Committee of Supply to deal with the Resolution for \$6,488.

RESOLUTION FOR UPKEEP OF HIGHWAYS

Mr. COX: Mr. Chairman,—I propose to deal with the following Resolution:—

Resolved that the sum of \$6,488 be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1952—53, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1952—53, No. 36 which form the Schedule to the Resolution, and that the Legislative Council be invited to concur, herein and if concurred in

Resolved that His Excellency the Governor be asked to assent and take the necessary steps to give effect to this Resolution.

As honourable members will see from the Addendum, it is stated that the amounts allocated to the Commissioners of Highways for the parishes of St. George and St. Joseph towards the upkeep of parish roads during the year 1952—53 were \$25,661 and \$17,356 respectively.

The Highway Commissioners for these parishes have now represented that heavy rainfall during the months of October and November last has caused considerable damage to several of the roads in these parishes and it is necessary to have these roads

repaired as soon as possible in order to allow for the reaping of the cane crop.

The Director of Highways and Transport has inspected the roads and has advised that repairs should be effected without delay. The Highway Commissioners, however, have no funds at their disposal for carrying out the work which is required and it is proposed to make special grants of \$2,648 and \$3,840 respectively to the parishes of St. George and St. Joseph for the purpose.

I may say at this stage, Sir, that His Excellency the Acting Governor, the Director of Highways and Transport and I have visited these roads, and they are in a bad condition, especially Parks Road. As a matter of fact, while I was there instructions were given to close the road completely. I suggested that inasmuch as the buses had to take people from Parks Road over to Chalky Mount, people would have to walk a long distance if the road was closed and much hardship would be caused; and it was decided to allow it to remain half opened, so to speak. We all know that when the crop is on, this road is the main road used, and if it is not repaired as early as possible it is likely that great inconvenience will be caused to people in the area, not only those who travel by buses to and from town, but also to those who would like to get their canes to the various factories.

I hardly think that it is necessary to say any more because I think that honourable members realise the position. I now beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman,—This Resolution is rather disappointing. I notice that it only takes into consideration a part of the amount applied for by the Road Commissioners of St. Joseph, namely enough to do Parks Road, to which the honourable senior member for St. Michael has referred. No notice has been taken of Joes River Road. At the beginning of the last financial year we sent in an estimate of \$51,000 to put our roads in order. That would have taken care of the entire parish. This Resolution allocates to us \$17,356, merely a third of what we asked for. We applied for £800 to do Parks Road and Joes River Road, and we also asked for £750 to repair the flood damage to Coconut Grove. I am wondering if the Government cannot get down another Resolution for \$3,600 which we can use on the other roads. If that is not done, there will be a lot of trouble in reaping the crop in certain parts of the parish. I hope that the honourable senior member for St. Michael has heard what I said, and that he will take up the question and that the Government will come down with another Resolution.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman.—The method which the Government adopts in allocating sums to the Road Commissioners of various parishes is somewhat disappointing, and causes a lot of unemployment. Every financial year certain amounts are allocated to the Commissioners to keep their roads in a proper state of repair, and every now and again the Commissioners are forced to lay off road workers.

Government has not yet released the money which is needed to carry out such and such a project. I feel, Sir, that it is a waste of time to ask the various parishes to send in estimates of the work which they propose to do in a financial year if after such estimates are sent in there is much delay before the Administration releases such funds.

There are many roads in the parish which I represent, and the peasants are asking why the roads have not been made passable for them to get out their crops. The Road Commissioners are quite will-

ing to carry out the work but their hands are tied in view of the fact that they cannot get the money released. I hope, Sir, that the Minister in charge will go into the matter and see that such sums as are provided are released to the Road Commissioners of the various parishes, and the parish of St. John especially, so that tenantry and other roads can be put into proper order to assist these peasants in getting their crops out, remembering that the reaping season will start in a few days' time. I think that with immediate action something can still be done to help the situation.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—I want to support the remarks of the last speaker pertaining to the method that the Government adopts in this business. No Government is worthy of its name that does not interest itself deeply in the welfare of its citizens. The haste with which the Government is attempting to deal with the bad roads in St. Joseph should be commended. But I would go further and say this: There is still something wrong with this state of affairs. I am sure that the Government is aware that in the parish of St. Philip last year the Commissioners of Highways refused to accept the amount of money allocated for the repair of tenantry roads in that parish and none was done. There are many tenantry and parish roads that are in a bad condition, and I hope that the Government will interest itself more deeply in this affair. I realise that the parish of St. Joseph might need prior attention from the honourable representative of that parish; but I want to tell the Government that the other parishes are also worthy of consideration. I hope that the speed with which the Government is dealing with this particular matter is an indication of the future stand that they will take with the bad roads throughout the length and breadth of the island.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The remarks made by the honourable junior member for St. Philip spring from his very deep sympathy with the people whom he represents over the condition of the roads which they have to traverse; and it is a matter for considerable consideration that during the last 12 months not one cent has been spent by the road authorities in St. Philip from the Government's allocation for tenantry roads on the tenantry roads in the parish.

The Highway Commissioners of St. Philip claim that the amount they asked the Government for would have taken care of the programme they had in mind, including the paying of wages on the scale at which they are now being paid. They say that the amount the Government offered would not have been enough for them to pay wages at the existing rates in the parish, and they refused, therefore to take a single cent.

It is not easy for me to say whether this *impasse* arises from complete indifference on the part of the Highway Commissioners, or complete indifference on the part of the Central Government. I am personally inclined to the opinion that if the Parochial Authorities of St. Philip were a little more interested in the affairs of the Parish they would have taken what was offered, spent it as far as possible and when it was expended, so long as they would justify the expenditure, they could have stopped until the Government came to their senses and gave them sufficient money to pay at the proper rate the men engaged on the work. But the Highway Commissioners saw fit to completely ignore the grant, and refused to touch a single item in the Schedule of work which would have been done if they had accepted the Government's grant.

The result has been that the roads which have been for years in an almost impassable state, and which caused the utmost inconvenience to the

parishioners who have to use them are yet in the same condition. As things are at present, the Vestry of St. Philip and its subsidiary Board are almost a law unto themselves, and the ratepayers who suffer from their neglect have very little means or redress owing to the constitutional position under which Vestries are at present elected. But it is certainly to be hoped that the Central Government will be more interested in the condition of ratepayers all over the island, and to endeavour to take some decisive action in some way or the other to assist in bringing these Commissioners to their senses.

It would be very unfortunate, to say the least, for Government to expect these wages to be paid at a rate less than the rate at which the Parochial Authorities pay. This is a matter which the Government should have sought to redress when it was brought to their attention. There can hardly be any excuse for the Government to refuse to try to put the situation in order. At the same time the honourable member on my left (Mr. J. C. Mottley) and myself cannot fail seriously to be concerned over the condition of the three roads which were to have been done in the schedule for last year if things had proceeded according to plan. It is a terrible condition, Sir. As regards one road especially when the rain falls you can hardly get out unless you have a canoe.

It may sound almost incredible but it is true that these Highway Commissioners, elected to represent the parish refused to do a single inch of the roads last year, because the money was not enough. I do not believe that there is any Road Authority in any other part of the island that would have acted in a similar fashion.

In 1951 these same roads were to have been done. They were not done because the money was squandered in another direction. In the following year, on the pretext that the money was not sufficient they refused to touch them at all. These are the sort of people who are entrusted with public funds and the maintenance and construction of roads that serve the people of the parish. I can say nothing too strong in condemnation of the action of the Highway!

Of course they do not care; because the districts they have to traverse, by and large are fairly well served with good roads, but it does seem to me that with such complete indifference exhibited by the Commissioners, the time has come that some steps should be taken specifically to ensure that these authorities are not finally responsible for the maintenance and repairs of roads in the parish.

I am suggesting now, Sir, that the Government in this year's allocation should add the amount which lapsed from last year's. I hope that by then the rates of wages would have been settled. So I am suggesting to the Government to add the amount which lapsed and to set up proper supervision to ensure that both last year's schedule and the proposed schedule for this year are finished by the end of the next financial year.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman,—Before the question is put, I would like to bring to the attention of the honourable member in charge of this portfolio that not only in St. Joseph and St. George does this sad condition exist, but also in Christ Church. In that parish there are many roads that have been impassable for many years; roads that have remained untouched for 20 years and upwards. Take Parish Land. That has been untouched merely because of the fact that it leads to poor people's houses. There is also Sea View Road. I am speaking of roads over which lorries have to pass in order to take off the crop and which should be used by residents of the district. These roads are parish roads in the true sense of the word, and by virtue of the fact that all the poor people live in these back roads. I

am glad to be able to make this point here, because I do not happen to have a seat in the Vestry nor on the Commissioners of Highways. I hope that my colleague will use his position to see that something is done to Sea View Road and Parish Land. If there are not sufficient funds to do them—I know it goes by rotation—I am hoping that a special grant along lines similar to those of this Resolution will be allocated. It should not be thought for a moment that there are only two roads in Christ Church that are in this bad condition; the two that I referred to are the ones which came to me in speaking.

As regards the method of allocating this money, at present the whole of a year's grant is not released en bloc to the Road Commissioners of Christ Church. It is released so much per road. That method is used nowadays, I suppose, because in the past a lot of money was spent and very few roads done. I do not know if that is the reason. I am hoping, however, that although great care and caution has to be exercised in the spending of the money that is allocated for the building and repairing of roads, I am hoping that the money will be released a little more freely. The Department of Highways and Transport is glad to release this money. As the position stands at present, only one tenantry road was done in Christ Church for the whole of last year. Sometimes you can exercise too much care. I hope that these words will be taken notice of, and that the minister in charge of this portfolio will see to it that the necessary funds are not only voted here, but are allocated to do the work.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—The suggestion which I have to make is that we should co-operate with the Commissioners of Highways of these parishes and repair these roads according to how the crop is being reaped. I know you can repair half a road at a time. If there are growing canes in the vicinity of these roads it is likely that the repairs will not be as lasting as if the roads were given time to "set" before being used by traffic. I think that that suggestion is worthy of consideration.

I think that these parishes should be very grateful to the Central Government for the assistance that they get. What should happen is that if they cannot repair the roads the roads should be taken from them, and the Central Government should take over the roads and do them. I think that the repairing of these roads in St. George and St. Joseph should be done as quickly as possible and should be co-ordinated with the reaping of the crop in the particular vicinity. It does seem to me that a fatal delay has taken place when you bring a resolution like this the very week that the crop is scheduled to begin. I do not think that they can be repaired so well with the crop moving over them and the people would have been much more glad for the work, say in November. If we repair these roads now, and the crop moves over them before they are given time to set, I think they will have to be repaired again sooner than if they had been given time to set.

Mr. COX: Mr. Chairman,—I would like to reply to the remarks made by the honourable junior member for St. Andrew. Right now I have not got the information relative to the point he raised in connection with the other amount which he says the Commissioners of Highways had asked for before. I only know that they asked for £600 and when the Executive Engineer examined the road he felt that it would cost a little more, and that is why we have £800 in the Resolution. I will promise him, however, to make inquiries into what he has said, and inform him accordingly.

I want to thank the honourable senior member for St. Philip who no doubt has a very good view of the situation as it exists in St. Philip. I am not

prepared to say much this evening because the situation is a very indefinite one, and a very regrettable one. To the honourable senior member for St. John I would only say that the sooner the vestries agree to having some sort of government supervision of the money that is allocated to them by Government the better it will be for St. John and other parishes as well. But as honourable members know, some of these vestries are quite willing to ask for money to repair this or that road; but the Government must have nothing to do with how they spend the money. That is not good enough. I am sure that the members of this House have been always pressing that the Government, through the Highways and Transport Department should have some authority to see that the money allocated to these various Commissioners of Highways through the vestries is well spent; and that applies to both the parishes of St. Philip and St. John.

Mr. ALLDER: I would have liked the honourable senior member for St. Michael to have been more explicit in the statement which he made in replying to the point made by me. I would like to know if he is implying that the money allocated to the Road Commissioners of St. John is badly spent. That is what I would like him to make clear. If that is the case I would join him in deprecating such action. I feel that the further the taxpayers' money is allowed to run the better it is for the colony. If the honourable member can make a statement like the one he has made I can only feel that he has some reason for making it; because as the minister in charge of Highways and Transport he is certainly in a position to take the initiative in seeing that these monies are spent as carefully as possible. I do not like the insinuation that the honourable member has made, and I hope that in fairness to the committee he will make his point clear.

On the other hand, Sir, the Government would not be carrying out its responsibilities to the taxpayers—whether those of St. Michael, St. Philip, St. John or any other parish—if it did nothing to prevent the bad spending on the part of those who have to keep these roads in order. I feel that we have reached the stage where if the Government wants to assist the peasants they should allocate the necessary funds to do all the roads recommended by the Commissioners. Barbados is still an agricultural community, and the peasants contribute a lot to the economy of this colony; and the least that the Government could do besides taxing them is to make it as easy as possible for them to get in and out of their plots with their canes.

I hope that the honourable introducer of this Resolution can give me some understanding with regard to the implementation of the suggestion in reference to a double allocation to the Highway Commissioners this year, provided, of course that the Government would set up proper control and supervision of the expenditure. After all Sir, we in this Chamber have an obligation to represent the broad masses of the people in so far as their material needs are concerned far over and above that of a few reactionary and vindictive vestrymen.

I repeat, Sir, it would hardly be fair merely through the abstruseness of the Vestry of St. Philip to have those people wait again for another year—1954—before these roads are done. The amount of work is not too large; nor is the amount of men to do it beyond the capacity of the Commissioners to find, so that both years' schedule can be done in one year. I say that because the normal schedule would hardly have taken more than about three months. I am again suggesting to the Government to give the matter earnest consideration.

Mr. COX: I must apologise to the honourable senior member for St. John and to the honourable senior member for Christ Church. But all I can say where the point made by the former is concerned is that I will take his remarks to the proper quarters as is customary. But I cannot guarantee that there will be the double allocation that he suggests. As the honourable member knows, whatever money is left unspent at the end of a financial year lapses in the Treasury; and when the Budget is introduced for the following financial year we generally bring down an offsetting sum for each parish as far as tenantry roads are concerned, and the money is allocated according to the estimates of the Commissioners and the Director of Highways and Transport.

As far as the remarks of the honourable senior member for Christ Church are concerned, I just want to say at this stage that this Resolution is for flood damage which took place in St. Joseph and St. George; it is nothing to do with the ordinary repairs and maintenance of roads. I can only express the hope that soon—if not this year, then in the next financial year—money will be available to repair the roads which the honourable member has in mind.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman,—What I am not happy about is road construction. I think that the old idea of marl roads should be abolished. I am wondering if the Government can assure me that they are conforming to some standard; at least the standard adopted by the Department of Highways and Transport. I am anxious, of course to see this Resolution passed. Some people might regard the sum allocated to St. George as colossal; but I do not know that it will do much more than patch a couple of roads. The Commissioners of Highways should not continue with the marl roads because they are cheaper. In truth and in fact they are ugly in these days, and are a waste of money. The groups of gentlemen known as Road Commissioners do not in truth and in fact have any real knowledge of, or experience in, road construction. What worries me particularly is whether the Commissioners of Roads of St. George will continue with these marl roads. If they do, it can only be regarded as a relief to the workers. With another few weeks' rainfall you will have to do it all over again.

Mr. BARROW came into the Committee and took his seat while Mr. MILLER was speaking.

Question that the Resolution do now pass was put and agreed to *nem. con.*

DEBATE ON PROCEDURE

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—I propose to take No. (1) of Order No. 10, Committee of Supply, as the next order.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—On a point of order—the honourable senior member for St. Michael moved the suspension of Rule 60. His Honour the Speaker was of the opinion that he was only going into Committee of Supply to deal with the Resolution which we have just passed.

Mr. COX: Mr. Chairman,—I think that the honourable member is wrong. As he knows, you must move the suspension of Rule 60 so as to move an order out of its place. If you have the rule suspended once you can deal with any matter on the Order Paper. I moved the House into Committee of Supply to deal with Money Resolutions and there was also the instruction to the Committee to deal with this Resolution.

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable member has condemned himself. Taking an order out of its place is something that concerns the House; not a committee. You cannot shift about the Order Paper after you get into committee. If the honourable member

had moved that No. 10 be taken as the next Order of the Day there could have been an instruction to the Committee to deal with this Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—I propose to take No. (1) of Order No. 10 next. It is a Resolution for \$87,120.

Mr. LEWIS: I rise again to a point of order.

Mr. ADAMS: Is the honourable member in order?

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I am asking you to rule; because I know what Mr. Speaker understood. This is money coming out of the Treasury. We cannot behave as we like. If you discuss the matter with the Speaker he will tell you what he understood. The honourable senior member for St. Michael did not say anything about Order No. 10 when he moved the suspension of Rule 60.

Mr. ADAMS: Before you rule, Mr. Chairman, I will point out that a motion has been made that the House go into Committee of Supply. We are in Committee. You cannot have two motions to move the House into Committee on No. 10. It is too late to waste time with petty legal arguments. What need is there for a ruling on this point? The House has moved itself into Committee of Supply. We are now in Committee dealing with Resolutions for sums of money. Forty or fifty years ago when we were running around our mothers' knees was time to make all these petty criticisms.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable junior member for the City said that Mr. Speaker intimated to him what he (Mr. Speaker) understood. Mr. Speaker did not intimate it to me. I will have to rule that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph is in order. I do not know what Mr. Speaker's feelings are.

Mr. LEWIS: I am asking for a ruling on the matter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is saying what Mr. Speaker told him. He did not tell me anything.

Mr. LEWIS: The House went into Committee to deal with one particular Resolution only. I thought it peculiar myself.

Mr. ADAMS: I think we should all thank God that there is only one mind in this House which could waste time like this.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: My ruling is that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph may proceed with other Resolutions under Committee of Supply and being No. 10 on the Order Paper.

RESOLUTION FOR PUBLIC BUILDINGS, HOUSING ETC.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, — I am moving that the following Resolution do now pass: Resolved that the sum of \$87,120 be advanced from the Public Treasury (to be subsequently refunded from Loan Funds) and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1952—53, Part II, Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1952—53 No. 33 which form the Schedule to this Resolution and that the Legislative Council be asked to concur herein and if concurred in

Resolved that His Excellency the Governor be asked to assent and take the necessary steps to give effect to this Resolution.

This Resolution, Sir, is for the purposes set out in the Schedule. There is the sum of \$1,120 in respect of advice as to the erection of a modern abattoir and cold storage plant. Then there is \$16,000 for the new Self Help Housing Scheme. This item is the chief one which caused me to deal with this Resolution today. Then there is \$70,000 under Mis-

cellaneous for Motor Tractors for Peasants. It is estimated that the Scheme will cost \$120,000 and we are now asking for a supplementary provision of \$70,000 for the reasons given in the Addendum.

I will deal with the first item first. As far as the abattoir and cold storage plant are concerned, honourable members will see that it is proposed to obtain the advice of an expert.

He will come here for a month to advise us on the erection of this modern plant. The estimated expenses in connection with his visit are \$1,120. As far as the Self Help Housing Scheme is concerned, honourable members must be aware of a recent article in the Press asking what was actually taking place. It will be remembered that we passed a Resolution to enable us to pay such slight expense as fell to our lot in order to participate in the Point 4 Programme under which experts in Self Help Housing visited the West Indies. The items are set out in Para. 2 of the Addendum over the page, and included is money for loans etc. I do not propose to say much on this last bit inasmuch as I have to say more when I deal with another Resolution. But to anticipate questioning I will say that the whole question of what interest should be paid on loans of this sort is before the Executive. We started off by charging two per cent. where the Labour Welfare Loans are concerned. Government itself has borrowed money at 4½ per cent. It may be that the Executive will have to steer between the extremes of having people feel that we are charging too much interest, and the other extreme of discrimination by charging one person 2 per cent. and another person more. Those are only tentative proposals, however because the Executive has not reached a decision. Honourable members will agree with me that you do not want to appear to be discriminating; but on the other hand you will find it difficult to give very low rates of interest especially when you have to borrow at a higher rate. As regards the last item, Motor Tractors for Peasants, that has already been debated both as a result of questions asked by Your Honour and under the Five Year Plan. Honourable members will see that the Board of Agriculture recommended that there should be a pilot scheme to cover two acres instead of one so that we may get a more accurate opinion. The Government by including it in the Five Year Plan and the House by agreeing with that Plan has agreed to starting this pilot scheme.

I beg to move, Sir, that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. Cox seconded.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,—The Government will get my commendation for having at least started to do something about the abattoir and cold storage plant at the Public Market. But unfortunately their action has been so late in coming after so much delay that there has been much loss as a result of faulty storage facilities. We had the case where the butchers would take their meat from next door to the Government's cold storage plant and store it at a private concern about a quarter of a mile away; so you will realise how bad were the conditions at the Government's plant. However, Sir, I hope that after this expert has come and the Government has received his advice they will go ahead with the project and put things in order in the shortest possible time.

Now I hoped to hear some explanation as regards this Self Help Housing Scheme. It is a new scheme to the island. I do not know if other honourable members are fully acquainted with the Government's proposals, but I am really ignorant of the proposals in this respect. I thought that when the Government came down for a release of funds the whole programme would have been put before this Chamber.

I see in the Addendum that it is proposed to rent spots. I would like to know what rents are going to be charged, and what will be the method of paying back the money loaned under this scheme. Also what interest the Government proposes to charge. I would like to make myself quite explanatory on this issue. I would prefer to know that the Government ran this scheme as a business rather than as a patronage or charity scheme. It should be a scheme properly run and paying for itself and realising some profits, however small, to help people in the other parishes who are also in need of assistance. With all due respect to the honourable members for St. Lucy I do not know what has caused the Government to focus this scheme on St. Lucy. I do not know if it is a result of recent kindnesses. I cannot remember hearing any application from the people of St. Lucy nor from their honourable representatives in this House for assistance of this sort. But I myself have taken part in the demand or demands from people in other parishes for help along these lines.

However, I do not want to blame the Government for being so partial as to have that feeling given to their actions, but I am still hoping that the schemes will be run similar to those of private concerns. I am not suggesting that the profits should be extortionate; they should be reasonable. We have to be careful not to give an overdue amount of patronage to any section of the community when assistance is needed all round. Seeing that the amount proposed for this housing scheme is what I would consider to be a nominal amount, I am wondering if the Government could not have started similar projects in other parishes at the same time, because, speaking in terms of Government finance, the sum of \$16,000 is nothing. If you are spending \$16,000 at Clinketts, could you not have said: "I will deal with two or three parishes at the same time and allow them to get ahead with their self-help schemes?" I feel that that is necessary; it is definitely within the ability of the Government to sponsor several schemes in a few parishes at the same time.

As regards the supply of motor tractors for peasants, provision has been made in the Five Year Plan to spend \$120,000, but the Government is now asking for \$70,000. I would like to know how many tractors will be used, what area has been recommended for the operation of the pilot scheme and what are the charges to the peasants. I would like reasonable charges to be made whereby this scheme will be able to pay for itself. There are private individuals who rent tractors and although the charges made for them are considerably high, yet the peasants are glad to be able to rent them. You may find yourself getting into trouble in the operation of these tractors if you limit their operation to any specified area. I feel that with the number of Agricultural Stations which the Government now owns, one or two tractors could be attached to each Station and arrangements could be made whereby a few peasants whose plots lie near to each other could have the use of the tractors at the same time. I hope that everything will be done as well as it can be done; I hope that the Government will be kind enough to give us some explanation of these various items.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I am glad to see that the Government has brought down this Resolution in respect of this aided self-help housing scheme and other matters, and if we are spending money on capital projects intended to raise the productivity of the island, I would ask the Government to see that the money is spent wisely so that we will be able to get the best results. As regards the Abattoir and Cold Storage Plant I think the Government must be commended on bringing out this expert from British

Guiana who will be able to advise them on the type of Abattoir and Cold Storage Plant which will suit our conditions, but they must bear in mind that a commercial service is being provided by the Barbados Ice Company, and when the Government is putting down a new cold storage plant at least it will have to put down a plant to compete with a concern like the Bridgetown Ice Company which already provides a good service. I hope that the Government will bear that in mind, so that the plant can be worked to its full capacity and the charges made will be such as to help defray the expenses of this plant. I have seen the condition of the plant at the Public Market and I know that on many occasions representations have been made in respect of people who put their meat there; obviously the plant is not giving of its best. I do not think that honourable members will take any sort of objection to the fact that the Government intends doing something about the abattoir at the Public Market.

There is not much to be said as regards the aided self-help housing scheme. I take it that this housing scheme is at least a beginning and very shortly the Government will wind up any sort of housebuilding and let the people build the houses themselves. I hope that much experience will be gathered from an experimental scheme of this nature. Assuming that this pilot scheme is a success and the people take the initiative in building houses themselves, the Government should seek to get block-making machines and machines for mixing cement and so on, so that you will get a greater amount of productivity. I do not think I am bringing any tales out of school, but I have advised Mr. Lashley as to the matters I have mentioned. The honourable senior member for St. John has said that he does not know why the parish of St. Lucy has been chosen for this housing scheme, but my colleague has always been asking for an extension of the Labour Welfare Fund because the parish of St. Lucy is a poor one and I think the Government had that in mind in choosing this parish for this scheme. In time the parish of St. Philip will benefit just as well, but if the Government intends to pass on this housebuilding to the workers themselves, I hope the Government will see to it that they get the equipment and let the people learn as much as possible from the pilot scheme so as to make the operation successful. Another matter from the point of view of the success of the scheme is that at least some of our young men will be helped by way of being bursary apprentices.

I am sincerely hoping that at a later date the House will be given information as to how the scheme is operating, the rate of interest paid, and so on. I would like to know whether the Government intend to confine this scheme to the same category of workers as in the case of the scheme in relation to the Labour Welfare Fund. I do not think that a scheme of this nature should be confined to that category of workers who are already well protected: I feel that this scheme should be carried out for the assistance of workers other than those who can benefit from the Labour Welfare Fund. It is unfortunate that under the Labour Welfare Fund the Government will be lending money at the rate of 2½% interest and under this scheme the people will be paying 5% interest, I do not know how that can be got over, because the funds for financing this scheme are borrowed funds and if the Government has to borrow money at 3½% interest they will obviously have to lend it out at 4% interest. It might cause some handicap to the schemes if the Government has two rates of interest in respect of these funds.

As regards the provision of motor tractors for peasants, there are certain estates and plantations in this island which already provide some sort of service in this respect. If, for instance you send your canes at Bulkeley, that factory will send along its tractor and help you out. The Government has to bear in mind what Bulkeley charges for that service as compared with what the Government will charge. I am hoping that the Government will bring down to this House details as to these projects so that we will be well informed as to how we are progressing.

Mr. ADAMS: I was careful to say that this is a very knotty problem; I can only imagine that the honourable member was not in the House when I introduced this Resolution. The Government has most seriously to consider having discrimination in lending people money at 2% interest and having to raise on other people who come in later on. The honourable member could not have raised that point if he had been in the House; I anticipated that the higher intelligence on my left might want to make a good point; I said I anticipated possible questions and answered them. I did that deliberately today. Rather than hold up these two housing experts, we are going ahead with this scheme and the House will know exactly what is the rental, the rate of interest and so on. It is far from being advisable to hold up this scheme and not get on with it straightway.

Mr. CRAWFORD: In so far as the aided self-help housing scheme is concerned, I expect that so long as experiments have been successful, the idea would spread to other parishes and there would be no further necessity for much Government meddling in the matter. Therefore what worries me is to see that we start off on the right foot, so to speak. The impression has got around that the average cost of a house under this scheme would be around \$800; I do not know whence the idea came, but it is obvious that one of these houses will cost probably close on \$2,000. There is nothing attractive in price about that; the loans for the purchase of materials for the erection of 15 houses amount to \$12,000—almost \$1,000 per house. Even assuming that the work is done on a community basis, incidentals and the cost of paying expert workmen for doing certain parts of the construction will appropriate finally almost another \$1,000, so that a house will cost about \$1,800 to \$2,000 when finished. I do not know how the Government will get the materials, I do not know whether they will buy the materials in bulk or let an individual concern supply them; but however it is, I, for one, am terribly disappointed as to the estimated cost per unit.

With regard to block making, I see in the addendum to this Resolution the item; "Cost of block making machine, tools, etc., \$350." I am wondering what sort of machine this must be, since an ordinary machine only costs about £50; I am suggesting that although we are as anxious as possible to get ahead with this scheme as fast as we can, it may be advisable for us to make haste slowly in order to see what success attends the efforts of block making in this island. I understand that operations in this direction will be started very soon and if these schemes are successful, the results will completely revolutionize the erection of houses in this country. Even if the people make these concrete blocks themselves and the price of a block is regulated by the price of the cement and so on, it will not be as cheap as the clay brick. The average price of a concrete block is 26 cents but if these blocks are made on a community basis, they will not cost less than

a shilling apiece. Incidentally, in this construction work, the contractor, for whom I see we will pay \$400 for three months' work, will have his hands full in supervising the construction of the walls of these houses, otherwise many of these houses will collapse. The entire community will be awaiting the success of this Scheme at Clinketts and on that success will depend the rate at which the scheme will spread to other parts of the island.

There is one final observation which I would like to make and it is in connection with the provision of motor tractors for peasants. I am somewhat sceptical about that scheme. There are certain parts of the island like St. Joseph, St. Thomas and St. Andrew in which the necessity might exist for some experience of planters, but these motor tractors might do a lot of harm to the soil in this island eventually, unless they are used very carefully. They plough very deeply and turn over a lot of the sub-soil and you cannot get any crop especially in those parts which are shallow. There is also the question of the displacement of labour through this mechanism for ploughing throughout the island. The plantations now have all the tractors they want and they rent them to peasants; farming is done on the small holdings of the peasant and with this mechanism in use one wonders what the workers will do out of crop. These workers used to dig cane holes at the end of the crop but that is not done now; the ploughing is to be done by tractors now. I suppose we will get to the position of the South Sea Islands where the men remain at home and the children and the women earn the income. I should like to know whether the Government is importing these tractors through the garages in Barbados because they are the biggest exploiters in the community: they are making 300% on motor equipment and accessories and the price is not controlled. It is easily ascertainable that the amount of profit which the agents for these tractors will make will almost give the Government a new tractor. I believe that the conditions to which I have referred do permit of some investigation being made on the part of the Government in an endeavour to economise as much as possible on the expenditure in respect of these tractors.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: I do not want to be tedious, but there are two points I would like to make. I should like to know whether at this cold storage plant there will be accommodation for surplus fish. (A MEMBER: Yes). With regard to the aided self-help housing pilot scheme which is being carried out in St. Lucy, that is a good step in the right direction, and I hope that the Government will utilise all their energy to make the scheme a success. I would like to draw to the attention of the Government that in St. Philip there are 42 acres of land which is leased by a big plantation and through our agitation that lease will be terminated by next June. I think the Government should interest itself in this land and see if they cannot get this land for the accommodation of the peasants. People are living on this land now and they are paying a good price to the plantation for it; I want the Government to see if they cannot assist the peasants in acquiring this land. These peasants who are now occupying this land would like to possess it, and I think this is a good opportunity for the Government to establish an aided self-help housing scheme up there as well. I hope the Government will take my few remarks into consideration.

As regards the provision of motor tractors for the use of peasants, I know that that will cause some confusion, but I hope the Government will keep before their eyes the fact that these tractors can do harm as well as good. I wish the Government success in

these schemes and I hope that they will think not only of Clinketts for establishing a self-help housing scheme but they will also think of St. Philip, St. John and other parishes which need the same help as St. Lucy needs.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Both the hon. junior member for St. Philip and the hon. senior member for St. John seem to have forgotten that we passed an Address agreeing to the purchase of motor tractors for the use of peasants. The question as to whether these tractors will do more harm than good does not arise now, and the question of the unemployment situation would not be dearer to anybody else here than it would be to me. This is a matter of seeing something purely and simply from an economic point of view. You are not getting any agricultural labourer to use a fork now; tractors are being used all over the island now, and it has been agreed that we will get two tractors—one to be used on the flat parts of the island, perhaps Christ Church, St. Philip and St. George, and the other to be used over the hills in St. Andrew and St. Joseph. The purpose of that proposal is that we will have experience as to what the position will be in two areas which are not similar.

As far as the cost of this operation is concerned, I can assure you that it will be cheaper to the peasants than what it is at present, because the Government does not propose to make the capital cost of the tractors a charge on what is being done; what is being done will be put to the running expenses of the tractors. What is the use of saying that we are not doing anything to help the peasants and now that something is being done to help them, hon. members say that what is being done will damage the land and the peasants will not get any crops?

On the question of a profit of 300% being made on these tractors that question will be gone into; honourable members will realise that the Government has to ask for authority to purchase these tractors. The Government cannot place any order for the purchase of these tractors until the money has been voted to pay for them; we are now seeking authority to place an order for these tractors. This work will be done by tender. This scheme would not be a pilot scheme if you put two tractors at each of the Agricultural Stations; it would be something of which you already have experience.

As to the matter of the abattoir and cold storage we have a plant which is antiquated, and before we embark on spending this money in getting something modern, we want to get the advice of somebody who is better qualified to give it than the people whom we have here. We want to know what is the experience of British Guiana in this matter of abattoir and cold storage plants. Dr. Fulton is free to give advice to the Government and he has experience in this matter.

With regard to the question of the glut of fish, we hope that wise collection will be able to help the community. I repeat that the question of the provision of tractors for peasants is something which has been accepted—one tractor for the southern area and the other for the hills. I think that the Agricultural Department is more equipped to give the Government expert advice as to whether a tractor should be used in any particular soil, than any honourable member of this House no matter who that honourable member is.

Mr. BRYAN came into the Committee and took his seat while Mr. F. L. WALCOTT was speaking.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: As regards the Abattoir and Cold Storage Plant, I must commend the Government for having taken this step at long last,

because there is not a week which has passed during which complaints have not been received from the butchers at the Public Market that they have lost meat by putting it in the Government's cold storage. That is a shame: it is now years ago since I put a question in this connection to the Government and debated the matter in this House, and I am still glad to see that even at this late hour, the Government is bringing down somebody here to go into this matter. I sincerely hope that after we have got this report which is bound to be an adverse report as far as the Cold Storage Plant is concerned, immediate steps will be taken to remedy the state of affairs. A layman has already condemned this Plant and if you cannot keep meat in this cold storage after three days, the Plant is absolutely of no use. The butchers have had to lose their meat week after week after putting it in this cold storage, and I hope that the Government will not be as long in implementing Dr. Fulton's report as they have been in getting somebody to report on this Plant. I must draw the attention of the Government to the site at Eagle Hall where it is proposed to erect a market. I do not know if the honourable Leader of the House is aware of the fact that the plans have been sent in and the authorities have done all that the Government has asked to be done. It is now—

Mr. LEWIS: On a point of order. There is on the Order Paper a Resolution dealing with markets.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I quite appreciate that; it is a small point. I was saying that the Government will appreciate this mild criticism and get something done about this market. It is a shame to see the squatters at Eagle Hall; it is not in the best interests of these people that they should be there in that way.

On the question of housing, as a member of the Housing Board I am going to contribute my quota in this matter. I am one of those persons who feel that nothing can beat a trial but a failure, and even a failure does not always beat a trial. It is not that I have so much faith—I have very little faith—in this aided self-help scheme; but I would not be a member of a Board and have a scheme put up by experts and turn it down. What I am worried about is this; in a community like ours where there is always a question of supply and demand, where there are always a number of unemployed artisans, there is always a difficulty in approaching a self-help scheme in saying that whereas the cost of a house will be so much, it can be made cheaper if you can build it yourself. I throw this question out to the economic brains in this House which will follow it more closely than others; there is always a difficulty in saying that you may be able to pay somebody to teach a few people to build their own houses and thereby eliminate labour which would be drawn from the large number of artisans which we have in this colony, people who, day after day, seek employment. However, one wonders whether even if after a trial there is a failure, out of evil good may not come. I agree with this scheme as a trial, because these experts from the United States are offering us this assistance and we should try out this scheme. Anything that can reduce this housing problem should be tried, but if there is anything which tends to reduce the housing problem to the detriment of labour I wonder whether that will be in the best interests of this colony. I have read the newspaper report as to the Housing Board and other reports and I say that in other countries where you have Crown lands and you can occupy them and you cut down the trees and provide a lot of the material for erecting houses, that results in a great deal of saving; but in Barbados where everything which is to be put into the building of a house still has to be imported, the only

saving you will effect is the labour of artisans. If you are making your saving from the labour of carpenters and masons I am wondering if you have thought of this matter from every possible angle. In any scheme for re-housing Barbados we want to be as economical as possible so as to show people how they can raise their standard of living. I am supporting this scheme to-day and I hope that this \$16,000 will be well spent. If it comes back to this House that this scheme is a failure, nobody will be able to say that the Housing Board failed to offer its support to such a scheme.

As regards the provision of motor tractors for peasants, I cannot see that there should be any criticism of that item. I know very little about these tractors but I remember well that when an Address was passed in this House asking that the importation of mechanical implements for tilling the land be prohibited, and that Address was backed up strongly by the Government members, I stood alone. I remember distinctly that the then honourable senior member for St. George, Mr. Springer, looked at me and I reminded him that I represented the City; but a political metamorphosis has taken place. (Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: You were not in the House then). A short memory is the greatest gift of the politician, I am told. I am glad to see that it is now realised that we must have mechanical tillage and modern equipment. From all I have said I do not want it to appear that I am abandoning my role of offering constructive criticism.

Mr. LEWIS: I want to make a few comments on his Resolution; I am glad to hear the second thoughts of some honourable members. I would like to tell my colleague that as far back as 1946 or 1947 the Government bought a tractor for working their own plantation at Seawell. As to the first item in this Resolution, on looking at it one would get the impression that the Abattoir and Cold Storage Plant would be built for \$1,120, but the Addendum to the Resolutions says:

"In the case of the Abattoir and Cold Storage and the Self Help Housing Scheme, preliminary investigation and expert advice are necessary before these schemes can be started and funds are required to meet the cost".

What we really have here is that we can build two things for \$1,120 and I think there should be some amendments made here if it is merely a question of getting this expert advice. I think the Government said that these schemes were under investigation but it appears that they have not started the investigation until now.

The next thing is the aided self-help housing scheme. We are told that the cost of this scheme is estimated at \$15,978 and I see that the salary of the construction foreman for three months is \$400. I would like to know what are the three months; they have either taken on this foreman in January or not, and if they wait for this Resolution to be passed, he can only work for two months and a few days at the most. I take it that this amount for travelling expenses is for him and he will be living somewhere in St. Michael. It will not be a bad idea to train somebody for doing this work.

Honourable members have described this scheme as a trial one; in my opinion, if this is a trial scheme, we should not provide for as many as 15 houses. Why provide for all these houses if we are having a trial scheme? Two or three houses of different types would be enough for a trial scheme, but 15 houses would be a solid scheme. I would like to know whether this amount of \$400 is intended to cover this foreman's salary for the month of January or whether this foreman has been taken on before this Resolution has been passed. I think it is ridiculous to come

here and say that you are providing this money for three months when the financial year ends in March and this is the end of January.

With regard to the housing loans, I heard the honourable senior member for St. Joseph say that the Government must be given credit for something. I draw to the attention of the Government that we have a scheme by which we lend to fishermen money from the Treasury and we advance fishermen money from loan funds, so that these loans must be in existence already and they must have decided something about the interest which they will charge. To tell the House that you are now or still considering whether somebody will get money at 2% and somebody else will get it at higher rate will mean that the scheme must be in existence already. Money was lent to fishermen for paying insurance on their boats; therefore this system must be in vogue already and the House should hear something about it.

As far as the tractors for peasants are concerned, I am confused over the matter. The honourable junior member for St. Peter spoke about putting one tractor in one area and one in another area. The cost of a tractor and the running of it for two months will be \$35,000. We see from the addendum to this Resolution that the necessary orders for the tractors are to be placed, but if the orders are now to be placed before the end of March, the tractors will not be here. You therefore stand the chance that this money will have to be re-voted.

I am glad that the honourable senior member for St. Philip has returned to his seat; he referred to the high percentage of profit made on these tractors. I observe that the honourable member is mixed up with the erection of a gasoline station. However, I hope that the Government will not have to pay any profit as high as 400% on the parts they want; but if these orders will be placed if this Resolution is passed, all that is necessary will be the putting down of a token amount. If these tractors are not here already, can we not get them here and then pay for them? Otherwise we will have to re-vote the whole amount of this money. You have this \$16,000 in respect of the erection of these 15 houses and unless they are built by the end of March, we will have to re-vote this money. That will give the taxpayers the impression that we are voting all this money now and by the end of March half of it or none of it will be spent. We had a similar state of affairs last year and we had to re-vote considerable sums of money, which is not a very nice way of regulating our financial matters. I am sorry that the Government is making this mistake again. We have had to re-vote considerable sums of money because they lapsed; sums of money which were voted in January had to be re-voted in August. The sum of \$10,000 which was voted for the fishermen had to be re-voted, and it seems to me that this is just making a show and we will have to re-vote this money. Can these sums of \$16,000 and \$70,000 be spent before the end of March? Can these 15 houses be built when these housing experts are going away in a short time? Now that these experts are announcing their departure we are voting money for a block-making machine and other things which are preparatory to starting anything at all! I think we should be voting what money we know can be spent for certain or we should be voting a token amount for it; we should not let go out from this House that we are voting this money now and then we have to re-vote it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: There are two points which I want to make in connection with the remarks of the honourable junior member for St. Peter. The honourable member says that you cannot get anybody to fork the land because it is too hard.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: On a point of order. I said that when the ground is too hard you usually find it difficult to find people to work it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: You can prepare land at any time of the year; but at this time of the year no forking would be done except in very exceptional circumstances. At the time when land is generally prepared, the difficulty of getting hard soil would hardly obtain. In so far as effecting deep ploughing by tractors is concerned, no one wants to assume that he has the expert knowledge of the Agricultural Department; but I do know that it would be possible now for my colleague or myself to take the honourable junior member for St. Peter and the Director of Agriculture to a certain area in which the owner of the land used a tractor for ploughing the land this year and he has not got any crop at all. That is common knowledge; the soil was too shallow for the use of a tractor, the ploughing went too deep and the result was that the owner of the land had no crop. I know from my own experience that several of the big plantation owners are also sceptical as to the widespread use of tractors and the effect of this deep mechanical tilling of certain parts of the island.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The honourable member will agree that the Government is embarking on this pilot scheme because we want this necessary knowledge. If it is found that this scheme is not working in the best interests of the peasants, the Government will find much use for the tractors. In reply to the honourable junior member for the City, it is not divulging any secret if I say that I anticipated his criticism; I felt he would have made the point that we are asking the House to vote money which cannot be spent. As to the Abattoir and Cold Storage Plant we have not put in the cost of its installation; we have only put in the cost of the investigation because the cost of the installation was not put in the scheme. In the Five Year Plan the matter of the Abattoir and Cold Storage Plant was put under loan funds, but no specific amount was put down; it was included in the amount of \$2,071,000 for "Schemes under Investigation." We wanted to get advice as to this Plant and we put down the expenses in that connection; we cannot estimate what the Abattoir and Cold Storage Plant will cost. A token vote would not be the best means of dealing with these matters; we felt that it would be in the interest of the community to come down with these amounts. We have this debate on these matters now and when we come to re-vote the money we will have the same debate all over again. The amount of money for the tractors and the Abattoir and Cold Storage Plant could not have been avoided: as regards the tractors the original idea was to have one tractor and one trailer, but we are getting two tractors and two trailers and the sum of \$70,000 has been put down in this connection. This is something of a capital nature and not a recurrent vote and there will be a re-vote anyhow.

Mr. LEWIS: If you are only now investigating the matter you do not know what the scheme will cost. The honourable member did not answer my point about this money being for the investigation rather than for carrying out the scheme: if you are only now investigating the matter you cannot put down so much for the scheme. The Government must have made some enquiries as to the amount for which

they would get a tractor, and if the amount is over that figure they will have to come back for the remainder. If you put down a token vote, we would know that the amount will come up to this \$70,000 or over. I think it is ridiculous to give the impression that we are voting \$70,000 now and perhaps in April or May when the tractors arrive we have to vote this money all over again. I feel that we are giving the public a wrong impression; it is either that you know what you are doing or you have to get an investigation of it and you cannot get that in two months' time. I have now learnt that it is a question not only of getting the tractors but also of housing them: if that was set out in the addendum to the Resolution it would give the impression that the Government had really gone into the matter. I expect that the money will lapse so they will have to come back for it.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. Cox, the CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave for the Committee to sit again.

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.

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

RESUMPTION

On the re-assembling of honourable members:—

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to lay replies to the following questions which I regret to say I had to lay about two or three weeks ago and which I forgot to lay. They are as follows:—

No. 31 standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Andrew.

No. 39 standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. John.

No. 63 standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas.

No. 64 standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY RESUMED

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 in the Chair.

Mr. LEWIS and Mr. GODDARD entered the House and took their seats.

RESOLUTION FOR LOAN EXPENSES

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, — I propose to deal now with the following Resolution: Resolved that the sum of \$1,500 be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1952—53, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1952—53, No. 35 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution, and that the Legislative Council be invited to concur herein, and if concurred in,

Resolved that His Excellency the Governor be asked to assent and take the necessary steps to give effect to this Resolution.

In moving the passing of this Resolution I will point out that it is for expenses in connection with the raising of a loan. As the Addendum says, "It

is proposed at an early date to raise a loan locally. The expenses in connection with the loan will include a commission of one-eighth of one per cent. to bankers on allotments made in respect of applications bearing their stamp. Payment of such a commission is usual."

If there are any reasonable questions—by which I mean that there may be questions to which no immediate answer can be given—but if there is any further information which I can give I will do my best to do so.

Mr. Cox seconded.

I move, Sir, that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I would like to ask a question which I hope will be considered reasonable. The Addendum says "this commission is usual." Is it usual for us to do this? I have got the impression that it is an unusual procedure for this island. I know it has been done outside the island. I would like to know if I am mistaken in my view. I would also like to know what is meant by applications bearing bankers' stamps. Is this a means of having bankers apply for something on behalf of their clients or on behalf of themselves? If this is an unusual procedure for us we are entitled to know something more about it before we pass this Resolution. As far as I can see these are not the expenses in connection with the raising of the entire loan which we need. It must be a certain amount of the loan which will be applied for in this manner. The whole thing is very vague. I want to know if it is absolutely essential to vote this money in order to raise this loan. As far as I remember it was said that the loan would be raised from time to time. I would like to get some idea of what portion of the loan Government plans to raise say, between now and the end of the financial year. If this is usual procedure I suppose we will have to support it. But I am told that this is not usual procedure in Barbados. We are merely copying something that others do when they want to raise money.

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable member is not as void of information as he would like us to believe. He knows all about it. I cannot state what sum is going to be raised immediately. I suppose anyone who can work out \$1,500 at one-eighth per cent can get an idea of the amount. If there is any change in the bank rate, however, we may find ourselves raising less than we told the House we are raising. Then honourable members will ask why we led them to believe that we are raising a hundred thousand dollars when we are only raising twenty-five thousand. There is nothing more I can tell the honourable member. Some applications will come through the banks. It is not customary in Barbados it is true, but the honourable member knows it is customary for banks to insist on the payment of this commission in other places. Some applications will not come through the banks, and there will be no payment of commission. It has been brought to the notice of the Government that the banks will be expecting this commission for any application made by their customers through them.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to tell the honourable senior member for St. Joseph that I have no information up my sleeve. I am trying to find out exactly what is the position. It was hinted to me that this is unusual procedure for Barbados as far as raising a loan is concerned. If the present condition of the Treasury is not such that the money is wanted before the end of the financial year. I am wondering whether the Government would postpone the actual raising of the loan. Is the financial position such that this loan cannot be postponed until early in the coming financial year, so that the money put into the Treasury can be used in schemes? I know that we have large amounts here that we have voted even today, and the

Government might need some money. But they can take stock of the Treasury and see whether the actual loan that is to pay for money advanced already is absolutely necessary now, or whether it can be left over until the beginning of the next financial year so that the money put into the Treasury can be used at the time when they are really setting out on the second phase of the Five Year Plan. That is what I would like to counsel the Government to do. It is no use putting money in the Treasury merely because you have decided to raise a loan, if you have enough money to meet your commitments. I am also throwing out the suggestion that there need be no secret about how much the Government intends to raise on this occasion.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman,—I take it that this is the normal procedure for applying for loans through banks. I do not know that the Government will find any difficulty in getting large loans through any of the commercial banks. I am concerned about the remarks of the honourable senior member for the City as to whether the Government need raise this money immediately. I also must appreciate that arrangements for the loan must go forward early, and the interest will hardly be paid until the Government has decided to draw this money. I would like the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to put my mind at ease. It is true that the commercial banks who operate savings departments keep the money in circulation by means of loans. Is it the intention of the Government to make these preliminary arrangements so that when they are ready for the money there will be no delay, or is it their intention to take the money from the bank in such quantities as they require from time to time, or will they take the total loan as soon as it is available? I would like to be enlightened as to the Government's intentions.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman,—There are three questions that I would like to ask. Is it possible for the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to tell me how much the Government will raise immediately? There is a limit of two million dollars. You do not need all that now. I do not know if it is possible for me to be told how much will be required in the near future. I would also like to know the rate of interest. It cannot exceed $4\frac{1}{2}\%$ per cent. I also want to know for how long a period will this loan be required.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,—I have never had the misfortune to deal with higher finances; but are we not breaking new ground in paying commission for the acquiring of a loan? I am told it is not usual practice for the Government to do this. I am told that you must advertise and there are always people who are willing to lend money. It does appear as if we are creating a precedent on this occasion. As I have said, I have never dealt with anything of this magnitude, financially speaking, and I would like to know what is the practice. If in the past the Government and the Parochial Bodies have been able to get loans without paying commission, why are we breaking new ground now?

Mr. ADAMS: The parochial authorities go to solicitors and the man who is lending the money has to pay the solicitors in the usual way. Some people go through banks. Barbados, I am told, is practically the only country that does not follow the procedure laid down in this Resolution. That is the information which I have. It is not expected that all this money will come through the banks. Some may come from individual people or through solicitors. I would say that it is normal practice to raise from time to time such sums as you are advised it will be useful to raise. For years we have been raising loans and issuing debentures. There has been no departure from estab-

lished practice. The only departure is this payment of commission. The Government has been advised that it is necessary to do so.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—At the risk of being considered ignorant I must say that I cannot understand the honourable member. What is the true position? Government is going to borrow money. If you are going to follow this procedure all that anyone with money to lend will have to do is to go and put it in the bank. I cannot understand it. I would like further explanation. I would suggest that we postpone the Resolution. It strikes me that Government itself is not sure about what it is doing. This is all right if you are going to raise money through the bank. What will be the position if private individuals want to lend you money? I plead guilty of ignorance. Maybe there is some other honourable member who can enlighten me. If the bank is going to do business it will not do it for nothing. If the Government has in mind solicitors' fees when a man has to go to a solicitor in connection with making a loan, all well and good. I would like the matter postponed. I have seen the Government borrow money from various people and you get cheques from those people. But this is something entirely different.

Mr. ADAMS: What is the difference between a bank and a solicitor as far as lending money or borrowing money is concerned? What is the difference between a bank commission and a solicitor's charge? I cannot give any more explanation. I would like the honourable junior member for St. James to say whether the point ever arose in his time; because the present Government has been advised that the necessity for paying this bank rate may arise, because a lot of lenders may come through banks. On the other hand some may come through solicitors.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman,—I cannot remember this ever happening in my time, and I have seen hundreds of thousands of pounds raised. We never did it like the other colonies. We advertised and people sent in applications. As a matter of fact you got more applications than you wanted money. I understand that the other colonies get money through the banks. When it is done that way the particular government does not deal with it at all. The banks do the underwriting and everything. But we have never done it that way. What I am afraid of is that these little habits are gradually being brought in to this colony as we bring in officials from other places. Perhaps the official who saw after this only knows one way—getting it through the banks. But as far as I am concerned it is new to me, and I really do not understand it. As the honourable senior member for the City said, the money in a bank belongs to individuals; not to the bank. If the bank has the equipment for underwriting in each case the client should pay; not the person who is borrowing. If they are accommodating their clients they will probably charge 6 per cent until the loan is paid back or the bank rate may be fixed at 5 per cent as the case may be. I really do not know this practice. If it is a case of a man in London wanting to take up a loan in Barbados it may be that the bank will have to come into the picture, and they may have to be paid for their services. But even in such a case I think that the client should pay.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to say that the House was made to understand since the discussion on the Five Year Plan that this loan would be raised locally. If the Government goes outside and raises a loan and this is part of the expenses I think that the Government has got to consider carefully if they have not misled the Legislature. What I want to say is that although a bank may negotiate for someone a solicitor will still have to be brought into it. If the practice

proposed in this Resolution is followed, it is obvious that the bank will tell its client, "we will look after that money for you so that we can get something out of it which you do not have to pay." Government may start off by paying this \$1,500 bank charge and then find that the business still has to be done through other services.

I would like to tell honourable members that I have been informed that this practice is followed in Trinidad and British Guiana. It is from that the latter colony that we have probably got the idea. But I do not think it will do the Government any harm if they do not borrow this money immediately. Nor do I think it will do them any harm to postpone consideration of this. Honourable members will be able to come back in a week's time with a better idea of what we are doing. It is obvious that this is something new. As soon as this is done the Government is going to find themselves paying 4½ per cent instead of 4¼ per cent on a vast amount of this loan.

Now, Sir, I am not averse to accepting a suggestion because it may come from a source with which I am not usually in agreement. I would like to warn the Government that if they do not need now the amount of money they intend to raise it would be better not to raise it immediately; because in the next two months the amount of money they are putting into the Treasury will come out as Revenue Equalisation Fund. We have passed a Bill saying so. I think it is a serious matter to consider.

Mr. ADAMS: In the first place let me remind honourable members that we are hiding nothing. They will soon know what the Government intends to raise because they will soon see the prospectus. They will know what amount of the two million we are now raising and the rate of interest. In the Five Year Plan, speaking of the intention to raise a loan of six million dollars, Government said: "It will not be necessary or expedient to raise at once the additional proposed loan expenditure approximating \$6,000,000. At this stage it appears that the new loan proposals could be financed during the next two years from Government funds and by short term borrowing; but it will be necessary to keep the cash position continually under review." Government is carrying out that proposal. If honourable members will do a simple bit of arithmetic they will see that we are not providing expenses to cover the raising of the entire loan. And the Government would be only too glad if all the old ladies who have money at home in their stockings would lend it to the Government because it would cost us nothing. But if the Government has got this advice what are they to do but follow it? The banks may never have to be brought into the picture. But if we get advice that if the commercial banks come into the picture we will have to pay this charge what are we to do but provide it? We hope we will not have to spend it; but we may have to.

Perhaps only half of the two million dollars may have to come through the banks. I myself have heard the opinion that the Government may find it difficult to raise money at the rate of 4½ per cent interest—even a government as financially sound as the Government of Barbados. We may get solicitors telling us that. Therefore we will have to go to the banks and ask them to raise this money for us. It is all right to criticise the Government. We realise our difficulties. We know that the Five Year Plan has more than got us on the spot. There is not a single cent that the Government will spend if it can save it. But if we get advice that you may find it difficult to raise this money except by employing the banks to raise a considerable portion of it, and that you will have to pay the banks so and so, what are we to do?

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: We all appreciate the explanation given by the honourable senior member

for St. Joseph; but surely he will agree that it is a little premature to come with this at this time. I will say that the advice the Government has got is premature. If you proclaim to the public and the banks that you are willing to pay this one-eighth of one per cent what do you expect but to get the honourable senior member for the City asking the bank to make an application for him. The Government has fallen into something that Barbados with its Scotch or Jewish shrewdness has hitherto avoided. In those days we did not have a Financial Secretary. This is what the lazy governments or lazy Government Officers will do. Let us not lose confidence in ourselves. I believe that we can raise a million dollars at $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent interest in the old way without going near Broad Street.

Of course the honourable member can bring down this Resolution and pass it on the strength of his party. But there is no House which will refuse to pass it if it is postponed and brought back and the honourable member comes back and tells us that they have tried to raise money otherwise and cannot. But I believe that a Barbados Security stands high in the opinion of local residents and residents of neighbouring islands. Those who are observant of world affairs will know that one will want to invest money in other countries, even in the Mother Country in the present financial position. I notice that there are millions of dollars belonging to residents here and abroad which could be attracted to this island as long as the interest is more than they would get in the Savings Banks.

I would suggest to the Government to advertise their loan as was done before. Do not mind lazy officials and play with banks.

Mr. MOTTLEY: This little talk has cleared the air because the Leader in his second speech sort of admitted what the true position is. Whatever our criticisms might be, we want this to be borne in mind: The honourable junior member for St. James has so clarified the position that I am sure that the Government understands the feeling of the Opposition in the matter. In other words, as I see it, this is not the custom of Barbados. But, says the Leader, he has been told that there is going to be great difficulty in raising an appreciable amount of money. I agree that there is a scarcity of money at present. But what I do not agree with is this one-eighth of one per cent in respect of a loan that is to be raised locally. I thought the honourable Leader of the House would have said that the provision was put in because there was the possibility of our not being able to raise it locally. What I see is that the three commercial banks in this town for some reason or other are going to underwrite this, and they will naturally let their clients have it. That is the first thing that they will obviously do. It seems that the Government is going straight to the banks before going to the public. If they are not, why come with this? The answer seems to be because they think they may have to go to the banks. I say they should wait until they have to go. Go to the people first, because as the honourable junior member for St. James said, a government security at $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent is better than $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent in the Savings Bank. The only reason why some people have money in the Government Savings Bank is because it has a government guarantee behind it.

Mr. ADAMS: If the honourable member would give way—I would like to say that I am prepared to move that Your Honour do now report progress, and I propose to start the Federation debate immediately after. I beg to move therefore, that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and report the passing of two Resolutions in Committee and the postponement of two.

Mr. Cox seconded.

The question was put and agreed to.

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

On separate motions of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Mr. Cox the two Resolutions passed in Committee were read a first and second time and agreed to.

DEBATE ON FEDERATION.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I am asking leave to take No. 1 as the next Order of the day; but I am not quite sure of the procedure. The Order reads, "consideration of the Interim Report," but now that the Final Report has been laid, I am suggesting that perhaps I should put the motion that there should be considered along with the Interim Report the Final Report, or alternatively that we confine our debate to the Interim Report and get it out of the way. Honourable members will remember that we have discussed the first Interim Report and on that we passed an Address to the Governor. Then there is the second Interim Report, discussion of which has not yet been completed. That is the one on the Order Paper. So perhaps we can deal with the second Interim Report and get it out of the way and then deal with the Final Report, or a motion can be made to deal with the Interim Report and the Final Report today. So, Sir, I am asking leave to take Order No. 1 as the next order and also to deal at the same time with the Final Report on West Indian Federation which was laid today.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no objection, leave will be granted the honourable member.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker,—I rise to object to leave being granted. I have been presented with the Final Report since I came here this afternoon. I have hardly had an opportunity to go through it, and I do not think that other honourable members have had such an opportunity. Now we are asked to discuss it. This is a very important matter. Certainly we should have been given an opportunity to study it if even only for a couple of days.

Mr. ADAMS: If the honourable member will give way—I will explain that in some respects the Final Report of the committee brings in some things mentioned in the Interim Report. If we discuss the Interim Report alone, what happened on previous occasions will happen again — honourable members will bring in things which do not appear in that Report. I was not proposing that we should finish the discussion tonight. I agree that it is a matter of the utmost importance. But certain honourable members may be prepared to make their contribution to the debate tonight, and then we can adjourn at some stage in the debate. I must point out to the House that the Colonial Office has waited a whole year on Barbados.

The question that the House do also consider the Final Report presented today, along with Order No. 1, was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. SMITH, MILLER, MAPP, LEWIS, TALMA, HOLDER, BRYAN, F. L. WALCOTT, ADAMS, COX and BRANCKER,—(11)

Noes: Messrs. CRAWFORD, J. C. MOTTLEY, ALLDER, E. K. WALCOTT, GODDARD, and E. D. MOTTLEY. (6).

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph—to move the consideration of the second Interim Report of the Select Committee on the subject of British West Indian Federation.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I am asking the leave of the House to allow the honourable senior member for St. Peter to take care of this Order which stands in my name. I am unable to be in the House

for a little time now, and I will make my speech at the end.

There being no objection leave was granted.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—I regard this Report of the Select Committee as being very vital. As far as the views of the Barbados House of Assembly are concerned, I do not not have the same misgivings as some other honourable members. It is the Report of the British West Indian Standing Closer Association Committee which will be the basis of any discussion that we might have in this Assembly and not only the Reports of the Select Committee.

It is true that outside of this island Barbados has been regarded as one of the stumbling blocks in the road of West Indian Federation. Unfortunately, when the last debate on an interim Report occurred I was out of the island. I want to say at the outset that I am pro-federation. I feel that so far as West Indian nationalism is concerned, our only hope is in a federal structure—a unification of these scattered British Caribbean Colonies. I believe in West Indian Federation from that point of view because I want to throw off the shackles of colonialism. I do not feel that the future generations of these islands should be regarded as colonials all through their lives, but that we should begin to carve out a structure for ourselves and build a nationhood that we can be proud of. I say all that as a preamble, because some of the things that I will say later may give the impression that I have some misgivings about Federation itself. What worries me is that some of the same members who have been persistently discussing the question of federation do not want to discuss the written report and what has been signed by the delegates who attended the conference. There must be a basis for discussion.

I will begin by saying at the outset that I do not agree with many of the recommendations of the Rance Report. If I use a phrase that has already been used, I will say that the Rance Report would make the federal structure a glorified crown colony set-up. There is another aspect. The Barbados Legislature has been consulted, and its attitude has been conspicuous by lukewarmness. The Rance Report was made in 1948 or 1949. There is not a member of this Chamber who can say that he has not read the Report so that he cannot base his views and come to a decision one way or the other. This House has expressed the view that there should be a conference before the London Conference. I agree because I do not like a conference taking you out of your native atmosphere and carrying you into a sort of atmosphere where you may make decisions that you see when you return to your atmosphere that you should not have made. But how can we expect the Secretary of State for the Colonies to take us seriously on the question of federation when the House of Assembly postpones it and makes interim reports and the Other Place would not discuss it at all? The other territories have made up their minds one way or the other. British Honduras and British Guiana have said they will not come in, and the others have said they will come in. They accept the principle of the Report; they have stated their views; and they are ready to proceed. No decision by the Barbados Legislature can carry any weight as far as dictating policy or the venue of this conference is concerned because the attitude of the Barbados Legislature has been lukewarm where the question of federation is concerned.

We have said that we agree with the principle outlined in this Report. But when we go through this Report in detail there are certain disadvantages

that we can foresee. As I said earlier, I do not like any glorified crown colony system because here in our local affairs we are attempting to evolve a form of government which will give us more power in internal matters, and I for that reason agree to having a superstructure that is weaker in itself than the very foundation which we are trying to build up in our own single territories. Therefore I do not agree with the structure and the powers that have been given to the proposed federal government. I feel that in the West Indies we have sufficient men of ability to run a West Indian Government. I maintain that we are not inferior to the people of Australia, New Zealand or any of the other territories that are running their own affairs.

I do not want us to postpone this question. This was one of the burning questions in this island. It was one of Labour's planks for the future of these colonies, that we could look forward to the day when we could speak and act on a federal basis. I believe that a Federal Parliament will give us that nationhood that is so essential to our future progress. As I have said, we are not inferior to any other people, and I can see no reason why the members of this Assembly should not be able to make up their minds one way or the other. I believe in federation. But I regard federation as a marriage. You take a chance when you take a wife, because you do not know if a storm will break or if you will be blessed with a calm. But you do not marry for the sake of marrying. You marry because you feel that a union has been made and you want to stabilise it; and even if the storms break, you will have someone on whom you can rest your head when you are being buffeted by the winds.

As one who is a deep believer in West Indian unity, I do not believe that we should go into federation merely for the sake of federation. We should be willing to discuss the problems and remove some of the barriers, and the obvious dangers, or it will be worse for us and for future generations. I have gone to conferences with other West Indians, and I have been moving around the West Indies fairly frequently in recent times. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that today, after six years of discussing federation and meeting other West Indians, I must say frankly that with all that I have said before I am not as enthusiastic about federation as I was six years ago. I say that because some stark realities have presented themselves to me.

I do not want to be insular or to give the impression that Barbados thinks so much of itself that it feels that the other colonies do not matter. I would not like to give that impression. But I must emphasise that if we are to federate now, we must enter federation with a measure of equality and a measure of give and take and a sense of deep unity in all these territories. Some of the territories have expressed themselves. I have nothing against individual territories. Barbados is a small unit in the Caribbean area and it has been running its own affairs and balancing its budget for 300 years. We cannot boast of many natural resources. Our only resource is sugar. We do not pretend that we have vast economic potentialities in the sense of natural resources, but we must realise that our slender financial position is one which we have to watch carefully when we are considering entering federation.

At this stage, Mr. Speaker, I move that this House do now adjourn for three quarters of an hour.
Dr. CUMMINS seconded.

The question was put and agreed to and His Honour the Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.

CONSIDERATION OF ORDER POSTPONED

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to postpone the consideration of the Second Interim Report of the Select Committee on the subject of British West Indian Federation in order to deal with the Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

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

ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that the honourable senior member for St. Thomas be appointed as Chairman of Committees during the absence of the Chairman of Committees.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to take Order No. 10 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 is to resume Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Colony.

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

EXPENSES *re* RAISING OF LOAN

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—In connection with the Resolution for \$1,500 in respect of the raising of a loan, I am sorry I have to proceed with the consideration of it in the absence of the honourable senior member for the City who thought it would have been postponed until next week. The prospectus appealing to the public will soon be ready and therefore it is essential that we get this Resolution through to-night. It is regrettable that the addendum to the Resolution is worded as it is. We are appealing to the public of Barbados to subscribe to this loan; we are not going outside the colony; we would only do so if we were compelled to do so. As the honourable member has pointed out, local people are interested in lending money at 4½% or 5% interest. I cannot add anything more to what I have already said and I suggest that the question be now put. I am sorry that the honourable senior member for the City is not here, but I had intended to come back to this Resolution to-night.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY VOTES *re* CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

Mr. ADAMS: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is one to place the sum of \$194,158 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1952—53, Part II, Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1952—53, No. 34, which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

The Heads of the Schedule are; Public Buildings, including Schools and Markets; Housing, including roads; Water Supplies and Miscellaneous items. These are Supplementary Estimates and the reasons for them are set out in the notes. If hon-

ourable members need further explanations than what are supplied in the notes I will be able to give them. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. TALMA: Under the Head "Schools", I see that item 7 is "Purchase of land adjoining Christ Church Girls' School." I am glad to see that the Government has seen fit to purchase this quarter of an acre of land abutting this School: that step has long been desirable for the purpose of providing ample space for the children of this School. It is not only the Christ Church Girls' School which needs facilities but also the St. Bartholomew's School where a similar condition exists. Fortunately for the authorities, there is abutting this School ½ acre of land which was for sale for some time now, and I would be very pleased if the honourable senior member for St. Joseph would make a note of that. Similarly at St. Matthias Boys' School; I am glad to see that attention is being paid to the playing field facilities at these schools.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: I am dealing with the electrical installations at Seawell Airport. I speak under correction, but I think that this is about the third time within the past year that we have had to vote money for electrical installations at the Airport. On the last occasion the figure was \$5,000 or something like that. I want to counsel the Government that when these large sums of money are voted under various Heads, they should go very carefully into the expenditure, because I see that somebody is trying to take advantage of the generosity of this Government. Since I have been a member of this House a plenty of money has been spent at Seawell Airport and I hope that the Government will take careful note of this recurrent expenditure at Seawell. I know that the Airport is of vital importance to the well being of this island, but I want to counsel the Government that we can still go too far. I hope that the Government will make a careful scrutiny into these matters at all times. I want to draw to the attention of the Government that there is a great demand for electricity on the straight road from the Crane to Seawell Airport; I think it is time—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is wandering a bit. This Head of the Schedule deals with special electrical installations at the Airport; We are not now discussing the supply of electricity as a whole.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for enlightening me as to the procedure, but I think I should still draw to the attention of the Government that something should be done in this matter. At Six Roads much apparatus is lying idle and it could be used to assist in the matter.

Mr. ADAMS: I appreciate the spirit lying behind the honourable member's words as far as he points out the necessity for being careful about this expenditure, but as it appears here in the note, certain of these items were not foreseen, and it is for that reason that the Government thinks that this expenditure is reasonable. If the honourable member feels that we have to watch the Electric Company, I could not agree with him more. I want to assure honourable members that this Government has gone as far as it intended to go towards lessening the cost of electricity in bringing forward the Public Utilities Bill because the whole public is suffering from the action of the Electric Company. I think it is only fair to say in respect of both the Seawell Airport Committee and the Public Works Department which carried out the additions at Seawell, that everybody who has seen airports in this area speaks most highly

of the work which has been done at Seawell. I believe that the island of Barbados can pride itself in the fact that what has been done at Seawell—the improved facilities as far as the runway itself is concerned and the extension work up there—is a good job. I give the assurance that, in view of the criticism which has been made here and in view of the misfortune which befell us in respect of the original work in the extension of the runway, the Government is taking particular care about anything which comes down in connection with Seawell: we are watching it with eagle's eyes. Even the Hospital is voted out in respect of the critical watch which we used to give it as compared with Seawell; we are not ignoring the Hospital, but that does not give us the same worry as we have with Seawell.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS in each case, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

BARBADOS TURF CLUB (IMPOSITION OF DUTY) (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1953

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to take Order No. 13 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. Joseph:—To move the second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to amend the Barbados Turf Club (Imposition of Duty) Act, 1941.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—In keeping with our policy of getting revenue under the Five Year Plan we are introducing bit by bit taxation proposals which are affecting one honourable member of this House rather closely. I do not say it pharisaically, but I have never attempted to buy any Pari Mutuel tickets. The object of this Bill is to increase and extend the duties imposed on Sweepstakes and lotteries run by the Barbados Turf Club. We propose to amend Clause 2 of the Principal Act, which sets out the amount of duties to be raised on Barbados Turf Club tickets; we propose to raise the duty to three cents in respect of every ticket the price of which is 24 cents or less, 6 cents in respect of every ticket except Pari Mutuel and Forecast Tickets, the price of which exceeds 24 cents. Before we drafted this Bill, certain two shilling tickets had already been sold and we cannot impose the duty on the remaining tickets. The Pari Mutuel and Forecast Tickets will still be taxed; the two shilling tickets will not be taxed this March, but the other tickets will be taxed this year because they have not been sold. It would be wrong to try and devise a method whereby you let off some people who have already bought tickets and try to collect the duty from the sellers; it was impracticable to collect the duty on the two shilling tickets for March but we can collect it on the others. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

The three Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

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

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

ADDRESS RE BRITISH WEST INDIAN FEDERATION

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to move the passing of an Address to the Acting Governor on the question of British West Indian Federation. I do not think that honourable members should have any objection to dealing with the reply to His Excellency's Message on this subject now because the Secretary of State for the Colonies should know that we desire that Barbados should be represented at the proposed Conference in London. It might be difficult for us to finish our debate on the proposals tonight if we begin it, but there is no harm in letting the Secretary of State for the Colonies know that whatever we decide, we are still coming to England. We have approved of the principle of Federation and we would be justified in accepting an invitation. I therefore ask leave to move the passing of an Address in reply to the Acting Governor's Message No. 2/1953 on the subject of British West Indian Federation.

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

Mr. ADAMS: This is a very short Address in reply to the Acting Governor's Message. His Excellency's Message reads as follows:—

MESSAGE NO. 2/1953

*His Excellency the Acting Governor
to*

The Honourable the House of Assembly

His Excellency the Acting Governor has the honour to refer to his Message No. 35/1952 of the 17th of November, enquiring whether it was the wish of the Honourable the House of Assembly that Barbados should participate in a proposed Conference on West Indian Federation to be held in London in March or April this year, and to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that he has received the following communication from the Secretary of State for the Colonies:—

"It was announced on 14th November that a Conference on West Indian Federation would be held in London in March or April. It has now been arranged that the Conference shall open on Monday 13th, April, 1953."

In the announcement on 14th November it was stated that the Governments of Jamaica, Trinidad, the Windward Islands and the Leeward Islands (with the exception of the Virgin Islands) have been invited to send delegates to the Conference. An invitation to participate in the Conference had also been sent to the Government of Barbados where the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly are still considering the Federation proposal put forward in the Report of the Standing Closer Association Committee. The Legislature of British Guiana has rejected the proposal for Federation of the British West Indies and British Honduras has deferred indefinitely any further consideration of the proposal."

2. His Excellency would be grateful to learn at as early a date as possible whether it is the wish of the Honourable House of Assembly that Barbados should be represented at the proposed Conference.

R. N. TURNER,
Acting Governor.

Government House,
Bridgetown,
12th January, 1953.

We are merely saying in reply to the Acting Governor's Message that we desire that Barbados should be represented at the Conference. The proposed Reply reads as follows:—

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

The House of Assembly has the honour to acknowledge receipt of Your Excellency's Message No. 2 of 1953 on the subject of the proposed Conference in London on West Indian Federation and states that it is the desire of the House that Barbados should be represented at the Conference.

I beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. MAPP: When the honourable junior member for St. Peter was speaking earlier tonight he referred to the fact that in a previous Address this House had asked that the opinion of other Legislatures be sought as to the holding of a Conference in the West Indies before the proposed Conference in London, and I am wondering if the honourable Leader of the House can give us any information as to whether that has been done. I feel that the House should have been told about the suggestion contained in that Address, otherwise it would be tantamount to ignoring our express wishes in a very important matter such as this is. I see either from a Jamaica or Trinidad newspaper that the honourable Leader of the House recently agreed that there should be some previous Conference held in the West Indies. I have always felt that it would be far better for the West Indian representatives, at least those with progressive and Socialist views, to go to London knowing what they want and agreeing on what they should put forward there, rather than go there with different ideas on this very important subject. I am hoping that the express wish of this House has not been ignored but that it has been conveyed to other Governments and Legislatures in this region. If other Legislatures are not so minded, I do not think we can blame ourselves or anyone in authority in this island for that; I am hoping that the honourable Leader of the House will give us a little information as to whether the suggestion contained in that Address has been acted upon in the proper quarter or not.

Mr. ADAMS: I entirely agree with the hon. member as to the necessity or advisability of having a prior Conference. I say this not by way of a threat and I have to be very careful as to what I say in respect of our sister Colonies, but I think it is a howling mistake to go to London first, except to discuss the financial provisions. To a great extent we have to sit down and listen to what the United Kingdom Government says about helping us with finance; it is a waste of time our saying that we want three million pounds or three hundred million pounds. If we are differing fundamentally on some of the proposals in the Rance Report, it is stupid to go to London first and expect that those differences will be hammered out. I cannot see any West Indian colony giving plenipotentiary powers to any delegate, and where we insist that the Reserve Powers should be limited I cannot see that matter being

hammered out in London; we will have to go back to our Legislatures and get their approval and we cannot get that approval without any meeting in the West Indies. The trip to London will serve some useful purpose, but it will not hasten Federation if we have outstanding differences, on the side of Barbados, at any rate.

I can quite agree with the postponement of the Federation debate to-night because hon. members have to take a serious decision as to the position of Barbados; we want to see Federation come about, but we do not want to come down the scale as regards Constitutional development. I presume that our Message was sent to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, because when I was there some time ago the British Honduras and the British Guiana representatives were invited and we were asked about meeting in London or the West Indies first. As I was leaving before other representatives, an appointment was arranged for me before the normal time for appointment, and I stressed strongly the Barbados point of view about having a Conference in the West Indies first. I do not think I was speaking to an unwilling listener, but he had to consider the views of the majority whom he was to meet a few days later. It seems to me that the others wanted a London Conference and he has decided to have the London Conference. That is the position. If out of six people five say: "Let us go to London first", he would be a pretty rash man who would not give way to the five people. All the other representatives of West Indian Colonies wanted to have a London Conference first; I hope that will cover the hon. member's question.

Mr. MILLER: I expressed my feelings very strongly in agreement that it was not only necessary, but very important, that these Federation talks should start with a Conference in the West Indies. Most of the work on Closer Union and Federation has been done by Conference, which I do not know was representative, in the area. It was important, and it is still very important, to have some understanding by way of a Conference of the various elected members in the area. To think in terms of Federation is something tremendous and I think they are just playing with it. Here and there you hear that the British Government is not concerned about the matter, that there must be a decision of the people in the area and then you have to hear from London whether you want to federate or not; and sometimes you are told that Barbados is the stumbling block in the way of Federation in spite of the fact that we are told that British Guiana is not interested in the scheme. You may send representatives of the Colonies to London and you may have differences of opinion in all the colonies; very often in conference you find that there are nominated members and a lot of gentlemen who are more or less selected but who have no regard for the people. I think we are making a great mistake in going to London to have this Conference; I do not think the elected representatives of the people have had any opportunity of getting together in Conference in the West Indies, whereas the original idea was that it was necessary to have a Conference in the West Indies first. Whatever the ancient colonial system has been, you have to wring something out for yourself; that has always been the case.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member speaking on this Address?

Mr. MILLER: I am speaking on the Address. Several of the elected representatives of the people want to have a Conference in the West Indies. If you go to England and have a discussion on Federation, that is all right; but you should not go to

England for a final discussion on Federation before you have a conference in the West Indies. I regret that five out of six people should want to go to England for a Conference without prior discussion in the West Indies. Let us examine the seriousness of what is taking place; I see nothing wrong in bringing together all the elected representatives in the area to discuss this matter at length and hammer out all the details before going to London; people may be thinking of the formation of a nation, but thousands and millions of people have suffered in the formation of a nation. If there are 2½ million people involved and there is a question of only 200 people deciding anything, in that case democracy would be a farce. You will go to London and whenever you are finished the matter will be in the hands of the Other Place. I am asking the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to see that we have a Conference in the West Indies first; you can have the Conference wherever you like—in Barbados or anywhere else in the area. If you go to England, all the talk will go on behind closed doors and we will be down the drain.

Mr. TALMA: In all matters of this sort, the moot point is from what source will this Federal Government be financed? If the question of finance is discussed in London and you say that it will not serve any useful purpose in going to London, I do not subscribe to that view entirely. This matter of Federation has been spoken of for the last 25 or 30 years, but the whole question is; who is going to pay the bill? This is a question of economics; getting a Federal Assembly and having opportunities for a Federal Government is all very well and good, but financing the Federation is the main point. If you are going to London to decide the question of finance, the biggest issue will be decided; we will not get the economic side of the matter arranged by sitting in the West Indies; there will be a lot of hot air which will end in mid air. If we want to do anything constructive, let us have the Conference in London; that will not prevent a Conference being held in the West Indies, but let us have the financial matters settled first. We want to give West Indian Leaders and Parliamentarians a better idea of what Federation means; we have great men in the Colonies, but we do not know all about Federation. If a Conference is scheduled to be held in England, my view is that we should send the very best member from our local Chamber and let Barbados be properly represented in every political sphere.

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

Mr. ADAMS: As Your Honour pleases.

ADDRESS *RE* REPAIRS TO MOBILE CINEMA UNIT

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to deal with a similar Reply. Last month Message No. 36/1952, from His Excellency the Acting Governor was presented to this House in connection with repairs to the Mobile Cinema Unit. That Message reads as follows:—
MESSAGE NO. 36/1952

His Excellency the Acting Governor

To

The Honourable the House of Assembly

His Excellency the Acting Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of

Assembly that a Board of Survey has inspected the Mobile Cinema Unit with a view to determining whether or not a new one is necessary and has recommended that the Unit should not be considered unserviceable but that certain repairs and replacements be undertaken. The estimated cost is approximately \$2,200; and, if such repairs are done, it will not be necessary to purchase a new unit for which the sum of \$12,000 was provided under Head XX, Item 67, of the Estimates, 1952-53.

2. It is proposed to expend the sum required to render the existing Unit serviceable from the funds provided for the purchase of a new Unit, unless the Legislature indicates that this course is not acceptable.

R. N. TURNER,

Acting Governor.

Government House,

Bridgetown.

12th December, 1952.

The proposed Reply is to say whether the House agrees with the proposal to repair the present Mobile Cinema Unit or not.

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

Mr. ADAMS: The proposed Reply reads as follows:—

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency the Acting Governor

The House of Assembly has the honour to acknowledge receipt of Your Excellency's Message No. 36 of 1952 and states that it is in agreement with the proposals contained in the said Message for the repair of the Mobile Cinema Unit.

I am asking honourable members to agree to the passing of that Address in reply to the Acting Governor's Message. I beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. ADAMS: As Your Honour pleases.

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL, 1953

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to take Order No. 9 as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph:— To move the second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to continue various expiring laws.

Mr. ADAMS: Hon. members will remember that last year we passed an Expiring Laws Continuance Bill putting in the Schedule certain Acts which we normally pass every year as soon as the Estimates are over. The Government is making investigations as to whether some of these Acts should not be made permanent; it does not seem that there is the necessity for making them annual Acts. As regards the riding on bicycle bars, there was a compromise and we tried it out for a year; however, the Act was put under the Expiring Laws Continuance Act and it continued year by year. We might make up our minds once and for all about that; there is nothing in the Act which says that you may ride somebody

on the bar of a bicycle. In view of the fact that in some suspicious minds there is a feeling that the Government, at a certain time of the night, seems to want to railroad Bills through the House, I want to point out that it is present to the minds of the Government that the Exports and Imports (Restriction) Act did form the subject of adverse criticism in another place, but the Government is absolutely determined that the time has not yet arrived when we can take off controls despite what has been done in other countries. (Cheers). It is hypocritical to pretend — I say it without any reflection on other countries—that if you take off controls, prices will drop; that is contrary to human experience. Prices fall when the market is flooded with perishable goods. These expiring laws should be continued for a further year. 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.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. Cox, the Preamble was postponed.

The three Clauses of the Bill and the Schedule were called and passed.

The Preamble was called and agreed to.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE INCOME TAX (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS, 1953

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to take Order No. 8 as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph:— To move the passing of the following Resolution:— Resolution to sanction the Regulations entitled the Income Tax (Amendment) Regulations, 1953.

Mr. ADAMS: This Resolution seeks to sanction an amendment to Regulation 11 of the Income Tax Regulations, 1942, by adding at the end thereof the following proviso:—

“Provided that, notwithstanding the provisions of this regulation, where any person dies after the date of the notice of assessment but before the tax payable becomes due the tax shall be payable on the expiration of six months from the date of the death.”

There is a Regulation now dealing with the period of time in which you must pay the income tax of a person who has died but who has not paid his income tax. There is a special case in which the relative of a deceased person did not have funds to pay the income tax of the deceased within the proper time, and, according to the law, the interest on the amount of the payment went up. The relative or executor was quite willing to pay, but he could not handle the money and he had to pay interest on the amount of the payment. It is proposed to ease that

hardship by allowing for payment an additional six months of the date on which the money is due. An executor may not always be able to handle money within the period when the income tax is due and in such a case he is allowed six months within which to pay the income tax without interest. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. MILLER: I am asking a question as to the collection of income tax and I would like to get a reply. Since you can collect this taxation by law is it fair and democratic—

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member speaking on this Resolution?

Mr. MILLER: I am wondering if it is democratic to make this surcharge of 5%; if you fail to pay the tax, the tax is collected. If you collect \$4 more from me and \$54 from my rich friend, that is all right; I do not think it is democratic to make this surcharge of 5% when you can collect the tax through the Court. I do not think the imposition of this 5% surcharge is the correct thing to be done; you collect the normal bill and all the collection charges. A lot of the members of this House do not pay any income tax.

Mr. MAPP: I object to that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the honourable member is in order to make such a reference to honourable members.

Mr. MILLER: It is not my intention to hurt the feelings of anybody who has been forced by law to pay his taxation.

Mr. MAPP: I think the honourable member should be asked to withdraw both of those remarks. They are a reflection on this House.

Mr. MILLER: I do not think there is anything I said which would affect honourable members.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the honourable members to withdraw those remarks.

Mr. MILLER: Which of the remarks do you want me to withdraw?

Mr. SPEAKER: The remark that honourable members do not pay their taxation.

Mr. MILLER: I withdraw that remark with ease; I withdraw what I regard as a generalization. I was not referring to any particular honourable member.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is wasting the time of the House.

Mr. MILLER: If you want me to sit with pressure I will sit; but I have a right to speak in this Chamber and I would like to exercise that authority and privilege. You may decide that I should not speak, but if you permit me to refer to the remarks of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, I will do so. The question has always arisen with me as to if it is altogether fair to make this surcharge; I do not say that there is no precedent for it but one will have to say that it is irregular. I would like the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to tell me whether or not it is fair, Christian and democratic to make a surcharge of 5% in respect of this tax and then collect both.

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable member is attacking an Act of this colony without moving for its repeal.

Mr. MILLER: I thought the honourable member was rising to some point of order.

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable member rose to give some assistance.

Mr. MILLER: I thought the honourable member would have explained if it is consistent with democracy to make this 5% surcharge.

Mr. ADAMS: Any law passed in the constitutional way by a democratic Assembly is democratic. This surcharge is obviously an incentive to make a man pay his income tax. Some people still pay the 5% surcharge because sometimes the alternative is to borrow the money at 6%.

Mr. BARROW: No honourable member has the intention of repealing the existing legislation. To come back to the main point before the House, I will say that two swallows do not make a summer and because one executor's funds may be tied up in the United Kingdom or in any other country, I do not think that that is sufficient justification for amending these Regulations. I really cannot think of an instance, apart from the one which has been mentioned on the floor of the House today, in which a person who is the legal personal representative of the estate of a deceased person, could not have access to the funds of that deceased person. If the legal personal representative of a deceased person does not have access to the funds of the deceased, I would like to know who has access to the funds of the deceased. The honourable member on my left (Mr. Talma) should be well aware of the fact that there is no legal personal representative unless the Will is proved. I am not against the amendment to the Regulation, but I do not see the necessity for it. Until such time as somebody takes out Letters of Administration to the estate or the Executor qualifies or the Will is admitted to probate, there is no legal personal representative of the deceased person; but when there is a legal personal representative, if he does not have access to the funds of the deceased person, I would like to know who has such access. If the funds are tied up or involved in overseas securities or something of that sort, the legal personal representative would have full power to raise income tax, death duties or whatever liabilities have been incurred against the estate of the deceased person. Because one person may have had a little difficulty in getting funds because somebody has a prior lien on the estate and refuses to release it—it may happen that a bank may have a prior lien on the estate of a deceased person and because of some obligation it refuses to release it—that does not preclude the legal personal representative of the deceased from raising the money in whatever way he can in order to pay the liabilities of the estate. It may sound like a legal quibble, but what I am saying is this; I do not see how a legal personal representative cannot have access to the funds of the deceased person. All the property of the deceased person is vested in the legal personal representative, so how is it that he cannot have access to the property? The legal personal representative would have to call for claims and pay them.

If Regulation II of these Regulations has been like this for all these years, I do not think it should be changed because one person tried to tie up an estate. It has just occurred to me that the way in which the amendment is phrased constitutes an anomaly; it may be that the legal personal representative has no ready cash, but the Government should not take a case like that and alter the whole law. If people have six months in which to pay the tax—six months after the normal period for payment—that means six months less interest at 5% which would have accrued to the Government. In normal circumstances the Government would collect that 5% interest. A Regulation like this would more apply to a big estate than a small one. I see no objection to the amendment but I think that before we go making Regulations like these we should consider whether the Government does not stand to lose by taking an exceptional case, and widening the possibility of

Government revenue suffering as a result of what *prima facie* is an innocuous Clause, but which may eventually turn out to be something which may cause the Government a few thousand dollars a year because of the further period of six months which we allow for the payment of the tax without the 5% interest.

Mr. TALMA: Unlike the honourable member who has just sat down, I can well see the necessity for having this proviso in this Regulation. The proviso reads as follows:—

“Provided that, notwithstanding the provisions of this regulation, where any person dies after the date of the notice of assessment but before the tax payable becomes due the tax shall be payable on the expiration of six months from the date of the death.”

That means that if any one dies after he has received notice of assessment, his personal representative

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. I have not referred to any particular personal representative.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member used the term in a general way.

Mr. TALMA: There is no personal representative under a Will; there is an executor. After a person dies his Will has to be proved so that someone can qualify to be administrator of the estate. The person who is named as executor has to find money to pay the death duties, and it might also be a question of finding money to pay the income tax of the deceased person and there might be difficulties in finding the money. It is only when the money is available for paying the death duties that the person assumes the status of a personal representative. This normal relief of six months with payment free of interest is a small thing; I think the position should have been like that all along. I do not think that this Regulation as amended goes far enough more especially in view of the fact that by law one is given a year in which to administer an estate. I see no harm whatever in amending this Regulation; I regard it as granting some measure of relief because the personal representative to be may not have money with which to become qualified. Far from being unable to pay the income tax, a person would pay the death duties so as to become the personal representative of the deceased.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT ORDER

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I am now asking leave to take No. 11 as the next Order of the day, after which I shall ask leave to take Order No. 12.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member to proceed with Order No. 11.

On the order being called for Mr. ADAMS to move the passing of the following Resolution:—

Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1953.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I do not think that this is a controversial matter. Previous Houses have for some years been in agreement with the idea that the Office of Solicitor General should be wholetime, and the proposal under this Resolution is to change the Civil Establishment Order affecting this post in order to make it a wholetime one. The Resolution removes the post from the schedule of part time offices. I move, Sir, that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker,—It was I think, session before the last that there was an Address standing in my name on the Order Paper proposing

that the Office of Solicitor General should be a whole-time one. But I do not think that I should let the opportunity pass without reminding our representatives on the Executive to remind the Government and the Head of the Administration that when offices are being filled in this country we in this Chamber want preference to be given to suitable West Indians, and if possible to suitable Barbadians. We are in this position that the average imported official who started off in the Service as a magistrate in Africa, when he comes out here his ability is so limited, that a defence counsel has no trouble with him when he meets him in Her Majesty's Court.

I welcome this proposed change, and I agree with it, as the honourable senior member for Christ Church would say, "*in toto*." With the present set-up have we got enough work for a whole time Solicitor General? I understand that there is someone who would be very worried if he did not succeed in getting this post. But with a wholetime Attorney General, a wholetime Assistant to the Attorney General and a wholetime Legal Draftsman, one hopes that there will be a full day's work for a Solicitor General to put in. A square day's work for a square day's pay. I am not one who thinks that the Heads of Departments or imported officials should sit and relax while the man at the bottom is bearing the heat of the midday sun. I hope there will be enough for a wholetime Solicitor General to do, and I hope we will get a West Indian and preferably a Barbadian in the post.

As you know, Sir, the Crown is not supposed to be interested in the result of any criminal litigation. They just put their case before the Court and as ministers of justice are satisfied with the result of the jury's verdict. If it happens that the new wholetime Solicitor General is not of the brightest that is not anyone's concern, and we do not have to be worried about that. I give my blessing to this Resolution because I feel that an officer advising the Government should not have any other masters or mistresses. But it is, I think, a bit unusual in a colony of the size of this one to have all these wholetime officers that I have mentioned. However, if it is felt that there is enough work for four wholetime officers I entirely commend the principle of having a wholetime Solicitor General.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker,—I rise to commend the Government on the action which it has taken on this very important issue which has been lying dormant from time immemorial. It is only a Labour Government such as this which would have taken this step and removed an anomaly which existed in this colony only among all the colonies of the Caribbean area. This is an anomaly which existed side by side with many other anomalies which this island had at one time. This is a means whereby anyone vested with the power of Solicitor General and playing that role actually found himself acting in a dual capacity; and in most cases the two interests conflicted. It was a conflict between his duty as Solicitor General and his own private fee. If there is anything else that the Labour Government has done for which it should be commended, it is this. It is something that was long overdue.

It is said that certain parties are not interested in retaining the post; but many parties would be interested in retaining the old status quo which allowed abuses to be practised at every turn. With the old set up many abuses of power were possible although the average standard of intelligence of the Barbadian is supposed to be fairly high. But the average lawyer's clients in the Police Courts are far from being properly educated. And you found an

officer in the role of Solicitor General in the Police Courts and the Assizes, and in a private capacity on another occasion. It was not only a question of public duty and private interest connecting; it was a scandal. I am not a lawyer, but I happen to be sufficiently associated with the law to be sure of my facts. And what is more, Sir, only a certain type of individual could play such a role. You must possess certain peculiar requirements of knowing how to manoeuvre and things of that sort. If you look at the history of that post for the last 20 years, not to go further back, you will see that the post being a double role was only occupied by stooges, and stooges in the strict sense of the word. It did not necessarily call for brilliance or knowledge or exceptional ability as a barrister. Those are the requirements for the post in the U.K. and in other Caribbean colonies. I am not saying that it is the reverse entirely here, with reference to the present holder of the post. I am not referring to him at all. But any honourable member can cast his memory back to a former holder of the post both in name and nature. When you think of the arrears of work, the lack of opinion, and the hundreds of opinions lying undone one can readily understand the point I made that the post did not necessarily call for brilliance or knowledge of the law.

So it is a question, Sir, of our now putting an end to a practice by doing which Barbados in my view will breathe a little healthier air, and justice will not only be done, but will appear to be done as from the time that a permanent Solicitor General is appointed.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker,—I have no intention of holding a *post mortem* examination over the post that is now about to be interred, a ceremony which should have taken place a long time ago. It is to the future that I am looking forward when I say I hope the Government will not perpetuate the practice which has gone on in the past in this colony, of shifting people automatically up into posts to which they may be unsuited, or what is far worse—because at least you will have some knowledge of the capabilities of the people shifted—what is far worse bringing in people from outside to occupy these high legal posts who may eventually to their own surprise find themselves sitting as Lord Chief Justice of Barbados through a combination of circumstances. Therefore, I hope that when the appointment of a permanent Solicitor General is made the Government will see to it that consideration is given to Barbadians and West Indians outside this colony and that proper publicity is given to the vacancy which will arise as a result of this debate here to-night. I hope as I have said that proper consideration will be given to Barbadians and West Indians outside the colony who have shown promise in the legal field. Nothing could be more deplorable than to encourage the people responsible for these appointments, whether it is the Colonial Legal Service or not, to do otherwise. We must tell them that we in Barbados do not favour the practice of shifting people up who may be totally unsuited for the particular job into which they are put. I would like the Government to be aware of that, and to see that the strongest representations are made that this automatic musical chairs game of making legal appointments locally should not be the inevitable rule when such appointments are to be made.

Question that the Resolution do now pass was put and agreed to.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE CIVIL
ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL)
(AMENDMENT) ORDER

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I am now asking leave to take Order No. 12 as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection leave was granted.

On the Order being called for Mr. Adams to move the passing of the following Resolution:—

Resolved that the House of Assembly approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1953, made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the seventeenth day of January, 1953, under the provisions of section 3 of the Civil Establishment Act, 1949, and that the Legislative Council be invited to concur herein and, if concurred in,

Resolved that His Excellency the Governor be asked to assent and take the necessary steps to give effect to this resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—The purpose of this Resolution is the insertion of the post of Solicitor General in the schedule of whole-time posts. It follows from the Resolution just passed by the House. I move, Sir, that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded.

BILL TO AMEND LAW RE TORTFEASORS

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to take No. 3 as the next Order of the day.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

On the Order being called for Mr. ADAMS to move the second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to amend the law relating to proceedings against, and contribution between tortfeasors, and for purposes incidental thereto and connected therewith—

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—As honourable members will see, for some years now in Great Britain the law relating to the inability of a plaintiff to recover from more than one of several persons who may have done him harm has been altered. We in Barbados have not yet come into line with the new legislation and the purpose of this Bill is to bring us into line. This is nothing rash. The Lord Chancellor some time ago appointed a committee which sat for a long time on a number of items of the law, and one of the recommendations that emerged was that the law relating to the liability of tortfeasors should be amended. That has been done in England for some years now. For a long time it has been exercising the mind of the Government that we should also amend the law, and they have now brought down a Bill to that effect. The non-legal members of the House will see from the Objects and Reasons that under the present law where damage results from a tort committed by two or more persons (referred to in the law as tortfeasors) there is only one cause of action and judgment may be recovered against any or all of them for the whole amount of the damages. The damages could not be apportioned by any method between the various tortfeasors. If all are sued and judgment obtained against all, execution may go against one and the whole of the damages may be obtained from him. No contribution among the tortfeasors can be obtained at law. If judgment is recovered whether it be against one or more, or if a release is given by one or more, any action arising out of the same tort against any of the other tortfeasors is barred.

This Bill seeks to bring the law into line with legislation in the United Kingdom by providing—

- (a) that judgment recovered against one or some of a number of joint tortfeasors will no longer be a bar to an action against the others liable in respect of the same damage;
- (b) that if more than one action is brought against tortfeasors liable in respect of that damage the sums recoverable under the judgments will not in the aggregate exceed the amount awarded by the judgment first given;
- (c) that a tortfeasor may recover contributions from any other tortfeasor who is, or would if sued, have been liable in respect of the same damage, but not if the latter is entitled to indemnity from the former in respect of such liability. In any proceedings for such contribution, the amount thereof must be determined according to the latter's responsibility for the damage, and the Court may exempt him from liability to contribute or direct that any contribution ordered shall amount to a complete indemnity.

The Bill follows the corresponding English legislation contained in the Law Reform (Married Women and Tortfeasors) Act, 1935 (25 and 26 Geo. 5. c. 30), the provisions of which have been adopted with only such variations as are necessary to suit local circumstances.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker,—I think that there is a certain amount of confusion as to which Bill we are dealing with. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph in his remarks referred to joint tortfeasors. I thought at first that he was talking about the Contributory Negligence Bill. I just wanted to have it made clear.

Mr. ADAMS: I draw to Your Honour's attention the fact that the honourable member has spoken once. This Bill concerns joint tortfeasors. As the law stands to-day if you recover against one and he is the poorest of them, you cannot go and sue the wealthier. That has been the law all along, and the purpose of this Bill is to bring us into line with U.K. legislation that is 17 years old, so that you can recover from more than one. If an auctioneer sells your house or property by wrongful levy you can sue the auctioneer as well as the person who really trespasses on your house or property by selling it through the auctioneer. Even to-day an auctioneer gets indemnity. He says, "I will sell; but if he had no right to sell the house and you can sue him, he will have to pay. I do not think I can say anymore. The objects and reasons set out the matter clearly.

I beg to move, Sir, that the Bill be read a second time.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded.

The question was put and agreed to.

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

The three clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS in each case the Bill was read a third time and passed and the title was read and agreed to.

CONTRIBUTORY NEGLIGENCE ACT

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I now ask leave to take Order No. 4 as the next Order of the Day. There being no objection, leave was granted.

On the order being called for Mr. ADAMS to move the second reading of a Bill intituled an Act relating to contributory negligence and for purposes connected therewith,—

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—This Bill, like the last one, is one arising as a result of a recommendation made by the Lord Chancellor's Committee which recommended changes in the English Law. I think that all honourable members know that in the case of a collision on land either party may be held to be alone liable, or both may be held to be negligent. But in any event between plaintiff and defendant only one or the other gets judgment, while in the case of a collision at sea where negligence is proved against both parties, each pays the other according to their particular degree of negligence, and the damage done. Legislation has been passed in the U.K. so that the same principle which applies to collisions at sea will apply to collisions on land. I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker,—I hope that the Leader will accept what I say with good grace. He really could not be referring exclusively to collisions, although it is difficult to think of a case other than a collision in which a person suffers damage at the hands of another which he himself has contributed to. But there are other cases. We have a Factory Act which says that certain measures and precautions should be taken by the employer or the occupier of a particular factory. For instance in the Wood Working Machine Regulations in the U.K., a man using a circular saw has to use a certain safety device. I believe we have recently passed similar precautions which occupiers of factories have got to take. It may happen that a man who is supposed to use a certain safety guard is himself negligent, although there is an absolute duty on the part of the occupier of the factory to have this safeguard. The man may have omitted to put it on. Would it not be the same position as in the case of an accident where both parties were negligent?

There is another example which I can give. Take the case of sugar factories in this island. We have had some unfortunate accidents in the past in which a man working along a gangway may have slipped and fallen into a tache. There again the occupier of the factory may not have made the gangway reasonably safe. But at the same time the worker may have omitted to take the simple precaution of turning on the factory lights, and by going along the gangway in the dark contributed to his own grief. So that although the occupier may have omitted to take the precaution of providing a strong railing for the gangway the worker contributed to his own downfall by not taking the simple precaution of turning on the lights.

So when the honourable Leader referred only to collisions on land, I hope he is not saying that the Contributory Negligence Act as we have it here only refers to collisions on land.

I welcome the principle of this Bill especially as we are shortly to have compulsory third party insurance, and with this provision pedestrians and motorists will not be placed at a disadvantage if they have to go to Court. I think it is high time that we brought some other laws into line with modern legislation as we have done with these two Bills tonight.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker,—Like the last honourable member I am very happy to see a Bill of this nature before the House. When I was checking over the law on this point I noticed that the principle of the Act still stands. It is true that we have the 1883 Fatal Accidents Act. The 1934 Act got rid of the distinction between personal action and real action. I feel that in passing legislation of this sort one should consider the whole historical and sociological approach. I think that all the Canadian Legislation follows the England Legislation on this matter, and they have got the Third Party Insurance Act, Lord Campbell's Act and the Joint Tortfeasors Act. I hope that the Leader of the House will give me an assurance that legislation will be brought down to abolish the old legal practice which now exists so that it will be ironed out along modern lines.

Mr. ADAMS: If I understand the honourable junior member for St. George correctly, I seem to have given the impression that this applies only to collisions. It does not. The Bill itself states what will happen under the Workmen's Compensation Act. We have provided in the Workmen's Compensation Act for cases such as those instanced by the honourable senior member for St. George where both the employer and the workman are negligent. There is provision in some of the Workmen's Compensation Acts passed in Great Britain from time to time. If the workman has been negligent by disregarding a safety guard or anything like that he may still recover if the accident takes place on his employer's business, and death or serious disablement occurs.

The only other point I can make is that when I read the Objects and Reasons where the writer says in the last part of the first paragraph " . . . no damages can be recovered by either party except in certain exceptional circumstances," I think he is loose in his language. Both parties may be negligent. If I am driving very fast and on the wrong side of the road, and you are coming out of a side street and you see I am negligent, and you have time to stop and do not stop and an accident occurs, you have been also negligent and you have to pay. It is not true to say that if the plaintiff contributes to the accident he cannot recover.

As regards the point made by the honourable junior member for St. Lucy we have had these things before us a long time before we brought them down. This was brought to the notice of the then Executive when it became law in England. We have now got to it.

Question that the Bill be read a second time was put and agreed to.

On motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Mr. COX Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee Mr. MAPP in the Chair.

Clauses 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 were called and passed.

On motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Mr. COX Mr. Chairman reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ADAMS moved seconded by Dr. CUMMINS that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday the 3rd February at 7 p.m.

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