

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1953—54

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 7th July, 1953.

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

Present:

His Honour, Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS (*Deputy Speaker*), Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., Mr. M. E. COX, Mr. L. E. SMITH (*Chairman of Committees*), Mr. R. G. MAPP, Mr. F. C. GODDARD, Mr. J. A. HAYNES, B.A., Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. E. ST. A. HOLDER, Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN and Mr. C. E. TALMA.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting which was held on the 16th June, 1953, having been circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

LETTER FROM HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JAMAICA.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a letter from the House of Representatives, Jamaica, conveying a resolution passed by that body in connection with the invitation from that colony to persons to meet in Jamaica at the time of the visit of Her Majesty the Queen. I understand that the Other Place has received a similar Message and it is my intention to discuss the matter in consultation with the Senior Member Presiding of the Other Place.

The letter reads as follows:—

House of Representatives,
Jamaica,
27th June, 1953.

Sir,

On the 18th day of June, 1953, the House of Representatives of Jamaica unanimously resolved —

“WHEREAS Her Majesty the Queen has announced her gracious intention to visit Jamaica in November this year;

AND WHEREAS it would be appreciated that on this historic occasion our sister territories of the British West Indies should be associated with us in the loyal welcome to be extended to Her Majesty;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Speaker of this Honourable House of Representatives, in association with the Honourable President of the Legislative Council, should be requested to extend an invitation to the other Legislatures of the territories of the British West Indies to send representatives to participate in the welcome to be extended to Her Majesty in Jamaica:

AND FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED that the representatives of the other British West Indian Legislatures should be guests of this Government during the period of the Royal Visit.”

In accordance with that resolution I am now directed by the President of the Legislative Council and the Speaker of the House of Representatives to extend an invitation for two representatives from the Legislature of Barbados to visit Jamaica and participate in the welcome to Her Majesty.

I am to say that your representatives will be guests of the Government of Jamaica during the period of the Royal Visit, that is to say from 24th to 28th November inclusive, and that this invitation is extended to include their wives.

As arrangements will have to be made for the Royal Visit which would include your representatives, it is important that you let me know at an early date whether the invitation is accepted and if so, the names of your representatives and whether they will be accompanied by their wives.

Yours faithfully,

CLINTON HART,
Clerk of the Legislature.

Clerk of the House of Assembly,
Bridgetown,
Barbados.

LETTER FROM Mr. P. D. McDERMOTT

I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a letter from Mr. P. D. McDermott offering his services to be re-appointed as Auditor of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank.

PAPERS LAID

Mr. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker,— On behalf of the honourable Junior Member for St. Peter I am

commanded to lay a Statement showing gross Customs and Excise Receipts for eleven months ended 28th January, 1953.

NOTICES

Dr. CUMMINS: On behalf of the honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph, I give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$25,162 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1953—54, Part I—Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1953—54, No. 7, which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to consider the money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

QUESTIONS

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of yourself, I beg to lay the following question:—

To enquire of the appropriate member of the Executive present at the next meeting of the House:

Will the Government please say under what authority, legal or otherwise, are any motor vehicles kept at Government House permitted to be driven on the public highways of the Island without the index numbers being exhibited thereon in the usual manner?

Mr. MAPP: Again Sir, on behalf of yourself, I beg to lay the following question:—

To enquire of the appropriate member of the Executive present at the next meeting of the House:

Is it the intention of Government to send the Fishery Officer to attend every and any conference, seminar or other gathering of persons purporting to meet in the interest of the development of fisheries in any area or generally?

2. If the answer is yes, will Government give some idea of the benefit that has accrued to Barbados from this policy and alternatively the help given by Barbados to other territories?

Mr. MAPP: Again Sir, on behalf of yourself, I beg to lay the following question:—

To enquire of the appropriate member of the Executive present at the next meeting of the House:

Has Government been made aware of the serious cracks that have developed recently in sections of the walls of the Combermere School building?

2. If the answer is yes, what has Government done in the matter and why has no public statement been made on the situation?

AUDITOR FOR SUGAR INDUSTRY AGRICULTURAL BANK RE-APPOINTED

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Mr. P. D. McDermott be re-appointed Auditor of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

RESOLUTION FIXING SALARY OF LIBRARIAN AND SECRETARY, HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The First Order of the Day is to resume debate on the passing of a Resolution fixing the salary of the Librarian and Secretary of the House of Assembly at \$2,280 per annum from 2nd September, 1952. When this resolution was debated on the 16th June, 1953, the honourable Senior Member for St. Thomas moved that further debate be adjourned. The honourable member is entitled to speak if he cares.

Mr. MAPP: Sir, it is not my intention to do so. The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. CRAWFORD entered the House and took his seat.

HOUSE GOES IN COMMITTEE ON BILL TO MAKE BETTER PROVISIONS FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The second Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable Junior Member for St. Thomas to move the House into Committee on the Bill intituled an Act to make better provisions for Local Government in the Island.

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

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called. It read as follows:—

“(1) For the purposes of local Government the Island shall be divided into three areas which shall be known as the City of Bridgetown, the Northern District and the Southern District.”

“(2) The boundaries of the three areas are set out in the First Schedule to this Act.”

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. TALMA: Before the question is put, Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw the attention of this Chamber to a few points on the division which in my opinion should be carefully considered and which I hope will meet with the approval of the majority of honourable members who are present. In so far as the principle of the Bill is concerned, I am in entire agreement but with regard to the boundaries I am not in agreement. On the face of this Bill the boundaries of the three areas are far from being practicable and grave hardships and inconveniences will be meted out to many people, more especially the poorer ones, on account of these divisions. I am thinking more as regards to the administration of poor relief in so far as these boundaries are concerned. I am going to suggest at this stage that from a matter of expedience, it will be wise for this Committee to adopt something better which will be more workable and practicable than to attempt to bulldoze this Bill through this stage. We all know what sad fate this Bill met with on a previous occasion and it is my belief that if it be sent back to the Other Place identically as the previous Bill, in all probability, it will meet with similar fate. Legislation of this nature is far-reaching, making provisions for generations to come; therefore, for that good reason, we have to be as discreet as possible and see that the boundaries which are suggested not only meet with the general approval of honourable members but of the entire population of this island.

I am going to suggest to honourable members who think that by making an amendment to this clause that it will entail too many consequential amendments, that in itself is not the answer, because an important piece of legislation as this is, should be done in the proper way. We must bear in mind that for a hundred years or possibly more this Bill must be acceptable to this Island and it will be better to amend the boundaries at this stage than to allow these boundary divisions which seem glaringly wrong.

Sir, if you take the parish of Christ Church as an instance, that parish has a population of almost 27,000 people. It is to a large extent residential, consequently, it is the most built-up parish in the island. At present, it is the centre of the tourist trade. Its equality with the metropolitan parish of St. Michael can be seen from the fact that its Vestry comprises of sixteen members, which is the same as St. Michael, and no other parish is given this membership. Christ Church, therefore, should not be relegated to a position, as proposed in this Bill, where five District Councillors will be elected to serve that parish. When I say so, I am expressing the sentiments of the majority of the people of Christ Church. They too feel that this parish should not be divided as set out in this Bill but that it should be a separate and distinct entity, just as Arima, Trinidad, is a separate borough council, so should Christ Church be in Barbados. We feel that it will be better and more beneficial if the whole of Christ Church is placed into a district by itself so that competent people of that parish could be elected to lay their own rates, collect their own taxes to bring in the required revenue and to spend it as expeditiously as possible, as they have done in the past. Christ Church should not be placed in the position where it must go cap in hand with other parishes to beg for grants-in-aids from Central Government, which it might never get, and which it has never yet done.

I will quote a few figures to bear out my last point. The revenue of that parish at present is \$160,000 in round figures and of that amount, \$67,000 is spent in Poor Relief, \$45,000 on Sanitation, \$1,000 on the granting of exhibitions to secondary schools, which I do not agree with and feel should be more, \$9,000 on Churches, \$3,000 at the Cemetery, \$3,700 on its functioning, and \$3,400 on street lighting. The remaining part of the revenue goes in salaries to the Parochial Treasurer, Assessors, Vestry Clerk and Auditor, Interest on Loans, Miscellaneous and Sinking Fund. Sir, that is a brief idea as to the revenue of Christ Church and the manner in which the money from the taxpayers is being spent. You will see that at present the Vestry of that parish does not go to Government for any grants-in-aids or subventions, because of the industry and ability of the people of that parish. As I have said, it is the most built-up parish and because of that, it is no wonder that the people of St. Michael are rather eager and anxious to tack on the built-up part to St. Michael. It seems to me for sake of argument that if what is known as the Gold Coast or the Garden in St. James, or Four Roads, in St. John, or any other like district in the island becomes a built-up and attractive area as the built-up area of Christ Church, that those parts would not remain any longer rural, owing to the people of St. Michael taking them over. It seems as if they are willing to tack on any part of the island to St. Michael that does not appear to be rural. To strengthen my argument, Sir, the people of Christ Church feel that if a sewerage system is necessary they, themselves, will put down one for the parish. I used that as an argument; in my view that system will not be necessary.

I repeat, Sir, that Christ Church, standing as it is, should form a separate and distinct entity. It is sufficiently well developed and populated to impose in its own right its own taxes so as to get in the necessary revenue to make better provisions for local government. The parish has also the necessary number of men and women who are politically minded and who are willing to assist in the running of the affairs of the parish and as Arima, Trinidad, which has less means and is less built-up

than Christ Church has its own borough council, in like manner Christ Church could be called a borough and have its own borough council.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I am going to make a suggestion to the honourable member. I feel that his argument is not in order at this stage and that it will be well to postpone consideration of this clause until after the Schedule to it is dealt with. This section merely states that the boundaries of the three areas are set out in the First Schedule to this Act, therefore if this Committee wants to make any alterations, in the division of the areas, it will have to make them in the Schedule. I will therefore counsel this Committee to postpone further consideration of this clause until the Schedule is dealt with.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, that same suggestion was made by the honourable junior member for the City when a similar Bill was dealt with on the last occasion and the honourable senior member for St. Joseph refused to accept the suggestion and suggested that it should be resolved one way or the other when giving consideration to this clause. I suggest that we follow the same procedure now as was suggested by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. Let us deal with this matter now.

Mr. LEWIS: I did not know that if one honourable member refused to accept a suggestion that his view should be carried. A suggestion like that is a matter for the House.

Mr. TALMA: With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will continue. As I was saying, Clause 2 refers to the Schedule and if you postpone consideration of this clause until the Schedule is dealt with, you will have the same trouble. If you are giving consideration to Clause 2, you are giving consideration to the Schedule connected with it.

Mr. LEWIS: I am saying that this Clause does not deal with the point. It refers to something which has not yet passed this House. If any honourable member wants to make any alteration to the Schedule let him move that this Clause be postponed until consideration of the Schedule so that when you come back to it, you will know exactly the amendments that you are making.

Mr. TALMA: This is the only moot point in this Bill. It is no point postponing this most important matter.

Dr. CUMMINS: It is not postponing the issue; it is only dealing with the clause when you are dealing with the Schedule.

Mr. TALMA: Sir, I am saying that Clause 2 refers to the First Schedule to this Act. The Schedule does not form the body of the Bill, and the honourable Junior Member for the City fails to realise this. We will have to amend Clause 2 before we amend the Schedule. Clause 2 is an intricate part of the Bill, but the First Schedule to which it refers is something which is appended to explain the Clause in the Bill. If this Clause be accepted as it is, so that the Island should be divided into three areas, it would mean that this Committee will have to re-commit this clause, so to suggest that we need not amend this clause at this stage is out of the question. The necessary consequential amendments will come when dealing with the First Schedule. Sir, in spite of the distraction, I wish to repeat that the three areas set out in the Bill are impracticable. We should all realise this position now and this Committee should not insist on something which many of us feel will not work well. With regard to the question of consequential amendments, it is better that this Committee settle down and deal with them when they appear. We will then have put this

Bill in proper shape and it will not contain anything which is impracticable.

Sir, the people in Christ Church along with myself, feel that Adult Suffrage is absolutely essential and that every man and woman should be given the right to take the opportunity in the running of the parish or the borough as the case may be. We believe that you should not move from eleven parishes to three districts in one single breath. We feel that the people for a long time will still be parochially minded and because of that, there should be a much simpler group than contained in this Clause, though we quite agree that the number of Vestries should be reduced. We feel that St. Michael should be a separate and distinct municipality as that parish is sufficiently large, built-up and self-supporting for that purpose, without having to borrow that part of Christ Church as contained in the Schedule to this Clause. At this stage, I am willing to agree to either four or six districts. Should the decision be four districts, I am suggesting that St. Michael would be separate and distinct by itself without encroaching on any other parish and that Christ Church be also treated in like manner. I am saying to let Christ Church take care of itself as it has done for generations in the past. It is not because I am parochially minded that I say so. I will then say to link St. Philip, St. George, St. John and St. Joseph so that these parishes could form the Eastern District and to link St. Andrew, St. Lucy, St. Peter and St. James together so that they could form the Northern District. I am implying that three districts are not enough and that the eleven parishes can more easily be run by having four districts than three. I am however willing to accept the suggestion of six districts if moved by any honourable member. Definitely, Sir, I feel that Christ Church should be a separate and distinct entity under this new arrangement of the Maude Bill. As I said before, as it is, Christ Church will have only five seats on the Council and with six Aldermen being allotted for the four parishes joined together by this clause, the chances are that Christ Church will only get one seat for an alderman.

Sir, these changes according to the Schedule to this Clause may look well on paper but in actual practice they will not work as well as they seem to be. Sir, too far east is west and it is no point hitting our heads against a wall. I am not making a conservative speech. No one is more anxious than I to see this Maude Bill implemented, but I am appealing to the Deputy Leader and the other honourable member of this House on the Executive who are both present to see the wisdom in making some slight amendment to this clause so as to meet some little favour with the Other Place and to prevent this Bill suffering the same fate as it did before. There is no objection to the Other Place legislating on this Bill as it did before. Sir, let us do something which seems reasonable; let us compromise on this question; let us so divide this island for local government that its provisions will be more workable and more acceptable to the people. We must bear in mind that members of the Other Place and of the several Vestries are for the most part drawn from vested interest and it will be better if we adopt a conciliatory attitude on this vital question which is second only to Adult Suffrage. We should so regulate the boundaries in this Maude Bill as to meet with more approval and at least that it may appear that a greater measure of justice and fairplay is meted out, not only to members of the Labour Party but to the population of the island as a whole.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I beg to move that the word "three" appearing in line 2 of sub-clause

1, Clause 2 be deleted and the word "six" be substituted. I will also move an amendment later for the nomenclature of the districts should this amendment be agreed to.

In making this amendment, Sir, I am in agreement with the arguments put forward today by the honourable senior member for Christ Church. As a matter of fact, I think both the honourable senior and junior members for Christ Church have supported that stand in the past and I presume that both will do so today. I am prepared to support them because I feel as has been said, that Christ Church is sufficiently developed already and has the potentialities to support the entire structure of a borough council by itself. Sir, I want to remind honourable members that Sir John Maude in recommending the division of this island into three areas merely suggested that as an alternate proposal. Sir John Maude on one occasion suggested that there should be four centres for purposes of local government and on another occasion suggested six so as to correspond with the Police Posts in the island.

(A VOICE): He never said that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir John Maude did say that one possibility would be to follow police administration for purposes of local government and that the areas could be laid out to correspond with the districts of these Police Posts. Sir John later suggested three areas. My own conclusion is that the proposal in the Public Health Bill to divide the island into three districts for purposes of public health administration proceeds on right lines but because you are dividing this into three for purposes of public health administration does not necessarily mean that you should divide the island in like manner for purposes of local government. Sir John Maude is an Englishman who came here to spend a few months—in order to investigate local government set-up. He never came here before nor has he ever come back. It does not mean that we should follow every suggestion of his blindly. It would be sheer nonsense if we do so. Let us bear in mind first and foremost that this local government reform is not part of the policy of the Government Party, and it is not to say that these proposals in this Bill are before this Committee because they represent part of the manifesto put to the country by the Labour Party. The entire question of local government arose as a result of a decision by the Acting Governor of this island, Mr. Rankine, in 1948. Mr. Rankine thought when he was Colonial Secretary that the Vestry system needed reform. He never suggested that we must further centralise our administration or do away with the Vestry system. He merely remarked that the Vestry system needed reform and during the term of his office as Acting Governor, he invited Sir John Maude here to investigate and to make recommendations. Sir John Maude came and looked at the position and made his recommendations and it is up to this Assembly as a whole to support, reject or amend these recommendations. Nobody in his right senses would say that after a short cursory visit to Barbados, a man who came here for a few months, who never came before or afterwards, who never had the opportunity of seeing parochial administration here, must be the final answer to what is needed for Barbados. We can, if we like, follow the hard basic chore of his recommendations but we should know that they can proceed and function satisfactorily where we agree radically to revise or implement any of the recommendations which he made. I repeat, let us completely discharge any idea in our minds that we should support any single recommendation which has been put before us either recommended by Sir John Maude or adopted by the

Government Party. Let me remind you that no party in this island was even concerned fundamentally with the question of local government before, except to say that some people, every now and then, suggested to make a municipality of Bridgetown and St. Michael and justifiably pleaded that there should be amendments to the Franchise for election of members to the Vestry. I repeat, Sir, that as the honourable Senior Member for Christ Church has said, to reduce the division of this island from eleven parishes to three districts is too great a step. The honourable member suggested four, but I am saying that there should be six.

Mr. TALMA: I suggested that there should be at least four, but said that if any honourable member moved an amendment for six, I would vote for it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, he did say so but he appeared to be leaning on four. As a matter of fact, he did not so much stress the point as to the desirability of reducing the division from eleven parishes to four districts as he stressed the point of giving Christ Church an individual borough. I agree with him on that point. Although personally, in so far as the parish which I represent is concerned, it would be better if it had that part of Christ Church, as has been proposed in this clause, tacked on owing to that part of Christ Church being richer than St. Philip, I am not prepared to stress that point which will be a selfish point of view. I believe Christ Church, both now and in the future, is entitled to a separate and distinct parochial administration in order to preserve what it has and to further develop this parish which has tremendous scope for further development and which has not yet reached saturation point in this respect. Christ Church should be left to itself to work out its own destiny. This parish is the main tourist centre in Barbados; it is what can be called the Mecca for tourists here and for this fact alone, it should be given every possible assistance but left unhampered and unhindered by other areas in the colony to progress as far as it can and to improve its administration in the most satisfactory manner possible. Sir, I am contending that in actual practice, it will be discovered that if you abolish the eleven parishes as your first step and come down to three areas, your administration is bound to break down. (A VOICE: WHY?) I will answer by asking: how can anybody argue to say that because twenty-four members sit here in this Assembly to represent the whole island that five councillors can very well represent Christ Church? Certainly this Assembly legislate for the whole island; we sit here and pass laws, but we have the law courts and the Police there to see that the laws we pass are carried out, but it must be remembered that parochial councillors must have direct contact with the people and the various duties of parochial administration in his particular parish. You therefore cannot humanly expect that five men for this southern district of Christ Church could adequately attend to the sanitary services, administer poor relief and what not with any amount of efficiency. They could not do it. None of us leave our houses as members of this Assembly and go to attend to poor people weekly but our Vestrymen have to do it. Sir, your parochial administration is so bound up with every-day existence affecting almost all of the population of the particular parish that if you go to a figure of three from the figure of eleven for administration as your first step, in my opinion, your administration is bound to break down. Even from eleven to four is far too great. You cannot argue that because you are centralising your public health services which are long overdue and eminently

desirable that it must follow, as a matter of course, that you must gear your entire machinery to the same extent for all your services. As a matter of fact, the Government Party has never explained its reasons for changing from its own original suggestion that there be six areas when it brought down the first bill to this House to the three now proposed. The six areas were then named: the Bridgetown District, the Bristol District, the Scotland District, the Courteen District, the Codrington District and the Seawell District. It is true that in these six divisions there was some overlapping with regard to the boundaries of Christ Church and other parishes and other minor matters, but, by and large, those six proposed divisions appeared to be more eminently suitable, more practicable, more desirable and more easy and satisfactory to be operated. Last week, the honourable Junior Member for St. John alleged that it was his opinion that the only reason why Government had proposed the division into three areas was because the Party thought it would give its members more control over the whole island. That argument, in my opinion, cannot hold water because we are not legislating for any party; we are legislating for the good of the country; we are legislating for twenty, fifty or a possible hundred years to come; therefore, let us disabuse our minds from along the lines of argument that the division into three would suit any particular party. In my opinion, if anybody in this country is thinking in terms of Vestry reform merely to have any particular set of people controlling their destiny, that person is living in a fool's paradise. Professional politicians might desire and think good of local government as a result of these proposals but bearing in mind that you will have to pay your District councillors and what not and will need more money to run an improved system, one that will produce better results, those responsible will have to find the necessary taxation to do it; therefore, if you entrust control of administration in the hands of people who are merely politically ambitious, you are going to filibuster the interests of the people in the particular parish concerned.

Sir, whether or not the Government Party or anybody else feels that three, four or six areas might suit their particular purpose or might be better for their own ulterior motives, that should not be the yardstick in the final resolving of whether their particular thought would be the best thing for the island at this stage. I seriously contend that to start with less than six divisions is to invite disaster before you start. I feel that those names which appeared in the original Bill should be the names of the six districts should this Committee so determine the matter. Although I am not particularly enamoured by the particular names,—the actual nomenclature being not of paramount importance,—we may use them for the naming of the six areas when we get to the Schedule to this clause.

In conclusion, I may say that it is true that this matter may be conveniently postponed until such time as we get to the Schedule but nobody knows when we will get to that point. It might not be until after midnight tonight; therefore, there is no reason why the amendments which have been proposed could not be resolved one way or the other now, and when we get to the Schedule, in the process of time, we can insert any consequential amendments. I sincerely hope that honourable members will support this amendment for six areas and that both honourable members for Christ Church who are desirous of seeing Christ Church more practically treated will be willing to support it.

Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. BARROW came into the Committee and took their seats while Mr. CRAWFORD was speaking.

Mr. GODDARD: I am glad to see that honourable members are beginning to realize that we are in grave danger of too much centralization of our parochial services. I therefore am seconding the amendment which was moved by the honourable senior member for St. Philip for the division of the island into six areas. Sir, we must bear in mind that our parochial services are within a very densely populated island. We are dealing with people not areas. In Christ Church, which is potentially a tourist resort, there are 26,000 people and they are increasing at a rapid rate and in the near future it is likely that there might be another 10,000 people. According to the proposals in this Clause, you are taking part of Christ Church and adding it on to the municipality of St. Michael. I do know that in England, there is a Boundary Commission which deals with changes in borough boundaries from time to time but I am sure that Christ Church with its population of 26,000 is in a position where it can take care of itself. I do not wish to appear parochial because it is Christ Church of which I am referring but if it were St. James I would argue in the same manner. There are places in America where the population is broken down to groups of four to five thousand people for purposes of parochial administration. These groups have their own small councils because it has been proven that when it comes to administration by these parochial or town councils, the smaller they are, the better.

On the last occasion, I spoke of the danger of centralisation and the expression of views by honourable members who have spoken on this clause shows a beginning of seeing in the right direction. I repeat that there are 26,000 people in Christ Church and within the near future this number is expected to rise to 40,000. This parish can take care of itself. The people who live in it can run it quite well and it would be far better to let that parish remain as a separate entity than to tack on to St. Michael the most lucrative part which comprises of Hastings and the centre of the tourist industry. St. Michael comprises of seventy to eighty thousand people and by this division, you will be adding on ten thousand to that parish. It is surprising to see that they are not taking over the Christ Church Almshouse, but are taking over the tourist area and leaving that parish like a wilderness. Sir, I have great pleasure in seconding this amendment.

Dr. CUMMINS: Sir, I have been listening carefully to the honourable members and I have heard nothing new in their arguments against the three proposed districts in this clause. Sir, we have heard this argument before, nothing new has been adduced. The honourable senior member for St. Philip said that the Government gave no reason why it chose to change from the original proposition of six districts as was contained in the first Bill sent down to the three districts which are proposed in this and the last Bill. He is mistaken because I gave the reason which was based on the same explanation adduced by Sir John Maude. It is that it has been decided to establish three health centres for purposes of public health administration. One of these centres has just been opened—a couple of weeks ago; another one has been proposed for St. Michael and the third for the southern area. It is considered that it will be very much easier to have three districts for purposes of local government to correspond with these three public health centres. If you legislate for six districts the alternative is that you will want six public health centres, that is, a public health centre for each district. I do not think anybody in this House would

want to burden the people of this island, with its small size, with six public health centres when they know that this island cannot support that number of centres. The salary alone of the officer who has just taken up duties at the Speightstown Centre is between £11,000 and £12,000 per annum; therefore you can easily see what the expense of six centres would be without taking into account the cost of employing nurses, sanitary inspectors and the equipping of these centres which is also a costly affair. Therefore, Sir, in view of that, the Government decided to revert to the recommendations of Sir John Maude for three districts to correspond with public health set-up for the reason of easier and cheaper administration. Sir John Maude also considered this question from the point of view of population. The honourable junior member for Christ Church has just said that this Bill deals with people and not districts; and it is for the very reason that we have dealt with it from the point of view of people so that you can have a good and consistent number of people in each area. The population in each district as suggested here is 85,000 in the City area, 52,000 in the Northern area and 63,000 in the Southern area. Allowing Christ Church to take good care of itself would indeed be offsetting the calculation on the population basis and the recommendations of Sir John Maude who looked at the developed portion of Christ Church and considered it as a continuation of the urban area of St. Michael. He felt from the point of view of future development, such as sanitation and other services of local government, that the developed portion could be tacked on to the urban area and the productive part to the other areas of the southern district.

Sir, a lot of talk has been made on the consequential amendments. It is true that if this section is amended, there will be lots of consequential amendments to make owing to the redistribution of people according to the boundaries. I therefore, do not think that we can offhand decide on the changing up of these areas in view of the amendments that would be entailed to regularise the whole affair. I will therefore counsel honourable members that since this House on the last occasion passed a Bill with three areas it would be consistent to pass this section as it is, that is, for the division of the island into three districts.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir,—The honourable junior member for St. Thomas referred to Sir John Maude making recommendations about dividing the island into three areas owing to it having been proposed to establish three public health centres in the island, one of which the honourable member said has been already established at Speightstown to serve the six northern parishes. Does the honourable member with his knowledge of Barbados really believe that the Speightstown Health Centre can serve those six parishes? Does the honourable member think that people are going to leave St. Andrew and St. Joseph to go to the Health Centre in Speightstown? They will have to go by car or charter a bus. If people in the parishes of St. Andrew and St. Joseph wish to go to Speightstown, they have to bypass the General Hospital. It is therefore sheer nonsense to think that the people from those parishes will go to the Speightstown Medical Centre for treatment and it is for that reason that the division of this island into three areas is bound to break down. It is merely a fallacy to claim that this Health Centre in Speightstown can serve these parishes. I heard it mentioned. I read it and I chuckled at it. Sir, there is no transportation between St. Joseph and Speights-

town. If you live in those parishes and wish to go to Speightstown you will have to come to Bridgetown first. It is fallacious to the extreme, like one living in a fool's paradise, to believe that if even your proposed division of the island into three for the purpose of public health administration is correct that the same is correct for purposes of local government and that you should therefore follow the same pattern for your municipality and other districts. Sir, it is an absolute farce to suggest that three health centres would serve the island in the manner as suggested by the Government. What will happen is that the people in Speightstown and the immediate conspicuous area will use the health centre at Speightstown and the people of St. Joseph and St. Andrew would continue to use transportation to the City of Bridgetown and go to the General Hospital when they are in need of medical treatment until such time as cross-country transportation between those two points is available. Until such time, the general pressure on the General Hospital would and must remain and I go further and repeat that in the same manner as the three proposed public health centres cannot adequately serve the people in the areas for which they will be built to serve, so too would the division of the island into three areas for purposes of local government not serve. I have not got before me the parishes which the Speightstown Medical Centre is placed to serve, but I think mention was made of St. Joseph, St. Andrew, St. Lucy, St. Peter, St. Thomas and St. James. Even if this division works for the purpose of public health, it does not mean that as a consequence, it will work for purposes of local government; therefore, the recommendation on the basis of population is purely arbitrary.

Sir, what one person might feel is reasonable for the purpose of local government another person might feel is unreasonable and has no practical merits to it. The factors which should influence us to a final decision in this matter should not be a question of nice round proportions in which to divide our local government area but what in the final analysis are the most practicable considerations in which to influence the division into a given number of areas.

Dr. CUMMINS: I rise just to answer the honourable member on the question of these public health centres. The honourable member seems to think that the Government is going to ask people to journey from St. Andrew or St. Joseph to the Speightstown Public Health Centre. Nobody could imagine that at all. At a public health centre there will be a number of nurses and inspectors who will visit the people in their homes in their parishes. He seems also to think that with the opening of the Speightstown Public Health Centre that the pressure on the General Hospital would be relieved. May I tell him that public health centres are not erected for treatment of diseases. The people will still have to go to the General Hospital for such treatment but public health centres will, in the long run, ease the pressure on the General Hospital from the point of view of preventative treatment which will be given from those centres.

Mr. MAPP: I think the honourable senior member for St. Philip really upset his whole argument when he said that it was a matter of one's feelings as regards the number of districts.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, on that point of view I never made any reference to general feelings; I said "from the general principle."

Mr. MAPP: There is no general principle in the matter of how many public health centres there should be and the same thing applies to the number of acres in which this island should be divided for

purposes of local government. It is only a matter of feeling. One of the arguments put forward was "why divide into three areas when we know that that number cannot proceed satisfactorily?" I answer by asking: How do we know that? It is therefore only a matter of feeling. How do you know it will proceed more satisfactorily? Our argument is that in all probability it will be better. We feel that the division into three will reduce costs, it probably doing away with as many officers as will be needed for six areas. I feel where we can reduce costs we should do so. I agree with the honourable senior member for Christ Church when he said that we do not want hotch spotch legislation and that is why we should oppose any amendment and pass this Bill as it is. Anything like this disagreement over boundaries or anything of this nature which would need a big change and many alterations to the Bill must lead to hotch spotch legislation. One honourable member cannot suddenly say that there should be six boundaries and that a particular area should be in a particular boundary and then all of us agree and say yes to the change. That is exactly what the honourable senior member for St. Philip is saying. He is making an amendment here which I hope he will be able to carry through to a logical conclusion. Mr. Chairman, let us avoid these changes at present. Part of St. Michael is going to other areas but the people in those divisions that are taken off from St. Michael are not saying "Let the whole of St. Michael form the municipality," or "Do not take off some, let St. Michael stay as it is." Sir John Maude in his recommendations stated that under present practices for administration, police, and other purposes, certain part of Christ Church should be tacked on to St. Michael. At the present for police purposes. District "B" contains part of Boarded Hall, part of Christ Church, part of St. George and part of St. Michael. For this same purpose, part of St. Thomas is tacked on to part of St. James, and these divisions for police purposes, as far as we are aware work efficiently. Therefore if you say that the boundaries of the City municipality should be extended and should include some of the built-up area of Christ Church, —not all — I do not see any reason why it should not be so. These arguments by honourable members are merely parochial topics and we should leave it between the two honourable members for Christ Church. Sir, let us pass this Bill as it is.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman—I cannot understand nor can I appreciate the argument of such totalitarians. They have the idea that once some expert has recommended such a thing, it is impertinence on our part to alter it. This Labour Government has the idea that so long as they send it down, it is right and it will be impertinence on our part to alter it. That is the mind of a totalitarian. The honourable senior member for St. Thomas says that because Government is making provision for three Public Health Centres, you must have three local government areas. Does he know that the country of England is divided into counties and in those counties are several types of local authorities but the counties with their own council are responsible for certain services of which public health is one while the other autonomous authorities in that county are not responsible to that authority? The larger authorities are responsible for certain things such as education but that does not prevent certain areas from having their own elected council for certain performances; therefore, there is no argument for having only three areas for local government in this island. Mr. Chairman, we are now enlarging these areas to an extraordinary extent

which means that there will be greater responsibility on the local authority, yet we are reducing the powers of the council. This is political absurdity. You are enlarging the areas; you are enlarging the responsibility because you are enlarging the population; yet on the other hand you are reducing their power because you are saying that a District Council cannot appoint its Chief Sanitary Inspector. Where is the philosophy in this? There is none whatsoever. As I have said, the English county has its County Council, then there are county borough councils responsible for other functions and then there are rural district councils. All are autonomous local authorities and they comprise of a population from 5,000 up to 50,000.

The argument for complete autonomous authority for Christ Church is quite in order. If we take an instance from another part of the West Indies, Arima is a borough council in its own name. Arima has not the population nor the importance economically as Christ Church, yet it can have a borough council. In Trinidad it is easier to get to Arima from Port of Spain than it is to get to Speightstown from Bridgetown here although there is a greater distance from Arima to Port of Spain. Sir, these autonomous areas cut right across county councils. There is no such question that because you are not responsible for public health that you cannot be autonomous. Mr. Chairman, honourable members who support Clause 2 without amendments have not the faintest conception of the meaning of local government. Local government means more than cost, more than area, more than population. It means the giving of the opportunity to the citizens of the colony to learn something, to take an interest in their own needs and to be reasonable for the local government of the area. If you are reducing this possibility, then you are reducing the possibility of more people becoming responsible for self-government. That is the important thing about local government. The most important and fundamental concept for multiplying these areas to more than three are because you will be giving the opportunity to more people to take part in their own affairs. That is vital for a backward community. We should not have a totalitarian mind. We should not feel that a narrow clique must control almost all the people, that the party in power must confine itself to a few governors of the land, and that if you allow more people to have a knowledge of the affairs of the state, the less power will be in the hands of the few governors. I will emphasize that the fundamental ideas of local government is that as many people as possible should be sensible to take part in it, but not so many as will cause confusion and chaos.

Sir, the word locality which means a place originates from the Latin word *locus*. It means a place sufficiently small that nearly all the inhabitants are conscious of it; a place sufficiently compact that the inhabitants can have personal interest in it; fundamentally, a place where people can know and experience the everyday functions concerning the household and everyday life of the people. It does not mean legislating for tariffs, or income tax, or defence or anything in this nature. All these larger vital things are for the authority of the large areas to handle.

Mr. Chairman, in this clause you are dividing the island into three areas, each area responsible for an average population of 60,000, yet they are not responsible for water services or any such thing. If you are going to have these areas, the intelligent thing to do is to increase their responsibility. If I may give an instance, for housing, there should be three housing authorities in the country. Local

government in England is responsible for education. When you take these vital services from the local government and execute them from your central government, then there is no necessity for these three large areas. Your three large areas become an absurdity. What little there is for local government to do is so important that it is better for small districts to do them, therefore, the idea of six areas is superior from every conceivable point of view than the idea of three areas.

I think, Sir, that I have said most of what I wanted to say. It is not necessary to retain the eleven areas we now have, but I cannot agree that it is necessary to go from eleven to three. There are local government authorities elsewhere responsible for less than the population of some of these parishes. They collect less rates, and are autonomous local government authorities just the same. We are going from one foolish extreme to the other foolish extreme. The Government, as I have said already can only see the difference between black and white, but there are various shades between black and white. Division of the island into three areas has nothing to recommend it. There is no necessity, as far as local government is concerned to have the country divided equally as to population.

As far as public health is concerned, an honourable member has said that nurses will go to the people. If you are going to carry public health to the people there is no necessity to tie public health to the local government areas and to make the two correspond to each other.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—I find myself at a disadvantage coming after the honourable junior member for St. John. After listening to the brilliant speech that he has made I find myself definitely at a disadvantage. Still I feel that I should contribute my quota to this debate. This Bill seeks to deal with the fundamental set-up of this island—the entire island and not merely a fragment of it. It is not merely a matter of political principle. It is a matter that holds vital interests where every man, woman and child in this island is concerned. The economic set-up is at stake as well as the political. I cannot sit here and allow a Bill like this to pass without voicing my sentiments. Mr. Chairman, I was never in favour of these areas from the beginning; if you look back you will see that. This Bill came before this House already. It also went before the Other Place. It was passed in a questionable manner before this House. It was passed at 2 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would ask the honourable member to stick to the principle of the section which we are dealing with.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: It was passed in a questionable manner here and it was rejected in the Other Place. That shows that something is wrong. The majority of people are not in favour of it. The vestries have protested against the passing of this Bill already. I am not going to allow this to go on without speaking my mind on it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please address the Chair.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: This Bill will affect the taxpayers of this island to a greater extent than they are affected already. It will put greater burdens upon them. I am in favour of a change; but not of this grand change. I feel that some change could be made which would be satisfactory to all concerned but not this Bill in its present state. We should not allow political matters to obscure our views of certain broad relevant facts.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I want to remind the honourable member that he allowed the opportunity to

pas; for making the speech that he is making now. He should have made that speech on the motion for the second reading. I am asking him to confine his remarks to clause 2.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: I was opposed to it from the beginning. I will oppose it again. I feel that it is not in the best interest of the people of this island.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,—I am sorry that the debate has taken this turn, because it might give the wrong impression to those who have to deal with this Bill in the Other Place as well as to those members of the public who are not sure whether they want the Maude Bill or not. I regret very much the kind of argument which we heard started by the honourable senior member for Christ Church. What I fear is that some honourable members might find themselves in a trap appearing to be defending the old Vestry System, and in so doing lend argument to the members of the Other Place for throwing out this Bill. Honourable members know that legislation like this cannot be perfect when first introduced. As time goes on you improve it. But the fundamental principle behind this is that you feel there should be a change in the present system and you introduce this Bill. If there are faults in the Bill they will be rectified after trial and experience. But I do not see why members should want to go into details and make the matter appear so difficult in the eyes of the public as regards this Bill and what it proposes to do.

I feel that this Bill should be passed. I do not want to say necessarily as the last time. If honourable members feel that there should be four or six divisions instead of the three recommended let them say so. But what is the sense of attacking the Bill, attacking the Government and wasting time? The Government should be attacked when it is necessary. But to attack the Government on this Bill is to strengthen the feelings of the vestrymen that they are right in their opposition to the Bill. If members feel that six divisions are better make a motion to that effect; but do not attack the whole thing and give armour to the opponents of the Bill.

I speak for myself. I am not lending my voice to anyone. If honourable members want to give the impression that they are not expressing their own will but the will of someone else that is their business.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the word "three" proposed to be deleted stand part. Honourable members in favour will please say "aye" and those against will please say "no". I think the ayes have it.

On a division being called for the question was resolved in the affirmative the Committee dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs MAPP, BARROW, WILLIAMS, HOLDER, BRYAN, Dr. CUMMINS, Cox and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—(8).

Noes: Messrs TALMA, CRAWFORD, J. C. MOTTLEY, VAUGHAN, ALLDER and GODDARD.—(6).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I now declare the ayes have it.

Question that Clause 2 stand part was put and agreed to without division.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

TEA ADJOURNMENT

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

RESUMPTION

On the re-assembling:

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I regret to have to inform the House that His Honour the Speaker is not very well and is unable to attend the House to-day. I would have apprised the House earlier but His Honour assured me that he would make every effort to attend.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—Unfortunately I was unable to attend earlier this afternoon due to professional business; but there is a question which I am seeking to give notice of if Your Honour will permit it. I am asking leave to give notice of this question.

There being no objection leave was granted.

NOTICE OF QUESTION

Mr. BRANCKER gave notice of the following question:—

To enquire of the appropriate member of the Executive present at the next meeting of the House:

Whether consideration has been given by Government since publication of the Dos Santos Report, to the question of increased remuneration for such persons as (a) scrubbers and cleaners at Police Stations and Courts (b) rockblasters and other quarry workers in the service of Government Departments, e.g. Department of Highways and Transport?

2. If the answer to the above question is in the negative, will Government without further delay, afford this matter the consideration to which it is entitled?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When the House adjourned it was in Committee on the Bill to make better provision for Local Government in the island.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

Clauses 3 to 30 inclusive were called and agreed to.

Clause 31 was called.

31. A person shall be disqualified for being elected or being a member of a Council—

- (a) if he holds any paid office or other place of profit (other than that of Mayor or Deputy Mayor of the or Chairman of a District Council) in the gift or disposal of the Council; or
- (b) if he is an undischarged bankrupt having been declared a bankrupt under any law in force in any part of Her Majesty's dominions; or
- (c) if within five years before the day of election or since his election he has been convicted of any offence under this part of this Act; or
- (d) if he has been convicted in any part of Her Majesty's dominions of any offence punishable by death or imprisonment, unless he has received a free pardon or has served his sentence or otherwise suffered the penalty imposed upon him provided however that if he is so convicted while a member of a Council, the Council shall declare his office to be vacant pursuant to section thirty-six of this Act, notwithstanding that, at the time of such declaration, he has served his sentence or otherwise suffered the penalty imposed upon him; or
- (e) if he has any pecuniary interest, direct or indirect in any contract with the Council.

Provided that a person shall not be disqualified by reason of his being interested—

- (i) in any sale, purchase, or lease of land to or from the Council; or
- (ii) in any newspaper in which any notice or advertisement relating to the affairs of the Council is inserted; or
- (iii) in any company which contracts with the Council for lighting or heating or insuring against fire any property of the Council; or
- (iv) in any agreement with the Council for the loan of money or any security for the payment of money; or
- (v) in any contract with the Council as a Director or shareholder in any company incorporated by or under any Act, but he shall not take part in any discussion of or vote on, any question in which such company is interested, at any meeting of the Council, or any committee thereof.

Dr. CUMMINS moved, seconded by Mr. Cox that Clause 31 stand part.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman,—On the last occasion when this Bill was before the House I drew to the attention of the members of the Government who were present then certain anomalies in the disqualification for being elected a member of the Council under Clause 31. The Government at that time promised they would do something about it; but unfortunately the members of the Other Place rejected the Bill in its entirety, and perhaps for that reason the Government was not able to pay close attention to the amendments which the honourable senior member for St. Thomas and I advocated at that time. I would again like to draw to the attention of the House Clause 31, which is one of the most vital clauses in this Bill, because it deals with the disqualification that I have mentioned.

Paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (d) are more or less in keeping with the wording of the equivalent section of the Local Government Act in the U.K., the Act of 1933. I would like to draw again to the attention of the House that Clause 31 (e) is no longer part of the Local Government Act in England. In the English Act it reads something entirely different from the way in which it reads in our Act. Now note the wording of Clause 31. I would say in passing that the wording of the first part of (d) is very remarkable because if a man had been convicted of an offence punishable by death the question of his being elected a member of the Council would not arise.

However, sir, with these disqualifications generally I do not think there can be any dispute. No one could disagree with them because they are entirely in keeping with the spirit of the Local Government Act and with the dictates of commonsense. Take the disqualification in (e)—“if he has any pecuniary interest direct or indirect in any contract with the Council”. If section 31 were left like that I would be most happy because it would mean that no one who carried on trade directly or indirectly with the Local Government Authority could be a member of the Council. That would be almost an elysian state of affairs because we would get a certain standard of purity of Government which we cannot get under the present vestry system, since the interests of the members are so closely inter-related with the interests of commerce and big business in this island as they have found to their detriment in a neighbouring colony. Section 31 (e) is

therefore very good. But then you get the reservations, and the sting is in the tail.

The first reservation is, provided that a person shall not be disqualified by reason of his being interested “(1) in any sale, purchase or lease of land to or from the Council.” Certain members of the present Vestry of the parish of St. Michael would be glad of that reservation. “(2) in any newspaper in which any notice or advertisement relating to the affairs of the Council is inserted.” Again certain members would be glad of that. “(3) in any company which contracts with the Council for lighting, heating etc.” I wonder what is meant by “heating”. I thought we had enough heat in Barbados. Here in this Chamber we often generate more heat than light. That is just a slavish copying of the English Act or rather what it used to be over 20 years ago. “(4) in any agreement with the Council for the loan of money or any security for the payment of money.” So the shareholders in the Electric Company or the Gas Company, money lenders, newspaper proprietors and real estate agents can be members of the Council and not only deal directly with the Council, but when you read the next paragraph you will see that they can be judges in their own cases. They can vote upon the awarding of a contract to themselves, because nothing in the Act prevents them.

Paragraph (5) is the most important, and it is the one on which I want to focus the attention of members of the committee. It says, “(v) in any contract with the Council as a shareholder in any company incorporated by or under any Act, but he shall not take part in any discussion of, or vote on, any question in which such company is interested at any meeting of the Council or any committee thereof.” I want honourable members to take this paragraph and weigh each word of it carefully. We have let in the money lenders and the newspaper proprietors and the directors or shareholders of the Gas or Electric Company despite the fact that they may be awarding contracts to themselves.

Imagine writing in this paragraph which states that a person shall not be disqualified if he is a director or shareholder of a company incorporated by or under any Act. That could only refer to the Companies Act of 1911. All the directors and big shareholders of big businesses in Bridgetown can be members of the Council and deal with the Council. It also means—and this is my chief objection to it—that if you are a director, Mr. Chairman, like yourself or some other members on the other side you get this privilege. But if you are a man carrying on a small shop, or making bread by the sweat of your brow late at night you cannot get a contract with the Council because you are not a shareholder in a company incorporated by or under the Companies Act.

As a matter of fact you cannot be a member of the Council, and put in an application for a contract; but if you are one of the directors of a big business in town you can do so. If you are a newspaper proprietor or a bank manager you can be a member of the Council and be present at a meeting and even vote for yourself. It is only the director or shareholder of a company incorporated by or under any Act who is disqualified from voting. All the other people, the money lenders, the newspaper proprietors etc. can vote on the matter and take part in the discussion that is going on. What about the small man, the shoemakers, the cabinet makers, joiners, carpenters and masons? Those people cannot even be a member of the Council and have a contract. A man may have a tender to supply milk to some school or institution of the Bridgetown Municipality. When an election for that Council comes up he cannot enter

himself as a candidate; but if he formed himself into a limited liability company and made himself the director he would be able to stand for election. Yes, Mr. Chairman, we are bringing in the big directors and shareholders of the big companies, the shipping agents and the real estate agents who control trade in this island and giving them monopoly powers in the awarding of contracts from the council.

I have pointed out this thing before, and the Leader of the House said it would be considered in Executive Committee. So far nothing has been done. How can we face the electorate if we allow section 31 to stand like this? I cannot remember which Government was in England in 1934; I believe it was a Liberal-Labour Coalition. Anyhow they changed the Local Government Act of that country. They struck out these things about pecuniary interest. It was only squeezing the small man. No one else was being squeezed by the wording of the Local Government Act in the form it was in then. They left out what we now have as Section 31 altogether, and all the reservations. Obviously a lot of people would not stand for election to the Council and the majority of members of the Vestry would not stand for election to the Vestry unless they felt they could have some control over the awarding of contracts. Despite what they tell you of being interested in the ratepayers, most of the members of the vestry, speaking of them as a body, go there to see what plums they can pick out of the things they are interested in. I intend no aspersions on any member of the House at all, because I know that we, at least, are above that. I could call names and no one could prosecute me because this is a privileged occasion; but I will not take advantage of that. But I repeat most of the big shareholders and directors go into the vestries now so as to be able to control the contracts.

Our Bill is foolishly worded. It shows how antique the books in the Attorney General's Chambers must be because they have apparently copied the 1834 rather than the 1933 English Act. As I have said, Section 76 (1) of the 1933 English Act leaves out the business about pecuniary interests and the reservations and says that if a member of the local government authority has any pecuniary interest direct or indirect in any contract or proposed contract or other matter, and is present at a meeting of the local authority at which the contract or other matter is the subject of consideration, he shall at the meeting as soon as practicable after the commencement thereof disclose the fact (compulsory disclosure) on the pain of fine and being brought to book. But under our Act there is nothing to make a shareholder, director or newspaper proprietor who is interested in a contract disclose the fact. The English Act goes on to say that he shall not take part in the discussion of, or vote on any question of the contract or other matter.

That is all we need. Obviously in a small community it will be difficult to find men of the right calibre. If you need businessmen in the Council because of their experience you cannot say that because he has a few shares in a company he cannot be elected. Nor should you do anything to hinder the small man with a little bakery or shop. We should not tell such a man that we cannot give him a contract at all and further more that he cannot stand for election if he wants to do business with you, and then let off all the other people. I would like to see the whole of section 31 deleted. We have had a promise before, but nothing has been done about it. I would like some assurance from the people who are responsible that it will be actively considered.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I am going to make a motion that sub-section (e) be deleted in

its entirety, and a new clause will have to be inserted. Clause 31 deals with disqualifications for being elected a member of the Council. This clause really does not deal with disqualification from being a member. It deals with disqualification from voting. You will have to take out Clause 31 (e) in its entirety.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman,— If the honourable member will allow me I would say that when this Bill was dealt with on the last occasion I was out of the island. I know nothing about any undertaking given to the honourable member by the Leader of the House. Everyone knows what was the fate of this Bill when it went to the Other Place, so perhaps the suggested amendment never had a chance of seeing the light of day in that Chamber. When the Executive considered the re-introduction of this Bill the Leader of the House was not in the island nor is he in the island now. As I have said, I knew nothing of the undertaking, but I told the honourable senior member for St. George last night that I would undertake to have the suggested amendment considered in Executive Committee, and we would see that the Bill was amended in the Other Place.

The honourable member has suggested an amendment. I am not a lawyer, but I understand that drafting is a science. I will give him an assurance that I will bring his amendment to the notice of Executive Committee and we will have one drafted along these lines.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman,— I think it is correct to say that when this matter was dealt with in Select Committee I pointed out this clause to the Chairman, and I think the Chairman was the honourable junior member for St. Thomas. I think too that on the last occasion that this Bill was dealt with here the honourable senior member for St. George brought the matter to the attention of the Leader of the House. It is all very well to take assurances; but I think that matters like these should be settled once and for all. I expressly drew the point to the Chairman of the Select Committee.

Mr. BARROW: I would like to say that I have the greatest respect and admiration for the honourable junior member for St. Thomas. I know that his word can be relied upon. But I wonder if it rests entirely with the honourable member as to whether we will get this amendment inserted or not. It seems to me that before we can move a further amendment to the Bill we have to have it sanctioned by the Executive Committee. If that is so we are wasting our time in this House.

Dr. CUMMINS: I never said anything about sanction of the Executive being necessary. I was looking at the matter from the point of view of drafting. If the House wants to amend it they can go ahead and amend it. I have often heard it said that the amendments made here wanted tidying up, and they have had to be referred to the legal draughtsman. I am not such a lunatic as to say that the Executive Committee has to sanction amendments before they can be made by the House.

Mr. BARROW: I am in a very awkward position. The very person or persons to whom we are going to entrust this tidying up did not even have the time to find out what the latest legislation was in the U.K. on this subject. They have put in a particular clause which has been amended in the U.K. more than 20 years ago. I feel that we can pass this amendment and leave the tidying up to the Executive Committee. To ask me not to make an amendment would be to leave me in the same position that I was in the last time. I feel that is asking too much of human nature. The draughtsmanship that I am relying upon is the draughtsmanship of the Parliamentary

Draughtsman in the U.K. because I intend to adopt Section 76 of the English Act. I think that there are no better draughtsmen in the Empire than the Parliamentary Draughtsmen in the House of Commons. I do not think we will be going far wrong in adopting that particular section. To ask me to leave it to be tidied up would mean that I would be leaving the whole principle to be accepted or rejected by Executive Committee, a constitutional practice which I abhor to use a mild word. We should have government by this Chamber. We are here to put forward ideas which we feel are in the interest of the electorate. We do not have to go cap in hand and ask someone if they think it would be a good idea to do this or that. If honourable members agree with the observations that I have made; if they agree that section 31 is a mistake and that it can be construed as protecting certain big business and giving monopolistic powers, they will accept the wording of section 76 of the Local Government Act in the U.K. and agree that section 31 (e) be deleted and a new clause inserted after section 31. I now formally make that motion, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WILLIAMS seconded.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—It seems to me that we may find ourselves in a rather awkward position. It is alright to delete sub-clause (e) but unless we know what is going to be inserted it is better to have something like the present sub-clause than nothing at all. I am appealing to the honourable senior member for St. George to make it clear, at least for my benefit, exactly what he wants to insert. I do sympathise with him because after all as soon as this Bill leaves this House the Government has no majority in the Other Place to put in an amendment, especially if the amendment is repugnant to the interests of the people who might have to put it in. Government may have someone to move and another person to second the motion for the insertion of the amendment when the Bill is before the Other Place; but that is all that they can say. If Government would think of the fate of this Bill in the Other Place on the last occasion they would not promise to put in any amendment when it gets there. But as I have said, I would like the honourable senior member for St. George to give a clear idea of what he is going to insert because I am in the House at present and I will have to vote on the matter.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Chairman,—I think that the honourable senior member for St. George should step very warily in proposing this amendment. I agree with his sentiments on the matter and on the last occasion I supported his views. I myself would like to see the section tightened up. In England these people are not only not supposed to vote on a matter in which they have some interest; they are also supposed to reveal the fact that they have some interest before the vote is taken, while discussion on the matter is going on. I think we could well adopt that method here. But the honourable member must realise that the honourable junior member for St. Thomas cannot act on the initiative taken by a member and say "I accept the amendment." He would have to go back to Executive Committee and the Legal Draughtsman. With all due respect to the honourable senior member for St. George who is a legal man I would say that doctors differ and so do lawyers. This to my mind is not the big issue facing this House at present. Our task now is to see that it passes the Other Place. After that the Government can propose further amendments to the Bill. But let us send it to the Other Place as it went to them before and if it is

passed we can then settle this other issue by way of an amendment.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman,—I am amazed at the attitude of the last member who spoke. The honourable senior member for St. George has expressed his point of view clearly. He wants to include the private individual who is doing business in partnership. It meets with my approval and I do not see why we cannot make an amendment without sending back the Bill to Executive Committee. You may as well stop reading it by the clauses, or rather by calling the clauses, and say we accept the Maude Bill without further argument or consideration.

The honourable member's amendment is clear. Leave out all the reservations that we have here and put in the same clause that appears in the English Act and which states that a person will have to declare that he is interested in a company that is seeking a contract with the Council. And then he cannot vote. It is as clear as a pikestaff. If any business of any kind or size should have the right to seek a contract with a local authority when the director of that business is a member of the local authority why should not the same privilege be extended to a private individual? I would also like to state that in the same way you have big companies you have small companies, and you may get the same thing applying in the reverse in the case cited by the honourable senior member for St. George. You may get a small partnership interested in a contract, or you may get a large partnership interested in it.

I would also like to say — because reference was made to the Vestry System — that in my experience of seven years as a member of two vestries I have never seen a contract awarded to any big business that was not the lowest tender except for a very good reason. I have seen contracts awarded to individuals for the supply of milk, who might not have been the lowest tenders, but a very good reason was given for it. There is milk and milk. But from bread right through there is a committee which goes into the tenders, sees which is the lowest and awards the contract to the lowest, often to the detriment of the vestry because even in bread there is quality and quality.

I only say that in passing, but to get back to the main issue I think we should allow any person, big or small, to be awarded a contract while a member of the Council provided he states that he is interested in the contract. I know cases where large partnerships have been precluded from taking a contract.

Mr. BARROW: I would like to quote from a book the reasons given for the amendment of the English Local Government Act.

"Qualifications and disqualifications are primarily intended to secure two things: that the member shall have a real interest as a member of the public in the services provided by the Council, and that he shall have no substantial personal or material interest. On this basis, one omission may perhaps be surprising; there is no disqualification in being in contractual relation (other than as an employee) with the Council. There was such a disqualification until 1934, but the growth of trading through joint stock companies rendered it largely ineffective because even the managing director and the principal shareholders of such a company were not disqualified by the fact of a contract between the company and the council."

We have to look after the interest of the small man. Due to the extension of commerce and the idea of limited liability companies, almost every

man who has an interest in local government is usually a business man of some sort. It is not the ministers and the school teachers who go into local government. It is the small and the big business man. Why should you have special reservations against the small business man and not against the big business man? It does not make sense.

The only other problem that faces me is this: In moving the deletion of subsection (3) I did not see how we could substitute the wording of the first part of section 31; but since the honourable junior member for St. Thomas has spoken I no longer have any qualms on that score because the Government will look after the tidying up. Section 31 can be deleted after paragraph (d) and a new clause added. They will see to the tidying up. The tidying up can be done by the people to whom we pay £1,750 a year. What I am proposing does not come from my own speculation or intuition. It is what was done at the express desire of the House of Commons when they amended the Act in 1933. I am adopting Section 76 of the English Act in its entirety. It has happened before that the appropriate Government Department has sent down Bills to this House with the wrong clauses and they have had to be tidied up afterwards. Now they will have the privilege too of tidying up something which we have done on purpose.

Mr. MAPP: With all due deference to the remarks of certain honourable members, I still say that this House would be doing a shoddy thing to accept an amendment *ipse dixit* of the honourable senior member for St. George. The honourable member is not quoting from the Act of Great Britain. If he was doing that I would accept it. He is quoting from a text book which reproduces part of that section.

Mr. BARROW: I hope that the honourable member is not calling me a liar. If he is I would like to ask him to withdraw the statement. I challenge him to say that the amendment which I have proposed is not part of the English Local Government Act of 1935.

Mr. MAPP: I have not called him a liar. He is quoting from a text book which I also had. I know that the book goes on to say that there are certain sections which will require a definition section before you can say what you mean by pecuniary interest and indirect pecuniary interest.

Mr. BARROW: I intended to add a definition clause; but the honourable member has accused himself of not being a lawyer, and then he comes rushing in where angels fear to tread.

Mr. MAPP: The honourable member can speak again after I have finished. He admitted that certain things which we are doing would not be right but we can send them and have them tidied up.

Mr. BARROW: I can play this game better than the honourable member.

Mr. MAPP: I object to the honourable member saying that I am playing a game.

Mr. BARROW: I never said I would be sending anything up in a shoddy manner. All that would be left to be done would be to renumber the sections, and I am sure from the assurance given by the honourable junior member for St. Thomas that the appropriate Government Department would have no hesitation in doing that.

Mr. MAPP: Honourable members have said that my colleague is making it appear that this House cannot do this that and the other. That is silly. We all agree to the principle. The Leader of the Opposition has agreed in principle to the remarks made by the honourable senior member for St. George. We cannot appear to be playing solo in this matter. If the honourable junior member for St. Thomas has given an assurance, and as the

honourable senior member for St. George admitted, you can trust his word, he can leave it to the word of the honourable member to see that it is done. If it is not done, the honourable member can go home and look up the English Act, draft what he wants and bring it here as a private member's Bill and we will accept it. But we should not send up anything sort of half prepared. The honourable member does not have the Act. He is quoting from a text book.

Mr. Chairman, you know how it is with these professional gentlemen. They like to think that no one can improve on what they do. I accept the assurance of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas that he will refer this matter back and have an amendment prepared.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman,— My view is that this is a grave error of commission. By that I mean the insertion of this sub-clause: (e) which will prove detrimental to the people who sent us here. That being the case, we cannot risk leaving it to the members of the Executive. I am not casting any aspersion on the honourable Deputy Leader; but we have had an experience that only recently this same Bill has been twice or three times amended and this offending sub-clause is still in it. It is a grave mistake and here we are, just on the grounds of procedure and propriety attempting to make the same mistake twice. I certainly will support the motion made by the honourable member because in any case I feel that the object of this House going into committee on a Bill is to make the required amendments.

Mr. BARROW: I do not want to speak much more on this section; but there are one or two things that puzzle me to which I would like an answer. What is the constitutional machinery whereby after an Act has passed the second reading, and committee stage and gone to the Other Place the Executive can have that Act amended without coming back to this Chamber? The second constitutional problem is this: The honourable senior member for St. Thomas suggested that although we are in committee now I should introduce a private member's bill to amend a Bill that has not yet even passed the House. I understand that he is now saying pass the Bill as it is and if the Government does not amend it I should bring in a bill to do so. But why should I do that instead of doing something now that is the right and duty of this House to do? Do you mean to say that everything which comes down from the Attorney General's office is sacrosanct? They have sent a Bill here with every clause wrong because they copied the Trinidad legislation—the recent Immigration Act which went to the Legislative Council and the honourable senior member for St. Thomas sat here and voted for it summarily. That is the sort of thing we must sit here and encourage and bow and kneel to all the time, and the honourable member has the temerity to state further that I am not reading from the Local Government Act of the U.K.; that I am reading something from out of a book.

For the honourable member's edification I would like to tell him that I could quote the English Local Government Bill—I forget how many clauses there are—almost verbatim. But I am not asking that that Bill be adopted in Barbados I am substituting the specific wording of a specific clause. If honourable members disagree with the wording they can disagree with it. It does not matter if I am reading from a book or quoting it out of my head. That is extraneous, irrelevant and a *non sequitur*. I do not know whose duties the honourable member is usurping that he should behave like how he has. But I do not appreciate the arguments that he has put forward. He has said that I am not reading the Local Government Act of England.

But if you want to argue *ad absurdum* you will have to say that to read the Local Government Act of England you will have to have the original Act signed by the late King George V. That is the sort of childish argument to which this Chamber has degenerated. Does the honourable member have some psychological fear of some administrative Civil Servant? This is not the first time that the remarks which I made in favour of my amendment have come to his notice. He has on a past occasion supported my remarks when I was reading from the same book, and he seconded me by a process of supererogation.

Mr. MAPP: The honourable member must not tell glaring untruths. I never seconded any motion of his. I got up last time and said I agreed with the principle of what he was saying. I still agree with it. I am also saying that we must sympathise with the position of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. BARROW: If it is sympathy that the two honourable members for St. Thomas need they have my sympathy. The members of the House also have my sympathy for having to put up with the honourable senior member for St. Thomas. I am asking for the addition of a new clause after the deletion of subclause (e). I will read the new clause that I am proposing.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—If the honourable member is now proposing what he intends to be the new sub-clause he need not do it in detail. The only motion at present is for the deletion of Clause 31 (e). What I would like to say is that we must to some extent understand the position of then honourable junior member for St. Thomas. I agree with the honourable senior member for St. George that there is an anomaly in this section, and I can feel that other honourable members agree with that too. The honourable member in charge of the Bill must see it to some extent because he has promised to have something done about it. I would not like anything to be taken as doubting his word. But if this Bill is passed by the House to-night the Government has no power to have it changed.

I would also like to say that the amendments proposed are not before honourable members in a form in which they can read them. They can only listen to them being read, and if they feel that they are reasonable they will accept them. That is the only objection I have to what is being done. I see the point that there is an anomaly in the sub-clause as it stands, and I will let the honourable senior member for St. George know that I will vote for his motion if it comes to the vote in the hope that what he is proposing is reasonable; although I feel it would be better if it could be postponed until after the dinner recess so that honourable members might be able to get a copy of the amendment and read it.

Question that sub-clause (e) proposed to be deleted stand part was put and resolved in the negative, the Committee dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr MAPP, Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. HOLDER, COX and BRYAN.—(5).

Noes: Messrs. LEWIS, WILLIAMS, BARROW, TALMA BRANCKER, CRAWFORD, E. D. MOTTLEY, VAUGHAN, ALLDER, and GODDARD.—(10).

Question that Clause 31 as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. MAPP: Before you put the question, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the Committee is passing something which they have no power to do. We are deleting sub-clause (e) yet we are still allowing the provisos after sub-clause (d) to remain.

The question that Clause 31 as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. BARROW: I beg to move that Clause 32 be read as follows:

“32. (1) If a member of a Council has a “pecuniary interest, direct or indirect, in any “contract or proposed contract or other matter, “and is present at a meeting of the Council at which “the contract or the matter is the subject of consideration, he shall, at the meeting, as soon as practicable after the commencement thereof, disclose “the fact, and shall not take part in the consideration or discussion of or vote on any question with “respect to, the contract or other matter.”

“Provided that this section shall not apply to “an interest in a contract or other matter which “a member may have as a taxpayer or inhabitant of “the area or as an ordinary consumer of any services “supplied by the Council, or to an interest in any “other matter relating to the terms on which the “right to participate in any service, including the “supply of goods, is offered to the public.”

Sir, 32 (2) describes what an indirect interest is and is as follows:—

Mr. MAPP: I do not think the honourable member has carefully considered this amendment. I am going to suggest that the honourable member ask for a postponement in order to draft this amendment properly.

(A VOICE): There is no motion yet before the Committee.

Mr. BARROW: Before I actually quote what should be 32 (2), I was tidying it up. It reads as follows:—

“(2) A member shall be deemed to have an indirect pecuniary interest if,

“(a) he or any nominee of his is a member “of a company or other body with which the “contract is made or is proposed to be made or “which has a direct pecuniary interest in the “other matters under consideration, or

“(b) he is a partner or is in the employment, of a person with whom the contract is “made or is proposed to be made, or who has a “direct pecuniary interest in the other matters “under consideration.”

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second this amendment.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I think the members of this Committee have listened to something which, few according to my thinking, understand. Some members of this Committee have not even been listening; therefore we do not know if anything wrong has been put before us.

Mr. BARROW: That is your fault, if you do not take your work seriously.

Mr. MAPP: Sir, imagine the honourable senior member for St. George introducing a serious amendment as this to this Committee verbally, and on the back of it insulting our intelligence by saying “we do not take our work seriously.” Must I necessarily take it for granted that this amendment is right and properly drafted? The honourable member is treating members of this Committee as if there were little children. He is telling us that it is our fault if we do not take our work seriously.

Sir, under the English Act on this matter there are several other provisos because of the fact that you can disqualify people who should not be disqualified and the honourable member knows that. He has not the English Act before him; he is just taking something from out of a text-book and asking this Committee to insert it in this Bill. Sir, honourable members of this Committee have to act as

a responsible body and I am not going to accept something because he says it. I repeat again that there are several provisos to safeguard persons who may be employees of public bodies. If the honourable member has not the other provisos, or does not consider them relevant I will not accept this amendment.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman—evidently, there is a lot of confusion over this Act. I like my colleague heard something read. I have not heard it before nor I do not have it before me. Unless the honourable senior member for St. George wishes to push this through by a majority vote, I am counselling the honourable member to postpone this section and give honourable members a week to study it.

Mr. VAUGHAN: What does the honourable senior member for St. Thomas mean when he says if the honourable senior member for St. George does not have the whole Act here it cannot be known which proviso is relevant to this section? If the honourable member has a certain section suitable for the purpose, is it necessary for him to have the entire Act?

Mr. MAPP: The honourable member is not paying attention. He does not know the implications of this amendment. It is no need to ask him what the honourable senior member for St. George proposed because he does not know. However, the honourable senior member for St. George says that this amendment must be inserted after section 31. I do not know. It seems probable that a trustee or anybody else having a pecuniary interest in a business matter, if he be a member of the Council or an employee of a corporate body can be excluded from voting. What the honourable member has proposed, we do not know if it is absolutely correct and he knows that. It is not my responsibility to draft bills nor any of us. As a matter of fact, I do not consider myself an expert draughtsman. I only look at things from a sensible point of view and that is what all bodies do. The House of Commons employs a special draughtsman to do that for them. Ordinary members do not draft amendments. I only got up to say that there are obvious dangers of accepting things off hand when the House is in Committee without knowing sufficiently of the matter.

Mr. BARROW: I think the honourable senior member for St. Thomas is at cross purposes because he is now talking about drafting. Sir, I have read out the amendment which I proposed in common Bargon English. I credit honourable members with having some measure of intelligence and that they can understand ordinary English. With regard to draughtmanship, no one would quibble if the Attorney General changes same to suit this purpose or if any honourable member proposes any new provisos with the spirit of the clause which I proposed. I went further when I said in my opening remarks that I would be pleased to accept any refinements on this clause unless they were repugnant to the spirit of the amendment. I thought all honourable members understood me. I did not know that I was talking in a strange land. Unless the honourable senior member for St. Thomas is accusing honourable members of poor intelligence, I do not see what else he is trying to make out. I can only come to the conclusion that he is trying to filibuster things.

Sir, there is one thing which I will not accept as a member of a democratic assembly and that is I will not allow a Government Department to legislate for the people of the country. We have to do the legislation here, the legal Government Depart-

ment should only put in the commas and full stops. The thinking should be done in this Chamber and not in the Government Department nor should the Other Place usurp our place. The honourable senior member for St. Thomas seems to think that this Assembly should surrender everything to the Government Departments and to do that is in the best interests of the people of this country. I will always reject that idea. What we are doing here is legislating for the people of this colony. Those officers in Government Departments are the pen pushers; they are the people who are the hewers of wood and the drawers of water. I will sit down by saying that I do not know what constitutional machinery it is whereby the Executive Committee can put in an amendment without sending back the Bill to this House after it has passed its second reading. I did not know that Government had a majority in the Other Place or a spokesman there. I am sure that if we leave these amendments to the good auspices of the Other Place that this Bill will suffer the fate of the last Bill on the last occasion. The honourable senior member for St. Thomas wishes us to surrender our democratic liberty and to place it in the hands of Civil Servants. He is implying that the twenty-four of us does not understand English properly therefore we must have draughtsmen. I never heard of a draughtsman legislating. It seems to me that we are allowing draughtsmen to legislate when we should be doing it ourselves. The sooner we draw the line, the better.

Mr. MAPP: I do not want to bandy words with the honourable senior member for St. George. I am not a member of the Bench but he is a member of the Bar. However, I am going to put plain facts before the House and appeal to honourable members to see my point of view. The honourable member has quoted a section of the English Act which has two definition clauses to safeguard persons who may have a pecuniary interest in certain matters while serving on public bodies. I am going to read something too legislating for such persons. It is as follows: "Subject to the proviso that membership of or employment under a public body does not disqualify from voting and that a member or shareholder is not disqualified if he has no beneficial interest." As I have already said, the English Act has other provisos.

Mr. BARROW: I have already said that if any honourable member has any provisos which will put the House in a clearer way, let him do so. I know what I am doing. I will not accept any provisos.

Mr. MAPP: I did not suggest that we send this Bill back to any department. I suggested that if the honourable member does not have the English Act before him to let us postpone the section so that it can be circulated to honourable members and we could see what we are legislating on. I am no legal draughtsman. The honourable member is bringing in an amendment without circulating it to honourable members. Let us read it properly before we confide in it is all that I have said. Move that it be postponed.

Mr. BARROW: Sir,—as far as I am concerned, it seems as if a number of honourable members around this Table cannot understand ordinary English. They seem as if they cannot understand what I have said. They therefore are at liberty to vote for or against this amendment. I have already said if honourable members have any constructive proposals to put them in. The honourable senior member for St. Thomas can put in the provisos which he knows something about. I will not be so foolish as to put in provisos which will not benefit the people con-

cerned. Again, I am not asking any honourable member to do something which is against his conscience or to vote for something which he thinks I am stampeding in this Chamber.

The question that Clause 32 as proposed stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs Lewis, Williams, Barrow, Talma, Brancker, Crawford, J. C. Mottley, Vaughan, and Allder.—(9)

Noes: Messrs Mapp, Holder, Bryan, Cox and Dr. Cummins.—(5).

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 32 of the Bill be renumbered 33 and the subsequent clauses be renumbered likewise.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Clauses 33 to 51 inclusive were called and passed on separate motions moved by Dr. Cummins and seconded by Mr. Cox.

Clause 52 was called. It reads as follows:—

“(1) Every Council shall appoint such other officers and servants as they think necessary for the efficient discharge of the functions of the Council.

“(2) A Council may pay to an officer or servant appointed under this section such reasonable remuneration as they may determine.”

“(3) Subject to the provisions of any other Act, every officer or servant appointed under this section other than an officer referred to in the proviso to sub-section 1 of this section shall hold office during the pleasure of the Council but they may be included in the terms of his appointment a provision that the appointment shall not be terminated by other parties without giving the other party such reasonable notice as may be agreed.”

“(4) Provision in this or any other enactment that a person shall hold office during the pleasure of the Council shall not affect right or obligation of the officer to retire on attaining any specified age or on the happening of any specified event in pursuance of any enactment or scheme relating to pension or superannuation allowances which is applicable to the officer.”

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 52 stand part.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. MAPP: Sir, this clause deals with the appointment of Council officers, the Council appointing with the consent of the Governor. I will have to refer to Clause 50 which read as follows:—

“(1) Every Council shall, with the consent of the Governor, appoint fit persons to be respectively clerk of the Council and treasurer, and may pay to such officers such remuneration as, with the like consent, they may determine, and no officer appointed under this section shall be dismissed except by the Council with the consent of the Governor or by the Governor.”

Sir, when we come to Clause 52, the clause which we are considering, it deals with the appointment of staff, in other words, clerical staff such as clerical assistants, sanitary inspectors, inspectors of weights and measures and people like that. Sir, I think this matter was referred to the Select Committee on the last occasion but I do not know what were their conclusions on it, but I can tell you that there is really disquietude amongst certain parochial employees—I would say almost all of the employees of the vestries on the island—on this matter, for the simple reason that at present they hold office during the pleasure of the existing local body whether it be Commissioners of Health, High-

way Commissioners, or the Vestry itself. I would not be overstating the case if I went on to say that in some areas of the island, it is unfortunately becoming a prerequisite to the acquisition of a job with any of these authorities that you should support, actively or otherwise, certain persons on these local government bodies. It is no wonder that some of these parochial employees have been victimised because they hold office alien, let us say to that of the Churchwarden or another such powerful figure of the Vestry. Therefore, a lot of employees feel that the Clerk of the local government—if this Clause becomes law—will have no redress if they are going to hold office during the pleasure of the Council. If the treasurer and the clerk of the administrative council or metropolitan borough council is going to hold office and is liable to dismissal with the consent of His Excellency the Governor, I see no reason why the same dispensation should not be applied to the subordinate employees. It is true, Mr. Chairman, that there is such a thing as a “Better Security Act” under which the employees of the Vestries are not really liable to dismissal on whimsical grounds as they were in the past, but these employees are still dismissed nowadays at the whims and caprice of certain powerful members of the Vestries even though there is a Better Security Act. Notwithstanding that, we are now passing this Act which is not clear, it being ambiguous in its terminology, this clause stating that these other officers should hold office at the pleasure of the Council. Sir, we are making a special dispensation with the clerk and the treasurer. We are saying that with our bigger boys we are going to make their appointments and dismissals subject to the consent of the Governor. I think this provision should extend to all employees, except of course casual employees of the Council. Obviously, it would be difficult for a scavenger or cantonnier or casual employees to be placed on the same footing as senior staff. I do not think that the Better Security Act is really a workable Act because we still hear of unfortunate dismissals.

Sir, the question of dismissals is one thing but the question of getting a job is another. It has reached the stage now that one must be closely allied to politicians to get a job with local bodies. I am saying that the Governor should have the right to approve or disapprove any question involving the appointment of permanent servants of the local Government.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to draw to the attention of the honourable Deputy Leader and the honourable Senior Member for St. Michael something which I have noticed in sub-clause 3 of this clause. In line 3 it says: “an officer referred to in the proviso to sub-section (1) of this section.” The honourable Senior Member for St. Thomas has really made a point which was recommended by the Select Committee which dealt with this Bill on the last occasion and that Committee recommended a proviso to sub-section (1) which I see in their recommendations. There is no proviso to sub-section (1) in this Bill although it is stated here in sub-section (3). Evidently, it must have been placed in the first Bill and by some error has been left out of this one.

Mr. Chairman, under the circumstances, I move that this section be postponed for further consideration.

Mr. MAPP seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Clauses 53 to 87 inclusive were called and passed on separate motions moved by Dr. CUMMINS and seconded by Mr. Cox.

Clause 88 was called. It reads as follows:—

“Any person whose assessable income for the purposes of trade tax does not exceed five hundred dollars shall be entitled to exemption from trade tax.”

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 88 stand part.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Sir,—This clause deals with the exemption of income. In the first instance, the amount limited for exemption was \$1,000, now it is reduced to \$500. But, Sir, while you are doing this, you are not limiting the amount of money that a manager, director or such person in a business may draw as a salary.

(A VOICE): Oh yes, you come to that in a subsequent clause.

Mr. LEWIS: Sir, I am quite sure I am right on this point. You have abolished the limit of what a proprietor or a manager in charge of his own business should draw as a salary, therefore, you have left it to that person to put down whatever he may care as his salary. On top of that, you are allowing him a sum of \$500 exemption from trade tax. By what you are doing, it seems to me that you are making quite sure that you should ask the Governor for a subvention for the Council because a business can be manipulated in such a way that no profit can be shown as being derived from trade. If you let a businessman give himself any amount for managing his own business, he is going to make a return to government, probably showing a generous salary for himself for which he will have to pay income tax, but the business will show no profit, therefore it will be exempted from trade tax. He will pay his income tax to Government but the City or District Council will be compelled to appeal to the Government for a subvention. Let us not fool ourselves about this. At present, the Vestries have a wise provision to circumvent these traders when making out their trade returns. The Vestries tell a trader that it does not matter what he gives himself as salary for the management of his business so long as it does not exceed 50 per cent. of the profit that is shown. That is, you can give up £600 as profit, provided that it is more than 50 per cent. of your management, but if you show little or no profit and you have yourself down for £600 as management, you have to add that £600 as management on to what little profit you may show and that will be called profits of the business and you will get one-third of that amount off for management and the balance will be assessed for trade tax.

In this Bill, it seems to me that certain people are objecting to it not because it is creating a hardship on them but because it has loop-holes. They might be afraid of Adult Suffrage, But Sir, the fact remains that a trader's return will not be made out for the City or District Council; it will be made out to the Income Tax Commissioner so that these Councils will not have the opportunity of seeing the returns at first hand. The Councils will have to get these returns from the Income Tax Commissioner. Sir, I feel if you allow a businessman to take whatever salary he may choose for the management of his business, you should not allow this exemption of \$500. In my opinion there should not be at all any exemption on profits; you should pay trade tax on whatever profits you make, especially if you take out of the business as much as you like for salary. I cannot understand this side of the Bill, therefore, I am asking the Government to give it some consideration. As I see it, anybody can take mean advantage of the Council, by that person taking all the profits out for

salary, from which the Government will derive income tax, but the Council will get nothing.

(A VOICE): Oh no; read sub-section 2 of the preceding clause.

Mr. LEWIS: As I see it, you have increased both these amounts. You are allowing by Clause 87 a businessman \$5,000 for his own salary, then you are giving off \$500 of the profit that is made on the business as an exemption from trade tax. I think the Government is extremely generous and this is going to reflect in the amounts that these Councils will be getting in to dispense local government. I thank the honourable member for pointing out this to me. Sir, how many businesses in this island can show a profit of \$5,500? That is the amount that you are exempting from trade tax. Let us say that a man is doing business in the City of Bridgetown which is a business to be assessed for Trade Tax by the City Council. He will not pay a cent in Trade Tax if he allows himself a salary of \$5,000 a year for himself and ends up by making a profit of \$500. I will ask any honourable member to dispute that. This Maude Bill will give that man before he pays Trade Tax an exemption of \$5,500; under the present Vestry Act, he only gets an exemption of \$2,800. Sir, as I compare these two amounts, I wonder what businessmen are afraid of in this Maude Bill. Along with this, these businessmen are not going to have their returns seen by other people. I think Government is too generous in this respect. I am going to move the deletion of Clause 88. I feel in honour bound to do so. A businessman should pay trade tax if his business makes any profit. He should pay for the protection he receives from the Fire Brigade; for sweeping of the streets; and for lighting of the street to prevent people from breaking in his business at night.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Chairman,—I noticed that Sir John Maude recommended that there should be some system introduced for the graduation of fees that a trader should pay in accordance with his stock-in-trade. I think that is a necessary thing. I believe that it will provide for a more equitable rate of taxation.

Mr. LEWIS: Sir, I rise again to make a point clear and that is that my amendment will not affect the small businessman. The preceding clause makes provision that a man should be allowed \$5,000 as salary for the management of his business before he can talk of profits. I am saying that no small businessman can get as far as \$5,000 per annum for salary out of his business.

Mr. ALLDER: I beg to second the motion which was moved by the honourable Junior Member for the City. I think this exemption is too great and that it will cause the local authorities to lose much that they should receive from trade taxes.

Dr. CUMMINS: I really cannot understand the argument of the honourable Junior Member for the City who attacked this clause. This amount of \$500 is assessable income for purposes of trade tax not for the purpose of income tax. I cannot see his argument that if a person is allowed \$5,000 as salary for the management of his business that person will be paying income tax and not trade tax. I would tell the honourable member that at first \$1,000 was recommended for exemption but the Select Committee dealing with the matter thought that amount was too much and reduced it to \$500. Our experience of traders in St. Michael is that you get the small trader on whom you are taxing for trade tax that his tax is generally very small. Very often, that trader is not able to pay that tax and he goes and asks for relief which he receives as a result of the case he has made out. Rather than having that type of person to be always going to a local government council and

asking for relief, it was thought better to reduce this amount to \$500.

Mr. LEWIS: I am not mixing this up with income tax. I am merely saying that I do not know what method the Income Tax Commissioner will adopt in this matter because it is not stated in the Bill. According to this Bill a businessman can get \$5,000 a year as salary for the management of his business. He is therefore entitled to \$5,000 out of the profits of the business for himself. Added to that if \$500 is left over after taking out the \$5,000 for himself, he does not pay trade tax on it. Although that business may make a profit of \$5,500, the director of that business would not pay a cent of trade tax to the Council. If the honourable junior member for St. Thomas can convince me that this is not so I will be quite willing to allow this clause to remain as it is. According to the Vestry Act, a businessman can only get off \$2,800 for himself and he cannot take it out if he only makes \$500. His profits must show more than his management else as in the case I have just mentioned, he will have to add on the \$500 profit to his \$2,800 for management making a total of \$3,300 and of this amount, he will be allowed one-third for himself and the balance will be assessed for trade tax. This has nothing to do with the small businessman. If a man takes \$5,000 as salary for himself according to this Bill, he does not show a profit at all.

Mr. TALMA: I think what is confusing certain honourable members is that sub-clause 2 of the preceding clause refers to assessable income which shall be allowed in respect of the salaries of proprietors of businesses and in the case of companies registered under the Companies Act, 1910, to the managing, governing or other directors, attorneys, managers or secretaries in regard to the management of such business. Provision is made in this case for \$5,000 to be allocated for salaries. This has nothing to do with the small shopkeeper. He cannot afford to pay himself \$5,000 per annum as salary. He is just a petty shopkeeper. Section 88 is put in to ease the small shopkeeper. If you take it out, he will not be protected at all. We want to protect the small shopkeeper or trader. This Labour Government cannot by its policy exert hardship on the people who put us in here. Whereas clause 87 refers to proprietors of big businesses and companies and makes provisions for the big people of those companies, clause 88 deals most specifically with the small shopkeeper who cannot even make a profit of \$500. If it is not left in, the Income Tax Commissioner will run him amuck although he is just making his way. This clause is put in to prevent a man from paying trade tax when he is only making \$40 roughly speaking per month. In these days, you cannot expect a man to run a shop and accept less than \$40 a month as his income. I think that the whole intention of this clause is to see that undue advantage is not taken of the small shopkeeper.

Mr. LEWIS: Sir, the usual good senses of the honourable senior member for Christ Church have deserted him on this question with a vengeance and from his argument, the very man whom he wants to protect he is penalising. The honourable member has legal training which I have not, but I am going to ask him to read sub-section 2 of Clause 87 again and try to interpret it correctly. Sir, the honourable member is entirely wrong on this occasion. According to this Bill, the small shopkeeper is entitled to \$5,000 as salary for the running of his business. What is put in clause 87 to protect the big businessman is that if the business has two or three big people in it, each is allowed \$5,000 from the business; that will be \$15,000 from the business in case there are three big people who get together and run the business. I know

what I am saying in this respect because I am conversant with the Companies Act. In the first part of clause 87, sub-clause 2, it tells you to whom you should give this \$5,000 deduction as salary. There could be more than one proprietor although it is not a company. In the case of a company registered under the Companies Act, 1910, it tells you the persons to whom you should also give this amount. It is defined in this subsection clearly all those persons who are entitled to this \$5,000 reduction from the business profits. It is as clear as a pikestaff. Sir, whether there be a proprietor or proprietors of a business, each one of them can take out \$5,000 as salary and after that, this Government is allowing another \$500. Of course, those persons cannot escape paying income tax on that amount which they take out. I feel this Government should be the last to do this thing.

Mr. TALMA: Although there is something in what the honourable junior member for the City has just said, I still maintain that clause 87, sub-section (2) deals with the big businessman. The sub-clause reads as follows:—

"In determining assessable income a deduction shall be allowed in respect of the salaries of proprietors of businesses and in the case of companies registered under the Companies Act, 1910, to the managing, governing or other directors, attorneys, managers or secretaries in regard to the management of such business a sum not exceeding in any case five thousand dollars to any one such person."

Sir, this is making provision for proprietors of big businesses, and then it goes on and deals with the big people in companies. I am saying that Clause 87, sub-clause (2), in truth and in fact, if properly interpreted, deals with big business concerns. This is clear and distinct. This clause — clause 88 — with which we are dealing, covers the small shopkeeper and is making sure that he will not be taxed in case his profit does not exceed \$500. Therefore, Sir, I see no harm in leaving in this clause. If you do so, you make sure that the small man is not taxed on a profit up to \$500.

Mr. MAPP: I think the honourable Senior Member for Christ Church is correct in his interpretation of clause 87. Obviously, that clause could not refer to a small businessman. I therefore feel that it is wise to safeguard the small businessman who does not come in under that clause and for that reason the insertion of clause 88 is a double safeguard. Anybody left out of clause 87, subsection (2) will be included under clause 88.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,—Regarding the point raised by the honourable member for Christ Church I feel that no matter how small a business may be, if it can show a profit of \$500.00 it should contribute something to taxation. The council has to be run and the district has to be improved, and everyone who benefits from that improvement should contribute something no matter how small. I do not agree with any exemption on \$500 profit. The \$500.00 mentioned in this Clause means \$500.00 after the person has paid himself and all his overhead expenses. After he has paid all those things must this \$500.00 still be exempted? If we agree to that how are the local authorities going to run the districts?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am quite sure that no businessman who makes a profit of \$500.00 and is taxed on that profit would come back and ask for relief from that taxation. This taxation is not on his property; it is on his profits. According to the present Vestries Act the vestry can allow a reasonable amount in each case to be fixed by them, on "(a) proprietors of businesses and tenancies and in the case of joint

stock companies to the managing, governing or other directors etc." But such amount shall not exceed 50 per cent of the average net profit of such business or tenantry, and in the case of joint stock companies it shall not exceed £600. There is no shopkeeper who is being penalised by the vestry where his profits are concerned. He may be penalised on a building that he owns. A man cannot make a return showing that he made a profit and then ask for relief. That is absurd. The Government has given a limit to joint stock companies of \$2,580. Now you are giving an exemption after \$500.00. Is that not giving away something to big people? In the preceding clause you have provided for exemption after \$5,000 in the case of the salaries of proprietors etc. That will only apply if he makes it. If you are going to allow him \$5,000 leave that in.

Mr. MAPP:—I see what the honourable member is getting at. But when he says that the \$5,000 will only apply if the person makes it that is not correct. You have to write off \$5,000 of each manager, secretary or proprietor of a company. The honourable member must make clear what he means. There is no harm in passing section 88. It safeguards the small man who cannot be included in section 87. It all depends on how you interpret the words "proprietor of a business." The small man cannot be included in that. I know that the Vestries Act has been interpreted in that way but Sir John Maude picked holes in the same Act. What I would suggest is that \$5,000 is too much to recommend. I feel that a company should not take out as much as the proprietor of a business should be able to deduct. You get companies having five directors and each of them can get \$5,000 written off the profits. The manager can write off \$5,000 and the secretary or secretaries can do the same.

I move, Sir, that we postpone consideration of this section because I am not convinced that a proprietor should get the same thing as a secretary.

Mr. VAUGHAN seconded.

The question was put and agreed to.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

DINNER ADJOURNMENT

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Mr. Cox the House adjourned for three quarters of an hour.

RESUMPTION

On the re-assembling:

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER said that on the adjournment the House was in Committee on the Bill to make better provision for Local Government in the Island, and left the Chair, and the House resumed Committee Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

Clauses 89 to 149 inclusive were called and agreed to.

The first to the eighth Schedule inclusive were called and agreed to.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Mr. Cox the Chairman reported progress and asked for leave for the committee to sit again.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,— I am asking that Order No. 5 be the next order of the day and that the honourable senior member for St. Michael be allowed to take charge of it.

There being no objection leave was granted.

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

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) Order, 1953."

Mr. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—This is one of those annual Resolutions that come before the House for consideration and ratification. Honourable members will remember that the Government, under the Act of 1947 is empowered to make regulations for the levy of rates from the Sugar Industry to be paid into the Rehabilitation, Price Stabilisation and Labour Welfare Fund. As you know, Sir, every year we have to pass these Resolutions to enable this money to be paid into those three funds, for the purpose stated in the Resolution and also in the Act. I do not think it necessary to go into much detail because this House is well aware of the operation of these funds. I would like just to quote a few figures to let honourable members know what is the position of these funds.

I will deal first with the Rehabilitation Fund. In 1947-48, \$529,884.09 was paid into the Fund. In 1948-49, \$375,610.59; in 1949-50, \$733,109.17; in 1950-51, \$760,028.10; in 1951-52, \$901,873.66; in 1952-53, \$762,410.04. The total is \$4,062,915.65 (A MEMBER: Give the totals). I will give only the totals of the others. The Price Stabilisation Fund: The total paid in up to now is \$4,735,329.30. Administrative expenses, \$1,760.99, leaving a balance of \$4,733,568.31. The Labour Welfare Fund: To the 31st December, 1952, \$3,066,950.23. The amounts allocated out of that are, Housing Loans, \$1,350,000, Playing Fields, \$300,000; Rural amenities, \$500,000, making a total of \$2,150,000. Balance available for allocation is \$916,950.23.

That, Sir, is the position of the various funds up to December 31st., 1952. As I said, Sir, this is an annual measure, and I do not think it is necessary to say any more. I now formally move that the Resolution be agreed to.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, — I think that by this time the Government should know the disadvantages that result to some parishes by the allocation of the Labour Welfare Fund on a population basis. I think it is time to review the method of the distribution of this fund. There are parishes which contribute the greater part of this fund but who, due to limited population, get far less from it than they really deserve.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not know that I can allow the honourable member to discuss that point under this Order, which deals with the amount to be levied. There is nothing here saying that there should be an allocation for housing or anything else.

Mr. ALLDER: I just wanted to make a suggestion.

Mr. VAUGHAN: On a point of order, Sir. I think that after the information which we have been given by the honourable senior member for St. Michael the honourable senior member for St. John is in order to make the point he was making.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like the honourable member to make the suggestion he talked about.

Mr. ALLDER: There is St. John which contributed the third greatest amount to this fund due to the number of tons of sugar which it produces. St. John has contributed \$3,000 to this fund, and now that they want a playing field—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member means up to last year.

Mr. ALLDER: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The allocation is \$1.50 per head of population and due to

the parish's limited population it has to suffer. They only want one field and community centre and they cannot, on the population basis, get enough money to do that. But other parishes which do not contribute as much as this particular parish can get six and eight playing fields. It is time to review the method of the allocation of this fund.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I read in Professor Shepherd's report that the intention of the British Government in adding to the price of sugar so as to create these special funds was, among other things, that this Labour Welfare Fund should be established for capital welfare works. That certainly should include the setting up of communal baths in villages all over the island. I do not consider that it is right that year after year this fund should have hundreds of thousands of dollars credited to it when there are still so many things left to be done. Each year there is a substantial amount credited to this fund. Why cannot it be used for Labour Welfare work in every single sense of the word? I feel that in the villages of the country there should have been already established communal baths from this fund.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think that the proper way to bring such a matter before the House is by way of an Address.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I do not want to seem to be going against your ruling, but I think that an excellent opportunity to air one's views on this matter is when this Resolution comes before the House. These funds were created by the Imperial Government, and so far as I know the Barbados Government are only the trustees. What really worries me is that nothing is laid before the House to show what point the Rehabilitation Fund has reached. There are some members on this and the other side of the table who feel that the Government should look at this matter of rehabilitation and say at what point of time that fund should cease. There are some people who go so far as to say — I will not say it unless I have the evidence to prove it — that the peasants are being robbed for the factory owners. I have been informed as a fact that some factories treat the Rehabilitation Fund as working capital, and not as it was intended to be treated. That state of affairs is very regrettable. I would like to know from the honourable introducer of this Resolution whether the Government is going into the matter of whether the Rehabilitation Fund should cease. We should get some information as to the existing state of the fund. We know that money is taken out of the fund but we do not really know what becomes of it. I am not accusing owners of sugar factories of misusing the fund, but we should know something about it. It is in the planters' interest and equally in the interest of this House to know.

What equally interests me is whether it is still the policy of the Government to establish playing fields or whether the emphasis has gone over to Housing. I have strong feelings on that. I feel that the Labour Welfare Fund should be used to help in the housing drive, especially in view of the plight which agricultural workers still find themselves in. It is all well and good to talk about playing fields and communal halls. But where a communal hall is concerned you will find that if the spirit to keep it going is not there it will become derelict. If this is put in Housing it will create a certain amount of thrift and a good amount of money would be paid back to the Government.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I think that the Government should take note of the criticisms relative to this Rehabilitation Fund. This is

not the first time that I have drawn to the attention of the Government the fact that if you are rehabilitating factories one would imagine that at some point the money required would be less not more. You must reach saturation point at some time. It seems to me that this amount is going on and on and we cannot hear at what point the saturation process will be reached. Is the money being put to the best use or are some of these factories contributing towards unemployment? Are they closing down factories and spreading this money over less factories? Should we not add to the Labour Welfare Fund in order to help those unemployed workers? Those are questions that should come to our minds when we discuss these funds.

You, Sir, and I used to talk about these things in this House, and we were told that the Government's hands were tied; that we would have to go back to the British Government etc. I think that especially now that conditions are becoming difficult due to the closing down of factories there should be some serious inquiry into this matter. We heard from the honourable senior member for St. Michael that the Rehabilitation Fund reached a total of over four million dollars and a little over three and a half million dollars was paid out. Every year the same percentage of the cess goes into that fund. What I am saying is that the total Rehabilitation fund over the years has been three million dollars so that that Fund amounts to more than the Labour Welfare Fund.

I think that the Government should make a serious investigation into this state of affairs. It has reached a point where we can no longer ignore it. It is worse than last year. Three or four factories have closed down since then. But the same amount is going into the coffers of the remainder of the factories. We should make some strong protest to the Colonial Office and the British Government. I am asking the Government to look into the matter in the very near future. Out of the Labour Welfare Fund we are looking after housing, playing fields and other amenities. All that is reducing this Fund. We should add something to it so as to provide for the people who are thrown out of work by the closing down of the factories who are being rehabilitated so generously. Even during the crop season workers were complaining that the amount of money they worked for was very restricted compared with the amount they were getting last year. What must be the position when the crop is over and they only get two days' work a week! It is a serious situation, and Government should make some inquiry or report the matter to the Colonial Office.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think that the honourable member is labouring under a delusion.

Mr. MAPP: Your Honour has always maintained that our hands are not tied in this matter. Speaking as a responsible member of the House and of the Government Party I would like to ask the Government to do something about this situation.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I have heard the honourable member talk about the "situation". I do not know what the situation is.

Mr. MAPP: I am not responsible for the honourable member's lack of understanding. As I was saying, the Government has assured us that their hands are tied to a certain extent. If that is so, I feel that they should take some definite action to bring it to the attention of the Colonial Office. If their hands are not tied to that extent they themselves should make some investigation into these funds. We do not know how this Rehabilitation Fund money is being spent, and I feel that

the Labour Welfare Fund should be made to benefit the people to a greater extent. We have argued that in this Chamber for years and I shall continue to argue it until something is done. Do you think that the British Government would subsidise an industry in England, create a special cess for the purpose and then fail to see that it is supervised properly? We should do the same thing at home when we see the unemployment situation at the stage that it is at and do something by way of adding to the Labour Welfare Fund.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I am in hearty agreement with the argument put forward by the honourable senior member for St. Thomas. This is one of the occasions on which I can co-operate with him because some of the remarks which he has made are timely. Without further ado I want to know from the honourable introducer how many factories today benefit from the Rehabilitation Fund and what the Government is doing about this continual closing down of factories. I want to know if these factories are benefitting from the fund, and how and why they are unable to function any more after receiving this money. There is something wrong. I am calling on this Government to make a prompt investigation and see what is taking place, because as the last honourable member said, the employment situation is reaching a critical stage. If money is given by the British Government for the rehabilitation of these factories I think it is the Government's business to see whether they do put in new machinery. There is something wrong, I repeat. Let the Factory Inspector or someone see about it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Factory Inspector's job is to see after the protection of factory workers.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Then Government should bring down someone else. Do not leave it to the whims and caprices of the factory owners because there is something going wrong. It is incumbent upon this Government to provide a livelihood for everyone of its citizens. The day the Government fails to do that it should declare itself incapable of being a government. It should then step out and let someone else do it. Government must see to it that these funds are utilised to the best purpose.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—What is very perplexing to me is this: The amount to the credit of the Rehabilitation Fund is in the vicinity of four million dollars and almost all of it has been utilised by factory owners, while in the case of the Labour Welfare Fund there was a smaller amount—three million dollars—and only one million three hundred and fifty thousand has been actually allocated to or spent on Housing, Playing Fields, three hundred thousand, Rural Development, five hundred thousand dollars—not yet spent. So where the Labour Welfare Fund is concerned we have a balance of \$916,315 along with the \$500,000 that is not yet spent, making roughly one and a half million dollars yet unspent.

It seems to me on the face of it as if there is no necessity for this welfare money. Is it because the party or parties responsible for lending out this money or for helping the poor classes do not realise their duty? It looks that way to me. What I am saying is that the Government, apart from acting as trustees and seeing that the money allocated to the Rehabilitation Fund is spent beneficially should also see that the money allocated to the Labour Welfare Fund is loaned more expeditiously to the peasants and Factory workers of this island.

As far as the money allocated for rural development is concerned, my opinion is that the time has come when the Government should acquire rab land for the creation of Housing Schemes in the rural areas. I agree with the honourable senior member for St. John that some of this money should be spent on the construction of communal baths. But whenever we come here with an Address relative to public baths we are ruled out of order because it is a matter affecting the vestries. But we know the needs of our constituencies and a lot of idle money is lying down wasting. There is \$500,000 for Rural Development and a balance of \$916,315 as if there was no necessity for it. The person who administers this fund is more conservative in mind and action than these who administer the Rehabilitation Fund. What I think is needed in the Department which administers the Labour Welfare Fund is an additional competent man who will be able to make the necessary investigation and inquiries relative to claims for loans. When you go to a bank to deposit or borrow money you do not always have to see the manager of the bank.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have given a certain amount of latitude to honourable members, but as I said previously the spending of this money is not before the House. If the honourable member would just pass on I would appreciate it very much.

Mr. TALMA: I appreciate all that, Sir, but I am saying that whereas very little money is left in the Rehabilitation Fund the balance in the Labour Welfare Fund remains as though there is very little to be done. I am hoping that this \$500,000 which has been allocated and of which notice was put in the newspaper by the Colonial Secretary's Office, Government will make up its mind to buy rab land for rural schemes which will render very useful service in those areas, in particular where there is no access to the sea and things of that sort, so as to give essential sanitary and other social services of which the community has been in need from time immemorial.

Mr. COX: I will be very brief. First of all I want to say to His Honour the Deputy Speaker that the original resolution did refer to the crop year. The next thing is that the honourable junior member for St. Lucy seems to be asking if we could not do away with the Rehabilitation Fund and seize the balance that remains to it. As you know, sir, the Act lays it down that the money which is paid by the British taxpayer should be divided among these three funds, so I cannot see any responsible government undertaking to abrogate that Act without first referring the matter to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and finding out whether the British taxpayer would be willing to abandon the allocation of money to the Rehabilitation Fund.

Mr. WILLIAMS: All I am saying is that the House should be informed as to how the rehabilitation of these factories is getting on and what is the existing state of the industry.

Mr. COX: I think that the honourable member has now seen the danger that the Government might find itself in if it attempted to act on his suggestion. As regards the efficiency of the administration of these funds, honourable members will remember that the Rehabilitation Fund was set up under a board, appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee, the members of which board are members of the Sugar Producers' Association, and the Director of Agriculture is Chairman of that Board. Therefore we can reasonably assume that the Director, as Government's representative, will see to it that the policy of the Government is carried out.

As regards the Price Stabilisation Fund that also functions under a Board and again the Director of Agriculture is Chairman. As regards the Labour Welfare Fund, I am sorry that the honourable senior member for Christ Church found it necessary to speak in uncomplimentary terms of the Manager of that Fund. I would like to say that the Government is satisfied that he is doing a good job, and that he is handling well a difficult and delicate matter.

All these applications have to be watched very carefully and gone into very thoroughly and the Government is satisfied that he is doing a good job. Because there is a balance of over \$900,000 to this fund it does not necessarily mean that the Manager is not doing his best to meet the demands of the applicants.

Mr. TALMA: I have not attacked the manager personally. I said that he needs more staff. People who make applications have to wait two years before

they get grants, and all that money is there lying down. He acts as if the money is his own.

Mr. COX: The question of the closing down of the factories and its relation to the Rehabilitation Fund has been raised. Only recently the Government has decided to investigate the whole question, and we hope in the near future to be able to put before the House the findings of the Committee which will investigate the question. As regards the question about public baths, I am sure that every honourable member knows that that is a question for the Sanitary Commissioners rather than for the Central Government.

Question that the Resolution do now pass was put and agreed to without division.

ADJOURNMENT

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Mr. Cox the House adjourned until Tuesday, 14th July, 1953, at 3 o'clock p.m.