

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1953—54

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 19th May, 1953

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

Present:

His Honour A. E. S. LEWIS, (*Deputy Speaker*), Mr. G. H. ADAMS, B.A., C.M.G., Q.C., Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., Mr. M. E. COX, Mr. L. E. SMITH (*Chairman of Committees*), Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. R. G. MAPP, Mr. O. T. ALLDER, Mr. J. A. HAYNES, B.A., Mr. E. ST. A. HOLDER, Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN, Mr. C. E. TALMA and Mr. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc.

Prayers were read.

DOCUMENTS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following documents:—

A report of the Highway Commissioners for the parish of St. George for the half-year ended 31st March, 1953.

A report of the Highway Commissioners for the parish of St. George on tenantry roads for the half-year ended 31st March, 1953;

A report of the Highway Commissioners for the parish of St. Thomas for the half-year ended 31st March, 1953;

A report of the Highway Commissioners for the parish of St. Thomas on tenantry roads for the half-year ended 31st March, 1953;

A report of the Highway Commissioners for the parish of St. James for the half-year ended 31st March, 1953.

MESSAGE NO. 13/1953 FROM HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR

Mr. ADAMS: I am commanded to lay the following Message No. 13/1953 from His Excellency the Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly conveying to the Honourable House an expression of Her Majesty's grateful thanks for their Address of sympathy on the occasion of the death of Her Late Majesty Queen Mary.

The Message read as follows:—

MESSAGE NO. 13/1953

*His Excellency The Governor
to
The Honourable The House of Assembly*

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that he has been asked by the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies, on The Queen's command, to convey to the Honourable the House of Assembly an expression of Her Majesty's grateful thanks for their Address of sympathy to herself and the Royal Family on the occasion of the death of Her Late Majesty Queen Mary.

R. D. H. ARUNDELL,
Governor.

Government House,
Bridgetown,
18th May, 1953.
(M.P.—7104/S.1)

PETITION

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I beg to present a Petition from the Vestry of Christ Church in connection with the sale of a portion of land, part of "Scarboro" by the said Vestry to the Governor-in-Executive Committee. The Petition is respectfully worded and I beg that it be taken as read.

The Petition was taken as read.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to give notice of a Resolution to authorise the Governor-in-Executive Committee to enter into an agreement for an extension of the lease of the Kingsland Factory Building from the 1st of August, 1953, to 31st July, 1954.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. TALMA: I beg to give notice of a Bill to authorise the Vestry of Christ Church to sell a portion of land from a place called "Scarboro" to the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

Mr. HOLDER: I beg to give notice of the following Address:

*The House of Assembly
to
His Excellency the Governor*

The House of Assembly respectfully draw to Your Excellency's attention the urgent need for the establishment of a Housing Scheme and/or land settlement scheme in the parish of St. James.

2. The House further suggest that the Plantation known as "Trents" in the said parish of St. James, would be a suitable area for the development of such a scheme, or schemes, to be run on a co-operative basis by suitable workers in the parish and would ask that negotiations be entered into for the purchase of this plantation.

3. The House would be pleased if Your Excellency would see fit to give effect to the terms of this Address at the earliest possible date.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. TALMA seconded by Mr. Cox a Bill to authorise the Vestry of Christ Church to sell a portion of land from a place called "Searboro" to the Governor-in-Executive Committee was read a first time.

FIRST ORDER OF THE DAY

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The First Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Peter to move the second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker:—I cannot proceed with that Bill as it has not yet been circulated to honourable members owing to the fact that it is still in the printers' hands.

**RESOLUTION FOR ALLOWANCES
TO OFFICERS**

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph to move the passing of the following Resolution:—Resolution that with effect from the 1st April, 1952, the allowances set out in Column II of the Schedule hereto shall be applicable to the officers set out in Column I of the Schedule.

Mr. ADAMS: This is a resolution forming part of what we did last week making provision for junior members of the Civil Service and it has to be done in this way for obvious reasons. As I mentioned to the House last week in moving the proposals for salaries and certain allowances, there were certain allowances which the Executive agreed to in the Dos Santos Report, but there were some which it did not agree to when discussing the salaries. Honourable members will remember those which we did not agree to from their reading of the Report. However, there are one or two of them which I am commending to honourable members as being fair and equitable and in keeping within reasonable expenditure over and above the recommendations of the Dos Santos Report.

I beg to move that in the Schedule attached to this Resolution that the allowances under Column II be applicable to the officers set out in Column I. There are as follows:—

Warden and Assistant Wardens, General Hospital: Rent Allowance when off duty at the existing rate for Nurses;

Nurses General Hospital: Increase in weekly laundry allowance from \$1.20 to \$1.50;

Head Male Attendant, Mental Hospital: Rent Allowance of \$275 per annum;

Assistant Head Male Attendant, Mental Hospital: Rent Allowance of \$240 per annum; and

Other Attendants, Mental Hospital: Rent Allowance of \$208 per annum.

I do not wish to stop honourable members from expressing their views on these allowances when I say that the Whitley Council agreed to these allowances as they are here. These are not arbitrary figures; but these are figures which have been debated, negotiated and arrived at with the people concerned just as one would arrive at a Trade Union Agreement which set out to make a settlement until they finally agreed. I know that what I say cannot stop the honourable Senior Member for St. John from talking on this matter, neither am I saying it with the object of preventing him but I would remind him that these are not arbitrary figures.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. ALLDER: I really did not have the time to go into the details of this matter but I shall deal with the point on house allowances with respect to the Head Male Attendant and Assistant Male Attendant at the Mental Hospital. I am sorry that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph did not give this House some more details on this matter because what he gave is somewhat confusing to me.

I see that the Head Male Attendant is being granted a rent allowance of \$275 per annum and the Assistant Male Attendant will be getting \$240, but I have not seen any provision made for the other members of the staff; therefore I would like to know why these two employees are singled out for what I consider to be this special treatment. What I do want to know also is if Government feels that it should house these employees.

Mr. ADAMS: If you read the last item, you will see that a rent allowance of \$208 per annum is granted to each of the other attendants there.

Mr. ALLDER: I correct that statement. I also see that Government will also extend the same concessions to stenographer-typists when the new ministries come into effect.

Mr. ADAMS: When I said "if you read the last item" I did not mean the last paragraph of the Addendum, I meant the last item of the Schedule. You have also misinterpreted this last paragraph of the Schedule.

Mr. ALLDER: I would still like to know if it is a definite policy of Government to give these concessions to employees in this category at the other institutions. The questions are: (1) Whether you are giving these allowances to similar employees at the other institutions? (2) If you feel you are permitted to give these house allowances to them? (3) Do you feel these house allowances are adequate enough, that is, in accordance with the high rentals? or (4) Is this an attempt by Government to boost the salaries of these employees as it feels that these salaries are inadequate? I am hoping that the latter question is not so.

I do not feel, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that these allowances should be granted. I feel that the employees should be given a more reasonable salary because you will still get a lot of these employees grumbling by this method. Even in the Police Force there are grumbings already because the allowances given cannot pay for their house rent. I feel that these allowances are inadequate and in another respect I feel that these allowances are unnecessary; and I also feel that it is a disguise by Government in the way

of increasing the salaries of the few singled out without being accused of discriminating.

As regards to the Head Male Attendant, I understood when we were dealing with the salaries last Tuesday, that this officer was also a member of the bargaining body of the Civil Service, and the increase which he got was a great deal better than the others in his division.

(A VOICE): That officer was not the Head Male Attendant.

Mr. ALLDER: There is another point which I would make now because if it is implemented, I do not want to be accused of having agreed to it. It is that I do not see any reason why there should be provision for allowance for the would-be stenographer-typists attached to the ministries when they are set up. I am told that there had been an attempt in this House before to abandon all these petty allowances but gradually, as it appears to me, these allowances are being brought back. I do not see the reason for including stenographer-typists in these provisions; they are not in the same category as employees at institutions that have to work night and day.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not see anything in this resolution where stenographer-typists are to be included in these allowances. The last paragraph of the Addendum states: "It is intended that as soon as Secretaries are appointed the allowance at the rate of \$240 per annum to Stenographer-Typists acting as Confidential Secretaries referred to in Schedule E to Resolution No. 33/1949 shall be discontinued."

Mr. ALLDER: Of course, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going to be modest enough to admit that I misunderstood that paragraph.

However, Sir, with the few remarks which I have made, I feel that these allowances will be the cause of more confusion. I feel if you are going to do something, it should be done fully; if you are not going to do it fully, you should not do it at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. GODDARD entered the House and took their seats while Mr. ALLDER was speaking.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—From the best of my knowledge, the attendants at these institutions, whether they be male, female or either, comes under this classification for house allowance which the Government has elected to do. In keeping with a suggestion of the honourable Senior Member for St. John, I too am wondering if these rent allowances are intended to be a permanent feature of the conditions of employment of these particular Government employees. I feel that while the salaries of the particular employees should not be increased by the amounts which are set out in this resolution, they should be consolidated in order to save petty book-keeping; to call a spade a spade, these allowances should be a permanent feature of the particular officers wage schedule. There is no earthly reason why you should not say that the particular officer's salary is so much plus so much and not that house allowance is to be given. The same thing should apply to members of the Police Force.

It still surprises me in matters of house allowances that this Labour Government still recognises the disparity between glass and class and between employee and employee; what this Government deems as sufficient compensation for living space of certain employees. I know that it is not intended to reimburse these meritorious employees of any disbursement which they have met in relation to their house rents; but I feel that if you give them allowances

because you recognise there is not adequate accommodation at the institutions, I see no reason why a distinction should be made between one class of employee and another, especially in a Government like this. We find at the Mental Hospital that the Head Male Attendant is to be given a rent allowance of \$275 per annum, and having accepted the principle that this amount is not intended to be reimbursement for any rent which that officer may be paying from time to time or for which he may have to pay in the future and then to find that the Assistant Male Attendant is getting \$240 per annum, and the other attendants \$208 per annum, I do not think this is a desirable thing, especially as the other attendants may have cause to live in a similar house as that of the other attendants more favoured. I think the first thing we should do is to consolidate allowances into salary and then make out a flat rate if you are going to give an allowance regardless of the status of the employee or his pay in the service.

In addition, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we find that substantial representation from this particular department of the Service had concurred in the allowances which have been proposed in this Resolution and yet these few employees are going to receive it. I know that there is a certain amount of dissatisfaction amongst members of the Service because the deliberations of the Whitley Council were not referred back to the Members of the Service so that they might have had some indication as to whether their views had been urged by the Council. I think that was a rather deplorable state of affairs. It should not have been so. We have developed a very unfortunate tendency in this island of holding Committee Meetings in camera when at those meetings, the interests of many people are being affected. Very soon, you will find that certain people will want meetings of the House of Assembly to be held in that manner. In matters of this kind, some members of the Head of the Administration are able to see the recommendations while they are filing through the various departments of Government at high level, on the other hand, the very people for whom the recommendations are purported to be made are unaware whether their views are even heard until they read the debates of this House of Assembly after the matter has been put before this House. I do think you can be too easily satisfied with the argument that the Whitley Council have approved of these things because very often, it is not representative of the rank and file of the Civil Servants and the Government on the other side. I think that part of the blame for this state of affairs can be attached to the very members of the rank and file, some who do not actively support the organisation and some who choose to elect people to their own Council because of the person's status or for some such consideration. Sir, we would like some assurance before recommendations from the Whitley Council or Civil Servants are accepted that the substance of the recommendations is given to the rank and file and meets with their approval before it gets into this House. The Civil Servants concerned should not know of what has transpired until after it is passed by this House.

The other thing that strikes me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that I have no recollection that any financial provision has been made in the Estimates for these allowances; furthermore, it is contemplated to pay these allowances as from 1st April, 1952. If it is, it has escaped me. I feel that this is the time to bring this to the notice of the Government.

Another point which I would like to bring to the notice of members of this House is that the members of the Civil Service who will directly benefit from this particular allowance will not be receiving it for some considerable time. As we all know,—those of us who have to pay income tax,—we have to pay it on all prerequisites, that is on directly or indirectly earned income. The small rooms which these attendants are accommodated in at the Mental Hospital are considered the equivalent to House Allowance and those particular attendants, who are eligible to pay income tax have to pay it on this prerequisite. It seems to me that we are now rectifying something which we should have done a long time ago. Mr. Speaker, from the disparity which appears in the allowances before us, we can see that some attendants seem to be more adequately represented than others, therefore, I hope the Government has some rational explanation for the disparity in allowances paid between attendant and attendant at the Mental Hospital.

MR. CRAWFORD, MR. E. D. MOTTLEY and MRS. BOURNE entered the House and took their seats while Mr. BARROW was speaking.

MR. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—When this matter was put to me by some of those attendants at the Mental Hospital, I advised them to go to other members of this House. I told them that you would be better able to air their grievances on the floor of the House than I. I could not promise with what they were contending to support them in view of the fact that I am a member of Government. However, I can answer for these recommendations as they are because I happen not only to be a member of this Government, but was also a member of the Whitley Council which looked into this matter.

It is true that the honourable Senior Member for St. John did not read the Addendum accompanying this Resolution else he might not have said what he did, it being remembered that he said on the Addendum being read to him that he was going to be modest enough to admit that he did not read it thoroughly. I thought he would have used the word 'honest' for 'modest'.

So far as allowances which are contained in this resolution are concerned, the amounts stipulated here have been requested by the people themselves. It can be seen from their memorandum. If honourable members had read the Dos Santos Report thoroughly, they would see that because the nurses at the General Hospital were given allowances—this taking place from the day that the General Hospital became congested and certain nurses had to live out and were given an allowance of four dollars per week—the attendants at the Mental Hospital said that they should be treated similarly. Although there is accommodation at the Mental Hospital for them and they were not called on to live out, they are asking to be put on a similar basis as the nurses at the General Hospital, they have not been told to sleep out or required to sleep out, they just would not sleep in. However with the prevailing practice at all hospitals in the Caribbean where attendants are called upon to work in shifts, so that they may always be on the job, they are paid an allowance of four dollars a week.

It has been urged by the honourable Senior Member for St. George that there is a disparity of allowances and he accuses the Government of causing that disparity. I would be glad to see the day when some of us who call ourselves Socialists will set an example in this respect; and instead of living in mansions, live in more simple houses; it

seems to me that some of us, more or less, accept these social inequalities. I would say that the allowances which are given here have been in existence for other people, and therefore, if you had not given it to the attendants at the Mental Hospital they would have objected.

With regard to the point raised by the honourable Senior Member for St. John with regard to give allowances to stenographer-typists it is clear that he was not conversant with the Resolution and to its reference on these stenographer-typists. I would tell him that there are ten stenographer-typists who are at present acting as Confidential Secretaries to this Government. In addition to the salary which they are getting as stenographer-typists, they are also given \$240 per annum as an allowance for their extra duties. When we shall have changed this structure to Ministerial Government, provision will be made for these ten secretaries on the establishment on a commensurate salary scale and there would be no need for this allowance which they are now getting. The question of this allowance for Stenographer-typist would not arise and that is why we have stated it will be removed.

As regards to the other point which he made when he said that he noticed that the Head Male Attendant was a member of the bargain body I would say that when it comes to representations on these Associations or Council, the people concerned are the best persons to make representations on their behalf, because other persons no matter what may be their position, whether they be members of this Chamber, cannot make representations for those people as the person whom those people have elected from among themselves. Some of us still believe that because someone may be a judge that he is better able to make representation on one's behalf than someone chosen from among the group itself. This mode of thinking seems to be a legacy which has been left behind for us. I do not believe in it; I know that it is better to have some person like yourself. I think this is the answer to that point. I would, however, go further and state that the Mr. Lewis, who was chosen by that group of Civil Servants to represent the attendants, represented them ably and more ably than what any member of this House would be able to do because there was a man who knew all the people for whom he was making representations intimately. I will challenge the honourable Senior Member for St. John by saying that he did not know what he was talking about when he made such reference on the representation of the Whitley Council which decided on this matter. I may say that the technique of running an organisation such as the Civil Service Association will differ from the running of a Trade Union. I have my own opinion on the working of a Civil Service Association, but I believe one of the tenets of the Barbados Civil Service Association is that you have a service which is tied from the top to the bottom; that is if you have to give an increase to a certain group in the Service—say to a cantonnier and people in that group—you will have to give an increase to everybody in the Service. I feel that is another legacy of the past. We have gone past this. I feel that the time has come when people who work in the Service as general labourers should be given the right to negotiate on their behalf just as a Trade Union, so that the wages of those people could be kept more in relationship with those outside.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot support the view that was put by the honourable senior member for St. George that the rank and file were not given the opportunity to discuss this matter before the Gov-

ernment brought it down. I know by my position that they had all the opportunity of discussing it.

I may further mention, Sir, in support of these rent allowances that owing to the peculiar type of work which these nurses and attendants are called upon to do, you have to give them this allowance, despite the fact that they have made out a case for it. You have to look on it just as a travelling allowance or any other such allowance. It is not basic salary. If I may draw an analogy, you do not give a travelling allowance to some officers because they are not in a position to buy a motor car; neither do you say that you should not give a travelling allowance to an officer because he is in a position to own and run his own motor car. You give it because of his having to travel owing to the job he is doing. Therefore, when you give rent allowance, it is not salary, nor is it given to the officer for him to rent a house; it is given because of the nature of the job which that officer is called on to perform.

Mr. ALLDER: I rise at a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I never mentioned anything of travelling allowance.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable junior member for St. Peter in his reference to travelling allowance did not infer that you mentioned it. He used it as an argument to show that allowances were given for a specific purpose.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker,— I only drew that as an analogy. I did it to show the fallacy of the contention of the honourable senior member for St. John. What I said had nothing to do with this matter. Because I happen to be a member of the Whitley Council and owing to that position I know all the facts concerning this matter. I rose to take exception to the points which were raised by those honourable members.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Sir, I was not in my place in time to hear the full explanation of the introduction of this Resolution, but I took pains to go into it very carefully and I shall sound a note of warning which might be in discord with the views of other honourable members. I am sorry that the honourable junior member for St. Peter who has just spoken has had occasion to leave the Chamber. He said that the person who represented his group, — a Mr. Lewis — represented his group ably. As far as I am concerned, I am going to represent the viewpoint of the people of this island; I am not here in the interest of three or four hundred Civil Servants alone, I am here in the interest of the population of this island as a whole.

The honourable junior member for St. Peter said that these attendants at the Mental Hospital were demanding rent allowance; yet they were not required to sleep in. After looking into this matter very carefully, I am of the opinion that this is one step too far. I think I would be the last person to be accused of not wanting to pay persons proper salaries, but if you take the case of the Head Male Attendant, what do you find? He is a member of the Whitley Council and as such was directly interested in these allowances. What else would you expect but this recommendation when a member concerned was sitting on the Council and this is where I have the most severe criticism for the Government. The report by the honourable member was that this officer, who was a member of the Whitley Council deciding on this matter, represented his group well. If you look in the Estimates, you will see that this officer is in receipt of a salary of \$130 per month and it also states that he is given free quarters, uniform and rations, and an allowance at the rate of \$120 per annum for night duty. In the resolu-

tion which was passed last week, you have proposed a salary of \$180 per month for this officer, that is an increase of \$50 a month, and now you are proposing a rent allowance of \$275 per annum. I ask: Did the Whitley Council, and the Government weigh this particular matter relating to this officer carefully and if they did, did they feel that it was correct? I would say that Government was either bludgeoned or blackmailed into this. Sir, if I may address myself to members of the Government, I will say that power carries responsibility and that the Government has equal responsibility not only to the few hundred who work in its service but to the community as a whole. Somebody must say this and I say it. I will get back in the House by making this bold statement. What I am worried about is not the people in my own constituency but the number of people who are unemployed in this community. I opine that there will be no money left in the Treasury to do anything else but to pay salaries.

Looking at these rent allowances again, the \$275 per annum to be granted to the Head Male Attendant works out at \$24.50 per month and the allowance of \$240 to the Assistant Head Male Attendant works out at \$20 per month and then the allowance of \$208 to the other attendants works out at \$17.30 per month. Think of it. I shall not vote for this today if I stand alone. What are you doing? In the same breath, you are giving members of the Police Force who must be intelligent members of the community, who have to sit an examination before acceptance, a much less salary than the \$180 per month which you are giving this Head Male Attendant, whose only job is to hold a madman and put him in a room — a strong man. Added to that a Police Constable only gets an allowance of seven dollars per month rising to \$10 a month for a Sergeant.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I hear voices from the gallery. I would like visitors to this House to know that they are here on sufferance and on no account can they take part in the debates or show their feelings in any way at all.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Sometimes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this silence of honourable members of the Opposition may be taken as weakness, but there are times when through prudence, you should not get up and criticise something; you really have to keep quiet. I may say that in the case of these attendants at the Mental Hospital, with the proposed increases, they will be receiving handsome salaries. You cannot compare salaries in Barbados with similar posts in Trinidad or British Guiana; you have to compare them with the economy of the island. I say again that this increase from \$130 to \$180 to the Head Male attendant is an extremely generous increase and when you go on to give an allowance of over \$24 per month that is asking too much. The honourable Junior Member for St. Peter says that these attendants must be compared with nurses at the General Hospital. Nurses have to be trained technically and besides that, their job compels them to take a certain amount of rest. They must sleep in to ensure that they do their job efficiently. The honourable Junior Member for St. Peter also said that because the General Hospital became overcrowded, the nurses had to be given allowances—they had to sleep out. I do not see if you have an overcrowded hospital, who can question your giving nurses \$60 monthly as salary and \$4 per week as an allowance. You must also bear in mind that they are returned at \$75 per month for income tax rates. They are not in the same position as the attendants at the Mental Hospital; therefore there cannot be any comparison between them as the

honourable member suggests. It may be argued that the attendants have to pay income tax on all the money set down against them; but these attendants are not asked to sleep in, and when their duty requires them in, they are given free quarters. The honourable member has not told us that there is a lack of quarters for these attendants.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, sometimes one feels when he is speaking in opposition to a resolution put forward by Government that it is difficult to convince members supporting the Government, but some light must be shed on matters of this sort. Sooner or later, this Government will have to say to its strongest supporters that this was a wrong thing which it did. I vouch to say here today that if you grant these rent allowances to the attendants at the Mental Hospital that it would be wrong and within two weeks you will have to enquire into the allowances paid to policemen. Just think on it; an attendant at the Mental Hospital is just a strong man and you have elected to give him twice as much allowance and even more salary than you give to a member of the Police Force who is a more responsible man in the Service.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going to move the deletion of the last three items from the Schedule—the allowances to be given to the Head Male Attendant, the Assistant Head Male Attendant and to the other attendants. I feel that this House should be satisfied first of all, with the reasons for these increases, one of which is that you must give them because you give it to the nurses at the General Hospital. It is obvious that you must pay income tax on these allowances because if you die in the Service and your representatives receive a gratuity or you receive a pension, they will be based on salary and allowances which you drew. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am counselling honourable members to vote strongly for the deletion of all these attendants from the Resolution. They should not only vote for the deletion of the Head Male Attendant and the Assistant Male Attendant and leave in the others. I am averse to giving allowances for rent unless it is proven beyond all shadow of doubt that the quarters provided are either unsuitable or insufficient. If you can prove to me that the quarters are insufficient or unsuitable, of course, I am prepared to vote for a reasonable rent allowance, but under no consideration for more than that given to a police constable or sergeant. In counselling honourable members to vote for this deletion, I warn you that you know your Barbados, and if you vote for these allowances which are more than twice that given to policemen, you will be voting contrary to your consciences. With the fullest responsibility, I am therefore moving the deletion of these three latter items from the schedule unless it is proven to me beyond all reasonable doubt that the quarters at the Mental Hospital are unsuitable and insufficient; then I will be prepared to give consideration to a suitable rent allowance. I feel this is wrong and I will continue to express that view unless somebody can convince me otherwise. Again I say, what is more obvious for a Whitley Council comprised as it was with a particular man occupying a particular position to make representation in his own interest? It is human nature so to do. The honourable Junior Member for St. Peter said this member represented his division ably. I say he must have been very able that they should give him this big increase.

I beg to move the deletion of these allowances for all the attendants at the Mental Hospital from the Schedule forming part of this resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS: For the short space of time that I have been a member of this House, I have found out that a member must be extremely careful

when speaking on money matters relating to Civil Servants. In this matter, my attitude is to look at what is equitable and what is at least for the benefit of the island. With the greatest respect for the honourable Senior Member for the City, I wonder if he realises that once the flood gates are opened, there is always the attempt to open the sluice gates also.

I think after listening to the debates which took place in here and reading the Dos Santos Report it is correct to say that a breach has been made with regard to rent allowances. In the first place, if you are going to give rent allowances, you should make them uniform or else they will be the cause of much dissatisfaction. Already we know that the Police are making recourse to higher quarters on that sore point.

The honourable junior member for St. Peter seemed to think that the whole problem was whether somebody slept in or slept out but agreeing that the problem is that, it must be recognised that where an employee is required to live at an institution, it is incumbent on the Government to provide quarters in that institution for the employees and if the Government does not have the quarters it will have to find the quarters. These allowances are only a rate subsidy, there are not real allowances or what one would have to pay if he was renting a house. Normally everybody pays competitive rent rates, therefore, it would seem to me that the best approach to this question would be to give uniform allowances—a uniform allowance which you can afford. I cannot see the reason why the Head Male Attendant should get \$275 per annum as his allowance, the Assistant Male Attendant \$240 and the other attendants \$208. Added to these differences, you give a Police Sergeant only \$120 per annum. I think this is discrimination.

The other aspect of this resolution which I cannot understand, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that the estimates of 1953—54, Head 23, Item 6 and 7 states that both of these officers,—the Head Male Attendant and the Assistant,—are provided with free quarters, uniform and rations, and an allowance at the rate of \$120 per annum for night duty. The salary of the Head Male Attendant has now been placed at the figure of \$2,160 plus these allowances, therefore it must be and can only be a demand for this rent allowance. From the Estimates, I cannot see for the life of me why these people should be granted rent allowances when they are provided with free quarters. As I have said, once you have started wrong, you will always end up wrong.

I have had some complaints from the employees at the Mental Hospital on this very matter and they are extremely dissatisfied. However, unless I can be made to understand that what is contained in the Estimates is an error, I cannot vote for these rent allowances to the attendants at the Mental Hospital.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, — I have listened with considerable interest to the remarks of the honourable Junior Member for St. Peter and I marvel at his trying to lock the stable door after the horse is out. The honourable member referred to the fact that this Head Male Attendant of the Mental Hospital who occupies the fortunate position of a seat on the Whitley Council to bargain for others including himself, received generous treatment from the hands of the Government. The honourable Senior Member for the City on the other hand, said that the Government must have been bludgeoned and blackmailed into agreeing to pay this generous increase. Let us now leave aside the actual principle of the thing. My own opinion is that what the honourable Senior Member

for the City had said would have been taken with very good grace had he taken similar objection when other Government employees in the higher brackets who had the opportunity to give themselves generous allowances did so and this House was asked to ratify them. Therefore, the Head Male Attendant did nothing more than the Colonial Secretary or the Financial Secretary. The Colonial Secretary was head of the Turner Committee and this Committee of which he was Chairman recommended an increase for him of \$120 per month. The Financial Secretary who was on the same Committee got a recommendation of \$120 a month more. I submit that it is merely human nature for the Mr. Lewis, who was banded with two other officials on a Committee agreeing to recommend increases for people like themselves, should recommend for himself a most handsome increase of salary. He would have been extremely conscientious or stupid not to get the best for himself. That is why we are confronted with this position. I personally am not prepared to say that this representation on the unestablished and casual staff was what it should be, but when we look at what was the compromise reached in the demands for the unestablished and casual staff, it seems apparent that the interest of that staff was sacrificed for the interest of the attendant who was a member of that Committee. It is really hard to understand how a negotiator under these conditions could get an increase in salary of \$50 per month for himself, plus a rent allowance of \$23, which is an overall increase of \$73 a month and simultaneously deals out a mere three or four dollars a month increase for the cooks, porters and student nurses who are on the unestablished staff and whom he represents. We have to admit in a sort of extenuating manner, that he followed the well-trodden path. This position is clear for anybody to see. I believe if anyone got a chance to sit on a Committee which sets out to freeze a Government, that person would make hay while the sun shines; you'll get what you can. This merely shows that the tail is wagging the dog and that is what is happening in this country. Anything which these Committees recommended, regardless of how absurd may be the recommendations, once they were sent to the Government, it ratified them and sent them down for our final ratification.

The honourable senior member for the City made a very useful point in drawing comparison of the allowances received by these attendants at the Mental Hospital and the allowances received by the members of the Police. Further down that line, one cannot help noticing the differential treatment meted out between these particular male attendants at the Mental Hospital and the officers occupying a similar post at the General Hospital. One would have thought that the Head Male Attendant would be given the same allowance as the one at the General Hospital, but it is clearly shown that because the officer at the General Hospital was not on the Public Servants Wages Committee, he did not get it. The General Hospital is by far a bigger institution and more important than the Mental Hospital, yet the Head Warden of the General Hospital gets less allowances than the Head Male Attendant at the Mental Hospital. The difference is in the vicinity of \$67 annually. I will say that it boils itself down to this, that if you want to get special favoured treatment, you must get on a Whitley Council or on a Committee to fix your own salary.

One will concede that the temptation to pursue a policy of this sort would be particularly strong on the part of these particular negotiators; but entirely outside of that is our responsibility to the community

and our responsibility as people responsible for the disbursement of government funds. If therefore they succumbed to a temptation which is to some extent human, and the Government turned a blind eye or unthinking mind to their attempts at raiding the Treasury, it is our responsibility to bring both Government and the negotiators to their right senses.

There are two points at issue here. One is that at the General Hospital the particular people whom we recommended for a special allowance had no quarters; no quarters were available to them. But we have seen no information to the effect that quarters are not available for their counterparts at the Mental Hospital. Until we are satisfied about that it seems to me that we are going too far to award them extra rent allowances; and if and when we are satisfied that no quarters are available that allowance should not be more than that for comparable posts at the General Hospital.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—Before the honourable member replies, may I say that I have listened very carefully to some of the remarks made on this particular resolution, and it strikes me that they did not so much apply to the justice or injustice of these recommendations as to the general over-all salary proposals for the Civil Service.

Dealing first with this Resolution I will tell the House that on principle I think that these attendants at the Mental Hospital are fully justified in asking for these allowances. The first paragraph of the Addendum to the Resolution states that the Resolution is intended to give effect to decisions of Government which are in accordance with agreements of Whitley Council arising out of the recommendations of the Salaries Commissioner appointed to review and make recommendations regarding the remuneration of all Government servants in Barbados excluding those covered by the Turner Committee Report.

The Dos Santos Report stated that these attendants at the Mental Hospital are not provided with accommodation at that institution; and that, Mr. Speaker, is a fact. If honourable members keep their ears to the ground and really follow happenings and events in this colony they will know that that is a fact. The accommodation at the Mental Hospital has for a long time formed the subject of strong protests on the part of these attendants. No dormitory such as there is at the General Hospital is provided for them. I am reminded by an honourable member that this has also formed the subject of a protest in this House. These attendants live in very deplorable conditions; they have to eat wherever they can. Their food is not properly done; there are no proper arrangements for them, and it is a miracle how their stomachs can stand up to the treatment that they have to go through.

Mr. CRAWFORD: In referring to this question of quarters at the Mental Hospital I quoted from the Estimates which stated that they are afforded quarters.

Mr. MAPP: I made no reference to the honourable member. I had in mind the juggled remarks of the honourable members for St. John and the City. I was surprised at the remarks of the honourable senior member for the City, particularly bearing in mind his remarks at the time we discussed the Turner Report. I feel that the Government is really doing justice to these officers at the Mental Hospital, and are trying to put right a state of affairs that they have allowed to exist for too long. I feel that it is really sad that what some honourable members should attack they do not attack, but when it comes to meeting out justice to some deserving Civil Servants they say we should not follow other colonies; look at our

finances; some of these Civil Servants are alright; Government cannot afford this and that and the other.

It seems to me that the honourable senior member for the City was merely following the line of the "Advocate" newspaper. You would think that these attendants are living in luxurious conditions. To say that because they will get these increases which are by no means generous, considering the cost of living today, they should not get this allowance seems to indicate that the honourable senior member for the City is only taking that line because there cannot be many voters in his constituency among these particular officers.

So far, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have spoken on the principle of these allowances. As I have said, it is not true to say that these attendants have accommodation. When it comes to the differentiation I am not going to attack it because I do not know how it arose. I will listen carefully to the Leader especially when he explains this differentiation in his reply. Sir Errol on Page 25 of his report dealt with this question of rent allowance. He recommended that the nurses at the Mental Hospital should be treated in the same manner as those at the General Hospital, and he went on to bring to the attention of the Government what obtains in Trinidad when it comes to these allowances. It is worded a bit complicated and it is not easy to calculate how it would work out with regard to these attendants; but it seems to me that if the Government would formulate some such basis of paying allowances they would get away from this haphazard way of giving rent allowances to an officer merely because he is a head male attendant, or an assistant head male attendant etc. I think that we should have some proper basis, and if we do not exactly follow the line taken by the Trinidad Government, we should lay down some definite principle rather than having one basis for the Mental Hospital, one for the Police etc. I throw out that suggestion for the consideration of the Government.

I do not want to venture on what was passed last Tuesday. I was not here; but there has been a lot of chat today about the cost of these things to the Government. I just want to add, apart from the Resolution before us, that gradually we are coming around to the observation made by Commissioner Adams when he made his inquiry. He was forced to the conclusion that this small island cannot afford a full scale administration of its own. He said that there was no doubt scope for economy in the present administration, but the ultimate solution would seem to lie in some form of West Indian federation. I did not hear the debate here last Tuesday, but from what I have read and seen and heard from members of the Civil Service I am entirely convinced that that is the only course we can follow if we are to get away from the several anomalies that now exist and from the fact that even with the Dos Santos recommendations the symmetry of the Civil Service is somewhat impaired and Civil Servants will still be dissatisfied. I am convinced that they will not be satisfied in the near future because what Commissioner Adams said is perfectly true. If we gave the Civil Service everything they really deserve and want I do not know what would happen. At the same time it must be admitted that there is dissatisfaction among the lower ranks of the Civil Service because of the fact that the symmetry has been interfered with and it has been thrown out of shape——added to at the top and tapered off at the bottom. I am convinced of that and I am convinced that the sooner we can centralise our services in a federal system the sooner we will

get away from the bugbear of increasing administration costs.

The greater inflation is, the higher the cost of living goes, and the less people we will be able to pay increased salaries to; because we will have to find money for other social services, like giving employment to the unemployed. At the same time we must stop the flow outwards of certain officers, and that will necessitate paying increased salaries in some branches; and that again will lead to dissatisfaction. It will throw things out of balance. That, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is what I wanted to say today even although the bulk of Resolutions dealing with these recommendations were passed last week.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I am not opposing the passing of this Resolution in any way, but what has struck me is the departure from the policy that is often adopted by Government in so far as other employees are concerned. I refer to the rent allowances. In this Resolution we see that rent allowances are being provided for the Head Male Attendant and the Assistant Male Attendant at the Mental Hospital, and while I agree with the policy of the Government and the principle involved, I am saying that the same consideration is not meted out to other employees of the Government.

As a case in point I refer to the Extension Officers of the Agricultural Department. They are provided with big houses, often not through any desire of their own, and they are told they have to live in those houses. Then I think that 15 per cent of their salary is taken out for house rent. So they are really paying house rent. Government is telling them to live in a house worth, say \$30.00 a month and they have to pay that \$30.00. That is an opposite policy to the one being pursued as far as this Resolution is concerned. The two policies are inconsistent. I would like to have that point cleared up by the Government because in truth and in fact you are telling an officer that so much money is to be deducted from his salary every month for house rent, whereas if he were not called upon to live in that house he might only pay half of that.

As far as allowances for policemen are concerned I do not see why Attendants at the Mental Hospital should be given special consideration. All are Government employees and all do important work. If you are going to increase rent allowance it should be universal. It should be on a proportionate basis right through the Service. What I mean is that I cannot be convinced that a Sergeant of a Police station should receive less rent allowance than the Head Male Attendant at the Mental Hospital. I feel that the question of rent allowance should be considered for all who have to live away from their homes. Although this Resolution will assist a few, it certainly will cause a great deal of dissatisfaction among the rank and file of the Service.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—Even at the risk of being followed by the honourable junior member for St. John there are a few points I would like to clear up. I do not want to be offensive, but I say plainly that the opponents of the Government have not even done themselves the common fairness—I do not want to say they have been dishonest—have not done themselves the common fairness to get their facts right or to use judgment rather than prejudice against the Government. Which man in this world giving a servants' room to his servants will give the yard boy the same consideration as he will give the housekeeper who has been with the family for 20 years? To talk about discrimination in rent allowances is sheer stupidity. If you are giv-

ing quarters to a housekeeper who has been with your family 15 or 20 years you will want to give her electric light, running water etc. Will you give the little girl who just came into your place to help her mother the same thing? Of course not. Even in Soviet Russia some people get flats and others do not, and some people get Rolls Royces and others have to travel by tram car. That is inevitable. Also, what incentive would there be for a man to try to do well and reach the top but for the fact that if he entered service, say at 15, he will get some reward if he ends up at 55 with the same employer.

About once in the last four or five years a point was made by the honourable senior member for St. John that the Government could consider. Let him try. It is time again for him to think of something that will be useful.

The next point was the one explained by the honourable senior member for St. Thomas. The attendants and nurses at the Mental Hospital asked to be given rent allowances as no provision for accommodation was made at that institution. I see no reason why they should not be treated in the same manner as nurses at the General Hospital. Government agreed honourable members should in common decency get their facts straight before making accusations. I am surprised at the honourable junior member for St. Lucy who had a copy of the Estimates before him. This House passed in the Estimates a sum of money for ration allowance, living out allowance etc. We passed four dollars a week for nurses for whom there is no accommodation at the General Hospital—the same as we are giving these nurses at the Mental Hospital. But honourable members have spent the whole afternoon trying to tell the Government that we are discriminating. When you have a good case, get your facts straight and your opponents will be bound to keep quiet; but when you come with a case that—use the favourite remarks of the honourable senior member for St. Philip—a nitwit child of a moron and village idiot can easily answer what is the use? We are not paying these people one cent more than we pay to the nurses at the General Hospital.

As regards the allowance of \$240.00 per annum for the Assistant Head Male attendant as compared with \$275.00 for the Head Male Attendant, is there not differentiation according to a man's position? You do not pay to the messenger in your shop what you pay to the counter attendant nor do you pay the counter attendant what you pay to the clerk. The greater the responsibility the more the extra emoluments and amenities. In the Estimates there are allowances for some people and in explaining the reason the word "responsibility" is used. It is because of the responsibility of a night nurse at the General Hospital that she gets extra allowance.

As regards the principle aback of these allowances, anyone in his sane and quiet moments—I do not want to say "sober" moments because the honourable members who make unwarranted statements do not even have the excuse that they get "tight". I have never seen any of them sufficiently human to be non-sober, while you can excuse some people for what they say by saying it is not they who are talking but the beverage in them. But as I was saying, no one in his sane and quiet moments would make the statements that some honourable members have made.

I cannot say anything more except to say to the honourable junior member for St. Lucy who at least will change his mind when he gets the answer, that if in the Estimates you are providing officers with quarters, obviously they would not get rent allow-

ances also. Rent allowances would only apply to those who are not provided with quarters. It is true that we are dealing with a Mental Hospital vote, but I do not think that every member of the Government should be in the Mental Hospital. This Resolution merely says that these officers at the Mental Hospital should get so much rent allowance. If they are provided with quarters they will not get it. That is the answer to the honourable junior member for St. Lucy, who said he could not vote for the Resolution until the point was made clear.

As regards the point made by the honourable senior member for Christ Church, it does sometimes look as if the position of a man who has to live in a particular house and pay part of his salary as rent is hard. But a man knows that if he wants to be Governor of Glendairy Prison he cannot live in his own house outside the institution. I do not agree with the honourable member that any hardship is inflicted if you ask an officer to pay 10 per cent or 5 per cent of his salary as rent. Suppose the officer has a house of his own what is to prevent him from renting it out and putting that money back in his pocket? The officer living in quarters provided by the Government does not have to worry about making repairs and patching. He rings up the Public Works Department and they do the patching. That officer has to live in these quarters because of the nature of his job. He has a distinct advantage over the householder. There is controversy over the percentage of salary that should be taken out for rent. Some people say 10 per cent and some say 5 per cent. The figure we use is the one adopted by the University College of the West Indies. It is as a result of experience that Government has come to feel that for an officer below a certain salary level the figure should be five per cent, and above that level ten per cent. It has also been, I am told, calculated from time to time on what a person ordinarily would have to pay for rent. The average householder who may never get a salary that will permit him to buy a house will have to say "out of my salary I calculate so much for rent." It has been found that the figure works out at something in the vicinity of 10 per cent. of a man's salary. That is the basis on which Housing Boards and authorities of that nature fix rents.

I hope that honourable members will see the point I have made. I may warn them that if they expend all their energy on this triviality they will be sleepy later on when something bigger comes up; the "Advocate" says that honourable members get sleepy. If they get sleepy the Government will get some work done. I am asking honourable members to reconsider all that they have said and see whether they have any case against the Government.

Replying now directly to the honourable senior member for the City I will say that I can well see how he feels as regards certain salaries. But I would like to see that attendant at a Mental Hospital in America who, according to the honourable member, only gets \$40.00 a week. Perhaps he only sweeps the corridors; he would still be an attendant. Making comparisons without giving us all the facts does not really help.

I will remind honourable members of what I said. Government did not agree with all the allowances asked for. Generally we have agreed; but there are cases where certain exceptions were made. If we have not given police more allowances it was because recommendations for basic salary were so great that we did not think it right to give increased allowances.

I do not see any policeman who should have a grievance where these recommendations are concerned.

I will say one last word. We are a Socialist Government who have got into power because we have preached for years the raising of the standard of the under dog. Imagine the honourable senior member for St. Philip or the honourable member for St. John attacking the Government because we have given the "poor man" too much. They should leave that to the honourable senior member for the City.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I would like the honourable member to say which member for St. John he is referring.

Mr. ADAMS: I apologise if I referred to the honourable member who has not spoken. Why should we be accused of giving the poor man too much? We have promised to raise his standards. When as in the case of the recommendations of the Turner Committee we had to help those higher up we faced a difficult situation and we had to do what we did with regret. In the present case we are doing this with joy because we can go back to the people whom we got cursed for helping so much. If we get cursed for helping the poor man we must have done a good deed. It is a matter for the members of the eastern parishes to square their political protestations with what they have said today. No case has been made out against the Government. I hope that honourable members will be more constructive in debating what follows on the Order Paper than they have been on this Resolution.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I will apologise for rising now. But this is what brought me to my feet: I would like to know, and I thought that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph would have explained the differentiation between the Assistant Warden at the General Hospital and the Assistant Head Male Attendant at the Mental Hospital. You cannot give the Assistant Warden at the General Hospital the same as you give a staff nurse and then turn around and give the Assistant Head Male Attendant at the Mental Hospital much more and brush it away as easily as by comparing it with the house-keeper and maid.

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

TEA ADJOURNMENT

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

RESUMPTION

On the re-assembling:

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before the House proceeds with the next order I would like to inform honourable members that it has been brought to my attention that on the occasion of the last Coronation of a Sovereign a joint Address of Loyalty and congratulation was passed by the Houses of the Legislature; and as the time is getting short I am suggesting that some attention should be paid to that matter now. I would like to know the views of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. My own opinion is that we should desire a conference with the Other Place and have the joint address passed that way.

Mr. ADAMS: I entirely agree with what Your Honour has said, and I would like to ask Your Honour's advice as to whether a formal motion is necessary now, in which case I would ask Your Honour to approach the Other Place and ask them to fix a convenient date and place for the joint conference.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would suggest that we pass an Address to the Other Place and in the meantime I can arrange about fixing the time and place.

Mr. ADAMS: In view of the shortness of the time, I will, if the House grants permission, move the passing of an Address to the Other Place. If we meet only from Tuesday to Tuesday there will be only next Tuesday available. I am therefore asking leave to move the passing of an Address to the Other Place and to deal with it immediately.

There being no objection leave was granted.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I beg to move the passing of the following Address to the Other Place:—

The House of Assembly

To

The Honourable The Legislative Council

The House of Assembly have the honour to desire the Honourable the Legislative Council to meet with them in conference to consider the passing of a Joint Address of both Chambers, to be presented to Her Majesty the Queen, on the occasion of Her Majesty's Coronation on the 2nd of June, 1953.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to *nem. con.*

BILL TO AMEND PETROLEUM ACT

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph—To move the second reading of the Bill intituled an Act to amend the Petroleum Act, 1950.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker—In moving the second reading of this Bill, I am going to find it one of the most difficult tasks I have undertaken since I became Leader of this Government, not because there is anything in this Bill of which the Government has cause to be ashamed, but because my natural inclination is to be as militant as possible in a matter which, taking all things into consideration, it is advisable to handle with kid gloves. This colony has been maligned, the Government, people and Legislature of this colony have been maligned in a way that I have never, in my public life at any rate, dreamed of, let alone thought possible. Things went so far that we have been accused by the highest parliament in the British Commonwealth of being worse than the Persians in breaking faith, of being dishonest and of proving that it is wrong to give natives self government.

I have found it extremely difficult to get down to the mild style which I shall adopt tonight. I am adopting it only because I think that in the interest of peace, in the interest of the island, it is perhaps better to forget the past. Honourable members are well aware that no member of the Labour Party has ever ceased to preach nationalisation of important industries affecting the life of the community as a whole; but we have never preached expropriation. When we said that mineral rights are based in the Crown we reminded the public that that started with a Conservative Government in Great Britain which during the war tried to get every portion of the British Empire to vest mineral rights in the Crown so that oil would be available for the war effort. Who could truthfully accuse us of even suggesting that the British Union Oil Company should have their rights taken away from them without as far as humanly possible giving them adequate compensation.

Now on this matter the Government made considerable investigation and obtained expert advice. Honourable members will see that I am talking as if they had all the facts at their disposal, as they must. I am not giving a historical account of everything. I take it that all of us know the facts

that have led up to the vesting of mineral rights in the Crown. Having read the Objects and Reasons of this Bill, honourable members will know why I have started off right in the middle. We were advised that the B.U.O.C. had a certain number of leases some of which dated back from 1922, all of which they took in a general way, but not all of which they thought would necessarily yield oil. They had leases in the Turner Hall area and in other parts of the island too. Government was advised that some of these leases were worth absolutely nothing on the market. If an oil company had come along to buy out the B.U.O.C. they would have said, "you have no geological data to indicate that such and such a lease is likely to give oil; we will give you \$100 or \$50.00. Our advice was that there was no big market value on the untapped leases and we came to the conclusion after obtaining all the advice possible, to compensate the B.U.O.C. in a way that we considered just. We tried first the division of the island into four horizontal lines, A, B, C, and D. We told B.U.O.C. they could have A and C and the other company B and D. We told B.U.O.C. we think you have a moral right to compensation, but you have no legal claim. The honourable junior member for St. John will forgive me using his phrase, but we can do everything except making a man a woman and vice versa. We could pass a law to expropriate all the real estate agents in Barbados, and legally the real estate agents would have no claim to compensation. Morally it would be wrong. Some of them, I am told, are nearly bankrupt. Therefore, legally, as soon as we vested oil rights in the Crown B.U.O.C. had no claim to compensation. Of course morally, if they had a chance of making money, we owed them compensation for what we were taking from them by law. We concluded that they should have first choice but we believed, as all honourable members know, that Barbados was not too small for two companies and that we should give no one company a monopoly.

For that reason, Sir, we told Gulf Oil Company who had been asking for a concession B.U.O.C. first and you next. B.U.O.C. walked out of the negotiations and told us to give the concession to Gulf, and they broke off negotiations. That is all that happened as regards the breakdown in negotiations between the Government and the B.U.O.C. We sat down with Gulf Oil Company and for the first time—it was a great development in self government—for the first time I was invited as Leader of the Government and therefore having to persuade the majority party and ultimately the House—to take part in what was purely an administrative matter, to take part in the actual drafting of the terms of the leases to Gulf Oil Company, on the ground, I repeat, that being the Leader of the majority party, and having the responsibility of persuading the House, I should be taking part in these negotiations that up to that time no legislator, barring the Attorney General used to sit on it. I mention that because I have seen letter after letter in the Press and read the statements that were made in the House of Lords, and because of my position I could say nothing even although I knew they were lies. It was suggested that we gave better terms to Gulf Oil Company than we were willing to give to the B.U.O.C. Apart from what was said in the House of Lords there were accusations in letters from Lord Teviott to the London "Times", and a bitter article appeared in "Truth". The honourable member for St. John can perhaps tell us why it is called "Truth".

We continued negotiations with Gulf Oil Company. The only advantage that that company has had was that they asked for and got the right to

explore in the sea off the Leeward Coast, and if B.U.O.C. had asked for that right they would have been given it too. It was completely untrue to say that the Government broke faith with the B.U.O.C., threw them out etc.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, although I intend to be as mild as possible I must go back to recount what some honourable members may have known from me personally, but what I have never said as publicly as now. If you read carefully the debate in the House of Lords and the letters in the "Times" you will find a constant confusion between Governor, Government and Legislature. You will find a speaker and even a writer, who as soon as he wrote it should have seen his mistake, saying that the company was assured by the Acting Governor that they would get the right to prospect for oil. Then you will see it stated that the Government of Barbados went back on its word. That is nonsense. The Governor of this colony is not the Government of Barbados. I want the utmost publicity to be given to this. I was approached many times by the Trinidad representative of Trinidad Leaseholds who had hoped to work in conjunction with the B.U.O.C. The honourable senior member for St. Michael was approached and so were the honourable junior member for St. Thomas and the honourable senior member for St. Peter. We were approached singly and together. We said singly and together every time that we had to talk over something that we were not experts. We were asking the Government of Canada to send down an expert. We did not believe in any monopoly. But if the expert came and said that Barbados was too small for two companies, we would have to reconsider whether to give it to B.U.O.C. But inasmuch as B.U.O.C. were here for a long time they would have first choice above anyone else. How in the face of all that can anyone say that B.U.O.C. were told by Sir Hilary Blood or any one else that they would have a monopoly? How could that be so, when we always said we would have to get expert advice?

The documents that I have seen bearing on the time that these things were happening make it clear that there is not the slightest trace of any specific promise by any official let alone by the Government that B.U.O.C. would have a monopoly. Sir Hilary Blood was very careful whenever he had a conversation and the person left the room, to write down the gist of the conversation there and then. I have before me copies of those notes, and some are in my private files at home. I therefore say in fairness to Sir Hilary to Mr. Perowne and to the Government of Barbados that there is no record whatever of anything like a definite promise that B.U.O.C. should have a monopoly. I am only guessing at what I am saying now, but I suppose it is true. I guess it from certain conversations I have had with representatives of B.U.O.C. that someone possibly on the other side, — I will not particularise anyone — knowing that Mr. Lepper had recommended that B.U.O.C. should have it, and that they should be the only one, and forgetting the constitution of Barbados, let alone the temper of legislators in Barbados, thought that he could promise B.U.O.C. to pull strings for them at this end and get a monopoly for them. Although B.U.O.C. were told in no uncertain terms by the four House members of the Executive that we were making no promises they went ahead feeling that some strings could be pulled in spite of what these four members of the Executive said, and that they would get the monopoly.

I cannot call names, and I have to be careful of some of the things I am saying because some of them may have been told me in confidence. But I do know that B.U.O.C. opened its eyes when it got the message from London saying, "look to the Barbados Government; they alone can decide whether you will get a monopoly or not." Then there was the flitting to and fro etc. But I must repeat that not a single shred of evidence can be brought to show any specific promise by a governor, an acting governor or the Government of this country that they would have a monopoly.

We know how these letters appeared in the Press etc., eventually leading up to the debate in the House of Lords. We know the accusations under which we have had to remain silent. The worst feature of it was that we were told on the highest possible authority that there was not the ghost of a chance of the Barbados Government being able to borrow two cents in London until the matter was cleared up because it had been said in the House of Lords and it was known in other quarters, and in the Press and otherwise it was alleged that the Government of Barbados could not be trusted to keep its word. That we had promised a monopoly to an English company and had given it to an American company. Some people even went so far as to allege that we had sold out to an American company. Lord Milverton asked what could they expect the Persians to do when a British Colony acted that way.

I believe that even the Electors' Association of which the honourable junior member for St. John was then a distinguished Assistant Secretary, went so far as to say why talk about a deep water harbour seeing that we could not borrow a cent in London. I think I can say that because of our desire to put an end to all that we have been generous in the proposals embodied in this Bill. We have told them that when they walked out they were stupid. If they did not walk out we could have gone on bargaining. We cannot give them half now. We told them originally that many of their leases were worth nothing; but they had a moral claim and we would give them first choice and 55 per cent. That was the offer they turned down. We cannot repeat that offer now but we will offer them the same terms as Gulf has over the rest of the island. If Gulf finds oil on any of their leases we will give them 12½% of the royalty for the same period for which they have the lease. So if they have a lease which still has 40 years to run they will get 12½ per cent. for that period. That is the offer we are making to B.U.O.C. Before negotiations broke down we offered to go to arbitration. They wanted arbitration in London we said no, in Barbados. I need not go into details because nothing came of it. The negotiations broke down.

At long last they have said yes, we will accept your offer. They have also agreed to a carefully prepared statement which I shall read now and which we hope to see published in the Press in Great Britain, admitting that the Government of Barbados did not let the B.U.O.C. down or break its word to them.

I do not wish to say all that I would like to say about what we have been accused of. We have nothing to be ashamed of. I shall promise honourable members on my left that they will not even provoke me into saying what I should not like to say. When they have attacked the Government on this I have remained particularly quiet. But we have nothing to be ashamed of. As I have said, because we desire to put an end to the bad things of the past and to live amicably with these two companies we will not retort in similar vein to that used against us.

Lest any honourable member should feel that the Government is not aware of the slippery thing that oil is, I will say that Government is well aware of the possibility of smart moves. Government is well aware that money talks, especially oil money. I do not suppose that I am putting them on their guard any more than they have a right to have sense enough to see that their future conduct should always be such as to avoid doing anything on their part to cause the community of Barbados to suffer. If, in short, we can have two companies in competition, and therefore each drilling as quickly as possible to bring oil to the surface, we will do so. In short, any license granted to B.U.O.C. will be a license of the sort granted to Gulf, and we will take the necessary precautions to see that oil tricks do not take place to our detriment.

I think, Sir, that I have covered all that appears in the Object and Reasons. I will remind honourable members of those points by reading the Objects and Reasons. They say:—

This Bill seeks to carry into effect part of the terms agreed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee and the British Union Oil Company Limited in settlement of a dispute between the Government of Barbados and the Company concerning the oil leases held by the Company prior to the introduction of the Petroleum Act, 1950.

The bill seeks to provide for the Company to receive twelve and one half per centum of royalties paid to the Government in respect of petroleum recovered from wells situated in land over which the Company had a valid lease not liable to forfeiture at the date of the introduction of the Petroleum Act, 1950. Provision is made for a list of such leases to be agreed between the Governor-in-Executive Committee and the Company. The bill provides that royalty is payable only up to the date of expiry of the lease and is not to be paid in respect of certain natural gas for which the Company has already received compensation.

The words "land over which the company had a valid lease not liable to forfeiture at the date of the introduction of the Petroleum Act 1950" were put in because to all or nearly all of the leases which B.U.O.C. had with local landowners there was a proviso that if they did not exercise their right to bore within six months the landowner could cancel the lease. I have never seen the leases myself, but I have been instructed that it was incumbent upon the land owner to draw attention to the fact that the company had not begun to operate within the specified time and that therefore, under that proviso, he was cancelling the lease. Just in case there may be some case where a landowner called on the company and said he was cancelling the lease those words have been put in. So from any lease which was not liable to forfeiture at the date of the introduction of the Petroleum Act, 1950, and on which oil is found by Gulf Oil Co. B.U.O.C. will be entitled to 12½ per cent of that proportion of royalty to be paid to the Government.

The statement which has been agreed to by B.U.O.C. and the Government, and which will be given to the local Press and the English Press arose, I may say, out of constant negotiations. When the Attorney General went to England last September, he, the Solicitors for the Company, Lord Teviott and I endeavoured to see what we could agree upon. I mention, that only to show that we have never let up in trying to get an agreement. It was after several such consultations and a good lot of correspondence that we have eventually got this agreement. The Solicitor for the

Company came to Barbados a month or two ago, and one of the directors, and this agreement was tentatively decided upon between the Executive and them, and was sent to England for the company to see if they agreed to the wording of it. After this statement which I am now about to read it cannot be said that the accusations made against the Government of Barbados have any validity, or that the company are not aware that they made mistakes, or that there were misunderstandings. The text of the Statement is as follows:—

It is announced for public information that the Governor-in-Executive Committee of the Island of Barbados has agreed to grant to the British Union Oil Company Limited a prospecting licence under the Petroleum Act, 1950, in respect of that part of the Island over which no licence or lease under the Act has so far been granted as part of a settlement of a dispute between the Government and the British Union Oil Company Limited as to the compensation that should be paid to the Company in respect of oil leases held by it at the passing of the Petroleum Act, 1950.

In connection with the settlement of this dispute, both the Government of Barbados and the directors of the British Union Oil Company Limited wish to clear up misunderstandings that have arisen between the Government and the Company and have been given certain publicity.

The directors of the Company were previously under the impression that the Executive Committee of this Island had agreed prior to the passing of the Petroleum Act, 1950, that the Company should have a monopoly licence over the whole of the Island of Barbados in return for their oil leases being abrogated by that Act. The directors are now satisfied from information made available to their advisers by the Government that no such decision of the Executive Committee was ever taken, and the Company has satisfied the Government's advisers that the directors' impression arose from a genuine misunderstanding.

It has been made clear that the Government of Barbados has never at any time intended that these leases should be abrogated without some form of compensation being given to the Company but has, on the other hand, always had in mind some form of preferential treatment to the Company by way of compensation when the granting of prospecting licences under the Act was under consideration. In pursuance of this intention, when offering prospecting licences to the Company and to the Gulf Oil Corporation in 1950, the Company was offered a licence over 55% of the Island with a preference in the choice of areas, whereas the Gulf Oil Corporation was offered a licence in the same terms except that the offer extended only to 45% of the Island and the Gulf Oil Corporation was given second choice in the selection of areas. The Company has always maintained its view that this preferential offer was an inadequate recognition of its claim but the directors now recognise that the offer was made in good faith after taking expert advice. It has now been agreed between the Governor-in-Executive Committee and the Company that, subject to the approval of the Legislature, this compensation should comprise the grant of a prospecting licence and also a payment to the Company of 12½% of the royalties received by the Government in respect of petroleum produced from a well situated in ground over which the Company had at the 28th January, 1949, a valid oil lease not then liable to forfeiture. These payments are to be made in respect of petroleum so produced up to the expiration of the term of the lease, but not in respect of natural gas for which the Company has already received compensation under the Act.

Publicity has been given to a statement that, when the issue of prospecting licences was being considered after the passing of the Petroleum Act, 1950, an offer was made to the Gulf Oil Corporation in terms more favourable than the offer made at the same time to the British Union Oil Company Limited. However, it is clear that the original offers were made simultaneously in the terms set out above and that any subsequent modifications were the result of later negotiations between the Government and the Gulf Oil Corporation.

This statement is made by the Government of Barbados with the approval of the British Union Oil Company Limited. The Government and the Company regret that misunderstandings concerning the above matters have arisen between them. However, these have now been satisfactorily explained and the differences settled. Consequently, no further reference to the past is necessary and both the Government and the Company look forward to a renewal of friendly relations and co-operation."

I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that that should silence the voice of the severest critic of the Government of Barbados. It is just not true that any preferential treatment was offered to Gulf Oil Company at the time when negotiations were being carried on. It is just not true that with regard to the British Union Oil Company any decision to grant a monopoly was ever taken by the Executive, or that there was ever any question of the Government of Barbados expropriating any property of B.U.O.C., as distinct from vesting in the Crown, without right of compensation.

I have spoken longer than I intended originally. I do appeal to honourable members to see that we are not betraying the people of Barbados nor have we let down the B.U.O.C. We are merely putting them back in the same position they were in, in 1949 before we passed the Act we are seeking to amend today. If oil is found on one of their leases they get money; if no oil is found they get no money. In truth and in fact they are better off, because Gulf Oil Company is prospecting for the oil, and if they bring oil to the surface on one of B.U.O.C.'s leases the latter company gets a reasonable proportion out of it. I am therefore recommending this Bill to honourable members and beg to move at this stage, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it be read a second time.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—As a Barbadian one is first and foremost naturally pleased to think that this matter has reached the stage at which some effort can be made to restore the fair name and reputation of the island abroad. The honourable introducer of this Bill has himself confessed that at one stage so much harm had been done to the credit of the country in consequence of this issue that it was openly said that we would not have been able to borrow a single penny in England. The people heard that the rate of constitutional progress in Barbados in comparison with that of some of the other West Indian colonies had been slowed up.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order — the honourable member knows that I do not like to interrupt; but who said that?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have not said that the honourable member said it. All that I said was said in the House of Lords. But I am quoting the honourable member as regards the difficulty, if not the impossibility of our being able to borrow money in England. I want to say that it has also been said, although not by the honourable member, that the rate of constitutional progress in this country in comparison

son with the other West Indian colonies has been slowed up because of this matter. Therefore I repeat, that as a Barbadian one is naturally pleased that an effort is being made to settle this issue.

Now, Sir, I want to say that it would be very ungracious, very unkind and very ungrateful of the B.U.O.C. not to be prepared to make public a statement of some sort in exculpation of the Government of Barbados after being treated so generously as they have been treated in this Bill. To be awarded 12½ per cent royalty on any oil found on any of their former leases without having to spend a single cent more to bring that oil to the surface is, to say the least, particularly generous. As a matter of fact the B.U.O.C. is in a more enviable position than the actual owners of the land in which oil may be found. The owners will get 25 per cent of the money collected by Government, and the British Union Oil Company will get 12½ per cent of the royalties collected by Government for as long as the lease lasts. The owner only gets 25 per cent for a maximum period of 25 years; but the Company gets 12½ per cent. for as long as the lease lasts; we are told by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph that some of these leases owned by the Oil Company may run for another 40 years; so that B.U.O.C. will get half the percentage of what the land owner will get for double the period for which the land owner will get it. Therefore the company is in a far better position looking at it from a business point of view, and especially bearing in mind the fact that in addition they will have further prospecting rights granted to them. So they are in a far better position than they were in when the negotiations began.

One thing in the statement read out by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph which intrigued me was the sentence that no previous decision had ever been taken by the Executive, with regard to granting a monopoly to any individual company. That does not mean anything. I have never heard the allegation, neither in rumour nor in the published reports of what took place in the House of Lords nor read in the English Press that the Executive had come to any decision to give any company a monopoly.

The honourable senior member for St. Joseph said that when he and the other members of the Executive were approached by B.U.O.C. and T.L.L. they made it clear that they were being guided by the advice of the expert, Mr. Lepper, and that they were not making any promises either individually or collectively.

(A VOICE): Not Mr. Lepper but Mr. Tanner you have made a mistake.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The Allegation to which I want to refer specifically, Sir, is that the honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph declared that no member of the Executive had given any promises either to the B.U.O.C., or T.L.L., or anybody else to grant a monopoly; neither did any member of the Secretariat. Mr. Perowne was Colonial Secretary at the time.

Mr. ADAMS: It was not Mr. Perowne either.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, Mr. Perowne did make a definite statement at the time. He said that the Government of Barbados would be willing to grant a monopoly to the B.U.O.C. That was the allegation made. While it would be untrue to say, as has been mentioned in this statement, that the Executive had not taken any decision, it seems to us that the B.U.O.C., all things considered, did have some justification for its feeling that it would have been given a monopoly to prospect for oil in Barbados.

Now, the Objects and Reasons in the final paragraph of the Bill provide that royalty is payable only up to the date of expiry of the lease and is not to be paid in respect of certain natural gas

for which the company has already received compensation. In the second place, if you even give compensation for Natural Gas as has already been attended to in the Natural Gas Corporation Act, what about the additional compensation that company is claiming for their oil wells? I feel the company is entitled to some commission. What will be the total bill for compensation to the B.U.O.C. in this issue? They are getting their royalty; they are now getting concessions for a prospective licence over the part of the island which the Gulf Oil Company has not taken up; they are also getting a further compensation in respect of their oil wells; and now that we are considering a partial compensation, we should be told something as to what the other rewards will be, because it can be readily seen that the present compensation to the company is exceedingly favourable. I feel that it is better off than before. As a matter of fact, Sir, this country will be losing by this and not B.U.O.C., all the shareholders should be singing the Hallelujah Chorus. This country would be far better off, if from the beginning Government had done what it is doing now.

The honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph began his speech by saying that there seems to have been a belief that the Barbados Government wanted to expropriate the oil rights without the appropriate licence, but as far as I am concerned that was never the issue. This B.U.O.C. was given less favourable terms from the beginning than the Gulf Oil Company when it rejected the terms of the offer and the Gulf took over. These terms were subsequently amended at the instance of the Gulf Oil Company and then there was no offer by the Government to the B.U.O.C. to re-consider their decision in accordance with the terms which the Gulf finally received. The point at issue is that if the Gulf Oil Company got certain terms in view of circumstances having regard to the money they were expending and all that sort of thing, there was no reason why the same terms should not be offered to B.U.O.C. Now that we have gone the full circle, we are turning round and offering B.U.O.C. 12½ % royalty for doing nothing and we are also giving them a licence for prospecting over the island in those places which the Gulf have not taken over on the same amended terms which the Gulf now enjoys.

Mr. ADAMS: You will see that company is in the same position as it was in 1949. Government would have done the same thing in 1949.

Mr. CRAWFORD: At any rate, the position would have been entirely different to what it is now.

Sir, I would say, all in all, the B.U.O.C. have to congratulate themselves on what has transpired recently and they should be very pleased that the Gulf Oil Company came into the picture when they did and actually got the licence. It does appear to me as if this 12½ % royalty plus the new conditions are exceptionally generous. My impression and that of a number of people in this colony is that the awards embodied in the terms of the Bill have more than settled claims of B.U.O.C. against the colony. The conditions they had and the further concessions which they will get have combined to place them in such an exceedingly good position that I think they have not done enough to back down in the way they did from their original allegation against the country and they have not gone far enough in making their contribution in clearing the good name of the country.

It is certainly to be hoped that the impression abroad about this country would not remain what it was before, because anybody considering the new terms which have been offered to B.U.O.C. would expect the directors of this company to do

no less than what they have done in the statement which has been presented this afternoon to the House.

Finally, I do feel that a clearer picture would have been presented if we had got some further light of the full compensation payable to B.U.O.C. in this matter. We understand that company is also claiming compensation in respect of the oil wells. Let us have this clearer picture at the earliest possible time of what this entire confused state of affairs would finally cost the country.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker—, This Bill engaging the attention of this Chamber accompanied by the statement made by the Leader of the House on behalf of the policy of the Government is something which I and other thinking people in these parts should take very seriously. I am going to say at the beginning I am indeed sorry that there isn't a full Chamber and more especially a full Chamber of a lot of those members who are supporters of the Government who somewhat amuses me when I sit over here and listen to them or when I am outside of Chamber listening to their speeches on soap boxes in respect of the saying "we are masters in our own country." I am going to be very brief on this matter. There is no point when you are in a position as I am in on this occasion to be saying: "I told you so;" "I said so;" or "I predicted this." This is an occasion I think, Sir, when you must take what was said by the Leader of the House seriously, particularly when he said: "It is not only the fair name of the Government of Barbados, but something which affects Barbados as a whole." I think all of us with the interest of the colony at heart and not merely a personal interest or a desire for power must fully appreciate what has taken place this afternoon.

Mr. Deputy Speaker,—The statement as has been made by the Leader of the House will show the leftists and ultra-leftists from Jamaica back to British Guiana that some of the loose talk and wild utterances which they make can do more harm than good, for this statement shows us in truth and in fact that we are not masters in our own house; we are only masters in so far as it appears to the Government of Great Britain that we are acting equitably.

I see no misunderstanding as to the actions between the present Government and the British Union Oil Company. If you will remember, Sir, when we were enquiring on the floor of this House during a debate on the question of the necessity for a Deep Water Harbour as well as on a discussion concerning the Barbados Electric Supply Corporation as to what were the chances of Barbados getting a loan in England, whether the situation had improved, we were told emphatically by the Leader of the House that the actions of the Barbados Government to the B.U.O.C. did not recommend us for any such loan in England. These were his words: "The good name of Barbados sinks like mud in England." When I heard those words, I could not walk about and boast about the statement although I am not a member of the Government Party. I took it very seriously. It was not then a question of party politics—it is not so in this case—it was a question of Barbados. Following politically the actions of the Leader of the House over a long period and listening to some of his more important pronouncements, and after listening to what he had to say this afternoon, and noticing the moderation in his speech. I will say that his statement this afternoon should be published in the Press and every member of this Chamber should cut it out and keep it safely for reference. Not only should it be published in the Press of this colony,

but it should be published in the Press of each West Indian colony. I am sure that if some of those honourable members who are absent from this Chamber heard this afternoon the Leader of the House with the pronouncement: "We are not masters in our own house," they would do away with such utterances as "nationalise sugar factories", "take over the Electric Company and run it." When they make these statements, you sometimes wonder whether they have taken the trouble to read the history of Great Britain and of this country and of the Commonwealth of nations.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, We are going to pass this Bill. I have heard long ago that the honourable Leader of this House was somewhat adamant or stubborn in this matter and was standing on his dignity with the Colonial Office. I have heard he was very strong on the matter and was sort of butting his head against a brick wall. What has happened does show that it was not a question of whether he was a Socialist or a Conservative. It was a question, in my opinion, of a man after seeing the whole situation, despite whatever utterances might have been made by him or members of his party, upholding and doing all he could for the good name of Barbados. Whatever has transpired to make the honourable Leader of this House to make this statement this afternoon; whatever has transpired to make him bring down this Bill, I will be bold enough to say that if the Leader of the House had insisted that this Bill should not come down, it would not have come down. I will say again that the honourable Leader of this House always had the impression that no harm was done the B.U.O.C. of Barbados. That seems to be an admission when the statement was published in the London Press and the Press of other places. If this statement this afternoon by the Directors and other high officers of the B.U.O.C. is an agreed statement, according to the honourable Senior Member for St. Philip, it would be ungracious and unkind in the B.U.O.C. not to make a statement setting out the true facts. We very well recall, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that not only were there rumours and many rumours, but there was a lot of correspondence in the Press in respect of this matter showing the disparity and the bad way in which the B.U.O.C. was treated.

What has inspired this matter, Mr. Deputy Speaker? Why has this Bill been sent down? Why has this statement been made? Why has there been such a speech by the honourable Leader of this House? The answer to these questions is that it was only because of the fair name of Barbados; it was only because that mattered. Power carries responsibility. When I recall when I asked: What were the chances of Barbados raising a loan in England, and the Leader of the House replying said "The name of Barbados is like mud in England." we should pay tribute to him now for bringing down this resolution which I would call a practical compromise. I say we should pay tribute to him without reference to the other members of the Executive because I know had it not been his willing, this Bill would not have been brought down. I call it a practical compromise because it was as if you feel you have done nothing wrong but have been accused of doing wrong and after a time you and the other party come together for a sort of settlement and decide on something mutually. You do all that just to get a loan from the London market and to put the name of Barbados back in the good position it was in England.

I say, Sir, that we are going to support this Bill. This is one of the occasions when you drop party and put shoulder to shoulder in the interest and for the good name of the country. I hope

this speech of the honourable Senior Member for St. John and everything leading up to it will go a long way in sobering up West Indians. Let them see that it is only up to a point where you are masters in your own house and only in so far as if the British Government feels that you are acting equitably. I am not here to say the Gulf Oil Company was right or the B.U.O.C. was right or the Government was right. What I am prepared to say here now is that something went wrong and radically wrong. I do not know who was right or who was wrong. I do not want to accuse anybody, but sometimes it is well to be suspicious of human nature and the higher up a person may be, the more suspicious one should be. It may be a good thing for the honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph that he is not suspicious of anyone's actions especially when he is dealing with top-ranking officials. I remember, when that statement "The name of Barbados is like mud in England" was told this House in an answer to a question put by me, I made it clear then that at the time when something must have gone radically wrong, we had an English Attorney General, and an English Colonial Secretary looking after the state of affairs in this country. I further said that Barbados might be like mud in England, but that it was most peculiar that it should be so when everything that was done in Barbados was done with high brass representing the Colonial Office.

I think, Sir, that I would be the last person who would try to fool anybody. We will support this Bill because we feel it is the correct thing to do. Finally, I am going to say again that I hope this speech by the honourable Leader of this House this afternoon will have a sobering influence on other West Indian leaders who feel that with the extension of the constitution of these colonies and with the improved conditions both socially and otherwise that they can do as they please and as some in Barbados would make us believe. It therefore gives me great pleasure to support this Bill and I do it with the fullest sense of responsibility and with a great appreciation for the actions of the Leader of this House in this matter although it might appear to be belated. When as he says this statement will be published in the English Press, I feel Barbados will be in a position where we can get loans not only from the British Government, but from other private sources in England.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Sir, I do not know why the honourable introducer of this Bill should have made reference to the fact that I was a former Assistant Secretary of the Electors Association but that was something which was recognised and I am in no way ashamed of it. If he introduced that 'red herring' in the hope of preventing me from giving opposition to this measure that hope will be dispelled. I have been paid a compliment which I shall never forget when I was coming forward for my constituency. I told a gathering at a meeting that I was an Assistant Secretary of the Electors' Association and if that would matter to them. A member of the crowd rejoined with this picturesque statement: "Whatever party you may have belonged to, I know you stand for rights."

Sir, we all know that oil is greasy and we know that if you touch oil, it will grease your palms. We have heard it said that there was quite a number of experts who came here to advise on this oil question. There were some who came from Alberta. Here is what Lord Milverton in the House of Lords said about this question: "I do not wish to go into the facts of the case which I understand are not in dispute and which have been stated by the noble Lord Teviott, but I should like to analyse the

"absurdity of going to the Mines Department of Alberta for advice on how to deal with oil concessions in Barbados." Further on, he says: "How ever well they are given to concessionaire work in Alberta which is, I understand about 250,000 square miles in area, it obviously does not make any kind of sense in the island of Barbados which has an area of 166 square miles; or, in other words, 21 miles in length by 14 miles at the broadest point. It is clear they should have thought that in that island, oil can only be worked efficiently and commercially by one concessionaire."

Now, Sir, the worst feature of this whole thing is the fact that it has destroyed the credit of Barbados in London even if it be for only a short period of time. Does anybody want us to accept the statement that the representatives of the B.U.O.C. which is a world renowned company, would have sat down in conference with this Government on this matter of granting concessions and then say that they misunderstood the terms offered and that they would have walked out? The representatives of that company sitting on that conference could only be legal experts. Sir, there are many reasons why those legal experts of that company could have walked out from that conference room, and there are not far-fetched reasons either. One may never know the truth, but if you have a company of people in conference and a representative on one side resorts to continual abuse as a weapon of policy, representatives on the other side may resent it and leave the conference room. We do not know if this was the case.

(A VOICE): How can you argue that?

Mr. VAUGHAN: Now Sir, the B.U.O.C. has been very valuable to this country, even if it be for no other reason than that of providing the Executive of this colony with a report on the Water Resources of this colony. This Government want us to believe that it granted these munificent concessions to the Gulf Oil Company after it was totally innocent of B.U.O.C. going out of the picture. This is really asking one to believe too much.

Sir, I cannot understand the reason for this talk of "we are not masters in our own house." Were you not masters to stand up to an agreement which at first, you appeared to be satisfied with? Were you not masters at that time when you stood up for the Gulf Oil Company and told the B.U.O.C. to take whatever course it intended? Sir, this Bill is the result of granting all those concessions to the Gulf Oil Company. Because of that blunder, whether it was ignorance or otherwise, this island is going to drop considerably in revenue in the event that oil is discovered in the colony. According to this Bill, 12½ per cent of the revenue which Government will get will now go to the B.U.O.C. That Company is still negotiating for compensation for their oil wells which I understand will be a substantial amount. The concessions now granted to B.U.O.C. are on the same terms as the Gulf Oil Company and they are for the remainder of the land which has not been contracted by the Gulf Oil Company. Therefore, the B.U.O.C. has gained everything, there is nothing which has not been granted them; everything has been granted including the compensation for natural gas. All this have resulted through this big blunder. Four substantial concessions now have been granted B.U.O.C. You can therefore imagine what this country is going to lose as a result of that blunder; you can imagine what the inhabitants of this colony is going to lose as a result.

(A VOICE): It may be a gain.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I must say, Sir, that if this Government had more foresight, it would not have committed these blunders. I am convinced that their predecessors would not have granted these concessions because their predecessors could hold too tight what they had. It is of no use for this Government to try to assure us of its innocence with this pristine interest it has given to these concessions. One contradicts the other. If this Government was perfectly innocent, it would not have given concessions like these which are entirely out of its favour, therefore this talk of innocence is just eyewash; it cannot absolve Government from this base blunder. This Government's conduct with oil has soiled its members. It has made them appear foolish or as the honourable Senior Member for the City has said, they must have been made fools of by a former English Attorney General and Colonial Secretary. Mr. Attorney General and Colonial Secretary. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am only concerned in establishing the nonsense of their trying to convince the public and this Assembly that they have been innocent of any wrong dealing towards the B.U.O.C. Innocent agents do not grant such liberal concessions. With these few remarks, I want honourable members to realise that in this matter without even hearing the whole question, you can only come to the conclusion that there was one party which is not innocent and that is the Government Party.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Whatever may have been said, it is clear that something went wrong in the negotiations between the Government and the B.U.O.C. We do not know what that was, but we do know the result has caused the fair name of Barbados to be like mud in England. Our credit standing in the investing world, until that day, was A1, it was second to the best, but ever since that speech by Lord Milverton in the House of Lords, we have been told on more than one occasion and from very high authority directly out of London which is the centre of world trade that the name of Barbados was mud in the investing world. Lord Milverton told us that the treatment meted out to B.U.O.C. by the Government of Barbados had spoiled the fair name of Barbados and caused it to go down. Since then, we have been sounding out the possibilities for raising loans for the development of Barbados, more especially, for the Deep Water Harbour because ninety-nine per cent of the people of Barbados would like to see that accomplished, knowing that without a Deep Water Harbour there cannot be much development; but we have seen during the interim, economic missions go to Jamaica and British Guiana and tell them what they can do and should do and also that the particular developments would cost millions and millions of pounds. Recently, a Commission of the World Bank went to Jamaica and proposed to finance a project there that would take millions of pounds. I hope missions of such sort would soon come here and advise our Government what can be done for the further development of this country; but we know that when those missions have finished their investigations and have reported, we can do nothing without the money for financing the projects, and we know that money cannot be obtained in this little place; therefore we would of necessity have to seek a loan either in London or from the World Bank. If, therefore, what we are doing this afternoon through the terms of this Bill can retrieve the fair name of Barbados, I will spend the whole night in this Chamber to see it through because I know that it would be a sorry plight for this island if we are to continue with this

high state of taxation and with that there can be no development. We are at the limit now with our taxation.

I know the only thing to save this country will be to make loans in large amounts and to use and direct that money with the expert knowledge of commissions which may come here. I do hope that this agreement between B.U.O.C. and the Government of Barbados will have the desired effect. The credit of a Government can be likened to that of a firm or an individual; it is not very much better. Once shaken, it takes a very long time to repair. If we can repair this damage by this treatment, I think we should give this Bill our unanimous vote and the least said about it is the better. Therefore, I am not going to indulge in what went wrong or who went wrong; suffice it to say, something went wrong; but whatever it might have been, I am very glad to know that the Government has taken this step to repair the damage. What we are doing now will worth millions. We are trying to repair the damage which has been done to the fair name of Barbados; we are trying to bring Barbados back in the investment world.

I take much pleasure in supporting the passing of this Bill.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can see from the reaction of the honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph that he accepts the statements of the honourables Senior Member for the City and the Junior Member for Christ Church as a compliment, particularly when the honourable Senior Member for the City enquired whether the statement of the honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph would be published in every West Indian newspaper from Jamaica to British Guiana as well as in the leading English newspapers. It should however be known that any such compliments coming from those honourable members to the Government is condemnatory to it. This matter is more serious than the honourable members who have previously spoken can imagine. The honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph is acting like a smart gentleman with this Oil Bill. He definitely injected in his address a certain amount of nationalistic feeling and you can see how honourable members are rallying behind him as though he was a general on a battlefield and they were the rank and file. Everyone of them is feeling that he is right.

Now, Sir, why has there been such a sudden retreat after so many years? Can the Government give sufficient reason for this retreat? Did the Government just receive the order to retreat and it retreated or the retreat has come purely out of the honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph recent visits to London without any agreement by the other members of the Executive who might have felt this agreement might be wrong as far as this colony is concerned? If it can be remembered, the feeling was expressed that this oil exploration project would bring to this colony improved social conditions which could never be obtained unless those concessions were given to the Gulf Oil Company. Now, this Government is faced with the dilemma of giving more concessions to the B.U.O.C., the company which we were made to believe was no good and would never have explored the oil industry here. Sir, this is a definite change of policy regardless of what other honourable members is going to say or said about the fair name of Barbados. I say that because I was one who was made to feel very elated over the policy adopted by Government at the time. The statement by the honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph therefore

comes as a shock to honourable members like myself who were in the House and who backed the Government for the carrying out of that policy. As I see it now, this company which has been ill-treated will get concessions equal to that given to the country and those people who are owners of the land on which the exploration will take place.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I feel this retreat in policy could have been avoided if the Government believed in the policy which it had adopted. It was only pretending to believe in it. Because of this retreat, no one is in the position to know what it will cost the colony. It depends on the quantity of oil that might be found. This Government could have been in the position of granting the concession to one company; but now it is in the position of having to grant concessions to two companies and one of these companies which have been making profits in this country for a number of years will be getting added profits without even doing anything for them. This is a serious matter. As far as I have been able to gather from this Bill and what other honourable members has said, this B.U.O.C. is going to get 12½% royalty of all the revenue which the Government will get besides compensation for other interests which it has already received. The company will also get a licence for the lease of the remainder of the land which is not leased to the Gulf Oil Company. I am also told that further compensation is under discussion between the B.U.O.C. and the Government for wells. The figure I have heard to settle this compensation is astronomical. It is a rather confusing situation and what makes matters worse is that things like this are done in a piecemeal manner by this Government. You find yourself committed to one thing this month, another thing next month and something else different the succeeding months until the business ends when you will find that you will have conceded more than what you may have conceded if you had known all the facts at the beginning.

I am not going to say like the other honourable members that these concessions are just a bribe to save the fair name of Barbados. What name has Barbados to save? My opinion is that Barbados has just as good a name as any other good country. Barbados is not a hostile country. It is a stable country with thrifty citizens. I personally am not disturbed as other honourable members are over that capitalistic slander "the fair name of Barbados sinks like mud in England." It is said that oil is big business and small men can never get to know the intricate parts of its dealings. What I would like to know is what motivated the minds of Government when they were dealing with these contracts previously and what has motivated their minds now? Government is bringing in this Bill to undo whatever has been done before. I am sure we will never get a satisfactory explanation from the Government Bench in this matter; yet we should be given a better explanation. There is still something hidden from us and the honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph said as much when he said that there were certain statements which he could not make.

Sir, I am certainly not satisfied over this matter. This Bill does not deserve being passed by this Chamber tonight. In the first place, we should be given more time to go into it; it will take a longer time to get to know the real facts. In the second place Government members should be given time to make up their minds on it, because it is implicating the Government and the people of this colony to the great responsibility of guaranteeing this company

all those concessions which this Bill provides. If oil is found the Gulf Oil Company is entitled to its rights for prospecting, but with the B.U.O.C. being given such handsome compensation by this Bill, I am sure by these terms the people of this colony would see oil gushing and for years afterwards they would not be able to enjoy any benefits from it. All this has arisen through mishandling by the Government and its past policy. Sir, I certainly would like to know that this House has members who would be bold and honest enough to the citizens of this country to reject this Bill. Let me remind honourable members that whenever this Government gets compliments from the honourable Senior Member for the City and the Junior Member for Christ Church, the Government is wrong in its policy.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is not the first time that this Government has stupidly compromised with its opponents. As I look around this Table and see in the faces of honourable members their reaction to this Bill, it looks as if I can only express my opinion, but will have to bear the pain of seeing it passed by this House to bring about what I know will be a damaging effect on this community. I am still hoping that the honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph will get up and say something more on this matter which would be satisfying and reasonable. This is a far-reaching matter: it is not as small as previous speakers have tried to make it.

Mr. TALMA: Without attempting to reply on behalf of the Government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to give expression to a view of mine. I am not in a position to reopen the case or to go into the closing of this matter between the B.U.O.C. and the Government, but there are two points which the Government can be commended even at this stage. When I say that, what comes more forcibly to my mind is that the B.U.O.C. have been operating here in a lackadaisical manner since its commencement in 1918 or 1919, it never trying to its utmost to bring to the level of the ground the hidden resources of this island; therefore, it was a good day for Barbados — and if I may be allowed to give full vent to my optimism, it was a blessing for Barbados — that the concession was granted to the Gulf Oil Company. I am hoping that in a short time oil will be found by this company in a sufficient quantity as to put an end to our unemployment problems. As we all know, the greatest problem which Barbados has to solve is unemployment and I know that the honourable Senior Member for St. John will join with me when I say that if even in the giving up of half of the royalties to the B.U.O.C., — he said all — this problem can be solved by the finding of oil by the Gulf Oil Company in a short space of time, we would gladly give it up.

Mr. ALLDER: I did not say all of the royalties.

Mr. TALMA: I am referring to the royalties which have been given up by the Government to the B.U.O.C. on account of leases which are still in existence to that Company, but which have been forfeited and given to the Gulf Oil Company. I am saying that on those rights, the B.U.O.C. would be entitled to the 12½% royalties and the Government the other 12½%. Whatever it may be, I am going to say that this Government has done a great service to this island by bringing in the American Gulf Oil Company to prospect for oil. Even at this stage of its operations, that company has offered a greater amount of hope in lowering the unemployment in his country when the situation is compared with what has been done by the English company during its operations in this island over the past 30 years.

Sir, the question of giving up 12½% royalties is a magnanimous and noble gesture on the part of this Government so as to clear the fair name of Barbados whether or not there were sins of omission or commission. It is more than can atone for any wrong doing and it should be enough to induce the English capitalist to invest his money here again or to make loans to us. It can therefore be seen that on all points, instead of a disservice having been rendered, a service has been rendered. This Labour Government has been magnanimous in this gesture even if it did not act at first for some reason or the other in favour of the B.U.O.C. and so caused the English Lords in Parliament to be dissatisfied with it. I am glad to see that this Labour Government is big enough to remedy any wrongs or injustice so that the fair name of Barbados would be cleared up and I hope that by so doing, outside world investments and loans on which this country depends will be forthcoming and projects like the Deep Water Harbour will be made practicable in the not distant future.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I hope not to keep the House long. One would have hoped that in a debate of this sort in which as the honourable junior member for Christ Church rightly puts it, the fair name of the island is being vindicated, honourable senior member and the honourable junior member for St. John would have at least tried to be constructive. I have hinted for the past two years that there was no chance of going on with the Deep Water Harbour until this matter was settled. As the honourable senior member for the City said, he got it from English Officials when they were out here. So, because of the importance of this debate one would have hoped that the two honourable members for St. John would have tried to be constructive. I know it is difficult. The honourable senior member for St. Philip, true to type, had to throw things at the Government; but even he realised when faced with incontrovertible facts that it was no use talking at greater length.

I am prepared to prove now with absolute certainty that we have not done one thing to B.U.O.C. which can be called a magnificent and generous gesture. What was the position in 1949? They had leases in different parts of the island, but not contiguous, over 78 per cent. of the island. Labouring under the delusion that they would get a monopoly, they made no protest either through themselves or through their friends in the Upper Chamber against the passing of the Bill. It passed this place and the Other Place, and got the Governor's assent because they thought it would protect them. As it has been said, you cannot hide when you strike oil. The day that oil gushes at Turner Hall anyone who has got money enough can come next door. I have seen how it happens in Canada and the U.S.A., although in portions of those countries there are laws to restrict them; otherwise the camps of oil prospectors would spring up like a forest of pine trees in one area. Therefore B.U.O.C. wanted Government to nationalise oil. They thought that if everything was vested in the Government and they alone had a licence no one could come in and take advantage of the fact that oil was gushing. They had the delusion that they alone would be able to explore for oil, get leases etc.

I therefore remind honourable members that B.U.O.C. started out with leases over 78 per cent. of the island for what they were worth. We were advised to give both companies licences. I take it that honourable members can balance the advantages and disadvantages of 78 per cent. not yet drilled and the 45 per cent. not yet drilled, but with possibly

someone else to help them bring oil to the surface. We offered Gulf and B.U.O.C. a licence; therefore in offering them both a licence today we are not doing anymore than we did two years ago. Two years ago we offered B.U.O.C. a licence and we gave them first choice. They were therefore in a position to choose the 78 per cent. which they had or a substantial portion of it if it did not fall within the two parts of the four which they were offered to choose from. It was up to the Government not to give them contiguous spots because if they took A and C and oil was discovered in A we could give a licence for B. The Alberta Government sometimes offers licences like that.

Now instead of being in a position to choose a substantial portion of that 78 per cent. today they are getting a licence over 45 per cent. of the island plus the fact that someone else will be bringing that oil to the surface for them. But they are not getting 25 per cent. royalty, as some honourable members seem to think. They are getting 25 per cent. of 15 per cent. royalty. The Government of Barbados is getting, I think, 15 per cent. of the value of the oil. If oil is worth two dollars a barrel they will get 15 per cent. of that two dollars for every barrel. Of that 15 per cent., 25 per cent. goes to the owner of the land and the Government gives back 12½ per cent. of that 15 per cent. to the B.U.O.C. I believe it works out at something like one and three-sixteenths per cent. of the value of the oil. And that is, if oil is discovered. Suppose Gulf does not bore on a B.U.O.C. lease, the latter company will get nothing.

Now I must correct a mistake made by the honourable senior member for St. Philip due to a faulty statement of mine. The latest B.U.O.C. lease ends in 1969, so they will only get this advantage for 16 years. Actually their leases were within a 20-year period. I can prove with certainty that B.U.O.C. are not better off today than they were originally, except Gulf spends money and energy on a particular spot where B.U.O.C. has a lease and brings oil to the surface. We cannot force Gulf to do anything.

I must reply to the suggestion made by the honourable member for St. John that the people of this island backed us on nationalisation, and we have gone back on our promises. That is absolutely untrue. All that has happened is that we told B.U.O.C. that their moral claim could be covered by offering them first choice. We gave them first choice over 78 per cent. of the island. When an oil company buys a lease they buy a gamble. Gulf may sink a well on every leased portion of B.U.O.C. and never find a drop of oil, and B.U.O.C. will not get one cent. Far from this Government giving away anything look at what has happened. B.U.O.C. claimed as compensation for these leases and money they had spent in this island a sum of over four million dollars. That was for all the money they had spent in sinking wells and getting geological information which would be available to the Government. That has gone to the winds. They will not get a cent of that. They claimed one and a quarter million dollars under the Petroleum Act. We said they were worth roughly \$570,000. That is all they will get. They had to accept the Government's figures.

Honourable members may forget that the Petroleum Act gives them the right to claim compensation for pipeline etc., and for a gas producing well. Our figures have been accepted by them and vary tremendously from theirs. All that they now have is the possibility that if Gulf finds oil on a lease of theirs they will get one and three-sixteenths or something like that of the value of the oil. The company claimed \$1,251,470.22 as the value of its interest in

Well No. 19 at Turners Hall. The company's total claims in fact totalled five million dollars odd. All that they will get is \$573,000 odd. Included in that is \$2,500 for certain equipment at Well No. 20 at Turners Hall. As regards Well No. 19 which produces natural gas, under Section 17 of the Natural Gas Corporation Act anyone who has a well producing natural gas in this island is entitled to compensation by two-party bargaining or by arbitration. As I have already said the company claimed over a million dollars in respect of that well. They have now accepted the figure of \$90,000 with interest as provided in the Act.

I was prepared to go to this length only because if we could hold our heads up to the world and say that we have not put B.U.O.C. in any worse position than they were in before the Petroleum Act of 1950 was passed the House of Lords could curse us for all they were worth. And we have done that. They cannot get the first offer of first choice over 75 per cent. of the island again. But we say to them that if their leases produce oil they will get the figure that I have mentioned. What we have done is immeasurably greater than the question of saving money. As the honourable senior member for the City and the honourable junior member for Christ Church have said we have made it possible to go ahead with schemes involving borrowing money on the English market. It is because of that, and without any desire to let down Barbados that we pressed and pressed and got around the table again and again to see what could be done to put B.U.O.C. in the position they were in before the passing of the Act.

When negotiations broke down we came to the House and told honourable members that they had broken down. If the company had refused this present offer they could not have held their heads up to the world. When they realised that this was a reasonable and fair offer they sent people here to agree with it, and to agree also that a statement be released. I was not going to come to this House asking honourable members to do anything without a statement letting the world know that the accusations against the Government of Barbados were unfounded. That was part of the settlement. Because as I have said, even an ex-governor of Jamaica who should know better talked in the House of Lords as if the government and legislature were the same thing. They seemed to think that the Governor could say something or seem to say something that was binding on the legislature.

I am sorry that I have had to keep back the House this last ten minutes. I did it so that the honourable senior member for St. Philip and the House could see that far from being magnanimous, we have only agreed to pay less than \$500,000 odd in respect of their claim of five million.

All the payment we will ever make apart from that depends on whether oil is found on any of the company's leases. Seeing that we are really desirous of establishing amicable relations, I hope that the necessity of having to reply with a little heat to the honourable member for St. John will not spoil the relationship which we hope, for the sake of Barbados will continue between Gulf Oil Company, B.U.O.C., and ourselves. With these new and amicable relations established, we can all hope that we will strike oil in commercial quantities; for if we strike oil thus, we can destroy the demon of unemployment as long as that oil comes to the surface in adequate quantities.

I thank the House for the patience with which they have heard me, and those honourable members

who see how important it is to Barbados for this Bill to be passed without more ado.

Question that the Bill be read a second time was put and on the declaration of Mr. Deputy Speaker that the "Noes" have it, a division was called for. The division was taken, honourable members dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. SMITH, Mrs. BOURNE, Messrs. F. L. WALCOTT, MAPP, TALMA, HOLDER, BRYAN, ADAMS, COX, MOTTLEY and GODDARD.—(11)

Noes: Messrs. VAUGHAN and ALLDER.—(2)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I now declare the *Ayes* have it.

DINNER ADJOURNMENT

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

RESUMPTION

On the re-assembling:

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Mr. Cox, the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

The two clauses of the Bill were called and agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. Cox, the Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in Committee, and Mr. Deputy Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

INCOME TAX BILL PASSED

On the Order being called for Mr. Adams to move the second reading of Bill intituled an Act to amend the Income Tax Act, 1921.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—The purpose of this Bill is to remove anomalies and hardships which have been found in practice to obtain under the Income Tax Act of 1921. Although it is a bit long I will have to draw the attention of honourable members to the Objects and Reasons. The first paragraph says —

"The effect of section 3 (3) of the Income Tax Act, 1921, is that in all cases where a wife has an income of her own, special calculations involving much waste of time and labour have to be made to determine the amount of tax appropriate to the wife although the sum is often trifling, and although in most cases the husband pays the full tax due from both. Its effect also renders unnecessarily complex the transactions involved when tax has to be refunded to the wife due to payment by her of tax in excess of her liability.

The amendments contained in clause 2 and 8 of this Bill therefore seek to lessen this work but at the same time they preserve the former position, for those parties wishing to take advantage of it."

Paragraph 2 shows that clause 5 of this Bill attempts to clarify the law relative to cases in which tax may be charged for a year of assessment in respect of which the person assessed is not physically present in the island. This is purely a technical correction because the test of residence should apply to the year of income, but at the moment the existing law erroneously applies it to the following year.

Section 3 of the Bill seeks to limit the amount of deduction allowed to owners for repairs. Under

the provisions of section 5 (d) of the Income Tax Act, 1921, the owner of a residence is charged on the basis of the gross annual value as assessed for parochial purposes under the Vestries Act, 1911 subject to the same deductions as if the house or land had been let. The Government has been advised that owing to the value fixed under the Vestries Act being considerably less than the commercial rent, a fictitious loss often results. This loss may be set off against other taxable income with the result that tax is lost to the Government.

As Para. 4 of the Objects and Reasons points out, Clause 3 (c) of the Bill seeks to regularise the fact that for a number of years income from certain annuities has been treated as tax free whereas the Government is now advised that this income should be assessed for tax. As purchasers of these annuities have up to the end of 1952 been led to believe that the annuities would be free of tax, the bill seeks to exempt from tax annuities purchased up to that date, but only up to the amount paid for the annuity, any excess being liable to be assessed for tax.

There are only a few annuities involved, but they were sold under a mistaken impression about the tax position. It is reasonable that these individuals should not be made to suffer through a mistake.

I feel sure that I have hinted to honourable members that when we came down with taxation proposals under the Five Year Plan there were a number of things which will come up in piecemeal and then there were a number of things which the Commissioner of Income Tax considered should come up in a body. After full consideration of all these things we have decided to integrate them in this Bill. I say that because I would like to say that it is as a result of having from time to time certain applications made to us that we discovered that there were certain things in the Income Tax Act of 1921 which at any rate called for careful examination. I would also say that for all these years the legislature has not been unmindful of certain anomalies which have not been hitherto corrected. Clause 4 of this Bill deals with employees of foreign concerns who work in this island under foreign contracts. Technically they are liable to income tax only on the amount of remuneration they receive in the island. They should be charged on the minimum of what they earn here. We do not consider it reasonable that they should escape on part of what they earn here because they do not bring the money here. It is quite easy to envisage a comparatively rich American employee whose job is in Barbados being well enough off not to need to bring in his salary to Barbados. The new law will only begin to be operative in respect of this year's earnings.

Now the question of tourists is dealt with in the next clause of the Bill. As honourable members know, tourists who come to the island year after year for a substantial period of the year are liable to income tax on foreign income even although their stay is less than six months. This obviously could keep tourists away, and it is considered desirable in the interest of the tourist industry to see that this liability to income tax does not continue and as a result prevent them from coming here and setting up homes in the island. I have not checked up on how many countries have it like that, but it has been found for a number of years that this provision in clause 5(b) of the Act often yields very little taxation because of relief provided in respect of double taxation, while at the same time a good deal of work and inconvenience is caused.

Clause 6 of the Bill deals with traders' losses. Hitherto a man could set off such losses only against certain other sources of income. It is proposed by

clause 6 to allow him to set off all losses. If he has income, and he has investments and he loses on those investments, he can set off the loss against the income earned. Also, as honourable members will see, the old provision that the tax could not be reduced by more than half in any one year is abolished.

I will come back to the next clause, and go on to life assurance allowance. Provisions for allowance for life assurance are substantially amended. Among other things insurance of the life of the taxpayer's child is eliminated; the right to insure the life of a child is amended. Some companies refuse to allow insurance of a child's life. In practice it was discovered that one or two parents forgot that a child is not a child after it is 21, married and out of the island. There have been cases as bad as that—a parent getting taxation relief on the policy of grown up children who have married and are out of the island. Government considered that while it is as anxious as most Governments are to encourage savings by insurance, it is clear that this provision should not stand as it is, in some cases as high as 60 to 75 per cent of the premium, it should be enough to grant it to a limit of 24 per cent. The new law will apply only to the future, so that even those taxpayers who were insured and who had policies previous to the 31st December last year will not be adversely affected.

I would just like to draw attention to the fact that at the end of para. 9 of the Objects and Reasons reference is made to the 30th of April, 1953. The date should be the 31st December, 1952.

I have commented on these sections at length although they are explained in the Objects and Reasons which honourable members have no doubt read. If as we go along considering the Bill section by section there is anything further that honourable members want to know, I will do my best to supply the information. I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker,— Although these recommendations are for the improved working of the Act, I would like to draw attention to Section 3 whereby you are putting an end to the practice of taxing the owner of a house or land on the gross annual value as assessed for parochial purposes under the Vestries Act. I think it is well known that you do not repair a house every year. You wait three, four or five years and then carry out major repairs. Can the honourable introducer of the Bill tell us if the full amount allowed for one year will be spread out over, say, five years? In other words, if a man instead of repairing his house every year waits until the end of five years and does major repairs will he be allowed deductions for the five years?

I would also like to know if the Government has considered any greater allowances on the personal income tax. If we raise income tax this year—against the recommendations of Professor Beasley — some further provision for personal allowance should be made. It is quite clear—it should be quite clear to Government who had to give increased salaries to their employees—that the cost of living today is bearing strongly on all sections of the community. To allow £50 for a child today is wholly inadequate.

There are other things which the Government should consider, such as higher education. People here who have to send their children abroad for higher education are not given the allowance that Trinidad gives. I think it is fair that we should get the same treatment as people in Trinidad get. There are other things which the Income Tax Association has

made application for, and I would like to know if Government will consider them in the near future.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Deputy Speaker,— I notice here that there is allowance to be made for children who might not be children of the husband or children of the wife. I think, Sir, that that is a good gesture, although I have heard that it may be amended. But I do not think it would be nice if the Government did not permit this allowance to be made to these children. I do not know the legal side of this matter; I do not know if this includes children who have been born out of wedlock—those children whom we term as illegitimate. There are many people who maintain these children and they have found it difficult to get any allowance for them in computing their income tax returns. It has been said here on many occasions that allowance should be made for such children; but the Government has not made any pronouncement on it. As far as I have read in the *Advocate* that newspaper feels that that is what the Government intends to do in this Bill. But the Bill does not state definitely that provision is made for illegitimate children. It only says in the Objects and Reasons that, "it is felt that in the circumstances existing in Barbados, provision should be made to enable any person who is actually maintaining his, or his wife's child to claim the usual deduction from tax in respect of such child etc." I do not know if that includes illegitimate children. My view is, Sir, that if before the Courts a man is held liable for the maintenance of a child which is termed illegitimate, allowance should be given to that child when it comes to computing his income tax returns. One department of the Government—the Courts—tells you that you must maintain a child, and another department tells you that you can claim no allowance in respect of the child as far as income tax is concerned. I am hoping that some assurance will be given by the Government Bench that allowance would be made for those persons who maintain children born out of wedlock.

Mr. ADAMS: I am afraid that I cannot hold out any hope to the honourable junior member for Christ Church about greater personal allowances. The trouble about taxation at the present moment is that with the Five Year Plan to be implemented we find ourselves looking for more taxation; not trying to grant more relief. Although in this Bill we have tackled some of the things that we felt were overdue for reform, I am afraid that we will have to go slow where other matters are concerned. Although I do hope to finish this Bill tonight I am afraid I cannot give any more assurance if we do continue with it, than I have given as to the extent of help which the Government is prepared to give at the present moment. I do say this: we may soon be coming to the House with some means of carrying out our promise to help higher education but not just by increased allowances. Honourable members may remember that in the Five Year Plan we had in a sum for loans to help people who had children at universities or other educational institutions. We will be proceeding with that soon. It is true that that will help comparatively few people. Much as I and the Government would like to ease up a bit on parents of children at universities, school etc. on the other hand with the commitments that we have, and with what we are likely to get out of Customs and Income Tax, I do not think that we can give greater personal allowances for these children.

I think that the point raised by the honourable senior member for St. John is covered in the Bill according to how that section reads at present. If honourable members have the Act before them they

can follow the amendments that this Bill proposes to make.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I did not want to speak after the Leader of the House, but as far as these allowances for children are concerned, I have said that they are a bit low. It seems to me that in spite of what the Leader said about the Five Year Plan we will have to find some ways and means of helping these people. I was looking for the Government to increase these allowances. I certainly hope that the Government will consider the matter again and try to do something. Even if you have to come back and tax again you will have to give relief in some form or other to these people. There are people with some four or five children going to school for whom fees have to be paid every term. It is definitely hard for such parents to get ends to meet. We should look forward to helping these people. They have to borrow and do not pay; and they trust and do not pay. I hope that the Government will consider it, and take it more seriously, because a lot of these people are going to get locked up. I hope that the Government will consider the matter because I am going to talk on it until something is done.

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

On the motion of Mr. Adams seconded by Mr. Cox the House went into committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called.

1. This Act may be cited as the Income Tax (Amendment) (No. 2) Act, 1953.

Mr. Adams moved seconded by Mr. Cox that Clause 1 stand part.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, — I am only drawing attention to the fact that according to the form we always use when we are amending an Act, this clause should read at the end, "Income Tax Amendment Act, 1953, No. 2" This is the first time that I have seen it in the present form. I am merely drawing it to the attention of the committee for the sake of consistency.

Question that Clause 1 stand part was put and agreed to *nem. con.*

Clause 2 was called.

2. Subsection (3) of section three of the Income Tax Act, 1921—6, (hereinafter referred to as the principal Act), is hereby amended—

(a) by deleting the word "shall" appearing in the proviso to the said sub-section and substituting therefor the word "may";

(b) by inserting the following words immediately before the word "notwithstanding" appearing in the said proviso—

"instead of from the husband if the Commissioner so requires and shall be so collected if by notice in writing given to the Commissioner on or before the date prescribed for delivery to the Commissioner of the return referred to in subsection (1) of section twenty-four of this Act, either the husband or the wife so requests in respect of the assessment for the year."

Mr. ADAMS moved seconded by Mr. Cox that Clause 2 stand part.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,— In this clause we are deleting the word “shall” and inserting in its place the word “may”. Now we have always been told that “may” and “shall” mean the same thing in these Acts. The lawyers are always telling us that. But it appears now that the lawyers were wrong. There is another little point. In paragraph (b) of this clause there are the words “said proviso”. That has no meaning here. There is no such thing as a “said proviso” in this case. These are the things that will result in trivial amendments coming back to this House from the Other Place.

Mr. ADAMS: If the honourable member would look at the Objects and Reasons he would see that we are allowing people to come in under the new provision, or those who wish can remain under the old provision. Therefore you change “shall” to “may”. The Objects and Reasons explain that the transactions under the old provision are very complex and often nothing is gained by them. This clause therefore seeks to lessen the work and at the same time preserve the old form for those who wish to take advantage of it. All that is in the proviso between the word “wife” and the word “notwithstanding”.

Question that clause 2 stand part was put and agreed to *nem con.*

Clause 3 was called and agreed to.

Clause 4 was called.

Mr. ADAMS: This Bill is printed wrong. What we would pass for clause 4 is not clause 4. Page 2 of this Bill as printed should be Page 3 and *vice versa*. I beg to move that Clause 4 stand part.

Mr. Cox seconded.

The question was put and agreed to *nem. con.*

On motions of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Mr. Cox, clauses 5 and 6 were called and agreed to.

Clause 7 was called.

7. Section twenty of the principal Act is hereby amended—

- (a) by deleting from paragraph (ii) of sub-section (1) thereof the words “married man, widower or widow in respect of each” appearing in line two thereof and substituting therefor the following words:—

“person who for the income year has had the custody of or maintained at his or her own expense, any”;

- (b) by deleting from paragraph (ii) of sub-section (1) thereof the semi-colon appearing at the end thereof and adding thereto the following words:—

“in respect of each of such children;

Provided that—

- (a) the amount of the deduction in respect of each such child shall be reduced by one dollar for every dollar that the income of that child for the income year exceeds one hundred and twenty dollars;
- (b) where the Commissioner is satisfied that more than one person is entitled or would, if they or any of them had assessable income, be entitled to claim such deduction in respect of the same child, he may divide such deduction between such persons in such manner as he may determine or may allow such deduction or any part thereof to one of such persons as he shall see fit;

- (c) by deleting paragraph (iii) of sub-section (1) and substituting therefor the following paragraph—

- (iii) from the assessable income of any person who proves that for the income year he or she has maintained at his or her own expense any number of persons not exceeding two, a sum of two hundred and forty dollars in respect of each such person whose income from all sources during the income year did not exceed one hundred and twenty dollars and who being a relative of the person claiming such deduction or a relative of the wife or husband of such last mentioned person—

- (a) was at the end of the income year being alive, under the age of sixteen years; or

- (b) if then over such age was during the income year either receiving full time instruction in a University, College, School or other educational establishment, or was unable to maintain himself by reason of old age or infirmity:

Provided that where the Commissioner is satisfied that more than one person is entitled or would, if they or any of them had assessable income, be entitled to claim such deduction in respect of the same relative, he shall divide such deduction between such persons in such manner as he shall determine, or may allow the whole of such deduction to one of such persons, as he shall see fit”;

- (d) by deleting paragraph (iv) of sub-section (1) thereof and substituting therefor the following paragraph—

“(iv) from the assessable income of any person who has affected an insurance on his life or on the life of his wife with any Insurance Company, the amount of the premiums paid by him in the income year in respect of such insurance:

Provided that the deduction allowed under this paragraph in respect of any one policy of insurance shall not exceed seven per cent of the capital sum assured on death, nor shall the total deduction allowed under this paragraph exceed one-sixth of the total income for the income year:

Provided further that the amount of tax which such person is liable to pay shall not, subject to the provisions of sub-section (6) of this section, be reduced as a result of the allowance of such deduction by more than twenty-four per cent. of the total amount of such deduction”;

- (e) by deleting paragraph (v) of sub-section (1) thereof and substituting therefor the following paragraph:—

“(v) from the assessable income of any person who has paid a contribution during the income year to any scheme or fund which the Commissioner is satisfied is *bona fide* and

reasonable for the purpose of providing pensions for the employees or the widows and orphans of the employees of a particular employer, the amount of such contributions attributable to services performed or work done in the Island under such contract, whichever sum is the greater:

Provided further that for the purposes of this section, the income arising from such contract shall be deemed to include the estimated annual value of any quarters or residence or any other allowance granted in respect of such employment whether in money or otherwise."

Mr. ADAMS: There are a number of amendments which I am asking leave to make to this clause. In the third line, after the word "each" there should appear the words "of his or her children". In the following line delete the word "thereof" and substitute the word "therein". Then four lines below after the word "any" insert "of his or her children or the children of his or her wife or husband as the case may be." On the opposite page are one or two of the typographical errors that we point out to the clerk. Page 2 should be Page 3. The inverted commas should come after the first semicolon on Page 3 which is now Page 2, that would be at the end of the proviso to paragraph (b), and the same thing should be done at the end of paragraph (d). On Page 4, line 2, the word "the" should appear before the word "annual". Similarly after the last word in paragraph (e) the inverted commas should come before the semicolon. In Paragraph (f) insert the word "the" between the words "to" and "end" lines 3 and 4. Five lines below delete the words "he or she" and substitute "that his or her wife or husband as the case may be". In sub-section (g) (6) in the second line, insert the words "on or" between the words "who" and "before".

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, — I think it would be best to put the words "as the case may be" at the end of paragraph (g). I have tried my best to follow these amendments, but there are so many amendments to the Income Tax Act itself that it is hard to follow this. I thought I could help the House by keeping clear about these life assurance premiums. Now, I know for instance that there is no limit to the amount you can pay for life insurance premiums in a place like British Guiana with the result that many people who make a profit out of their business can take it out in life assurance. As far as I can see this will not allow deduction to be taken off from someone who is paying 15/- in the pound. It is felt that since they get it off the income they get it off the higher rate. That is the argument. There must be some limit to this life assurance business. What will happen is that a man will now be able to take out twice as much insurance so as to find a means of getting relief; but that is only the man who is in a position to do it. That is a question that the Government has got to be careful about because it is a sore point in some other places. Another thing is that there are certain forms which the Government does not regard as insurance. A man has possibly passed the age or cannot pass the insurance test; but there is a form by which he can get a little pension. It is worked in such a way that it cannot legally be termed life insurance. I understand that the Governments of Trinidad and British Guiana provide for that.

My information is, Sir, that there is a rumour to the effect that the present Commissioner of In-

come Tax may be leaving here soon, and with the best intentions, expert as he is, he might give you certain proposals and then might not remain to see these proposals put into practice. The moment this law is passed there will be people who will pick it to pieces to see what advantage they can take of the Government. It is no use the Government coming here and thinking they are taxing people to find that there are people who are well enough off to afford such premiums as will enable them to take advantage of the situation, and to be better off than they were before.

Mr. ADAMS: We are being careful. At the present moment, with the Act as it stands, you are allowed an amount on the premium paid in respect of life assurance provided that the total deduction shall not exceed one-sixth of the total income for the year of assessment. I did not mention persons in the higher brackets. We have put in a provision that the amount which such persons are liable to pay should not exceed 25 per cent of the capital sum. In England the position is somewhat similar. As things stood here a wealthy man might be getting 75 per cent of the premium paid for him. The present Act says one-sixth of the total income and seven per cent of the capital sum, and as the Commissioner of Income Tax pointed out the law as it stands would encourage a wealthy man to go on taking out insurance as long as it did not exceed one-sixth of the total income and 7 per cent of the capital sum assured. All that he had to do was to add on another pound of insurance; so that the wealthier he was, the more insurance he took out and the more the Government contributed to the amount of his premium.

I really intended to bring in comparative tables of all the West Indian colonies, but I forgot.

Mr. LEWIS: This income tax business is a very complicated one, and because of that I excuse the innocence of the Senior Member for St. Joseph. As I see it we had a premium exemption limit of £200 whether it was one-sixth or one-millionth part of the income or sum assured; therefore the richest person got off only £200 for premiums. I understand that in other Colonies no limit is fixed and a man can in anticipation of an income of say £5,000 take out a paid up policy and pay the whole income in premiums and pay no income tax on it. As I was saying, income tax is a very complicated business and I know that in big countries there are lawyers who make a study of it and advise clients how to avoid paying the tax, and cases like the one I have mentioned do happen. We are now abolishing the £200 limit and shifting it to a percentage basis and the honourable member must see right away that the percentage basis must benefit the rich who will naturally have big incomes. It therefore depends on how rich a man is and whether he can afford £5,000 or five cents of his income for premiums; and as I read part of this amendment it says "provided that the deduction allowed under this paragraph in respect of any one policy of insurance shall not exceed seven per cent. of the capital sum assured on death". Again it depends on how much a man can afford to take in insurance. Another thing is that much is left to the Income Tax Commissioner, and there is a rumour that the present Commissioner who no doubt is responsible for these amendments is leaving us very soon; he will not then be with us to see these amendments in practice and see the full effect of them, especially their defects. Our legal draughtsmen may have much trouble and still not be able to close the gaps in the law. It seems to me

that the percentage system rather than a fixed sum for premium exemption is playing into the hands of the rich, even though the Government might eventually get back some revenue in another way like Death Duties. It must be remembered too that income tax is a personal and secret matter and no member of the House can ask a question as to what Mr. So and So is allowed off his income for insurance premiums, so the remedy for anything going wrong is not in our hands.

Mr. MAPP: As far as I see, Mr. Chairman, the position at present is a limit of £200 of the premiums which are allowed for taxation and this Bill is going to delete that entirely. The position as I understand it in other territories is that there is a limit but not as low as obtains here at present. In St. Lucia, speaking under correction, I think the limit as compared with our £200 is £500. In Trinidad it is much higher; but there is still a limit. The fact is that the limit in the other colonies is higher than £200. I am therefore wondering if we are doing right by not fixing a limited amount. I agree that the limit of £200 should be extended because the Government in the end will get back some. For instance, if a man takes out a bigger Life Insurance, the Government will get back a little more on Death Duties. The only difference is that instead of the taxation falling on the man himself, it will fall on the inheritors of the estate. The Government will get it back from them in Death Duties; therefore, the fears of the honourable Junior member for the City may be overcome in that way. I do not see Government losing anything at all; what I am wondering is whether it would be wise not to have a limit.

Sir, I hope that the Leader of the House will assure us that by abolishing some of these anomalies we would not be helping one section of the community which is better able to bear taxation than the other section which is less able to do so. Of course, that will be contrary to the objects and reasons which are stated. As I take it, we are trying to distribute the burdens more evenly and I hope that there will be fairly distributed.

Mr. LEWIS: Looking through this Bill again I see something that may have been copied from somewhere else; it is the exemption of contributions paid towards the provision of a pension for employees. We should go the whole way and copy too what I will call the corollary legislation or we may be doing wrong. There are business places in Barbados that have recently instituted contributory pension schemes for their employees, but the employees themselves have no say whatever in the management of those schemes. If we are going to allow a business place to deduct its contributions to such schemes for the purpose of income tax then we should have legislation dealing with the management of the pension scheme and too the disposal of the premiums in the case of dismissal. I have myself been a victim of this sort of thing so I know what I am talking about. The employees should have proper representation on the Governing Bodies of the pension schemes approved by the Income Tax Commissioner and the refund of contributions to an employee, not only his own contributions but those of the firm should be regulated by law. The Government will find an exam-

ple of this in the laws of Cuba. Strictly speaking, all the contributions belong to the employee because they are really part of his earnings, and if we allow the firm's contributions as an expense to be deducted from profits for the purpose of income tax, then we should follow that up and regulate the disposal of those contributions in case of the dismissal of the employee, especially where an employee loses his job through no fault of his own.

Mr. ADAMS: The Objects and Reasons of this Bill are set out as fully as possible and I do not think they can be misconstrued. This Bill is not as complicated as the honourable Junior Member for the City is trying to make it. I may tell him that the members of the Executive have given the entire contents of this Bill careful thought and they were at pains to do so while in consultation with the Income Tax Commissioner and the Financial Secretary who were there to say what the law was in this island and to make comparisons with other West Indian islands as well as to show the reasons for all these changes.

If the honourable Junior Member for the City would read the Objects and Reasons on this Bill, he would see under paragraph 9, it is stated: "the maximum deduction of £200 unduly restricts the amount of insurance and widows' and orphans' pensions for which allowance may be made." This clause therefore comes out of the Act and this Bill seeks to substitute "a maximum deduction in the tax that is payable equal to twenty-four per cent. of the premiums paid." This change will avoid those cases where wealthy persons get off as much as 75 per cent. of their premiums by this Government allowing them income tax. I therefore find it difficult to understand what is operating in the mind of the honourable Junior Member for the City and what is making him seem to be so confused.

The question that Clause 7 stand part of the Bill was then put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 8 and 9 respectively were called and on separate motions by Mr. ADAMS seconded by Mr. Cox were passed.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Mr. Cox, the Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR MR. ADAMS

Mr. ADAMS: Before I move the adjournment of the House, I am asking the House to grant me four weeks' leave as from next Tuesday.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, the 26th May, 1953, at 3 o'clock p.m.

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