

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1953—54

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 18th May, 1954.

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

Present :

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*), Hon. M. E. COX (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*), Hon. R. G. MAPP (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*), Messrs. F. C. GODDARD, J. A. HAYNES, B.A., J. C. MOTTLEY, E. ST. A. HOLDER, Hon. C. E. TALMA (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*), Mrs. E. E. BOURNE, Messrs. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc., and L. A. WILLIAMS, LL.B.

Prayers were read.

Messrs. ALLDER, CRAWFORD, F. L. WALCOTT and SMITH entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

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

DOCUMENTS

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

Statement of Revenue and Expenditure from the Commissioners of Highways of St. Thomas for the half year ended the 31st March, 1954.

Statement of Revenue and Expenditure from the Commissioners of Highways of St. Thomas for the half year ended the 31st March, 1954, in connection with tenantry roads.

PAPERS LAID

By command of His Excellency the Governor, Papers were laid as follows :—

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS : Report of the Registrar on Vital Statistics for the year 1952.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS for Hon. G. H. ADAMS : Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for one month ended 30th April, 1954.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS for Hon. G. H. ADAMS : Abstract of Revenue and Expenditure for the year 1952—53.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. M. E. COX : Resolution to place the sum of \$6,248 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1954—55, Part II — Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1954—55, No. 4 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. R. G. MAPP : Bill to amend the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilisation and Labour Welfare) (Local Consumption) Act, 1952.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS : Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to consider the money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

Messrs. LEWIS and VAUGHAN entered the House and took their seats.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Private Members' Notices were given as follows :—

Mr. CRAWFORD : Of the following Address:—

*The House of Assembly
To*

His Excellency The Governor

The House of Assembly are profoundly concerned over the existing position with regard to

1. (a) the unavailability of electric power in Barbados to large numbers of people who require it.
- (b) the difficulties which, for reasons of which the Government is not unaware, confront the Barbados Electric Supply Corp., in its attempt to obtain capital for the erection of additional plant and other essential development.

2. The House desire to draw to your Excellency's attention the fact that the existing plant would permit of immediate expansion of the Corporation's service which would entail capital expenditure of £60,000; on an average estimated cost of £500 per district, this amount would enable 120

new areas at various points throughout the island to obtain electric current with a minimum of delay.

3. The House are of the opinion that, in view of the existing circumstances with regard to the raising of capital in London for which the B.E.S. Corp. is not solely responsible, the Government should take whatever steps may be necessary in order to make this £60,000 available to the Corporation at the earliest date possible, either by way of loan or preferably by purchase of stock, in order that the distress and inconvenience which result from the unavailability of electricity might be partially relieved until such time as the \$3 million required by the Corporation for planned capital expansion can be acquired either on loan with the assistance of the Government or by Government purchase of stock.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Of the following Address :—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Governor*

The House of Assembly is of the opinion that the present salary of the Chaplain of the House of Assembly is inadequate, and the House respectfully ask Your Excellency to send down legislation to grant an allowance of thirty dollars per month for the said Chaplain, in addition to his present salary.

Mr. BRANCKER entered the House and took his seat.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, a Bill to amend the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilisation and Labour Welfare) (Local Consumption) Act, 1952, was read a first time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR
MR. F. L. WALCOTT

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—I am asking for two months' leave of absence as from the 25th instant.

There being no objection, the leave asked for was granted.

ADDRESS OF WELCOME AND LOYALTY
TO HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I am asking leave to move the passing an Address of welcome to Her Majesty the Queen on Her safe arrival back home.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—In consonance with the rest of the Empire, this House will take the opportunity to pass an Address of Welcome to her Majesty the Queen on Her safe arrival back home, and at the same time to reassure Her of the loyalty of the subjects in this ancient colony. This Address reads as follows :—

TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT
MAJESTY

We, Your Majesty's most humble and loyal subjects, the Members of the General Assembly of the ancient colony of Barbados here assembled, respectfully desire to associate ourselves with the spontaneous welcome Your Majesty has received on Your Majesty's return home.

Your Majesty's journey, though long and arduous, has brought great joy to Your Majesty's peoples across the seas, and has deepened the affection for Your Majesty's Person and loyalty to Your Majesty's Throne.

I beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Mr. GODDARD: In seconding the motion for the passing of this Address, I should like to say that it is gratifying to see that Her Majesty has returned home safely after such a long and arduous journey. We are particularly glad to know that She has enjoyed good health on her Empire trip. It gives me great pleasure indeed to second the motion for the passing of this Address.

Mr. ALLDER: I hardly think that any of us is not willing to maintain loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen. We have always shown our loyalty to the Throne and I believe that we will continue to do so; but, Mr. Speaker, I feel that an Address like this one is unnecessary for us to waste time with, in view of the fact that there are so many other important matters to which Her Majesty would prefer us to address our minds in the solving of the numerous social problems which confront this British colony of ours. I think that a better purpose would be served if an Address were introduced drawing to Her Majesty's attention the difficulties which are developing in this colony from day to day with our overburdening population and its limited opportunities for maintaining that population. In such an Address we could implore Her Majesty's Government that inasmuch as this colony is a very small one, they would use all their influence on other members of the British Empire whose natural resources are tremendously greater than ours and whose borders are so wide and encompassing

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not keeping to the terms of this Address; he is saying what he thinks the hon. House should be doing. I would ask the hon. member to desist from making such a speech.

Mr. ALLDER: I do not have the slightest intention of doing anything which is not parliamentary in connection with this Address; nothing that I have said can be considered as being unparliamentary.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will either speak within the terms of this Address or I will name him and ask the House to support me in it.

Mr. ALLDER: With due respect to your high office I do not want to challenge your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not speaking on this Address of welcome; the hon. member is telling this House what it might have been doing. He is actually reprimanding the House and I ask him to desist from doing that.

Mr. ALLDER: I regret very much that you have taken that view of my contribution to the passing of this Address, but according to my feelings I certainly cannot go straight in giving this Address my blessing unless I express some observations which I feel should not be taken as not being in line with an Address of this sort. I do not feel that there should be any apprehension over the points I have made; we, as a miniature Parliament are related to the British House of Commons from which we have taken our rules, and I hardly think that the statements I have made in relation to this Address would not have been permissible by the Speaker of the House of Commons.

I may say in continuation of my speech that I started off by saying that we are a most humble and loyal people to the British Crown and I do not think that there is any of us who would not like to perpetuate that relationship between ourselves and the British Crown. While this Address states that the members of the Assembly of this ancient colony desire to associate ourselves with the spontaneous welcome which Her Majesty has received on Her safe return home, I do not know that anyone looking like myself and representing the masses could, by any stretch of the imagination, support this Ad-

dress in its entirety without expressing regret that Her Majesty having travelled through a large part of Africa, has not found any time to visit places which I feel it is necessary for such a distinguished person to visit and see conditions for Herself and use Her influence over Her Government to get order and co-operation restored in some of the colonies in Africa, especially Kenya. We were proud to know that Her Majesty felt it convenient to travel in these parts; we were daily following her movements and hoping for her safety; but we were also disappointed to know that Her visits to these parts have not improved conditions as we feel they should be improved. Inasmuch as I have not been able to read or hear of any attempt having been made to bring about an amicable settlement of the dispute in Kenya and elsewhere, I cannot contribute my quota to this Address without making these observations.

I must say that the second part of this Address is contrary to the facts, because, as I have observed, I have not been able to hear any settlement brought about of the disputes in Kenya and elsewhere because of Her Majesty's visit. I have not been able to read or hear of any lessening of the treatment which is being meted out against those helpless people; I have not been able to read or hear any statement to the effect that Her Majesty has pledged that on Her return home She would use Her influence to stop the sending of arms and ammunition to destroy people who look like me. Could any honourable member looking like me and being honest to his people, get up here and agree to the passing of this Address without making comments similar to those which I am making now? Of all the legislative Bodies in the Colonies this is the first one I have heard attempting to pass an Address of this nature. What is more, if we attempt to speak on behalf of the other legislative Bodies in the West Indies and further afield, we might be taking on too much responsibility, because it might not be impossible for some of those legislative Bodies to view an Address of this nature differently from how we are viewing it.

That is my personal and conscientious opinion. I would have preferred to see an Address introduced here appealing to the British Government for a greater measure of economic assistance whereby we would be more successful in solving our problems, because the developments due to rampant unemployment and increasing population are becoming very frightening. These are problems which we cannot handle in ourselves; we have to get outside help with them. Inasmuch as the people of this island are subjects of the British Empire and are controlled by the British Crown, we are not beyond expecting greater assistance from the Home Government, and no Address of this sort should be passed without our throwing out these suggestions for help and consideration for our loyalty and things of that sort. Therefore, while I would endorse an Address of this sort, I am hoping that we do not indulge in things of this sort blindly without realising that while we are paying obeisance to the British Crown and giving it our loyalty, we have the right to get material assistance from the British Government because we are like one of the fingers on the hands; as far as this colony and the British Empire are concerned, our problems are their problems. While our loyalty might disguise the real situation in this colony, I feel that it should be our bounden duty whenever an occasion like this presents itself, to draw the attention of the British Government to our bad economic and social set-up and hope that they will eventually hear our cries and offer us some of the assistance which they are offering to their former enemies.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I notice that the mover of the passing of this Address gave in his unqualified support. Apparently his loyalty has increased within recent times because it is easy to recall that on the occasion of the Coronation Address he seemed to have expressed some break in his loyalty on account of what was taking place in Kenya. Apparently his feeling has undergone a change either for the better or for the worse and today he has given his unqualified loyalty and support to Her Majesty on the occasion of Her return home. I see no reason to question the phraseology of the first paragraph of this Address except that in the first line I do not know whether we should call ourselves Her Majesty's most humble and loyal subjects because we may cause offence to some people who regard themselves as being more humble and loyal than we are. Then in the second paragraph, the allegation that Her Majesty's journey, though long and arduous, has brought great joy to Her Majesty's peoples across the seas, calls for some qualification. I do not think that the Leader of the House really feels that Her Majesty's journey across the seas has brought great joy to the people of Kenya or Uganda to which places the visit in Her Majesty's itinerary had to be cancelled because of open dissatisfaction on the part of the natives against the dethronement of the Kabaka. This Address might claim that Her Majesty's journey might have brought some joy to some people across the seas and I therefore beg most humbly and loyally to propose that in line 2 of paragraph 2 of the Address after the word "to" the words "some of" be inserted.

While we in the West Indies may not have any outstanding reason for failing to rejoice over the successful termination of Her Majesty's trip, yet it is going too far for us to assume that people in certain parts of the African continent can wholeheartedly view with any feeling of joy or satisfaction whether Her Majesty went and returned safely or not. I submit that to them it is a matter of no importance at all, and we can readily recall that open threats were made against Her Majesty's life if She went to certain parts of East Africa. The additional fact that these parts were omitted from Her Majesty's itinerary goes to prove that the British Authorities did not take these threats lightly. If we want to go on record as humbly and loyally expressing our joy at Her Majesty's return, that is our own expression and we should not feel that this loyalty is shared by all the members of the Empire.

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

STATEMENT RE INSURANCE OF COMBERMERE SCHOOL.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I also ask leave to make a statement on the question of the insurance of Combermere School.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Honourable members will remember that during the debate on the Resolution for effecting repairs to Combermere School, the question of insurance occupied the attention of this House most seriously. I am happy to state that negotiations have been amicably concluded between the Government and the agents of the Insurance Company with which the buildings at Combermere School were insured. As a result, the Government has accepted the offer of \$33,504 in full settlement of the claim in respect of the damage by earthquake in March, 1953, and the Colonial Engineer has been authorised to proceed

with the repairs. The question of insurance between the Government and the Insurance Company has been satisfactorily settled.

SETTLEMENT OF THE POOR AND BASTARDY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1954.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I ask leave to postpone the consideration of Order No. 1 and to proceed with Order No. 2 as the first Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas:—To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Settlement of the Poor and Bastardy Act, 1897.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—The Settlement of the Poor and Bastardy Act makes a difference, from the point of view of a maintenance order before the Court, between a legitimate and an illegitimate child. That is considered to be quite unsatisfactory today, there being distinct discrimination between children of the respective classes. In the case of legitimate children, a maintenance order can be operative until they reach the age of 16 years as against the age of 12 years in the case of illegitimate children. If the putative father has been ordered to take care of an illegitimate child through the Court, his responsibility ceases as soon as the child attains the age of 12 years and the effect of this Bill is to extend the age to 16 years as in the case of legitimate children.

Another point is that in the case of legitimate children, either the father or mother may apply for a variation of the maintenance order; but in the case of illegitimate children only the father can apply for a variation of the order and that variation will be for a decrease of the order. This Amendment is for the purpose of regularising the position, putting illegitimate children on the same basis as legitimate children. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second it.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—There are many relics of our inglorious past to be found in our midst. We cherish many of these relics and I feel that this change which this Government is seeking to make this afternoon should be supported although it is not going far enough; with the incidence of illegitimacy in our midst, I feel it is time for this Government to take a greater step than this. If we make an investigation we will find that the incidence of illegitimacy in this island is the highest in the whole world and I want to say it is time that we do something about it. This Bill is a step in the right direction, but, I repeat, it does not go far enough. The incidence of illegitimacy affects us more than anybody else and it is a great lapse on our claim to be Christians. I feel that this Government should bring down a more comprehensive Bill with the object of obliterating illegitimacy from our midst.

There is in New York legislation which would be useful in this island; that legislation makes it compulsory for the Court to compel any man who has been brought before it in respect of an illegitimate child, either to marry the particular woman or deposit \$800 immediately or go to jail until he gets the money. That is a deterrent against the question of illegitimacy; whether we indulge in these conditions or not we are compelled to recognise this evil in our midst and to take steps to eradicate it.

This Bill seeks to increase from 12 to 16 years the period during which a putative father has to pay a maintenance order in respect of an illegitimate child. I say that that is a step in the right direction, but it does not go far enough: I would like to see the Government bring down legislation such as that which obtains in the United States of America. I think we should have legislation compelling the putative father of an illegitimate child when he is brought before the Court to deposit \$1,000 immediately or agree to marry the particular woman. The time has come when something should be done to remedy the existing state of affairs and we should really try to effect a remedy against it. I am in hearty agreement with this Bill but I am throwing out a hint to this Government that they should try and explore the possibility of bringing down a Bill with greater force in order to curb this low standard of living among the people of this island. I hope that my few remarks will have some effect upon the minds and actions of all and sundry in this island; we need to remedy this state of affairs which is degrading to our race.

Mr. WILLIAMS: While we in this colony would be alarmed at the existing state of affairs where illegitimacy is concerned, we know that it is connected with slavery in one way or another. I can assure the honourable junior member for St. Philip that we would prefer to have our method of corroboration than the American method of consistency of election: I understand that in the United States all a woman has to do is to repeat the statement: "This is the man." As to this Bill which is before us I think that this recommendation has come from the Over-population Committee.

Mr. ALLDER: On a point of order. As a member of the Over-population Committee I think I should challenge the statement which has been made by the honourable member. This Committee has not yet reported its findings.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I have no intention of disclosing the findings of the Committee. The suggestion of the honourable junior member for St. Philip amounted to putting a man in the position of getting married. We have to remember that married people have as many children as unmarried ones. However, I do not think that any honourable member would want to prolong the discussion on this Bill: the recommendations in this Bill have been considered and this is a Bill to which every honourable member will give his support.

Mr. BRANCKER: This Bill is indicative of consistency in that it proposes that the age of illegitimate children shall be the same as that of legitimate children when it is a question of getting support from the fathers. It is perfectly reasonable as in the case of the support of a wife or of lawful children, that if the means of the husband or father have been increased, the wife can apply to the Court for an increase in the amount of the maintenance order just as the husband or father can apply for a decrease in the amount of the order if he can establish that his means have been diminished. I do not know how very serious the honourable junior member for St. Philip was when he put forward his proposition that the putative father of an illegitimate child should deposit \$1,000 or marry the particular woman; of course in the case of a married man, he would have to deposit the money or go to jail, and instead of considering the erection of new Parliament Buildings we would have to consider the provision of a new and extensive jail for those who could not deposit that \$1,000 (Laughter).

I think that the honourable Minister of Social Services might consider a further adjustment in this

Act: in England, no case under the Act may be brought, if the man has been living in the United Kingdom, after the expiration of 12 months from the birth of the child. I think that that is a reasonable Clause in the English Act, which might be incorporated in our Act: it does not seem to be exactly right for a woman to wait for three, five or six years before she decides that she will bring a man before the Court so as to obtain a maintenance order in respect of the child. That puts the man in an awkward position when a woman waits for such a long time to bring forward such a case because the witnesses may not be available and he cannot defend the case.

In considering adjustments under this Act we must realise that the amount of 10/- per week as a maximum is inadequate. When an order of 5/- or 7/- a week in respect of a child is made for people of the artisan class, obviously the maximum of 10/- is too low when you consider the size of the income of the person who may be brought before the Court. Looking around this House I see only one local millionaire now, but there were about three millionaires in this Chamber today. The maximum amount of 10/- per week relative to the maintenance of a child is low having regard to the price of a pint of milk.

We have not yet reached the stage when action can be taken as to the father of a child on the strength of a blood test, but according to the latest medical report, the time is not far off when it can be established positively that a particular man is the father of a particular child; in many cases now there is a real difficulty in establishing whether a man who is alleged to be the father of a child, is really the father. This Bill is not without its merit but something more comprehensive should be enacted; I invite the honourable Minister to bear in mind the points which I have raised.

Mr. ALLDER: I am very glad to see that greater consideration is being given both to legitimate and illegitimate children, and I hope that the words "legitimate" and "illegitimate" will be removed from passport forms. I think it was during the consideration of the Estimates that I suggested that there should not be any discrimination against children who were born out of wedlock; a child which has been born out of wedlock is not given the same consideration as one which has been born in wedlock. I am glad that this equalisation is being brought about and I hope that the Government will encourage it to go further.

I dislike the approach by the honourable junior member for St. Philip to this problem of illegitimacy; this is a problem which has been forced upon us partly by habit and partly by nature and it has its background from the days of slavery. I have read that if you force people to do anything at a particular period it becomes as second nature to them and even for generations after you will find a semblance of that action. Illegitimacy is not anything which is confined to the Negro race because in countries where the standard of living is higher and where culture and education are more obtainable, you will find that there is illegitimacy even to a greater extent than what we have.

I must say that the law cannot do for the people what the Church or the honourable junior member for St. Philip should do for them and you cannot blame the people if the Church has failed. You cannot drive people to take part in morals so as to satisfy the whims and fancies of the Church Authorities; they will have to convince people that living a married life is more protective than living a life of promiscuity or licence. I agree that greater pro-

tection should be offered to children whether they have been born in wedlock or out of wedlock and we have to be very careful about trying to remove one evil and opening the door to other evils. We know that many cases reach the Courts and children are given fathers; but I presume that if a scientific test were carried out the position would be otherwise. On many occasions there is uncertainty as to who should be named as the father of a child and the whole matter has its economic background. It is because people find it so difficult to make ends meet that there is that indulgence which results in an indiscriminate increase of the population without that relationship which maintains a healthy and safeguarded family life. Those are things which we have to consider and a Bill of this sort will cause Judges to be more careful when cases under the Act are brought before them.

From the argument used by the honourable junior member for St. Philip it would appear as if the putative fathers are always to be blamed for illegitimate children, but they are not always at fault. The lawyers would know what I am talking about better than anybody else. I agree with the honourable junior member for St. Philip that illegitimacy is certainly a stigma on this colony but there are many other stigmas which society has got to fight. We have to approach in a most amenable manner the ways and means of reducing the incidence of illegitimacy, but the fundamental thing is to raise the economic standard of the people; it is when they reach a certain standard that they can imbibe knowledge and culture which make for greater indulgence in marital vows and better conditions in the household. We have to go very carefully into this matter otherwise we might find that we are doing more harm by opening the door to greater evils than the evil of having a couple of illegitimate children in our midst.

On the question of the Bill going further than it has gone, I hope that honourable members will not consider that point at all. The honourable junior member for St. Philip has mentioned what obtains in the United States of America, but things which are suitable for big communities may not be suitable for small communities of which this colony is one. I appreciate very much the matter of giving equal status to children whether they have been born in or out of wedlock.

Mr. BARROW: There are 21 Clauses in the Settlement of the Poor and Bastardy Act and not every Clause deals with the variation of orders which have been made. My only bone of contention with the Government to-day is that they have elected to amend three Clauses of the Act and only Clause 21 in any material particular. As the honourable senior member for St. Lucy has pointed out, there are several anomalies in the present Act of 1897 which, by its very nomenclature, demonstrates that it is concerned more with people who are likely to become charges on the respective parishes rather than the relief of single women who have been delivered of children or, as the law has extended the meaning of the term "single women", married women living apart from their husbands. I am wondering if the Government would not be wise in bringing forward a completely new Bill more in keeping with the English legislation and the exigencies of the present situation in Barbados, instead of acting on the suggestion of one particular Government Department and amending Clauses 18, 19 and 21 of the Act.

The first anomaly to which I would draw the attention of the honourable Minister of Social Services is this; a single woman can apply for an order

only if she is living or residing in a particular parish when, very often, it may be a matter of better convenience for her to have the discretion of applying for the order either in the parish in which she resides or that in which the putative father of her child resides. If we are bringing this Act up to the standard of the provisions of the Separation and Maintenance Act, 1950, then we should amend Clause 11 of the Settlement of the Poor and Bastardy Act to provide that a single woman who has been delivered of a bastard child may make application for a maintenance order in the parish or district in which she resides or in the parish or district in which the alleged father of the child resides. Under the Separation and Maintenance Act, 1950, a woman has the discretion of making that choice and I do not see that any great hardship could be caused if such an amendment were made to Clause 11 of the Settlement of the Poor and Bastardy Act.

There is also the question of the enforcement of these maintenance orders. If the mother of a child removes from St. Andrew to St. Michael, for instance, every time she wants to enforce an order she has to travel from St. Michael to St. Andrew which is the district in which the order was made. There is absolutely no reason why the mother of the child should not be allowed to collect arrears, which may be due from time to time, in the parish in which she may happen to be residing when these arrears fall due. In this connection there is another point which I would like to mention at this stage and it is this: it is the duty of the Clerk of the Court to collect these arrears, which will not prejudice the right of the mother of a child to do it on her own. The practice has developed in this island where the Clerk of the Court will give the mother of a bastard child an application form, but he himself will not touch the form to make out the application: the mother of the child has to bring back the application form to the Clerk's office filled out. The result is that a mother may have an order for 4/- or 5/- a week for the support of her child and she has to go into the court yard and pay one of these legal conveyancers or unregistered legal practitioners or members of the Outer Bar 2/- or 3/- just for making up that summons for arrears. That is not a satisfactory state of affairs when it is quite clear from the case law on the point that it is the duty of the Clerk of the Court to do that for the mother of the child. The alleged father of the child has to pay the money to the Court and the mother of the child should be entitled to collect it if she elects to do so. Very often it operates as a hardship on the mother of the child to have to go to the Court, take out a summons, pay for getting it made out and then she has to answer it on a particular date.

The procedure should be like this: as soon as a day has passed over the time when the money should have been paid to the Clerk of the Court, the Clerk should send out a summons to the father of the child asking him to show cause, etc. I do not think that the attendance of the mother is necessary at the Court at all; she might be working for \$1.32 a day and she would have to give up her work for a day so as to collect 4/- Clause 12 of the Act says this:

"It shall be the duty of the Clerk of the Court to receive such payments as may be directed to be made to him under this Act and to pay forthwith to the mother of the bastard child or to such other person as is named in the order, the sum directed to be paid in the order or such part thereof as he receives, without making any deduction therefrom."

"Nothing in this Act shall affect the right of the mother or other person entitled to recover pay-

ment under the order to proceed against the putative father of the child to enforce the payment of any sum due to such person."

In this connection there is an appendix in the latest edition of Halsbury which says this:

"Where weekly payments have been ordered to be made in the first instance to the Clerk of a magistrate's court, the clerk must proceed in his own name for the recovery of the sums due if the person for whose benefit the payments should have been made so requests in writing and unless it appears to the clerk that it is unreasonable in the circumstances to do so; but the person for whose benefit the payments should have been made may choose to proceed personally."

Obviously the Legislature of that time gave more detailed consideration to these matters than they are prone to do in these days; in saying that, I am not referring to this particular Legislature. A Bill is brought before the Legislature and unless it vitally affects the public purse, it is given a cursory examination; that is to be expected because of the abundance of legislation which has to be dealt with. However, it is obvious that it was considered that the mother of the child should not be put to any undue hardship in collecting the sums of money which may be due from time to time under an order made by a Magistrate and the order is always made that the money is to be paid to the Clerk of the Court. For the reasons I have given, I feel that greater attention to an amendment of the Act should be paid by the Government.

As to increasing the period during which the order is valid to 16 years, I would only like to say that in England, a Magistrate makes the order to be paid only until the age of 12 years. Only in special circumstances, a Magistrate is given the discretion to extend the period to the age of 16 years. I myself see no obvious reason why the mother of an illegitimate child should be placed in the same position as a married woman and I can give legal objection to support my view. Despite an order made by a Police Magistrate for the support of a bastard child, the mother still has legal custody of the child and is liable in every respect for that child, whereas the father of a legitimate child is responsible for his child and has legal custody, but the father of an illegitimate child does not have legal custody of that child. What you are doing when you allow a Magistrate to make an order for the support of an illegitimate child up to 16 years—and it will become a rule rather than an exception because it is stated in unequivocal terms that it is mandatory — is placing obligation on the father without any attendant rights of supervision or otherwise; that is, if the child is an out and out vagabond, the father does not have any direct control over the child. If the child gets itself into trouble, the father does not have any control whatsoever over the child, but because of the one indiscretion of his many years ago, he still has liability without the right. This is something which I feel one should weigh very carefully when you come to amend the Act.

There is one other point which I feel could be more appropriately dealt with when the Population Report comes to this Chamber to be discussed. I would however say that the question of these amendments encouraging women to have children could never arise in my considered opinion because we must realise that children are born — especially those children born out of wedlock—not by design on the one part of one party or the other, but in the majority of cases because of some indiscretion or lack of proper protection on the part of the parties. Peo-

ple do not set out to get children out of wedlock; married people may; therefore, the question of encouragement would not arise. It is true to say that in the United Kingdom, family allowance was given so as to encourage an increase in the population, but it was given for an object. It was given because there was a decline in the rate of population increase; it was not a marriage decline. A family allowance was given in order to step up the rate of population increase for national and economic reasons. Sir, increasing the age or the period during which an affiliation order, as I would term this amendment, is operative, in my opinion, has no bearing whatsoever on the population question of this country at all.

Sir, we have to face facts. One cannot with any mathematical exactitude or any pretext at mathematical analysis work out a marginal propensity of population. The propensity of population happens through a variety of accidents; the propensity of population in some cases is not the result of birth of children. If we had no Settlement of the Bastardy Act making provision for affiliation orders, we could not with any degree of certainty say that it would affect our population increase. Obviously, you might get some women who because they are doubtful of getting support would be inclined to get rid of the child before it is born.

I will just draw attention to some social services which exist in England in this respect. In England, a woman who is pregnant can go to the Court in her district and get an order made by the Magistrate for the support of that child. Bear in mind, that is before the child is born. It is not so in this island. Section 11 of our Settlement of the Bastardy Act reads as follows:—

"Any single woman who shall be delivered of a child and shall be unable to provide wholly or in part for the maintenance may make application to the Police Magistrate of the parish in which she may reside for a summons against the alleged father of the child and such Magistrate shall there upon issue his summons to the person alleged to be the father of such child to appear before him on a day to be named in the summons."

It would therefore be seen by that section of the Act that the delivery of a child is a condition precedent and the child at the time of the order, by the established practice in Barbados, must be proven to be alive, so much so, that the practice is that the mother has to bring the child into Court. Mr. Speaker, what is the hardship in not giving a single woman the right to make an application for an order before her child is born as is not the case according to our Act? In the first place, the woman may be in need of medical attention but is unable to seek it of herself. In the second place, the child may be born dead or may die before she has the energy or the strength to go to the Court to make the application for the order against the alleged father. It is known that unless she goes to the Poor Law Guardians of the parish in which she resides and can convince them that she is unable to pay the medical or funeral expenses of the child, she will have to foot the bill herself. Under our 1897 Settlement of the Bastardy Act, Section 18 makes it possible that the Poor Law Guardians can recover expenses from anyone who has been adjudged the father of a child in case that body was called on to foot the bill for medical attention or funeral expenses of a child. However, it is not clear from that section whether the Poor Law Guardians are entitled *expose facto* to put the alleged father of the

child in Court to cover the expenses. It is not clear under that section and I have not heard of any such case being brought. The Act says the putative father and that can only be taken to mean someone already adjudged to be the father of the child. As it appears to me, the unfortunate woman invariably has to stand the expenses. If Barbados had a provision like that in England where the mother could apply before the child is born for an order against the alleged father, and he was adjudged the putative father, he could be liable for the funeral and medical expenses or any expenses that may be incurred during confinement; but, at the present, a single woman of Barbados has to pay all the expenses of the confinement and can get only the normal sum for the weekly support of the child after she has been delivered of it and has got an order made out against the putative father.

With regard to the other point raised by the honourable junior member for St. Lucy in respect of the limitation of twelve months after the birth of a child for a mother to make an application for an order against the alleged father, I too think that it would also be good to make provision for that. It will however be subject to certain exceptions, such as the absence of the alleged father from the island.

There is another point which has been raised by the honourable junior member for St. Lucy, which to the very best of my recollection deals with the question of a blood test to prove the father of a child. The question whether medical evidence as to blood root is admissible as evidence in British Courts is still in its controversial stage, but of course, all of us are looking forward to the time when a Court can make an order with a greater degree of certainty when the case is proven from scientific information rather than word of mouth from another because witnesses may or may not be prejudiced for or against the respective parties. However, I do not think that should be a consideration which should deter us from making the other amendments which I have outlined and which I consider are necessary so as to bring our Act on all fours with the English legislation both in cause law and statute law.

There is only one other point which I would like to draw to the attention of honourable members and it is a question on which I have spoken on more than one occasion in this Chamber. It is with regard to the necessity of having a separate Court for the adjudication of separation and maintenance cases, bastardy orders and support orders for married women. I brought this matter to the attention of this House during consideration of the Estimates, therefore, I would not speak at length on it on this occasion. I will only remind honourable members that I consider it as necessary that there should be a nursery attached to the Courts and nurses placed there to look after the many children that have to be brought there when dealing with cases of this sort. I have seen children brought into the Courts of this island at 10 o'clock and kept there all day without any sanitary or other conveniences available for them. Sometimes, there are as many as three or four of them holding on to the skirts of their mother. I feel if we had a nursery and separate family court that the hearing of these cases could be greatly expedited. I hope the honourable Minister of Social Services will consider some of the points which have been raised by honourable members because I consider many of them as really necessary. In such a case, I think it will be worthwhile if this Bill is postponed for a short while with a view to the introduction of more comprehensive legislation in this respect.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY and Mr. BRYAN entered the House and took their seats while Mr. BARROW was speaking.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—I think this Bill is long overdue and I am hoping that because this House is constituted as it is, predominantly of members of my own sex, that honourable members will, nevertheless, give their wholehearted support to the Bill.

As I see it, honourable members are anxious to have a short adjournment before I proceed further. I am going to formally move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour for tea.

Mr. Lewis seconded the motion.

The question that the House do now adjourn for half an hour was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.

On re-assembling,

ADDRESS TO HIS EXCELLENCY PASSED

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day we passed an Address to Her Majesty the Queen and we should have passed an Address to His Excellency the Governor at the same time asking His Excellency pass on the Address to Her Majesty. I am therefore asking leave to proceed with that Address at this stage.

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

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, the Address reads as follows:—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Governor*

The House of Assembly respectfully request Your Excellency to have the accompanying Address forwarded to Her Majesty the Queen.

I beg to move that the Address do now pass.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

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

CONSIDERATION RESUMED ON SETTLEMENT OF THE BASTARDY ACT

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: On the adjournment, the honourable senior member for the City was addressing the House on the motion for the second reading of the Bill to amend the settlement of the Poor and Bastardy Act.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Sir, I began by saying that I considered the amendments which we are considering to the Settlement of the Poor and Bastardy Act, 1897, as very important and long overdue but I must say at the outset that there are several matters which should be clarified as well as several other things which should be put into this Bill to suit local conditions. I am therefore going to support the second reading of the Bill but when I am finished making observations on it, I am sure the honourable Minister in charge of it would agree that there are several matters which should also be put into it and as a result, he would consider that it would be well that it be sent to Select Committee. I do not believe anybody would have any objection to this Bill because it provides for a shortcoming in society, if I can so term it, which might happen in the best regulated family in the world, to say the least, Barbados. This Bill makes provision for the better support of children who are born illegitimately in that

it increases the age when a putative father shall be responsible for the support of a bastard child from twelve to sixteen years. It further provides that the amount which a Police Magistrate may order a putative father to give to the support of that child should be increased from what it is at present and that it should be an amount not exceeding ten shillings per week. It also makes a most important provision where after an order has been made out against a putative father for the support of a child, and the circumstances of the father improves, that the mother of the child can apply to the Police Magistrate for an increase in the order. This puts the mother of the illegitimate child in a similar position as that of a married woman when an order is made towards her for the support of her children. I do not think any person would object to these amendments. Sir, no country can rise higher than what its women make it. Individually, you might find one or two women whose morals are very low, but we are not passing legislation which would help them meet their ends; we are passing legislation to provide for the better protection of children born out of wedlock as a whole. As I have said, I am going to support the second reading of this Bill but I am going to ask that the honourable Minister in charge of it to agree to it being sent to Select Committee to make provision for other matters connected therewith.

I entirely agree with the remarks of the last honourable member who spoke on this Bill. In our amending this Act, we should make provision for such matters as a single woman who has to appear in the Court to prove that the alleged father of her child is the putative father, that she should not suffer the humiliating indignity of exposing her business to a crowded court room. We do not need to make provision for another Police Magistrate to remedy this situation but we can make provision as prevails in other British countries where cases of this sort are heard in a different atmosphere to what prevails in this colony. As the honourable senior member for St. George has rightly said, children of tender ages must attend these Courts according to the law and on several occasions I have observed that they have to sit in Court where criminals, direlects and others who are unwanted in society are in attendance. This should not be so. I think all of us would agree that birth is merely an accident, therefore, it is no fault of a child that he is born out of wedlock. When that child grows into a man and assumes his own responsibility, he is called on to pay taxes in the same manner as his counterpart who was born in wedlock.

I think it is a very good thing to have power given to a Police Magistrate to say that an illegitimate child should be supported until it reaches the age of sixteen but it strikes me—I might be wrong—that if the child becomes employed before he reaches the age of sixteen, that we should also give the putative father the right of making out an order before the Police Magistrate to reduce the amount wholly, or in part, which has been put upon him for the support of such child. I throw this out for consideration by honourable members. Similar rights exist where husbands who have to support their wives and children through an order by a Police Magistrate are concerned. I have brought this to the notice of this House, but I have not done it because I do not wholeheartedly agree with the amendments that have been put forward.

This Bill deletes Section 21 of the principal Act and substitutes the following in its place:—

"The Police Magistrate of any district in which an order has been made under this Act for the maintenance of a bastard child may, on the application of the mother or any person appointed by order of the Court to have the custody of such child, or of the putative father, or of the Churchwarden, a Guardian or the Inspector of the Poor of a parish upon which such child has become a charge, and upon cause being shown upon fresh evidence to the satisfaction of the Court, at any time, alter, vary or discharge any such order and may upon any such application from time to time increase or diminish the amount of any weekly payment ordered to be made so that the same does not in any case exceed the weekly sum of ten shillings."

I think this new section is most important. First of all, it strikes me as if the order should be made first, and then it goes on to say that the Churchwarden, a Guardian or the Inspector of the Poor of a parish upon which such child has become a charge, can on evidence get such an order increased or diminished. Everybody should know that under the old Statute, the Churchwarden of a parish only was given the power to bring a case, should a child become a charge on the parish, only against a father — not a putative father — should he prove that his wife had committed adultery and the order which she had made out against him for the support of herself and his children ceased as a result. Another unfortunate position of the old Statute in this respect is that it does not give the Police Magistrate the right to impose a fine on the father who failed to support his child or for him to pay some amount of money; the Police Magistrate was only empowered to send the father straight to prison. In my opinion, the sending of such a person to prison could not in any way help the poor, starving children. On the other hand, where no order has been made out against a putative father for the support of his illegitimate children—and I am referring to the instance where two people were living together and the man had accepted paternity rights of the children but left the colony and ceased to support those children—I see nothing in this Bill to give the right to the grandfather of those children, the Churchwarden of the parish or even the mother, to get an order made out against the father of those children should his whereabouts be known. That is a matter on which I feel this Bill should be sent to Select Committee so that people like the Probation Officer and Crown Law Officers could tell honourable members who would be selected to serve on that Committee whether something could be inserted in the Act to make provision for that and other such suggestions. There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, there are circumstances in respect to this matter that are peculiar to Barbados. We have people in official positions with no other view but to insult the people of Barbados because the population happens to be great and our rate of illegitimacy happens to be high; they say that our women are the worse. Sometimes, I feel it is better to face that fact than to face the demoralising characters who are in our midst striving to corrupt our women folk.

I repeat, this Bill is long overdue; the present Settlement of the Poor and Bastardy Act needed amending ever since, but I think we can go further than what we are doing now. As I have said, I feel that some provision should be made where an illegitimate child has not attained the age of 16 years but is in a position to support or contribute to the support of himself, that the putative father, should an

order exist against him, be able to apply to the Court to have it diminished. There is a law on the Statute Book which enables a married woman if her husband has left the colony and he fails to support her and their children to apply for an order against him for their support, should no adultery be proved. There are hundreds and hundreds of cases where people have been living together for many years as man and wife and have children under such circumstances but where the woman cannot apply for an order for the support of such children because the man has left the colony. Many women have made representations to me in this respect and I feel that some consideration should be given to this matter. I think all honourable members are acquainted with facts similar to this: Mr. X goes to America on the emigration scheme. He is unmarried but leaves a reputed wife with two or three children here. There is no dispute over the children as he recognised them as his. After a time he ceases to write her and she comes to you and enquires what she can do to get some support for her children. Those of us who have travelled know that some men become like 'Samsons' when they go to big countries and see women in a different light to those they left behind. Those men give away their all to the new women they have met. They leave their children here, though not unwanted, unsupported, I believe the learned legal luminaries of this House can make some provision for cases of this sort if this Bill goes to Select Committee.

Sir, we cannot pass this Bill without taking cognizance of the fact that cases of this sort should not be heard in open court. I agree with what the honourable senior member for St. George said that some arrangement should be made to take care of women who have to bring babies or three or four children into Court. I do not think you will need to appoint another Police Magistrate, but such cases can be heard on a day when other cases will not be heard. Another thing which I have experienced and which I consider should not be, is that some of these cases are set down for hearing six months from the date they are lodged. I feel that cases of this nature should be adjudicated as quickly as possible. Someone has said that justice delayed is justice denied and I agree with that statement.

Another thing which needs remedying is the question of mothers having to swear to orders. As it stands now, orders are made every four weeks and mothers are compelled to leave their jobs to line up in the Courtyard and await their turn to swear to an order in case the putative father of the child lapsed in his support of the child. If the books are there with the records and it is found that no money is paid in by the putative father, I think it is quite sufficient for the Clerk of the Court to go before the Police Magistrate and to say that Bob Jones is in arrears for eight weeks for support of his child; please sign this order to summons him to appear before the Court.

It may not have been the duty of the people who comprised this Honourable Chamber in the past to look into these things; but it is our duty to look very carefully into these matters. I do not think it is right that we should continue with the present state of affairs any more. We should make provision for every thing that needs amending in this Bill and that is why I am suggesting that it be sent to Select Committee. While I am supporting the second reading of the Bill, I will subsequently move that it be sent to Select Committee and I hope the honourable Minister in charge of it will agree to my motion.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, so far as I view this matter, this is a Bill that has two objects in view and in both instances the objects are to narrow the disadvantages between legitimate and illegitimate children. I do not think the Bill deals with legitimacy and birth rate as some honourable members suggested. I hardly think that we can deal with the question of birth rate by way of legislation as that is a social and economical problem. I sincerely hope if the House get the opportunity of discussing the Committee Report on over-population that there would be more scientific and realistic speeches made about it.

As far as sending this Bill to Select Committee, I would like to be sure before I vote that the amendments proposed by honourable members can be dealt with under this Act. I am not sure that amendments can be made to this Act to deal with the procedure of hearing cases of this nature in a Court so as to avoid embarrassment of the mothers of illegitimate children and the privations which mothers and the children undergo while attending Court. I would like to be assured that such things can be dealt with under the Act before I vote that it be sent to Select Committee.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, there are one or two points to which I wish to reply. First of all, the honourable junior member for St. Lucy erred when he said that this Bill is the outcome of the Report by the Select Committee on over-population. This Bill emanated from the Report of the Probation Officer in 1952. As a result of that report, the Government took the action as contained in this Bill. With regard to the point put forward by the honourable senior member for the City with respect to no provision having been made for the putative father of a child to apply to the Court for a change in the order in case the child was in a position to support itself before it reached the age of sixteen years, that point found some sympathy with me, but as I have just pointed out to him privately, just as the mother of the child, or the Churchwarden of a parish, or a Poor Law Guardian has the right to apply before the Court for the varying of the order in case the father's position in life changes, so too if a child gets a job before he attains the age of sixteen years and is able to support himself, the father would be in a position to apply to the Court to have the order against him reduced or cancelled. That provision exists under Section 21 of the principal Act.

There have been certain other observations which were made by the honourable senior member for St. Lucy and the honourable senior member for St. George and which were referred to by the honourable senior member for the City. I have taken note of them and will refer them to the proper authorities; probably, some of them can be dealt with by further amendments to the Act by another Bill. I do not think this Bill should be delayed by sending it to Select Committee to deal with such matters.

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

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I know the honourable Minister in his position is no lawyer; neither am I. I also am aware that the honourable Minister usually agrees with a suggestion which he thinks is agreeable. I would therefore make a further appeal to the honourable Minister to agree

that this Bill be sent to Select Committee. While what the honourable Minister said was correct, there are other observations which were made on the Bill by other honourable members and I think it would serve a useful purpose if this Bill be sent to Select Committee. It seems to me as if the one point which the honourable Minister seems to appreciate is the point raised by me but there are other points which were raised by other honourable members which I consider are of equal importance. I do not think we should deal with these matters piece-meal and I therefore beg to move that this Bill be sent to Select Committee.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I think the honourable member misunderstood me. I particularly pointed out that the point which I considered was the most important was the one which he raised; but I also said that I appreciated the other points which were raised by other honourable members and I would refer them to the proper authorities.

Mr. LEWIS: As I have said already, I am quite willing to second the motion for sending the Bill to Select Committee if there is anything more that can be added to the Bill. The honourable Minister in charge of the Bill said that there are points raised by honourable members other than my colleague which he would refer to the proper authorities. If that is so, I second the motion for the Bill being sent to Select Committee because I consider it improper for the House to be amending an Act every month. We have amended the Customs Tariff Act some five or six times in a year and I do not agree to that procedure. I would still like to hear whether you can make provision under the Act for the procedure of the hearing of cases of this nature in a Court.

If the honourable Minister in charge of the Bill can say that he has taken notes of points raised at the second reading of the Bill and will be referring them to the proper authorities and if they are worthy of adoption, he will come back with some other amendments to the Act, probably, in another two months, I think a Select Committee can with the assistance of the Legal Department get them into the Bill at once. If there are no further amendments which can be made to the Act, well, then, let us leave this Bill alone.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I would like the honourable Minister of Social Services to understand that along with other honourable members, I considered that this Bill should go to Select Committee because we thought that although these two amendments in this Bill were matters of importance, yet there were not matters of such vital importance that we should pass them by themselves without giving consideration to some other points which we considered as matters of importance but which probably were overlooked when the original Bill was drafted. I will give one further instance why I think the Bill should be sent to Select Committee. Under Section 18 of the Settlement of the Poor and Bastardy Act, which is amended by this Bill to increase the age limit from twelve to sixteen years for the support of a child, the funeral expenses have not been amended but remain at the same figure as was set out when the Act was introduced in 1897. You have thought fit to change the maximum amount from five to ten shillings for support of the child to suit changing conditions but you have not thought fit to change the funeral expenses from what they were to suit present-day conditions. I do not think the honourable Minister in charge of the Bill will say that what is provided under the Act for funeral expenses would in any way liquidate present-day funeral expenses in that respect.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: On further consideration, Mr. Speaker, I accept the motion for referring this Bill to a Select Committee. I therefore ask leave to withdraw my former motion that this House go into Committee on the Bill.

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

The question that the Bill be sent to Select Committee was put and decided in the affirmative on the declaration of Mr. SPEAKER: "I think the 'Ayes' have it."

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: I have the honour to appoint the following as members of that Committee: the honourable senior member for the City (Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY), the honourable senior member for St. George (Mr. BARROW), the honourable senior member for St. Lucy (Mr. BRANCKER), the honourable junior member for St. Michael (Mr. BRYAN) and the honourable senior member for St. John (Mr. ALLDER).

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I suggest that the honourable Minister of Social Services be also included on that Committee.

BILL TO AMEND THE COLONIAL SECRETARY'S OFFICE ACT, 1903

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of Order No. 3 which stands in the name of the honourable Premier.

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

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: The next order of the day now stands in the name of the honourable Minister of Social Services; Second reading of a Bill to amend the Colonial Secretary's Office Act, 1903.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, This Bill seeks to amend the Colonial Secretary's Office Act, 1903, with regard to the fees paid on passports in view of the rising cost of services. At present a fee of five shillings is charged for issuing a passport and a sixpence is the amount of Stamp Duty payable under the Stamp Act, 1916, but the cost of printing a passport is more than five shillings and as a result of that, this Bill seeks to increase the fee charged for issuing a passport to three dollars and for the renewal of it annually to thirty cents. Previously, it was one shilling for renewal of it every year. The Stamp Duty of a sixpence will not be charged in future. I think it is quite legitimate that this increased fee be charged inasmuch as the cost of printing these passports has increased considerably. As I have said, the cost of printing a passport is far more than the fee which was charged originally. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I just wish to remark for the consideration of honourable members when this Bill is considered in Committee that Section 3, so far as I know, is not necessary. I think we have already passed a bill which says that wherever in any Act there is reference to sterling, the amount should be converted into dollars and cents at a particular rate; therefore, it seems to me, that with that Act on the Statute Book the only thing that is necessary to do is to cut out the amount in sterling and write in the dollars and cents equivalent. Section three of this Bill is redundant and out of place. I hope I have made myself clear. For instance, suppose under that Act we had something for £1, 5s., we could say that the words and symbols are deleted and the words six dollars be inserted in its place. I agree with the principle of the Bill.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know on what basis are these increases made. The percentage increase seems to be fairly high, that is to say, if formerly the fee charged was five shillings for the issuing of the passport and you have increased it to three dollars, you have increased the amount by \$1.80; that is 150% increase. I would like to know how you arrived at that percentage of increase. This is one of the evils which have back-fired from what we did sometime ago in this House when we indiscriminately increased the salaries and emoluments of officers in the Government Service. Honourable members should weigh very thoroughly cases of this sort because there seems to be no limit in the increases of fees. Government, every now and then, is carrying up the charges for services rendered by the various Government Department. I certainly cannot see the reason why the percentage of increase should be so great in this matter. It is true, the increase on the renewal of a passport every year is fairly reasonable but the percentage of increase for the taking out of the passport is very high.

I suppose, it must be considered that it is very rare when one wants to acquire a passport and therefore the amount for getting it could be anything, but, be that as it may, this increase will still hit some people very hard. I certainly would like the honourable Minister of Social Services to explain why it is that this increase for the issuing of a passport is a greater amount than the fee which was formerly charged.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Sir, I think the honourable member is quite aware that paper costs three or four times the amount which it cost formerly. The honourable member is a business man and he knows that bow ties cost more, radios cost more. Therefore, he should know that the cost of paper and printing has increased substantially. Along with that, you have to pay more to the office staff that prepares the issuing of a passport. Government has also made enquiries in the Caribbean area and has been made to understand that in Trinidad a fee of fifteen shillings is charged for the issuing of a passport and two shillings for renewal every year. In British Guiana the position is similar and in general in the Caribbean area, the charge for the issuing of a passport is fifteen shillings. I think it is only fair if the printing of a passport is far more than what we were charged formerly that we should charge a higher fee.

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

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

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:—

"The Schedule to the Colonial Secretary's Office Act, 1903, (hereinafter referred to as the principal Act) is hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof the following words, figures and symbols—

For issuing a passport	\$3.00
For each year of renewal of a passport	\$.30

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, the honourable Minister of Social Services has not attempted to give the reason for the high percentage of increase in the fee for the issuing of a passport. I would like to take this opportunity to say that certain De-

partments of Government give receipts for money paid on a very large sheet of paper. A very much smaller receipt can be given. Another point which I would like to bring to the notice of honourable members is that a Government advertisement notice in a section of the Press sometime last week took up nearly a whole page of the newspaper. I feel that such notices could also be greatly reduced. If as an instance, you take the notices calling for tenders to supply ground provisions to the General Hospital and other Government institutions at certain periods of the year, you will note that the contractors who supply those articles know when they have to send in their tender; therefore, such notices can be very brief and need not take up so much space in the various newspapers. Almost a whole page of a newspaper was taken up with advertisements calling for tenders for various articles at the General Hospital, the Mental Hospital and the Lazaretto. Each institution had a separate advertisement. If Government were to go through the items for which those institutions were calling for tenders—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable member keep to Section 2 of the Bill? Say whether the fees should be increased or not.

Mr. ALLDER: If Government go through those advertisements, it will see that there is opportunity for reduction in the space of those advertisements.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is still straying from the purpose of Clause 2.

Mr. ALLDER: Sir, if what I was trying to point out were to be done, there would be no need for Government to come here and increase the rate of fees charged for services at the Government Departments. Nowadays, if a woman go into the Registrar's Office to get a birth certificate—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Must I read Clause 2 for the benefit of the honourable member?

Mr. ALLDER: The honourable Minister of Social Services made reference to the increase in the cost of paper.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The paper on which passports were printed; not baptismal certificates.

Mr. ALLDER: I am saying, Sir, that if one go to the Police Department to acquire a passport, the receipt given for the fee paid is partly the size of the Bill in our hands. Private business houses have recently cut down on the size of their receipts.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, this Clause deals with the question of the cost of issuing of passports and not with the question of receipts.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I brought that in because the honourable Minister made reference to the increased cost of printing and the increased cost of paper. If the honourable Minister does not care to take note of my suggestions, that is a matter entirely for him; I must pass them on. Every business house has recently reduced the size of their bills and receipts and Government should act similarly. Government should also cut down on the length of its advertisements in the local newspapers.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am again asking the honourable senior member for St. John to keep to the cost for issuing of passports; the cost of receipts and advertisements does not come under this Clause.

Mr. ALLDER: I think I have said sufficient.

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

Clause 3 was called. It reads as follows:—

"Where in the principal Act reference is made to pounds, shillings, or pence, the principal Act shall have effect as if the reference were to an equi-

valent amount of dollars and cents computed at the rate of four dollars and eighty cents for every pound, twenty-four cents for every shilling and two cents for every penny."

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: With regard to this Clause, the honourable junior member for the City made the point that there was no necessity for this Clause and produced the Accountant-General's Act of 1949 to support his contention. This Act does not say that all Acts should be expressed in dollars and cents. It is not a general Act; it refers to the keeping of public accounts. I am going to suggest that this clause remain as it is; it will cause no harm. I will, however, report the point raised by the honourable junior member for the City to the Executive when it meets on Thursday next and, if necessary, the Clause will be deleted. I beg to move that Clause three stand part of the Bill.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I would just like to say that the Act to which I made mention deals with the collection of money and describes the way in which you should keep it in your accounts. It states that anybody who receives money from public funds should receive it on a particular basis and that is what this Bill to amend the Colonial Secretary's Office Act is affecting. This Act affects public accounts. Of course, I do not see any harm being done by allowing the clause to remain because it does not change the method of computation. This clause is worded similarly to the corresponding section in the Accountant-General's Act. What we have been doing since the Accountant-General's Act, 1949, had been passed is to delete schedules of fees computed in sterling and repeating them in dollars and cents according to the computation of that Act. I can only look at what is done here as slackness on the part of the person who drafted this Bill.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I entirely agree with what the honourable junior member for the City has said. Unless the honourable Minister of Social Services is suggesting that the money which citizens will pay for obtaining passports will not be paid into the Public Treasury, I do not think that the reservations made are necessary. The remarks which the honourable junior member for the City has made are entirely valid. You should have deleted the whole schedule of the principal Act and redrafted the fees in dollars and cents while revising the amendments which you have made in this Bill. It may be that the money to be collected from issuing of passports is going into the Police Benevolent Fund or some such fund. In that case, section three of this Bill will be in order. I agree that if the money is to be paid into the Public Treasury, section three of this Bill is unnecessary.

Mr. LEWIS: I made a note on this point from the time I received this Bill but it slipped me to make mention of it to the Honourable Minister so that he could be apprised of it and could have verified it. I am convinced that I am right on the point. I do not think you should have two Acts on the Statute Book stating how sterling is to be converted into dollars and cents.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I am not a lawyer nor am I a Legal Draughtsman. This clause may be wrong; I do not know. What I do say is to let us pass it and I will report it to the Executive on Thursday. If it is superfluous, obviously, the Crown Law Officer would omit it when it comes up for consideration in the Other Place.

The question that Clause 3 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

BILL TO AMEND THE STAMP ACT, 1916

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of all Bills standing in the name of the honourable Premier.

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

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: The next order of the day now stands in the name of the honourable Minister of Social Services: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Stamp Act, 1916.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, This Bill is a natural corollary of the Bill which has just been passed. Consequent on the increase of the fee charged for issuing and renewing passports from \$1.20 to \$2.00 and from 24 cents to 30 cents respectively, it has been decided to abolish the amount of 12 cents for Stamp Duty which was required under the Stamp Act, 1916. This Bill gives effect to that amendment. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. M. E. Cox seconded the motion.

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

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

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

CROWN AGENTS (CHANGE OF TITLE) BILL, 1954

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas:—To move the second reading of a Bill to substitute a new title in local legislation for the Crown Agents for the Colonies consequent upon a change in the official designation thereof.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—The object of this Bill is to amend the title which was formerly given to the Crown Agents. Apparently their functions have been increased; they are extending their service to municipalities, local government bodies and so on, and it is considered that, inasmuch as their functions have been increased further than when the title was first given to them, it is appropriate to change their title to relate to the duties which they perform. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. BARROW: I am wondering if this is the correct procedure which should be adopted because under the Interpretation Act, 1949, which repeals the Act of 1894, it is stated that "Crown Agents" means the persons for the time being acting as Crown Agents for the Colonies in England, or any of them."

It seems to me that what we really need is an amendment to the Interpretation Act. I was under the impression that there was an amendment made to the Interpretation Act having regard to this matter but I believe that it dealt with the Colonial Secretary or some such dignitary. I think that some amendment should have been made to the Interpretation Act either with or without the present Bill before the House. Clause 2 of this Bill states:

2. (1) From and after the commencement of this Act, wherever in any Act or subsidiary legislation the expression "Crown Agents for the Colonies" occurs there shall be substituted therefor the expression "Crown Agents for Oversea Governments and Administrations."

(2) Any reference in any Act or subsidiary legislation to the Crown Agents for the Colonies shall be deemed to include a reference to the "Crown Agents for Oversea Governments and Administrations."

I really do not understand Sub-clause 2 at all; this is the result of bringing down legislation *in vacuo* and not as should be done after full consideration of all the possible ramifications of that legislation. My personal opinion is that the Interpretation Act overrides any other Act in its interpretation of terms and I personally feel that the Interpretation Act itself should have been amended rather than have what is contained in Sub-clause 2 of Clause 2 of this Bill. I am not necessarily saying that this Bill itself is wrong but I am suggesting that this is not the proper way to go about amending the Interpretation Act without any specific reference to the Interpretation Act itself.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: It seems to me that Sub-clause 2 of Clause 2 only means that from the time we have passed this Act whenever we see the words "Crown Agents for the Colonies" in any other Act, they mean "Crown Agents for Oversea Governments and Administrations." In this Sub-clause there is the legal phraseology of which I know very little.

Mr. LEWIS: I remember that we have just amended the Interpretation Act and that Act does say that "Crown Agents" means the persons for the time being acting as Crown Agents for the Colonies in England, or any of them." If you change the title to something else, the Interpretation Act would have to refer to the new title. It appears to me that it would have been a good idea to have put everything else in the Interpretation Act which we have amended.

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

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

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. BARROW: I do not think I made myself sufficiently clear on the second reading of this Bill. In this Clause, the operative words are: "From and after the commencement of this Act." It seems to me that we are not spending our money wisely on the Attorney General's Office, because after the passing of the Act no draftsman would refer to something which does not exist. Sub-clause 2 which is really unnecessary, refers not only to legislation which is passed after the commencement of this Act,

but any legislation which existed before. What we are saying by passing this Bill is that we are passing legislation and we are referring to the Crown Agents for the Colonies although we know that they no longer exist. As I have pointed out before, the correct way to deal with this matter is to go back to the Interpretation Act and amend it and destroy this Bill which is completely unnecessary.

In this Bill we are saying that after the commencement of the Act wherever we refer to the Crown Agents we mean "Crown Agents for Oversea Governments and Administrations." In England they have changed their title and after the passing of this Act we shall not be referring to them by that title; all we need to do is to amend the Interpretation Act and say that the expression "Crown Agents" means "Crown Agents for Oversea Governments and Administrations." This Bill is unadulterated nonsense as it is now.

The other ridiculous thing is that it is set out that the Act shall be deemed to have come into operation on the first day of April, 1954, and we are now in May, 1954. Retroactive legislation should only be made in exceptional cases; therefore this Bill does not make any sense in the light of the Interpretation Act which we have. I am asking the honourable Minister to go back to the legal advisers of the Government and ask them if they have forgotten the Act of 1949 which has repealed the 1894 Act.

Mr. BRANCKER: Whereas the proposal of the honourable senior member for St. George is an easier way of achieving what is contemplated in this Act, Clause 2 will also meet the Bill. What we have here is an alternative method of achieving the same end. The proposal to amend Clause 2 of the Interpretation Act which defines "Crown Agents" is an easier way of achieving the object of this Bill, but in this Bill we say two things. We say (1) "From and after the commencement of this Act, wherever in any Act or subsidiary legislation the expression 'Crown Agents for the Colonies' occurs, there shall be substituted therefor the expression 'Crown Agents for Oversea Governments and Administrations'" and (2) "Any reference in any Act or subsidiary legislation to the Crown Agents for the Colonies shall be deemed to include a reference to the 'Crown Agents for Oversea Governments and Administrations'".

If you go all through the Acts of this island, wherever the expression "Crown Agents for the Colonies" occurs, according to Sub-clause 2 any reference to them shall be deemed to include a reference to the "Crown Agents for Oversea Governments and Administrations." While I would prefer the method of amendment which the honourable senior member for St. George proposes, yet I must confess that this Bill carries out what it is intended to effect.

Mr. LEWIS: If you were amending an Act and substituting a title, that would be all right; this is not an amending Act and it strikes a layman as being funny. We have the Crown Agents existing and there is no Act saying that there are Crown Agents. What seems to be the difficulty is this; they want to get this title to operate as from the 1st April this year and this is the only way in which they can get it done. That is where I disagree with the honourable member on my right (Mr. BARROW). If we have Clause 3, Clause 2 must be worded as it is. Where is the Act creating the Crown Agents? There is no such Act. We are now giving the people an Act instead of saying that the Interpretation Act includes them; if we had an amendment to the Interpretation Act we could still put a com-

mencing clause saying that this Act shall be deemed to have come into operation on the 1st day of April, 1954. It seems to me that we still have to amend the Interpretation Act; in 1949 we passed the 1949 Acts and in 1954 we pass the 1954 Acts. We have amended the Customs Tariff Act about four times already.

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

Clause 3 was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

EXTENSION OF THE WATERWORKS IN ST. LUCY

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I ask leave to take Order No. 10 as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Michael:—To move the passing of the following Resolution—Resolution to approve the Book of Reference of the proposed extension of the Waterworks in the parish of St. Lucy.

Hon. M. E. COX: As honourable members will see, this Resolution is a formal one. In view of the fact that the Act has not yet been amended we still have to come before the House with these Resolutions. I think that this Resolution is self-explanatory; I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: I am naturally supporting the passing of this Resolution, but I cannot but deprecate the fact that provision has been made for installing only one standpipe. It seems to me that in every month one has an opportunity like this in connection with the parish of St. Michael. It is not merely a matter of considering the number of people who are living in a district; it is a question of distance. The practice which the Government has always followed in the past is to ignore distance when it comes to this question of erecting standpipes; there might be six houses in a village and they are a mile from a standpipe and the Government will take a long time to erect a standpipe for that village. They feel that because there are only six houses in that village, sufficient water is not a necessity for every individual in that village. They are working on a population basis and ignoring the distance which people have to travel in order to get water. Shortly after the honourable Minister assumed office he was presented with a list of long overdue sites for standposts in respect of the parish of St. Lucy; I hope that that list has not merely been filed and pigeonholed but that it is receiving attention. I know that the honourable Minister has paid a hurried visit to the Health Commissioners for St. Lucy; I did not have the opportunity of meeting him but I wish to point out that the distance between houses in a village and the nearest standpipe is a matter which deserves very serious consideration. The Government must not think only of the metropolitan parish; what can be worse than people having to travel $\frac{3}{4}$ mile in order to get water? In the country districts it is a question of distance rather than density of

population in this matter of erecting standpipes; the principle of density of population should only apply to the metropolitan parish.

Mr. CRAWFORD: In so far as the rural parishes are concerned, you must have a housing scheme in a parish in order to get water. In this case, the proposal is to lay a $\frac{1}{2}$ inch pipe from the existing main of the Waterworks Department at Clinketts to the Housing Scheme. In view of the fact that the rural areas are not getting the quota of standpipes which they have been getting, I am forced to the conclusion that you have to get a housing scheme in a rural area so as to get a standpipe. I do not know how many houses there are, but a $\frac{1}{2}$ inch pipe carrying water to these houses must supply a very low pressure to these houses. Presumably the engineers at the Water-works Department will know what they are about but as the position is set out here it does not make any sense to me.

I feel that this is the time for the honourable member to enlighten this House as to whether it is the Government's intention to maintain their original policy of erecting two standpipes every year in the various parishes. Last year the parishes of St. George and St. Joseph did not get any standpipes and there are other parishes which did not get their allocation last year; the parish of St. Lucy is being blessed with one standpipe this year and if it had not been for the Housing Scheme, the parish may not have got that standpipe. I hope that those parishes which did not get their two standpipes last year, will get four standpipes this year. It is not that four standpipes represent the maximum number desired, but at least if a parish did not get its two standpipes in any one year, it should be given four standpipes in the next year. There could not be any justification at all for not giving the parishes their two standpipes in very year.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I consider that a standpipe is being wasted at Dayrells corner where a new bungalow has been erected. I happen to know that in the area at Benthams the residents are suffering from the lack of a standpipe and I cannot see the reason for having a standpipe in that area at Dayrells which is a built-up area. There are many people whom that standpipe could serve in some other parish.

Mr. ALLDER: The proposal to erect this standpipe and the estimate show the social conscience of those who have arranged the Plan. This is a Housing Scheme in which there are 15 houses and I presume that there will be about 120 people in the area. The arrangements there are different from the arrangements made at other Housing Schemes and one could certainly not be satisfied in seeing that the proposed work of fixing a standpipe and a hydrant is going to cost \$220. One could not be satisfied with such a limited service being given to a new housing project; if it has been found possible to provide latrines and baths and other taps for the houses at the Pine and Bay Estate, in my humble opinion it is very important that the services at Clinketts should require more than one standpipe. For the accommodation of 15 houses with the possibility of more houses being erected, the provision of one standpipe is ridiculous. In the old days it was felt that a standpipe erected $\frac{1}{2}$ mile or a mile away from a village would be sufficient; but to-day, with the extension of the water supply and the large sums which are being spent on such extension and the boast of the Government that they are bringing social amenities right to the people, the provision of one standpipe for this Housing Scheme is a disgrace.

Inasmuch as the cost of this work is estimated at only \$220, would it not be better to put one standpipe evenly between two houses so that two householders could share that standpipe rather than have 15 householders using one standpipe? Is it felt that the social status of these people is not such as would merit their having the same attention paid to them as the people at the Pine? There is the possibility of the scheme being extended and if seven standpipes were erected for the accommodation of these 15 householders the additional cost would be negligible. I hope that the honourable Minister sees my point; I hardly think that he is as much concerned with the plight of the people in St. Lucy as he is with that of the people in the Pine and Bay Estate areas. I am sure that the honourable Minister would not be satisfied with the erection of one standpipe for the accommodation of 15 houses in either the Pine or Bay Estate area. I am submitting that it would cost very little more money if eight standpipes were provided for this Housing Scheme; while that point has not been stressed, I think it is worth while being considered. Now that the work has not been started, the programme could be amended even if the honourable Minister has to come back to this House for another \$500 for the purpose of increasing the number of standpipes so as to carry the water service nearer to these householders.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Any service like carrying water to the people should be commended, but I have to raise one or two points here. I have the Plan for the extension of the water service to this Housing Scheme and I would like the honourable Minister to tell us why they have chosen to put this standpipe where they are going to put it. On the other hand, I will make some criticism as to matters which have been worrying the public for a long time. If this pipe is to be $\frac{1}{2}$ inch pipe and it is to be run for 66 feet, calculated at the price at which we have to buy this material, the cost would amount to \$16. The estimated cost of the work which it is proposed to carry out is \$220 and if you lay 66 feet of $\frac{1}{2}$ inch pipe, the public must be concerned over the fact that over \$200 will be used for the supply of labour. Very often people receive bills from the Waterworks Department for $\frac{1}{6}$ or $\frac{2}{6}$ for material and \$9.00 for labour, and greater care should be exercised by this Department when people make calls and they have to send out labourers. Can the honourable Minister tell us how he will spend the balance of this money if he is using this $\frac{1}{2}$ inch pipe? Can he give us a breakdown as to this expenditure? Laying the main would be very little to do with this matter because they will not put the pipe more than 8 inches or 10 inches down.

I would like the honourable member to give us a breakdown of this expenditure; if this is only $\frac{1}{2}$ inch pipe, are you going to spend all this money to lay it down? I see that provision is made for fixing a standpipe and a fire hydrant; the cost of the pipe is \$16 and, I repeat, I would like to have a breakdown of this expenditure. I am supporting the idea of carrying the water to the people and, as the honourable senior member for St. John has said, more than one standpipe should be erected. I have the plan before me and if you are laying 66 feet of $\frac{1}{2}$ inch pipe and you are spending nearly \$200 for doing that, you are spending money recklessly. The general public, I repeat, have reason for complaint when they call at the Waterworks Department to have something done and they get a bill for $\frac{1}{6}$ for material and \$9.00 for labour. One wonders what is happening. I reserve the right to

vote for this Resolution on being given a breakdown of the proposed expenditure.

Mr. MILLER: Perhaps the honourable Minister will give a breakdown of what is going to be done. I understand that this is a matter of keeping down costs to a minimum and encouraging people to build their own houses. I should like to say that there is nothing wrong about running 22 yards of $\frac{1}{2}$ inch pipe for supplying water to this Housing Scheme; you can run 250 feet of this $\frac{1}{2}$ inch pipe for supplying water. There is nothing frightening about this expenditure of \$220 for running this pipe and also fixing a fire hydrant; I could say something more but honourable members are anxious to hear something about the breakdown of this expenditure.

Mr. BARROW: I wonder if the members of this House are to understand that the first Aided Self-help Housing Scheme which has been completed or is nearing completion in this island is going to depend for its water supply on one standpipe and this $\frac{1}{2}$ inch pipe will be used. It seems to me that if the Government is investing money in this Housing Scheme in this year of grace 1954, the use of $\frac{1}{2}$ inch feeder line to a group of houses is not a very enlightened policy. If the Government is establishing a model Housing Scheme as they are purporting to do at Clinketts, then sanitation must be one of the most important considerations in making this Scheme different from the normal condition of houses which one encounters in St. Michael and in the rural parishes from day to day and which has existed in the past. I quite appreciate the fact that it would be difficult to lay a 4-inch main and the expenditure could not be justified purely for fire prevention; if this Housing Scheme is only 66 feet away from the main, the equipment which the Fire Brigade has at its disposal must be capable of spanning that distance. I can understand the position as regards the fire hydrant but I am rather shocked to discover that the Government does not intend to instal water in each and every house and provide proper water toilets and baths in the Housing Scheme itself. We are fortunate in that the Minister for Works is also Minister for Housing and perhaps he can give the House some explanation as to why what I have just mentioned has not been done; but I must state very clearly that the Government has invested money in these houses down there and therefore when the Government is establishing this Scheme, it should see that the Scheme is carried out properly. In this Scheme the Government should take care of any eventuality such as sanitation, which is a day-to-day matter, and fire which may occur at any time.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: This question of water supply is a very burning one; I was wondering whether we could attempt to postpone the installation of this water at this Housing Scheme. I do hope that the honourable Minister will see about enlarging this pipe because in the near future some of these people will want to install their own water. I am wondering if it is possible for the honourable Minister to postpone this matter and effect some change in it, but at the same time we do not want to antagonise the people at Clinketts in this matter of their water supply. I hope that the honourable Minister will see the wisdom in some of the remarks made by honourable members and without delaying the Scheme, make the necessary changes with a view to the future development of the Scheme.

Mr. LEWIS: Although only one standpipe is being provided for this Housing Scheme, I think we have to be glad to know that at least some people

will be getting water nearer to their places of residence. I would like to remark that it is good to know that in St. Lucy today you can make arrangements of this sort, feeling fairly sure that water will flow through the pipe; a few years ago you could not be certain that a $\frac{1}{2}$ inch or 4-inch or any other pipe could produce any water. There is now dead a man who assisted the people in the northern parishes in not famishing for water and who also assisted the Head of the Waterworks Department in knowing where to put down his bucket so as to get this water; I have suggested that the Government on behalf of the people of this island, should show some gratitude to this dead man's family, but they have never seen fit to do that.

Hon. M. E. COX: Honourable members have spoken about the water supply in general, but I have always held that speeches should be kept to the question under discussion; we are merely dealing with the question of installing this $\frac{1}{2}$ inch pipe at this Housing Scheme. I regret to hear the remarks of the honourable senior member for St. John who knows that I am no parochialist as is the case with some Vestrymen. I have met the representatives of St. John and discussed with them areas in which standpipes should be installed and those representatives know that I am anxious to see that water is installed all over the island and not merely in St. Michael. I count myself as a representative of Barbados; (Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: What a metamorphosis?) I can go throughout the length and breadth of this island and command a hearing.

The honourable senior member for St. Lucy and the honourable senior member for St. John have compared the number of standpipes in St. Lucy with the number in St. Michael and the suggestion was made that the people in St. Lucy deserve the same treatment as those in St. Michael, thereby insinuating that I concentrate more on the parish of St. Michael. That is as far from the truth as the East is from the West. I shall endeavour to give the number of standpipes per head of population in the various parishes. The honourable senior member for St. Lucy has made the point that standpipes should be established in relation to the distance where people have to go so as to get water; the honourable member knows that where the question of the number of standpipes is concerned in relation to the population per head, the parish of St. Lucy is in excess now. The parish of St. Lucy has 22 more pipes per head of population than any other parish has at present; the parish of St. Michael is on the deficit. There are only two parishes, namely, St. Philip and St. George which are below the standard. (A MEMBER: Shame!) That is not my fault; however, we are trying to bring these parishes up to standard.

As to the question of this $\frac{1}{2}$ inch pipe serving these 15 houses, that number of houses is not such a large one when compared with the number in many years which was 15 times 15 to one standpipe. On the question of the installation of toilets and baths, the honourable senior member for St. George must remember that these people at Clinketts are people of slender means and they want to have these houses as cheaply as possible. The honourable senior member for St. John made an error when he compared the Housing Scheme at Clinketts with those at the Pine and the Bay Estate; with the exception of the early houses which were built by Mr. Crowe, not one of those houses at the Pine and Bay Estate has any private tap, water toilet or anything like that. I have come to this House more than once with plans for supplying standpipes in these areas and I am sure that the number of houses

to one standpipe at the time was more than 15; I want to make that point crystal clear. It is not fair to try to impress upon the public that we are doing one thing for the people in St. Michael and something else for those in the rural districts.

As regards the breakdown of this expenditure asked for by the honourable senior member for the City, I am afraid that I cannot supply it at this stage; if the honourable member insists on having the breakdown I will promise to get it for him. This amount of \$220 covers the cost of affixing the standpipe and the hydrant; in addition to that it must be borne in mind that this is a Government Housing Scheme and not anything connected with the parish, and therefore provision has to be made for the sinking of a well. All the wells at the Pine, Belfield and Deacons Road have been sunk by the Government and the honourable senior member for the City knows that. It is not a question of the parochial authorities coming into this Scheme now; it is a question of installing this standpipe and sinking a well as is done in the case of built-up areas. This is a Government estate and therefore the Government has to supply a well. I hope that this will be the last occasion on which honourable members will suggest that any special care is being taken of the metropolitan parish as against other parishes; even if that were done—the metropolitan parish carries two-fifths of the population and if greater attention were paid to this parish I think that would be well justified.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The point I want to make is this. The honourable Minister has said that the installation of these standpipes is done on a population basis.

Hon. M. E. COX: I have never said that. I said that if you take the number of standpipes as against the population you will see that in certain areas some standpipes are on the deficit while others are in excess.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The honourable member did not use the language which I used, but by implication what I said is the position. He said that you have to take into consideration that two-fifths of the population are in St. Michael and therefore the density of the population makes it incumbent on the Government to erect standpipes in this parish. The substance of what the honourable member said is that the erection of standpipes is done on the basis of population.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I have never said that the question of population is considered in erecting a standpipe; I did not say that we work on a population basis; I said that if you take the population as against the number of standpipes, you will see that some are on the deficit and others are in excess. As a matter of fact, it is only about two months ago that the Engineer produced these figures.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The honourable member said that St. Lucy has more standpipes per head of population than St. Michael. However, all I am saying is that I hope what the honourable member has said is not taken as the method of selection for these standpipes; from what he has said anybody sitting around here would get the impression or would infer that the question of population was considered in this matter of erecting standpipes. It is not that you ignore the population but that should not be the criterion in making selection for standpipes because in certain areas you have a large population but you do not need any standpipes because the areas are built-up areas. You erect a standpipe based on the need of the area and not on the population since in some areas there is a heavy

population but there is no need for a standpipe because people have their own standpipes.

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

SUSPENSION OF RULES 88 AND 89

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker,—I am asking leave to move for the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 in order to deal with the Bill of which I gave notice earlier this afternoon. I must express regret that the Bill has not been printed and circulated, but honourable members have expressed their willingness to deal with this Bill this afternoon. This Bill is in connection with the subsidisation of one all sugar consumed locally. As the crop is coming to a close and there is no more of this sugar on the market, I am asking leave to suspend Rules 88 and 89 so as to deal with this urgent matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that leave be granted the honourable member to move for the suspension of Rules 88 and 89.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: (Sitting). At least we should be treated with the courtesy of knowing what we are going to discuss.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I tried to give a simple description of the Bill. All we are doing in this Bill is this; we are changing the year 1953 to 1954, and as the honourable member knows, the Bill deals with the subsidisation of one grade of locally consumed sugar. It is an annual Bill; I am asking honourable members to look at the matter from the urgency of the situation and deal with this Bill tonight.

There being no objection, leave was granted the honourable member to move for the suspension of the Rules.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to move that Rules 88 and 89 be now suspended.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question that Rules 88 and 89 be now suspended was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. SMITH, Mrs. BOURNE, Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Messrs HOLDER, BRYAN, LEWIS, F. L. WALCOTT, BRANCKER, CRAWFORD, WILLIAMS, J. C. MOTTLEY, MILLER, E. D. MOTTLEY and GODDARD—17.

Noes: Mr. ALLDER—1.

SUGAR INDUSTRY (REHABILITATION, PRICE STABILISATION AND LABOUR WELFARE) (LOCAL CONSUMPTION) BILL, 1954.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas:— To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation Price Stabilisation and Labour Welfare) (Local Consumption) Act, 1952.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker,— This is a simple Bill; it follows the procedure which we have adopted since 1952. Levies are imposed on all locally-consumed sugar and these levies are used for the subsidisation of one grade of sugar. All we are doing in this Bill is to take the year 1953 out of the Act and substitute therefor the year 1954. The levies which will be imposed on locally-consumed sugar amount to \$13.20 per ton; there is a marginal difference of \$3.67 and there is a balance accruing from the Price Stabilisation Fund for last year leaving a total amount of \$185,000. The price of this sugar, Dark Crystals, will be re-

duced from 8½ cents a pound to 7½ cents a pound and 35,000 bags of this sugar will be reduced by 1 cent a pound.

This is the procedure which we adopted since 1952. I regret that I did not put this matter before the House earlier; with the situation facing us where this grade of sugar has disappeared from the market, we are asking honourable members to pass this Bill as an urgent matter to-night.

Some honourable members have hinted as to the absence of cyclo-styled copies of this Bill; however, I have had the approval of members of the Opposition and other members to proceed with this Bill. I therefore beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. MILLER: The honourable Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour seems to have adopted an atmosphere of arrogance. This is something that is thrust on the House and honourable members are anxious to consider it because they understand that it is a matter of importance; but the honourable Minister has reduced the feelings and sympathies of even members of his own party by his ridicule of them when he said that the Government was not concerned with the sympathies of the members of its own party who were sympathetic to the Opposition. Let me tell the honourable Minister that we on this side of the Table function as a party and he has no right referring to members of his party as the Opposition.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The honourable member must not misquote me. I said the Opposition and other members of the House.

Mr. MILLER: The least that the honourable Minister should have done was to consult honourable members in order to obtain their feelings on the matter. We are willing to help the honourable Minister get the measure through the House and I see no reason why he should make such reference.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Sir.—When discussing the adjournment of the House with certain members of the House, I spoke with the Leader of the Opposition and he reminded me of the urgency of this measure. The suggestion came from him that we should deal with it at once. The honourable Leader of the Opposition, who is a merchant, must know the position in this matter and the honourable junior member for St. Philip and some other honourable member from that side of the Table said: "Yes, it is an urgent matter, let us deal with it tonight." It was not the intention of the Government to proceed with it until after the position was put so forcibly.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: I am in sympathy with the honourable Minister, and I want to assure him that he has my sympathy and support. However, there is one point which I want to draw to the attention of the honourable Minister: First of all, I must compliment the Government for its efforts in reducing the subsidised grade of sugar for the people of this colony by one cent, but in doing so, I wish to say that the honourable Minister must in the future see to it that the distribution of this sugar is carried on fairly and squarely, because since last September none of it could be obtained in any of the shops in St. Philip. I am asking him to see to it that during this year this subsidised grade of sugar is distributed equally between the shops in the country districts and those in St. Michael.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am thankful for the explanation which was given by the honourable Minister of Social Services. This matter is more

important than just what the honourable Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour pointed out. He spoke about the reduction and about the subsidy. I can say as much or more on this matter as the honourable Minister. It is true to say that the selling price of sugar has been reduced by £1. 16. 8. per ton but it makes very little difference to the price paid locally for sugar. It is also true to say that after we have sold the sugar that has been negotiated for, we will also have some to sell at world market price which is something like £10 per ton below the negotiated price, and that is what I want to bring to the notice of this House. While this Bill is important, I do not see the reason why the Government should have acceded to the Opposition to deal with this matter hurriedly. I am one of those people who are of the opinion that when you are dealing with the important question of the price of sugar, you should go very thoroughly into it and put it on a firm basis not like the *ad hoc* arrangement which we are doing.

When the price of sugar was increasing it was felt necessary by the Government that you should not ask the local community to pay an increased price annually for sugar simply because the Ministry of Food was paying an increased price for it. It was always suggested that there should be some formula worked out so that the community of Barbados would not have to pay an increased price each time the Ministry of Food paid an increased price. We know what were the objections to that. The objections were that in Barbados if a factory made sugar for local consumption: the owners would still feel that they should obtain a price for it which was based on the negotiated price. They were not concerned with the fact that they would only be called upon to make a dark crystal sugar at 96 polarisation. Yet, it is a fact that in big countries, commodities are manufactured where there is a particular market price for that consumed locally and another price for that exported. In Jamaica and in British Guiana there is a different formula between the sugar made for local consumption and that made for export and the price of the local sugar is stabilised in that way. However, I am not attaching any blame, if there is any, to either the Government, the merchants or any other body of people who deal in this matter.

What I am worried today about is the changing conditions in the industry. The honourable Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour said that what we are doing today is what we did in 1952. But, there has been a change in the conditions since 1952. This is the first year that there has been a reduction in the price of sugar for the last ten years; therefore, the circumstances are not the same today as they were formerly. When there was an increase in the price of sugar paid by the Ministry of Food, the sugar sold locally was subsidised in order to avoid the community being called upon to pay the increased price which was paid by the Ministry of Food, but this year, the price paid by the Ministry of Food has dropped, therefore, there is no question of saying that there is a reduction in the price to be paid locally for subsidised sugar. The subsidy in itself must create the drop. If Government is subsidising it in the same way, then the drop in the price of sugar must bring the price lower down.

What I would like to point to the attention of the Government is not the question of the drop in the price of sugar sold locally nor the question of its subsidy, but whether Government has begun

an examination of the whole question. Locally, we consume about 10,000 to 15,000 tons of sugar annually and we manufacture in the vicinity of 180,000 tons, so you can clearly see that the amount of sugar which we consume locally is small as compared with what we manufacture, therefore, it should not be an insuperable difficulty for the sugar industry to arrive at a formula whereby it could spread the price obtained for sugar sold locally over the whole industry. Why I point this out is because I consider that this is something which the honourable Minister of Trade must use his own intelligence. He must bear in mind that prior to this drop in the price of sugar, there was only one price paid for it. From this year, manufacturers will be forced to take an overall average of the amount of sugar which will be sold at the negotiated price as well as that which will be sold at world market price which is £10 lower than the negotiated price so as to arrive at the average price per ton over the whole industry. I must point out that this is the time when Government must call upon those who are in the industry to look into this question of sugar which is sold locally; Government can afford to take the lead on this occasion. If you are doing something which in itself is right, there is no harm in making a proposition. We must bear in mind the changing conditions; we must bear in mind that there is more than one price at which sugar will be sold. If the honourable Minister of Trade think that this is a simple issue and as simple as it was in 1953, he is mistaken; it is not as simple as it was last year.

With regard to the question of marginal difference, I do not know if all honourable members of this House remember or are aware of how it came about. I will just say for the benefit of those who do not remember that marginal difference only applies to Barbados. There is no island in the West Indies where you can find a marginal difference except in Barbados because of the price formula that is used in this colony and the method in which it is worked out. The reason why you get a marginal difference is because the \$13.20 per ton of sugar which is placed to the Rehabilitation Fund is taken into consideration with the new Commonwealth Agreement. In order that the wages of workers in the industry should not bob up and down, what is known as a marginal price has been created.

What I want to bring forcibly to the minds of honourable members is that this year owing to the fact that there is a drop in the price paid by the Ministry of Food for our sugar, there would have been a drop in some way in the price which local consumers would have to pay for it. It is true to say that the £1. 16. 8. per ton drop by the Ministry of Food would not be as much as to make it a cent per pound lower as the honourable Minister of Trade has announced but it certainly would mean a reduction in the price of sugar sold locally. It is because of that that I make no apology when I say that this is an issue which is very important, particularly at this time when conditions in the industry have changed. Because of that, Government should not tie itself down to any arrangement it made in the past. We should never be forced now to think of subsidising the price of sugar consumed locally so to keep it at a certain level. I feel that the time has come when Government should institute an enquiry into the prices of the various grades of sugar sold locally. I know that it is a sore point when you say that we should not adhere to the principle that the prices of the various grades of sugar sold locally should be tied to the export price. I know what would be the argument of the producer if you

call upon him to make a special sugar for local consumption without giving him the same privilege as those who would be making sugar for export. He is not going to be satisfied in doing so unless he shares in the export price.

Sir, we are dealing with an issue which to-day calls for minute attention. I do not subscribe wholeheartedly to all that the honourable Minister of Trade has said about the issue. It is a more important matter than what the honourable Minister thinks. In my opinion, there is nothing more important to the people in this community than the price which they would be called upon to pay for sugar. The changing factor in the industry means this: we will be exporting more sugar on the free market than what the local community will be consuming, but the local community is asked to pay the same as the negotiated price. Of the 180,000 tons which we expect to produce, there is a guarantee for 130,000 tons to be sold at the negotiated price. It has been stated that British Guiana has fallen short of the amount of sugar it was expected to produce this year and by that 10,000 tons more of the sugar from here will be sold at the negotiated price. This would mean that approximately 40,000 tons will remain, some of which will be required for local consumption and the balance to be sold at world market price. Now, the people who are buying it at the world market price will be getting it at a cheaper price than the people of Barbados will be getting it. We must bear that in mind; therefore, with these changes taking place, we must look into the question more seriously. Of course, some people will hold the view that because of the small amount which is consumed by the people of Barbados, it will make no difference if in order to keep the price down to the local consumer, and in keeping with the negotiated price, the Barbados Government pay a subsidy on the cheapest grade sold locally.

This is not a simple question; it is simple from the point of view of the merchants because they want the sugar to sell. It is a deeper question than just what we are deciding and that is why I do not like the idea of the hurried way in which this House is called upon to deal with the matter. Honourable members should be given sufficient time to give it the study it deserves. This question of sugar is one of the important issues that are discussed at international conferences.

This is not the same question as when we dealt with it in 1952. We had to do something then to keep the price at a certain level for the local consumer. There are changing conditions in the industry now; let us stop at this stage and review the whole situation. Let us ask ourselves a question like this: Do you think by keeping the price at what it was last year and devoting some of the money which we would save from subsidising it owing to the drop in price, to labour welfare such as housing, whether the money would be more usefully spent? Of course, we must bear in mind when asking ourselves that question that the wages of the workers in the industry have been stabilised, so the average worker in the industry is not any worse off owing to this drop in the price of sugar. All these things add to the complexity of the whole situation and that is why I say it is not a simple matter. It may be a simple matter because the merchants are anxious to get this subsidised sugar released for them to sell.

I would therefore admonish the Government that in the future owing to the importance of this question, not to deal with it so hurriedly. It is too vital an issue to be discussed hurriedly. This very day I was discussing the issue but from a

different angle. There are many things that are involved in this issue. I appreciate what the honourable Minister of Social Services has said on the matter but he should bear in mind that the honourable Leader of the Opposition is interested in the matter from a different point of view than what the Government is interested in. Allow me to say that there has been the remark that there is a coalition of some members of the Government's Party with members of the Opposition; but on this issue, it seems to me as if there is a coalition between the Ministers of the Government and the Leader of the Opposition. The honourable Leader of the Opposition is agreeing with the Government to do something because he is interested in the mercantile community who wants this sugar released for sale. So far as the mercantile community is concerned, it is not concerned with whether the poor consumer buy his sugar at $8\frac{1}{2}$ cents or $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound. I would say, even if there is a coalition between the Government and the Opposition on this issue, it needs more investigation. I would therefore advise the honourable Minister of Social Services who is more amenable to reason in my view than any other member of the Government to counsel the other members of the Government to see that this is an issue which calls for early attention to settle the matter in the light of changing conditions. It may so happen that next year the Ministry of Food may make a further reduction in the price of sugar. From all indications this year, from the deliberations of the Food and Agricultural Organisation, there seems to be a greater surplus of sugar this year to be thrown on the world market and if that is so, it would be very difficult to get the Ministry of Food to pay £10 more for sugar than that of the world market price. I am very chary over the matter.

Sir, I hope I have made myself clear on this question. I have been stressing that the local price should be investigated in the light of the decline in the negotiated price as well as that of the world market. I say that because the honourable Minister of Trade in introducing this Bill said that it was a simple matter; it was just doing the same thing as was done in 1952. There are changing factors to what existed in 1952 or in 1953; therefore, the honourable Minister must bear in mind that the position is far different from what it was in 1952.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I am supporting the Bill, but I wish to counsel the honourable Minister of Labour to keep this matter closely under his consideration. I think it was in 1952 that it was pointed out that a subsidy was necessary in order to stabilise the price of sugar that was consumed locally and it was pointed out at the time that it would hardly be applicable in the event that there was a fall in the price. I therefore give my whole-hearted support to this Bill because I see that we are making a subsidy on a sliding scale. Allow me to say that I agree with what the honourable junior member for St. Peter has said in respect of changing factors in the industry. We must bear in mind that a sliding scale in subsidy would not always work to the benefit of the consumer when the merchants are going the other way.

I am supporting the Bill, but again I am counselling the Honourable Minister of Labour to keep this matter under constant consideration.

Mr. GODDARD: I am going to begin by saying that this Bill should have come to this House two months ago and for different reasons than those which have been given by the previous speaker. Let me emphasize at once that what we are doing today

is not a matter of doing something for the merchants; it is something which we are doing for the benefit of the consumers. The price of sugar, as we all know, has fallen by 32 cents per 100 pounds, therefore, it is expected that the local prices of all grades of sugar will be reduced by half-cent per pound.

According to the honourable Minister of Labour, Government had proposed to reduce the price paid by the consumer by one cent per pound which he said would mean that Government is subsidising the cheapest grade of sugar by half-cent more than last year; but according to the honourable Minister, while last year, Government subsidised 38,260 bags of sugar, it will only be subsidising 35,000 bags this year.

Sir, it is fortunate that Government has brought down this Bill so late this year. Last year as early as in December, you could not get one pound of brown sugar to buy in the shops in Bridgetown because by subsidising it, you created a greater demand for it than the other grades of sugar. I am firmly of the opinion that if Government from the beginning had taken off the levies on the various grades of sugar, and allowed them to meet with their real value, I do not think it would have been necessary to bring in this Bill annually. All sugars would have been reduced by taking off the levy off them. Government has taken the money which it receives from the levy and subsidised the cheapest grade of sugar with the result that Government has thrown that grade out of balance to the others. When this brown sugar is released at $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound, it will be so much desired that you must get a rush for it and it will soon be gone again.

I would point out to Government that there is a natural tendency nowadays for people to buy the better quality products. They are buying the clear sugars and from all appearances, they want to continue to do that. If that is so, why continue to subsidise this one grade of sugar when it is not exactly the grade that the people want? They are only buying it because it is sold at a far lower price than the other grades. However, I am anxious to see brown sugar released so that the people can get it from the various shops. This brown sugar should have been available to the people since the beginning of the crop in February; it is now late in May, and as we have heard, the last lot of last year's crop was sold out since December last. From that, we can see that we are really only subsidising brown sugar for seven of the twelve months of the year. Of course, that is the reason why Government has got more money from the levy by which it would subsidise less sugar. The circumstances are exactly the opposite to what the honourable junior member for St. Peter pointed out. The merchants are not anxious to see this Bill here; they are anxious to have the sugar released for sale.

As far as I have been made to understand, Government fixed the price at which this sugar should be sold more than two months ago but this Bill has only now reached this House. Tuesday after Tuesday, I have been enquiring of the honourable Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour when would this Bill be introduced, and on each occasion, I have been told that it was not yet ready. On the last occasion, I was told that it was in the Attorney General's Office. I have been pressing the honourable Minister to bring this Bill down, not because it is so much in the interest of the merchants, but because I know the people want to get this subsidised sugar to buy.

I am going to sit down with the assurance that this Bill will be passed but I am warning the

Government that the whole system of subsidisation needs investigating. I know that there is stress in this House along that line. I feel that the money used in subsidisation could be better used to the benefit of the people if it were used for some other purpose. I think the whole policy of Government with regard to subsidisation needs reviewing and I hope in the coming year we will have some Select Committee set up to examine the possibility of using this money we set by for subsidization to greater advantage.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say, lest it is felt that I have abandoned my policy in not supporting the dealing with measures on the same day that they have been introduced in this House, that I have not abandoned such policy of mine, but I agreed and voted in favour of proceeding with this Bill in all its stages today purely because of the urgency of the matter. The honourable Leader of the House said that I agreed to it; so did I, because I realise that it is a rather pressing matter owing to the fact that the honourable Leader of the Opposition for the past two or three weeks was enquiring about it to get that grade of sugar released to the various shops. As soon as I heard the honourable junior member for St. Philip remarked that people in St. Philip were unable to get any of it since September and realising that the crop was nearly over, I decided that I should vote to allow the Bill to be proceeded with today. I repeat that I have not abandoned my policy which is disagreeing with a measure being given notice of and discussed on the same day. I feel that honourable members should always be given the opportunity of studying it. With respect to this Bill, it is in the interest of the general public that we should proceed with it in all its stages today. I hope I have satisfied the honourable senior member for St. John. Again, Sir, when it comes to Government asking this House to deal with measures at late hours in the night, I shall always vote 'No.'

The honourable Leader of the Opposition has fully explained this matter; he has pointed out that it has nothing to do with the merchants and I agree with him.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I am one who is very disappointed over the fact that this matter is discussed to-night and at such short notice because I feel it is a matter of such importance that honourable members should have had some time to consider it before finally disposing of it. Several of the points raised by the honourable junior member for St. Peter have been raised before in this House from this side of the Table, but apart from that, there is that after a time the subsidised sugar became the disclosure tonight that in several parishes since September last year, none of this subsidised sugar was available and the honourable junior member for Christ Church has said that some of it was available in the City up to February this year. The honourable junior member for Christ Church is a wholesale merchant and probably, he regulated his distribution of that grade of sugar in such a way as to ensure that his business maintained supplies of it until February. However, it is surprising that in the rural parishes none of it was available since September last year. Where did it go to? What I think happened is that after a time the subsidised sugar became the unsubsidised sugar and people were forced to pay 11½ cents per pound for sugar which could have been sold at subsidised rates; therefore, I am in entire agreement with the honourable junior member for Christ Church that the entire matter needs investigation. In view of that, there is no point of putting

this subsidy on only a certain grade of sugar, if that grade would not be available in the quantity expected. According to the statements made on this Bill, since September last, you could not get a pound of it to buy in the country shops but some of it was available in town up to February. As I view the matter, it would be far better if we remove the subsidy on the brown sugar and let all grades of sugar find their price levels on the market. I do not think we will be working any great hardship on the community if we remove that subsidy. Whether we subsidise it or not, it is not going to be available to the members of the community for any length of period.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, the trouble with sugar started as far back as 1947 and I think it was an unfortunate day that I happened to be out of the island because, I am sure, if I were present, the whole course would be entirely different from what it is now. I am bold enough to say that, I was the only member who knew what was happening in the matter at that time. In 1952 when the price of sugar continued to rise, I suggested what I considered would have been a good remedy and that was to abandon the levy on the sugar for local consumption but what was done was to take the levy and subsidise the cheapest grade of sugar. I am very glad to hear the speech tonight by the honourable junior member for St. Peter because I think that he in his key position in the sugar industry might be able to get this view of taking off the levy on sugar for consumption accepted. In my opinion, the method which is adopted for subsidising the cheapest grade of sugar for the people is wrong. And it is very hard to change your method after you have started doing things in a particular way. So long as a body of human beings start to do anything a particular way, they will go ahead and produce argument that will justify their actions; they never like to undo anything that they have started.

In 1952, when the price of sugar again went up, honourable members asked the Government what it was going to do about it and after deciding upon it for a very long time, Government came to the House very late in the year with the Bill which we are amending now. Government was so late with the measure that it apologised for its lateness. Well Sir, in 1953, the same thing occurred. At any rate, I have discovered to-night why this Bill comes so late to this House. As far as theory I claim to know as much of this matter as anybody else although I have no practical experience. The reason why it is brought so late is that Government can tell you that it has reduced the price by one cent but in truth and fact, the sugar will only be subsidised for five months. Subsidization of this grade of sugar will start from June instead of from the beginning of January.

I am going to mention the following matter in order to draw it to the notice of the honourable Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour. There is a system of quoting the price of molasses to sugar, but it should be done on the same method as is done in relating the foreign price to the local price for sugar. The two things are on all fours. The same method should be used so that if the sugar producers get something more, the syrup producers should also get something more.

I feel that the Government should start from the very day that this Bill is passed to deal with that which it intends to bring down next year so that it will have a long time in deciding what it is going to do. Government should decide at once whether the price of sugar goes up or down what is its policy with regard to the levy. I have no doubt that the honour-

able Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour will be quite willing to listen to anything that is said along these lines though it is not a matter for him alone to decide. I do hope that he will intensify his efforts in this direction and get matters settled once and for all.

I think some deference should be paid to honourable members' wishes when it comes to proceeding with measures when there is objection. However, this Bill seeks to add the words "one thousand, nine hundred and fifty-four" to the 1953 Bill which added the words "one thousand, nine hundred and fifty-three" to the 1952 Bill. The words "one thousand nine hundred and fifty-three" have been deleted from this Bill. The right way to amend it was to add the words "one thousand, nine hundred and fifty-four" to the 1953 Bill.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I would just like to say that what the honourable Leader of the Opposition said with regard to subsidization having something to do with the sale of brown sugar is correct and not what the honourable junior member for St. Peter said with regard to it.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I never said that subsidization had nothing at all to do with it. As the honourable junior member for Christ Church has said, I said that the price of sugar to be sold locally would fall this year because it was tied to the negotiated export price which had fallen.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The price of sugar has fallen by almost half-cent per pound. Added to that Government is now subsidising the sugar which is to be sold this year locally to the extent of another half-cent more than it did last year. That is the actual position. We are also subsidising less bags. The changeover to Ministerial Government added further delay in dealing with this matter. When the matter first came before me, I raised the question about mixing sugar and the fact that sometimes you could not get the subsidised sugar. I went into this matter very thoroughly, but I found out that if we changed the basis on which we were acting on this occasion we would have probably thrown the whole thing out of gear, by having to start so late this year. Even though I may favour a change under the present system, perhaps by abandoning the levy, I cannot do it now. I may say that I am not satisfied with the system which operates at present and I ordered an enquiry into the matter and that too contributed to the delay. I give my promise to the House that next year I would act early in the matter whether it be that we decide to follow this same basis or abandon the system.

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

On motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

It reads as follows:—

(2) Section two of the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Wel-

fare) (Local Consumption) Act, 1952, is hereby amended by deleting the words "and one thousand, nine hundred and fifty-three" appearing therein and substituting therefor the following:—

"to one thousand, nine hundred and fifty-four inclusive."

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I was saying just now that there are Acts in this Island similar to this. When they are amended for the particular year, all that is necessary is to add the particular year to the other years that are set out under the Section. That is necessary is to add the particular year to the other what the 1953 Bill did. It did not delete 1952. I have no doubt that is the right way to do it. Now after the words "one thousand, nine hundred and fifty-two" you see the words "one thousand, nine hundred and fifty-four."

Hon. R. G. MAPP: For the benefit of the honourable member who raised the question in respect of the amendment of writing in the words "one thousand, nine hundred and fifty-four" last year, the words "one thousand nine hundred and fifty-three" were written in when making the amendment. However, it does seem as if the method we are adopting on this occasion is the correct one.

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

On motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: In fixing the Order Paper, Item No. 1 should be "To move the House in Committee of Supply"; Item No. 11 of today's Order Paper should be Item No. 2 and Item No. 1 should be Item 3. The honourable Premier told me on leaving the island that he expects to return in time for the next meeting of this House which will be on Tuesday, 1st June, and on that occasion he proposes to deal with consideration of the report of the London Conference on Federation. I am therefore fixing that as Item No. 4. The rest of the Items of the Order Paper will follow in the order that they are now.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, I am asking permission to remove Item No. 6 of Private Members' Business standing in my name from the Order Paper.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day fortnight at 3 o'clock p.m.

Hon. M. E. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1953—54

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 1st June, 1954.

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*), Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*), Hon. C. E. TALMA (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*), Hon. R. G. MAPP (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*), Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS (*Deputy Speaker*), Mr. L. E. SMITH, (*Chairman of Committees*), Mr. F. C. GODDARD, (*Leader of the Opposition*), Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER, Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN and Mrs. E. E. BOURNE.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meetings which were held on the 10th, 11th and 16th March and on the 13th and 27th April, 1954, respectively, having been circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

Mr. HAYNES entered the House and took his seat.

MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Honourable Legislative Council the following:—

The Legislative Council

To

The Honourable the House of Assembly

The Legislative Council have the honour to return to the Honourable the House of Assembly the Bill intituled an Act to make better provision for local government in the Island which has been passed with amendments which are shown written on the Bill.

H. A. CUKE,

Senior Member Presiding.

Legislative Council Chamber,
11th May, 1954

LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR DEPUTY CLERK

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Deputy Clerk of the House the following letter:—

14 James Street,
Bridgetown,
Barbados, B.W.I.
1st June, 1954

His Honour K. N. R. Husbands,
Speaker of the House of Assembly,
Public Buildings.

Sir,

I respectfully make application for leave for me today from my duties as Deputy Clerk of the General Assembly.

Mr. D. A. Banfield, Solicitor, has, subject to the approval of the Honourable House, kindly consented to act for me.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

H. LISLE THOMAS,

Deputy Clerk.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that leave be granted to the Deputy Clerk for the day's sitting.

Hon. M. E. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Mr. D. A. Banfield be appointed to act as Deputy Clerk for the day's sitting.

Hon. M. E. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. ALLDER and Mr. CRAWFORD entered the House and took their seats.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: On behalf of the honourable Premier, I beg to lay Message No. 15/1954 from His Excellency the Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly regarding the establishment of an Advisory Police Board.

The Message reads as follows:—

His Excellency the Governor

To

The Honourable the House of Assembly

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to refer to paragraph 14 of the Acting Governor's despatch to the Secretary of State for the Colonies,

No. 303 of the 30th of April, 1953, and to paragraph 7 of the Secretary of State's reply in his despatch No. 334 of the 24th August, 1953, both of which were contained in His Excellency's Message to the Honourable the House of Assembly No. 25/1953 of the 3rd of November, 1953, on the subject of the establishment of an Advisory Police Board.

His Excellency wishes to inform the Honourable House of Assembly that he proposes to establish the Police Board administratively in the first instance. In accordance with the Acting Governor's despatch referred to above, the Board will have the duty of advising the Premier, who will be its Chairman, on all the non-operational aspects of Police administration which are by enactment the concern of the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

R. D. H. ARUNDELL,
Governor.

Government House,
Bridgetown.

18th May, 1954.

(M.P.—C. 419)

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Also Message No. 16/1954 from His Excellency the Governor to the honourable the House of Assembly conveying Her Majesty the Queen's thanks for the Message of loyalty and devotion to the Throne passed by the Honourable House on 18th of May.

The Message reads as follows:—

*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 the Address passed by the Honourable House on the 18th of May has been submitted to Her Majesty The Queen through the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies, who has been commanded by The Queen to convey to the Members of the Honourable House Her Majesty's warm thanks for their Message of loyalty and devotion to the Throne on the occasion of her safe return to the United Kingdom.

R. D. H. ARUNDELL,
Governor.

Government House,
Bridgetown.

27th May, 1954.

(M.P.—5717)

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to lay the Sixteenth Annual Report of the Peasants' Loan Bank for the year June, 1952 to May, 1953.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS entered the House and took his seat.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. M. E. COX:—Resolution to approve the Book of Reference and Plan of the proposed extension of the Waterworks in the parish of St. Lucy.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS:—Resolution to approve the exchange by the Executive Committee of 5,036 sq. ft. of land at the corner of Probyn Street and Jordan's Lane for 5,628 sq. ft. of land, the property of Caribbean Theatres Limited, situated due east of the present city bus terminal on Probyn Street.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS:—Resolution to place the sum of \$26,577 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates

1954—55, Part II — Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1954—55 No. 5 which forms the schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS:—Resolution to place the sum of \$2,032 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1954—55 Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1954—55 No. 6 which forms the schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS:—Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921.

Hon. R. G. MAPP:—Bill to amend the Rum Duty Act, 1906.

Hon. R. G. MAPP:—Bill to amend the Merchandise Marks Act, 1949.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply to deal with the money resolutions of which notice was given earlier today.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

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

*The House Of Assembly
To*

His Excellency The Governor

The House of Assembly desire to draw the attention of Your Excellency to the following:—

1. That there is a great need and an urgent demand for the establishment in the parish of St. Philip of a Secondary School which would serve the parish and the adjacent parishes as well.

2. That the parish of St. Philip is the largest area in the island and the most easterly and children from all over the parish are forced to travel long distances daily — in some cases thirty-six (36) miles — in order to attend Secondary Schools in St. Michael; children are compelled to leave home as early as 7.30 in the morning and do not return until around 6 in the evening; that these long hours spent daily in transport leave them but little time for study and recreation and that many are forced, through the inability of their parents to provide it, to go the whole day without a proper hot meal; and that it is a serious financial embarrassment to many parents who are endeavouring to give their children a secondary education to have to provide, in some cases, as much as thirty dollars (\$30.00) per month per child for transport to school and a hot meal in town.

3. That the Education Act 1890 — 64 years ago — contemplated the establishment of a Secondary School in every parish of the island. It is high time that steps be taken to implement its provisions in this respect.

4. That the Directors of the \$25,000 Hutchinson Education Trust Fund are willing to co-operate to whatever extent the Legislature will permit for the utilization of the said Fund in such a manner as to make the proposal for a Second Grade School in the parish a reality.

5. That in respect of paragraph 4, it is noteworthy to recall that the Christ Church Foundation School which was converted into a Second Grade School was originally established as a result of the Williams Trust Fund.

6. That the educational needs of the parish make the establishment of a Secondary School an urgent necessity, and that a great boon could be conferred on the parishes of Christ Church, St. John, St. George and St. Philip by a change in the Gov-

ernment's decision to use the new building which is being erected at the recently acquired Admiralty land at Six Roads as an Elementary School and to erect a Secondary School from the outset.

7. That the parish is already well served with Elementary Schools. In close proximity to the said Admiralty Land — in fact, within a radius of a mile or so — are situated the following Primary Schools: Church Village Boys' and Girls'; St. Martin's Boys' and Girls'; Beulah Boys' and Girls'; Four Roads Junior School, and Ebenezer Boys' and Girls'.

Mr. CRAWFORD: And of the following:—

*The House Of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Governor*

The House of Assembly desire to draw to the attention of Your Excellency the fact that there is an acute shortage of labour at the present time in the Dominion of Canada and that both industry and agriculture are urgently in need of additional labour forces.

2. The House desire specifically to emphasize that, due in part, to the tremendous hydro-electric development which has been effected in recent times by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario, farmers in the Niagara belt and in Southern Ontario are experiencing the utmost difficulty in getting crops reaped by the early autumn and that the labour shortage is also being keenly felt during the grain harvest in the West. Organisations of agriculturists in both these areas are clamouring for assistance to relieve the situation and would welcome migrant labour during harvest time.

3. The House would emphasize that there are definite prospects for the temporary emigration of appreciable numbers of both men and women to Canada during the summer and early autumn, and are convinced that Your Excellency should head a delegation which should depart for Canada as expeditiously as possible in order to take advantage of the position.

4. The House would also remind Your Excellency of the possibilities presented by Trans Canada Airlines for cheap transport under special charter.

Mr. Speaker I beg to give notice of my intention to proceed with this Address later in the day.

Mr. BARROW: I beg to give notice of the following: Bill to deal with the adoption of children.

QUESTIONS

Mr. WILLIAMS: To enquire of the Minister of Education.

What are the qualifications if any, of the present acting holder of the post of Domestic Science Mistress at Queen's College?

2. What considerations led to the acting appointment of the present holder in view of the fact that they were other applicants more suitably qualified?

Mr. CRAWFORD: To enquire of the Minister of Trade, Industry and Commerce:

What is the total amount of U.S. dollars for imports allocated to Barbados under the Token Import Scheme which commenced to operate in 1951?

2. How many persons and/or firms qualify for quotas under the scheme?

3. Has the entire amount allocated to Barbados during the years 1951-53 been expended?

4. If the answer to Question 3 above be in the negative

(a) what was the amount of dollars which remained unused?

(b) why were they unused?

(c) were these unused dollars allocated and who were the persons and/or firms who failed to use their total allocations?

Mr. CRAWFORD: To enquire of the Minister of Works:

Will the Minister of Works please state why no provision was made for the installation of the scheduled two standposts in the parish of St. Philip last year?

2. Is Government aware that St. Philip was one of the two parishes which obtained no additional standposts last year?

3. Will the Government take steps to have four standposts installed in the parish this year in order that the normal ratio of installations may be maintained?

4. If the answer to No. 2 above be in the negative, why not?

Mr. HOLDER: To enquire of the Minister of Social Services:

Is Government aware that persons subjected to the disability of blindness are not qualified to receive Government pensions, under the Old Age Pension Act until they shall have attained the age of 40 years?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will Government consider reviewing the basis on which these pensions are paid, with a view to reducing the present qualifying age to 21?

Mr. HOLDER: To enquire of the Minister of Social Services:

Is Government aware that under the Old Age Pension Act persons permanently incapacitated are not entitled to receive pensions until they shall have attained the age of 65 years?

2. Will Government see fit to revise the present qualifying age so as to render assistance to a greater number of deserving persons who may have rendered valuable service to this island by reducing the qualifying age to 40 years?

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: To enquire of the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour:

Is Government aware that a large number of engineer mechanics and other factory workers were not able to find employment during this crop season because of the closing down of a good many factories?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will Government as soon as possible consider instituting an eight hour shift instead of the twelve hour shift in use at present in all existing factories, so that a good many of these unemployed engineers and factory workers can find some employment in the next coming crop season?

Mr. GODDARD: To enquire:—

Is the Minister of Transport aware of the grave dissatisfaction that exists in the villages of St. David and Edey in the parish of Christ Church due to the inadequate bus services supplying these villages?

Will the Minister have an early investigation made with a view to remedying the matter?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. R. G. Mapp, seconded by Hon. C. E. Talma, the Bill to amend the Rum Duty Act, 1906, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. R. G. Mapp, seconded by Hon. C. E. Talma, the Bill to amend the Merchandise Marks Act, 1949, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, the Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921, was read a first time.

STATEMENT BY. HON. M. E. COX

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, At the last meeting of the House, the honourable senior member for the City asked for a breakdown of the \$210.62 which was voted for the installation of standpipes at Clincketts, St. Lucy.

The breakdown is as follows:—

One 3" Hydrant	\$ 71.90
One 3" Hydrant Box	27.15
One 3" Special	10.00
One 3" Collar	5.00
One Hydrant Ring and Bolts	1.90
One 3" x 3" C.I. Branch	13.28
One 3 x 1/4 Bend	1.90
12 pts. Oil	.48
30 lbs. Lead	7.20
1 1/2 lbs. Yarn	.48
Labour and Cartage	34.00
10% Contingencies	17.33
22 yds. Half-inch Pipe for Standposts	30.00
Total	\$210.62

Your Honour will recall that not long ago I asked permission to make a statement relative to remarks made by the honourable senior member for St. Lucy and the honourable senior member for St. Philip during consideration of this very item. The two honourable members insinuated that I was actually using my position to get more public standpipes for the parish of St. Michael than any other parish.

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: I hope the honourable Minister would not overstep his grounds. The honourable Minister has simply asked permission to lay a statement. I hope you will not indulge in any remarks other than that of laying the statement because no honourable member is allowed the right to reply.

Hon. M. E. COX: Oh no. Sir. I have just brought the figures to show this House the distribution of the 827 public standposts in this island in order to satisfy the public that whatever was done was done without partiality.

I am taking the opportunity also to state the number of the population in the various parishes and the number of standposts that should be erected according to the basis of population.

The distribution is as follows:—

<i>Christ Church:</i> Population 28,620			
No. of standposts	No. required per population basis		Deficit
86	129		43
<i>St. Philip:</i> Population 17,580			
No. of standposts	No. required per population basis		Deficit
60	80		20
<i>St. George:</i> Population 17,160			
No. of standposts	No. required per population basis		Deficit
65	78		13
<i>St. Joseph:</i> Population 9,960			
No. of standposts	No. required per population basis	In excess	
62	45	17	

St. John: Population 11,520

No. of standposts	No. required per population basis	In excess
53	52	1

St. Andrew: Population 8,520

No. of standposts	No. required per population basis	In excess
58	39	19

St. Peter: Population 10,720

No. of standposts	No. required per population basis	In excess
58	49	9

St. Lucy: Population 8,520

No. of standposts	No. required per population basis	In excess
61	39	22

St. Thomas: Population 9,960

No. of standposts	No. required per population basis	In excess
55	45	10

St. James: Population 13,820

No. of standposts	No. required per population basis	Deficit
58	60	2

St. Michael: Population 88,880

No. of standposts	No. required per population basis	Deficit
211	327	116

Now Sir, I would now like to make a statement relative to the distribution of standposts erected throughout the island during the years 1950 to 1954. The total number of standposts erected is 92.

The distribution is as follows:—

St. Michael 13, Christ Church 11, St. Philip 4, St. George 8, St. Joseph 7, St. John 10, St. Andrew 9, St. Peter 6, St. Lucy 11, St. Thomas 5 and St. James 8.

The last thing which I would like to make a statement on is the number of public standposts at the various housing schemes to which reference was made by honourable members.

At the Bay Estate there are 1,440 houses and 20 standposts which mean that there is a distribution of one standpost per 72 houses. In St. Lucy the distribution is one standpost per 15 houses.

At the Pine Estate, there are 47 houses to two standposts in the developed area (in one section there are 14 houses to one standpost and the other section there are 27 houses to one standpost). In addition, 80 houses have individual water services. There is also in process of development another area for which six standposts have been approved. Two of these six standposts have already been installed. When this area is fully developed there will be 180 houses.

Mr. BRANCKER and Mr. BRYAN entered the House and took their seats.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: The first order of the day stands in the name of the honourable Minister of Social Services: To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the colony.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1954—55, No. 4.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, This resolution is for the sum of \$6,248 to be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1954-55, Part II—Capital. Honourable members will remember that sometime last year, a resolution was before the House for the sum of \$8,274 to complete the electrical installations at Seawell Airport. That resolution gave all the information in detail with respect to the various items required. I do not think it is necessary for me to repeat those items in detail as this resolution is a revote of part of that sum.

The notes accompanying the items under the resolution are as follows:—

1. In supplementary Estimates, 1953—54, No. 13, an amount of \$8,274 was revoted for completing the electrical installation at Seawell Airport. Work did not commence until 15th March, 1954, as the material required was not available at an earlier date. Consequently it was only possible to spend \$2,026.10 by the end of the financial year, leaving a balance of \$6,247.90 for which a revote is required to complete the work.

2. The amount of \$97,755 has been paid in respect of natural gas plant transferred to the Natural Gas Corporation in accordance with the provisions of Section 17 of the Natural Gas Corporation Act, 1950.

3. The amount of \$52,025 is being paid in settlement of claims for compensation under Section 8 of the Petroleum Act, 1950, in respect of certain gas wells at Turner Hall Plantation.

I beg to move that this resolution do now pass.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I must say that I do not understand the resolution in front of me. In the schedule to this resolution, besides the \$6,248 for which we are to vote, there are the sums of \$97,755 and \$52,025 which I see are under the Head "Authorised by Law" and the items to which these are set out are respectively "Item 11 (New) Compensation under Section 17 of the Natural Gas Corporation Act 1950" and "Item 12 (New) Compensation under Section 8 of the Petroleum Act, 1950." Now, these respective amounts are only authorised by law; they are not fixed by law. If we pass this resolution, we automatically mean that a sum amounting to almost \$150,000 is also to be taken out of the Public Treasury under this resolution. It seems to me as if something is radically wrong; at least, some explanation would have to be given on that point before this House can vote for the resolution. It is true to say that the taking over of the gas wells and compensation for the petroleum are authorised by law but, nevertheless, the amount of money has to be voted; the money has to be appropriated by this House. We are passing a resolution for \$6,248; what is the object of putting the amounts for the other purposes in this resolution? It is difficult for me to understand and it seems to me to be entirely wrong.

This is capital expenditure that we have to deal with from available funds and it is made up in the Estimates in an entirely different manner from how it is set out here. This resolution was not circulated, so far as I am concerned, until today. I did not get my copy through the regular channel. If Your Honour would give me a little opportunity I would add the various amounts — the two amounts that are under the column "authorised by law" and that to be voted. They amount to \$156,028; therefore, when we pass this resolution we are really passing a resolution

for that amount instead of \$6,248. Let me repeat that everything "authorised by law" has to be voted by this House in Committee of Supply and that was properly threshed out when we were dealing with the last Annual Estimates. I must warn Your Honour that if this resolution is passed in this manner, I will have to bring it to the notice of Mr. Speaker. I am drawing to your attention and the attention of the Auditor General that this House will not be voting for the \$149,880 under the head "authorised by law," therefore it will be illegal to take it out of the Treasury. The honourable Minister in charge of the resolution should say that he is not considering that amount and ask for leave to delete it from the schedule. However, I would like to hear what the honourable Minister has to say about the matter.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman,—The other sums and the purpose for which they are required are only set down in the schedule for information, so to speak. What is properly before this Committee is a resolution for the sum of \$6,248 for the purpose set out. If you look at the schedule, you will see that that amount is under the column "to be voted," while the other amounts are not under that column. As I have said, they were only put in for information, so to speak.

Mr. LEWIS: But that money has to be paid out, so it must come before this Committee.

Hon. M. E. COX: It has already been paid out; it is authorised by law.

Mr. LEWIS: I see what has happened. Now that they have paid this money out they have brought it down to get it appropriated by the House. They have gone into the Treasury without our consent and taken it out. Sir, you cannot even take the amount for salaries which are 'voted by law' out of the Treasury without coming here and getting the amount for them appropriated at the beginning of the financial year. The money has to be appropriated for every one of them unless that money which is taken out for such things as are paid on the authority of the Act. This House knows nothing about this money which has been stated by the honourable Minister to have been paid out already. Not only that, Mr. Chairman, but if you read the notes accompanying the items, you will see that some explanation has to be given. According to the Act, this money carries interest at a particular rate and honourable members should be told how long that money was bearing interest.

Sir, there are three explanations given—one to every item under the Schedule. There are three notes set down; so you would not be able to say that Government did not apprise you over what was happening. The Legislature must appropriate this money before it is paid out. If those in authority have found out that they have done wrong by paying it out without our authority, let them correct it in some other way; do not let them slip it in here and say that it is only put in for information, so to speak. Everything that is authorised by law must be put in another Act; it must be put inside a financial Act.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I too did not understand this resolution from the beginning. I was making enquiries over on this side of the table as to the reason why there should be this new departure of informing the House of something that has taken place. Should we not have known before? I feel that an explanation must come from the Government. If we are only called on to vote for \$6,248 as set out for the first item, and we are not dealing with the other items under Head VII—Miscellaneous, I would suggest that they be deleted from the schedule. What

is the object of setting them down in the schedule when we do not have to vote for them? I have never seen it done before and I would like someone with more experience to tell me something more about it.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY entered the Committee and took his seat.

Mr. LEWIS: When the honourable Minister replies, I would also like him to tell me what capital expenditure is authorised by law. Nobody would have expected after the debate we had in this House on the Estimates for 1954—55 that the financial advisers of the Government would have sent down something to this House for information which although might be authorised by law is nothing that has been voted by the House. It is ridiculous. So far as I can understand from the Act, a resolution should come to this House to authorise the paying out of the Treasury of the sums of money which are set down as "authorised by law," because the Act particularly states that whether the Natural Gas Corporation has that money at its disposal or not, the money has to be guaranteed out of the Treasury; it can be paid back otherwise.

Sir, I cannot understand this resolution at all. This matter has to be taken up at higher level. This is a case which this House debated for hours during discussion on the last Annual Estimates. Do you mean to tell me that because the debates on the Estimates have not been printed yet that nobody communicated with the Financial Secretary on the matter to let him know the feelings of the House. They have deliberately changed the form in which capital expenditure was made out. Mr. Chairman, if you look at the supplementary Estimates for Capital Expenditure, you will see that they are not made up in the way that this schedule is made up. I do not know where they are going to fit in this schedule.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable Minister of Communications claims that this money—those amounts set out in the column "authorised by law" under the schedule to this resolution—has been paid out already. The note to Item No. 2 says that the amount of \$97,755 has been paid in respect of natural gas plant transferred to the Natural Gas Corporation in accordance with the provisions of Section 17 of the Natural Gas Corporation Act, 1950; and the note to Item No. 3 says that the amount of \$52,025 is being paid in settlement of claims for compensation under Section 8 of the Petroleum Act, 1950, in respect of certain gas wells at Turner Hall Plantation; so, according to the notes, both have not been paid yet. I am not yet touching on the point as to whether or not the Government has been authorised to pay that money; I am only stating that the information given in the notes and the information given by the honourable Minister responsible for the resolution are entirely different from each other. We are waiting, apparently, to hear what is the real explanation for the appearance of the resolution as it is today. It is not enough to come in here today with something which obviously needs explanation and say nothing about it and then, probably about three or four weeks from now, come in and keep back the House with a long statement over the matter. Sometime ago, the suggestion was made that the Permanent Secretaries of the Ministers should be allowed to sit somewhere inside the House but it seems to me that this House would be better if the Permanent Secretaries of the Ministers fill the chairs of the Ministers and let the Ministers stand outside, because if we cannot get the information which we want from the Ministers when we ask for it, but all that we can get is a statement from them later, then we very well can transfer the position and put the Permanent Secretaries inside the House and the Ministers outside.

Sir, it is not easy for any honourable member to take up this resolution and say what it is. If the Government wanted to make a statement or wanted to inform the Legislature that compensation was being paid to the B.U.O.C., it does not appear to me as if this should be the place for it. Whether or not, as the honourable junior member for the City has said, the payment of this compensation is authorised by law, does that mean that the \$149,880 should be paid out without any previous reference to the Legislature? We do not do it that way with our capital expenditure. I challenge any honourable member to peruse the Estimates and pick out any item "authorised by law" and see whether this procedure is valid and on all fours. It is assumed that honourable members are acquainted with both Acts and the methods of payment under each and if honourable members are so acquainted, then they know that the manner in which the information has been divulged to this House has nothing to do with the question. If this is not a precedent honourable members should be told that they are making fools of themselves. I have never seen anything like it during my time in this House and I do feel that some further explanation is necessary. Do not merely say that it is put under this resolution for information. Of course, we have got accustomed to statements being made on certain things after they are dealt with in this Chamber. One thing I would like to know. The honourable introducer of the resolution said that the amounts of money have been paid already; the notes say something different. What is right? Is the honourable member right or are the notes to the resolution right? There is another thing on which I would like to know something. Why should there be this manner of informing the House about this matter?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, when I read this resolution, I too thought that this Committee would have been given some explanation over it. This is a new departure. Let us say that we of the Opposition were the Government and the members of the Government were in our position and we brought down this resolution, obviously, members of the Government would demand the right to know why should there be this new departure. There must be some reason; do not merely say it is just done for information. It is not true. Mr. Chairman, when I see stupid things like this resolution, I make enquiries. This is a stupid way of doing things, therefore, do not think we on this side of the House are a bunch of fools. I am not attributing any other motive for setting out this resolution as it is than the proper motive. I am awaiting the answer. You are in duty bound to give the correct explanation. You are not merely dealing with a few members on this side of the Chamber; even those persons who support you would like you to explain something you did if they did not understand it; therefore, it is your duty to give the explanation to this resolution. I am sure that not one honourable member belonging to your party outside of the Government can plead any knowledge of this resolution, but they seem to be afraid to ask you why it is set down in this manner. Sir, I am convinced that even some of the Ministers are ignorant on this matter. Mr. Chairman, you know as well as I do that you are ignorant over it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member should not be personal.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman.—I am sure the answer is forthcoming and I attribute proper motives to it being done that way; although I do not think that the resolution was the proper place to set out that information. I await

the answer and I am sure the honourable Premier would give it. At times, the honourable Premier becomes stubborn in giving an explanation because he wants to see whether you are acquainted with the true facts; at other times he becomes stubborn because he wants to try out members of his party to see how they would vote.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I was born stubborn. (Laughter).

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Sir, we know that he was away a few weeks ago; therefore, it is likely that he is not acquainted with the reason for this change. I do think that if the honourable junior member for St. James were in his place, there would be some drawn out argument on this matter. However I believe one of the Ministers can give the answer and I await it.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, only because I am, so to speak, Minister of Finance that I intervene in this matter. The explanation to this resolution is very simple. Sometimes these things happen because we take, as we should, the criticisms of honourable members too seriously. It has been constantly said that owing to the way in which Estimates are made up, you are not conscious of the real financial position of this colony. Certainly, during last year, Government has fallen on the plan, apart from the suggestion by Professor Beasley, of making available in every estimate of expenditure, every single financial transaction of the Government, both 'authorised by law' and 'fixed by law' so that every honourable member should know every single transaction. Because this resolution affects capital expenditure, the opportunity has been seized, just as if these were original Estimates, and you wanted to show your revenue and expenditure, to show what has taken place since the last Estimates. The House is being informed over what is taking place just as if these supplementary estimates were original estimates. Can any explanation be simpler? Honourable members have asked: "Why have you done this?" Government says: "it has done it this way purely for information." This resolution is done in this manner so as to give honourable members information; we put that information in just as if it were the annual estimates and it would have been put in. All that honourable members are asked to vote today is the amount that is in the column "to be voted."

Sir, Government is doing the very thing that it has been told to do when it put in this information. Government has been asked on many occasions to state exactly what is the financial position of the colony and that is all it is doing. It would not be put in the next annual estimates as it is now; all that you will see is a lump sum paid out. The reason for all this debate is purely because the Government has made the mistake of giving too much information. When you give too little information, you are accused of giving no information; when you give too much information, you can also be accused of doing something wrong.

This resolution is being handled by the honourable Minister of Communications but inasmuch as I have approved of this procedure, that is, anything which has been done after consideration of the annual estimates and you can find an appropriate resolution which comes subsequently to the House to be dealt with to put the information under it will be shown. I have given the explanation. In short, if Government has brought down something which concerns Current Expenditure, you would not have found this information. In short, this is an appendix to page 132 of the Annual Estimates.

Mr. LEWIS: I really thank the honourable Premier for the explanation, but it is worth nothing. There is not a dollar of capital expenditure that has been paid out without its having been voted for in Committee of Supply. Again, this resolution is not made up like capital estimates are made up. It can be seen by making a comparison. These supplementary estimates, No. 4, have been made up like ordinary estimates. The honourable Premier knows that every bit of expenditure in the Estimates under Part II—Capital was put in the Appropriation Act. What has come down in these supplementary estimates under Head VII—Miscellaneous, is under the column 'authorised by law' but you do not find anything under Capital Expenditure 'authorised by law.' You find things 'authorised by law' coming under such heads as "Charges of Debt" or "Pensions," but not under "Capital Expenditure." This matter has not been explained at all. I think what comes under Head VII—Miscellaneous in this resolution should be the subject of a special resolution so as to advance this money from the Treasury to be repaid subsequently by the Natural Gas Corporation. Under Section 17 of the Natural Gas Corporation Act, 1950, which gives authority for the first item under Head VII, the section reads as follows:—

"The amount of compensation determined
"by agreement or arbitration and any expenses
"incurred by the Corporation in the acquisition
"of any natural gas plant under the provisions
"of this section shall in the first place be paid
"for out of the Public Treasury on the warrant
"of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, but
"the Corporation shall repay to the Government
"such compensation and expenses."

According to Section 8 of the Petroleum Act, 1950, which is the authority for the other item under the head, it is stated as follows:—

"Any sum to be paid under the section
"shall be paid out of the Public Treasury on
"the warrant of the Governor-in-Executive
"Committee."

Under neither of these sections can you say that this money which is under Head VII is to be voted, but it is to be advanced out of the Public Treasury. That is commonsense. What has happened is that they have found themselves in difficulties over this money having been paid out and they do not know where to put it. A previous House would have made whoever paid it out to put it back into the Treasury.

Sir, you are still under jurisdiction of the Secretary of State for the Colonies never mind that you have changed the nomenclature of your Colonial Secretary to Chief Secretary and what you are now doing is breaking a constitutional rule. You cannot pay out this money in the way you have done; nor can you come in here and slip it in as you want to do. The reason why you are trying to slip it in as you are trying to do is because the Secretary of State for the Colonies will see it and will see the note to it, and by seeing the note to it, will come to the conclusion that the House of Assembly passed it. I am going to move that Head VII be deleted from this schedule to the resolution.

Hon. M. E. COX: I accept that amendment.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I rise for the second time in order for all times, to put an end to any suggestion that we have put something in to fool the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Let me say at once that this Government is not dictated to by the Secretary of State for the Colonies. As regards what the honourable junior member for the City says

about we have put it in so that when the Secretary of State for the Colonies sees it, he will come to the conclusion that the House passed it, let me say that the Secretary of State for the Colonies — and I mean those who see our estimates—see them in the same way as any member of the public. None of them has any authority to change any line and if there were any suggestion to this Government, we would write a rude letter in reply. Let me say again that what we pass in this respect has nothing to do with the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Barbados is not St. Lucia or Grenada where you have to send up your estimates. Purely for politeness sake the Colonial Office gets a copy of our Estimates. I do hope that honourable members will eradicate from their minds that we are merely doing this to fool somebody.

We have done it to inform the House. If the House does not want the information in the schedule to this resolution, it can be struck out. It is a fact that under our constitution, we cannot pay out money unless it is passed by the House. If the present Ministers break the constitution, certainly any honourable member is at liberty to appeal to the Law Courts or the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

(A VOICE): I would not appeal to the Secretary of State; I would appeal to the place where I can get you locked up.

Mr. LEWIS: I am quite satisfied now that the matter has been struck out. I am quite sure that a mistake was made and in due course, I expect to see a proper resolution brought down for the amounts.

I want to deal with another matter concerning the amount which we are now voting. Sir, the people who are concerned with the ordering of the material could have waited until the material was actually in the island before asking for a revote of the money. It would have saved us this trouble. When it comes to this question of electrical installations for the Seawell Airport, the people concerned should try their best to prevent it from coming here for discussion. It is one of the biggest items of expenditure this Government has to deal with for some time. What has been happening in this matter of electrical installations for the Seawell Airport? First of all, you buy something as a standby and then you have the Electric Company as a standby. Certainly, the people concerned should do their best to prevent this matter of electrical installations for the Seawell Airport coming to this House for discussion.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I would just like an explanation from the honourable Minister of Communications with respect to the \$6,248 which is to be voted to be spent on installations at the Seawell Airport. I wonder whether the honourable Minister can give me a breakdown of the amount according to what it is required to do.

Hon. M. E. COX: The honourable member, probably was not in his place when I said that the explanation was given when the original resolution was before the House and that this was merely a revote of the money.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that if I ask for information although it has been given one thousand times that I should not be given it. I do not want to annoy the honourable Minister, but I would like the information so as to refresh my memory on the matter.

Mr. BARROW: I would like to ask the honourable Minister of Communications this question: Who was the carpenter that drew up this resolution?

I am sure it could not have been drawn up by anyone who had the slightest knowledge of parliamentary procedure. As I see it, columns 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the schedule to the resolution are blanks and with respect to the sums in column 5 direction is pointed in column 7 to see notes 2 and 3 for explanation of the respective amounts. In column 6, there is the sum of \$6,248 which we are asked to vote and the first note explains that amount. As it appears to me, the person who prepared this resolution either was in the deuce of a hurry or was not the person in charge of drafting resolutions like this. I must therefore ask the honourable Minister of Communications who is now in control of the particular department to use his authority a bit to ensure that the people in the department do their work and that persons who are in charge of drafting these resolutions draft them in a proper manner. A lot of debate would have been saved if this resolution was drafted better.

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

On motion of Hon. M. E. Cox, seconded by Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one resolution in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. M. E. Cox, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, in each case, the resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

HAREWOOD TRUSTEES (SALE OF LAND TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE) BILL, 1954.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to take Order No. 3 as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for Christ Church:—To move the second reading of a Bill to authorise the Trustees of the Will of the late Henry Ulick, Earl of Harewood, to sell and convey certain parcels of land (parts of the Belle Plantation) to the Executive Committee of this Island.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker,—The "Objects and Reasons" of this Bill are clearly set out in the Preamble. The present Trustees of the Will of the late Henry Ulick, Earl of Harewood, now deceased, have, by their humble petition to the Legislature of this Island, represented that under the provisions of the said Will, the sugar works plantation, known as the Belle Plantation, is vested in them upon the trusts as set out and contained in the Will. The Trustees have now agreed to sell two parcels of land—the first parcel containing 1 acre 10 perches, the second parcel containing 12 acres 15 perches, making a total of 13¼ acres—to the Governor-in-Executive Committee subject to a restrictive covenant not to be built thereon provided that the vendors were agreed on their part to give a similar covenant in respect of the area of the land to the south of the gully which forms a part of the Belle Plantation.

This land is needed for the purpose of developing and extending the waterworks at the Belle Pumping Station, and the terms and conditions of the sale and purchase of the land have been settled and agreed on between the said parties. The Queen's Solicitor has expressed some doubt as to whether the Trustees or the tenant for life, Capt. Gerald Lascelles, can now sell the estate or any portion of it, and he has advised that the Government should enact legislation authorising the Trustees to sell the two pieces of land,

in other words, conferring on the Trustees the express power to sell the land.

The purchase price and the expenses amount to \$4,670, the breakdown being as follows :—Purchase price, \$4,320; Vendor's costs, \$144; Stamp duty, \$24 Fees to Clerks of the Legislature, \$32 and Queen's Solicitor's fees, \$150. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. ALLDER: This is one of those estates which are owned by absentee proprietors and I have always felt that these estates should have local owners; I definitely dislike knowing that such large portions of land in this colony are worked and the profits accruing from them go into the pockets of absentee proprietors, many of whom do not know this colony because the estates were bequeathed to them by their ancestors. I regret that the honourable Minister for Agriculture did not bring down a Bill to acquire this whole plantation for the purpose of extending the housing facilities and also to build up a healthy peasant proprietorship system in this colony. In view of the fact that we are aiming at building up a big tourist industry, peasant proprietors would be able to utilise this land for the purpose of producing a more generous supply of food.

I have read that this family owns so many thousands of acres in England that it has had to sell 10,000 acres of its holdings so as to pay Death Duties and Income Tax. We know that the economy of the people of this island remains low because of the fact that many who are willing to build up themselves as peasant proprietors cannot get land, which can be considered as arable, to purchase. We are perpetuating the system of absentee ownership but the demands of the population should make us look towards the taking over of those estates which have been owned for a long time by people who live in the Mother Country and elsewhere and who could very well give up the ownership of these estates in this colony. The size of these estates only compares as garden space with some of the mansions owned by these people in England. I feel that in view of the fact that the Earl of Harewood's family has had such a long connection with this island and it has derived such great benefits from the plantation system in this colony, that this family should, as a measure of gratitude, give over one of the estates which it now owns in this colony to the people of Barbados, so that the expansion of the population can be accommodated.

In view of the fact that this plantation contains one of the important social services in this colony in the matter of water supply, the Government should acquire the whole plantation for protective purposes instead of having a few acres in the centre of the plantation. I regret very much that the honourable Minister of Agriculture did not see fit to get the Government to take over the whole plantation instead of purchasing a bit to-day and a bit to-morrow, so that we could have an area to be utilised by Barbadians and their descendants.

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, the Preamble was postponed.

The four Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

The Preamble was called and agreed to.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

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

On re-assembling,

DEBATE ON REPLY TO THE GOVERNOR'S MESSAGE *re*
DEEP WATER HARBOUR

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to take Order No. 2 as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. LEWIS: I think that some explanation should be given as to why we are not debating the Federation Report. Honourable members have come here prepared to debate the Federation Report because we were particularly asked to come prepared to do so and I do not think it is fair just to shift around and deal with some other item. Undoubtedly we were led to believe that the Federation Report would have been the sole item discussed to-day, and not one word of explanation is forthcoming as to why we are not discussing that Report.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member objecting to the leave being granted?

Mr. LEWIS: Yes, Sir.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: How can you force the Government to do something which you want it to do?

The question that leave be granted the honourable member to take Order No. 2 as the next Order of the Day was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. Cox, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mrs. BOURNE, Messrs. HOLDER, BARROW, MILLER, J. C. MOTTLEY, VAUGHAN and GODDARD—12.

Noes: Messrs. LEWIS, CRAWFORD and E. D. MOTTLEY—3.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Michael:—To move the consideration of the Report of the Select Committee appointed to prepare a draft Reply to His Excellency's Message No. 9/1954, relating to the proposed Deep Water Harbour.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker,—The proposed Address in reply to His Excellency's Message reads as follows:—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor*

The House of Assembly acknowledge the receipt of Your Excellency's Message No. 9/1954 forwarding for their consideration the Report of the Deep Water Harbour Committee.

The House of Assembly accept and agree with the recommendations of the Deep Water Harbour Committee as set out in the Report of the said Committee, and sincerely hope that the necessary steps will be taken at an early date to implement the said recommendations.

In moving the passing of this Address I should like to say that the question of improving the harbour facilities has been under consideration for some 85 years. I think it was in 1869 when a gentleman named Mr. Bourne submitted plans with a view to improving the harbour facilities and again in 1883 Sir John Coode submitted plans for a scheme costing in the vicinity of one million pounds. In 1884 Mr. Charles Messervy also submitted plans for improving the harbour; between 1887 and 1889 Mr. Galloway also submitted plans costing in the vicinity of £140,000. Quite a number of people who were interested in the improvement of the harbour in those years made various suggestions and recommendations for improved harbour facilities; in 1873 a Message was sent down to the House forwarding plans for the improvement of the harbour and in this connection at least four Messages have been sent down in the 19th century. In 1945 the Incorporated Chambers of Commerce held a meeting in St. Kitts and it was recommended that steps should be taken to improve the harbour facilities in the Caribbean area. The representative from the Barbados Chamber of Commerce at the time, emphasized the necessity for having a comprehensive scheme and suggested that funds should be obtained from the Colonial Development and Welfare Organisation for that purpose. Following that meeting of the Incorporated Chambers of Commerce, a Resolution was passed by the Barbados Chamber of Commerce on the 15th November, 1946, asking the Government to take steps to send down a Resolution to the Legislature asking for a sum of money to get down an engineer to investigate the possibilities of constructing a Deep Water Harbour. As a result of that Resolution passed by the Chamber of Commerce, on the 18th July, 1946, the House passed a Resolution for the sum of £3,000 to secure the services of an engineer to investigate the possibilities in respect of the construction of a Deep Water Harbour. Mr. Lawson, of the firm of Messrs. Goode, Vaughan-Lee, Frank and Guyther, came to the island and made a survey and submitted to the Government a Report, copies of which were circulated to this hon. House and to the business people in this island. In that Report, as honourable members will see, the engineer favoured the North Scheme as a result of which he considered that the Government would reclaim something like 130 acres of land of which 92 acres could be reserved for development. The estimate submitted by Mr. Lawson in respect of the North Scheme was £3,078,500, and in respect of the South Scheme the estimate was £3,897,000.

Since then the Government was advised to obtain the services of Sir Douglas Ritchie to report on the financial aspect of the Deep Water Harbour. Sir Douglas Ritchie reported and in a similar manner his Report was circulated and publicised; he favoured the North Scheme in view of its potential development as against the South Scheme. After obtaining the services of Mr. Boyle, an engineer from Trinidad, who made various tests, Sir Douglas Ritchie reduced the figures in respect of the Scheme to £3,185,361. From that time the Government has been considering seriously the question of the Deep Water Harbour, but due for the most part to the lack of finance, the Government was unable to proceed with the matter any further.

In 1951 the Government and the Barbados Sugar Producers' Association signed an Agreement which among other things, provided the imposition of a levy of \$2.00 per ton of sugar produced as a contribution to the construction of the Deep Water Harbour; however, it was agreed that unless and until the Government decided that the Deep Water Harbour would be constructed, the levy would

not be imposed. Up to now, the Government has not insisted on collecting that levy. His Excellency the Governor, Sir Alfred Savage, in his speech in opening the 1950-51 Legislative Session made reference to the question of the construction of the Deep Water Harbour and I should like to quote from that Speech if honourable members have no objection to my doing so. His Excellency said this:—

"It is not possible to leave out of consideration in a plan of economic development the proposals made over many decades for the establishment of a deep water harbour for Barbados. While undoubtedly it is a "cross fertilizer" of industry and should not be considered in isolation, its financial implications demand the closest attention.

I do not propose to express a conclusion on the financial aspects for not unnaturally the figures in the report of Sir Douglas Ritchie are now out of date and require revision which doubtless will reflect modifications both beneficial and adverse to the economics of the proposal. But my point in mentioning the project to-day is to invite attention to two major considerations.

First, we must keep in mind that the progressive implementation of an economic development plan to which I have referred should itself promote prosperity and so far as is possible we should endeavour to measure the potential revenue advance arising from its implementation and give it the appropriate weighing in the consideration of the harbour proposals.

Secondly, weight should be given to the potential adverse effect on Barbados if deep water harbour facilities are not provided. Although not an exact parallel, there are many ports on the West Coast of Africa and elsewhere which fifty years ago were flourishing, but to-day are deserted for the reason that they failed to keep up with modern requirements. The townships which the ports supported no longer exist. That is unlikely to happen to Bridgetown, for our trade will flow without a harbour although, perhaps, far less efficiently and, therefore, more costly. At one time Barbados was the centre of entrepot trade in the Caribbean, but to recover that trade—if it is still possible—a modern harbour would be required."

Those were Sir Alfred's comments in opening the 1950-51 Legislative Session; it can be well seen that if we are to keep up to modern times we must face the facts and do not say whether we can afford to have a Deep Water Harbour, but whether we can afford to do without a Deep Water Harbour.

Sometime later the Government appointed a Sub-Committee of the Executive Committee to consider the proposal for constructing a Deep Water Harbour, but due to certain circumstances no Report was made by that Committee. Since then the Government in its anxiety to have the Deep Water Harbour constructed, got into contact with the Admiralty in order to find out whether they were interested in the matter in which case funds would be obtained from the Admiralty to construct this Harbour. I am afraid that the Admiralty appeared to be indifferent to the suggestion: more recently the Government decided to set up a local Committee to deal with this question. As will be seen from the Report, that Committee can be said to be truly representative of the community in general. Quite a few members of this House were members of that Committee: members of the mercantile community and people representing public opinion were also members of that Committee. This Committee went into the whole question very carefully and submitted its Report and with the two reservations—one made by the honourable senior member for St. Philip and the other by the Hon.

E. S. Robinson—the Committee agreed to the construction of a Deep Water Harbour—and also expressed the view that it would be an economic undertaking. A Select Committee of this House also went into the question and agreed to the construction of the Deep Water Harbour.

As regards the financial aspects of the matter, there are one or two points which I would like to make. In paragraph 6 on page 20 of the Report, the Committee says this:

"The Engineers (Messrs. Coode-Vaughan-Lee, Frank and Gwyther) estimate that the overall increase in costs since their original estimate in 1948 is 32%. They estimate the total cost at £4,053,300. On this basis the revised estimates are as follows:—

(i) Engineer's Estimate (a) Labour (b) Other Charges, £4,053,300.00; (ii) Modifications, (say 32% increase) £990.00 (iii) Engineers' Supervision (say 32% increase) £140,066.52; Total £4,194,356.52. Say £4,200,000.00".

It was suggested that the Government should make a contribution of £350,000 in the first year towards the commencement of the work; that suggestion was made by Mr. Lawson and Sir Douglas Ritchie. In paragraph 8 the Committee says this:—

"Indications are that a loan of £4½ to £5 million might be raised at 4¼% at about 98% repayable over 25 years or somewhat longer. It will be necessary to raise a loan of £4.75 million. Provision must be made for a Sinking Fund to which contributions at the rate of 1% per annum will have to be made."

In that case the idea of the Government's free contribution has been abandoned by the Committee, due to the commitments already undertaken by the Government in the Five Year Plan. Added to that £4,200,000 are amounts which the Committee has tabulated as follows:—

(i) Interest £4,750,000 at 4¼%	£201,875
(ii) Sinking Fund £4,750,000 at 1%	47,500
(iii) Depreciation on £3,185,361 = £11,188) on £4,200,000	14,750
(iv) Maintenance (on £3,185,361 = £26,214) on £4,200,000	34,560
(v) Staff: Original £27,000 add 10% for Dos Santos Salaries Commission and further 6% for cost of Living Allowance	31,500
(vi) Incidentals say	4,000
	£334,185

As against that estimated annual expenditure is the following estimated annual revenue:—

(i) Profit on Water	£ 1,000
(ii) Net Tonnage Dues	14,000
(iii) Warehousing	20,000
(iv) Levy on all imports and exports at 2%	316,742
	£351,742

Paragraph 25 of the Report shows the method of financing the works. Prospects of a reduction in the interest rate seem to be favourable. I have just noticed that the bank rate has been reduced from 3½% to 3% works (Mr. LEWIS: You just borrowed money at 4½%). Since then the rate has gone down to 3%. As the Committee has recommended, steps have been taken to get a substantial part of this loan from the Colonial Development and Welfare Organisation. I am not in a position to say what progress has been made in this direction, but I can assure the House that the Government is doing everything that lies in its power to get a free grant from C.D. & W. for the construction of this Harbour.

The question of the displacement of labour will no doubt arise and it will have to be

considered very seriously. While it is felt that lightermen, for the most part, will not find business very lucrative after we have constructed the Deep Water Harbour, yet it is expected that Barbados will regain much of its lost transshipment business which it once enjoyed. That being so, these workers can be absorbed into this business; in addition to that, I should like to assure this House that the Government will go into the matter and do whatever is humanly possible to find employment for these people, just as the Government is looking after those who have been displaced as a result of bulk shipment of molasses. We must face the situation and bring our harbour up to standard in order to cope with modern facilities, if we are to maintain our place in this area. It should, however, be borne in mind that the construction of a Deep Water Harbour does not completely abandon the case of lighters.

The Select Committee of the House raised the question as to what the Government intended to do with the 92 acres of surplus land which, it was estimated by Sir Douglas Ritchie, would be reclaimed. I was not in a position to answer that question at the time because the Government had not considered it, but some honourable members felt that this land should be retained for industrial development. I shall be willing to hear the expression of opinion by honourable members on that point particularly, but I shall take back to the Executive Committee the views expressed by them on this whole question.

Before I sit down, I should like to mention that some years ago the Government by a notice in the Press made it clear that no consideration will be given to any increase in land values in the area proposed for the construction of a Deep Water Harbour. That warning still holds good today; there may be a question of the payment of compensation in so far as beach rights are concerned, because people will lose those rights when the Deep Water Harbour is constructed.

I think I have made the main points which should be made. From the Report honourable members will see that a delegation visited Trinidad so as to see the working of the port there. That delegation got first-hand information in connection with the matter and it has reported. There are in the Report a few minor recommendations which might not be acceptable to the Government because some of us really did not attend the meetings of the Committees regularly as we should have attended them, but those points can be made right at the appropriate time. I beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I beg to second that motion. I am glad to see that this oft-discussed scheme has reached the stage of possible legislative assent. A Deep Water Harbour will mean much to the future of this colony, because the development of harbours in all countries more or less envisages a greater economic future for those countries. There is a certain West African port which was flourishing a few centuries ago but owing to the lack of a Deep Water Harbour, it is no longer a flourishing town. Even more important than the future of the colony is the expectation of thousands who are looking forward to the implementation of this Scheme as a means of getting employment: Barbados Governments are notoriously slow in implementing things which have been discussed from generation to generation, but I hope that this Government will not follow that terrible tradition. Although we know that the equipment for the construction of a harbour cannot necessarily be bought just as you would buy a few boats and that certain things would have to be manufactured in England, I hope that be-

fore the end of this year the foundations for this Deep Water Harbour will be laid.

This Scheme will necessitate the employment of about 4,000 people for a period of about five years; that is, by no means, an excessive number of people, having regard to the present unemployment situation in this island. It is amazing to know how many people will leave what they are doing and run for a job in connection with the construction of this Deep Water Harbour; it is amazing to know how many unemployed people there are in this island. From my point of view, the speedy implementation of this Scheme which has been spoken and written about for so long is most essential.

As regards the point about the displacement of labour, I have no fear about that; we have reached the age where a certain type of labour should be abolished from human society. Lighterage is a relic of galley slavery, and the sooner that we get rid of it, the recently what relief mechanical tillage has brought to the people who used to fork the land; he said that when a man has forked a row or two of land, he is not of much use to himself. I have no fear about the abolition of lighterage; I know that by the construction of a Deep Water Harbour trade will come to Barbados in a greater degree than formerly. It has been proved that any improvement by labour-saving devices makes room for even greater employment of labour. I envisage that those who will be displaced by the abolition of lighterage will be absorbed in the greater increase of trade which will result from the new harbour facilities.

I would emphasize that the Government should do everything possible to have the foundations of this Harbour laid during this year. The financial part of the matter is not a burden which is too great for the economy of this island; with the increasing production I have no fear that we will be able to meet the interest rates and the amortization of a loan. I think that the time has come when, with all this talk about the development of the colony, we should suggest to the British Government that they advance this loan free of interest. That is nothing which the United States of America would not do in the development of a country; that would be a substantial means of implementing the development of this ancient and loyal British colony which is even more British than the British people themselves. I am saying that the Minister of Communications should use his position and get behind those who are in authority and who are directly concerned in the implementation of this Harbour Scheme. I am afraid that the Ministers are not carrying their full weight where certain Departments are concerned. I do not think that the speech of the Minister was enlightening enough in this matter, but I hope that he will throw around his weight because there are many people who are asking about this Deep Water Harbour of which they have been hearing so much. With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would advise the Government not to pigeon-hole what is passed by this House this afternoon in respect of the Deep Water Harbour.

Mr. GODDARD: We are debating this afternoon what should have been done by some previous generation. It is not a question as to whether we should have a Deep Water Harbour; we had arrived at that years ago. As it has been aptly put by a previous Governor, the question is not whether we can afford to have a Deep Water Harbour, but whether we can afford not to have it. This is a matter of past history and I am sure that every member of this House thinks that way. I think that we should devote our attention to the financial aspects of constructing the Deep Water Harbour, our ability to

pay for it and what additional burdens the people of this colony will be called upon to bear so as to have the advantage of this Harbour.

On page 9 paragraph 17 of the Report of the Committee, the position is summed up in this way:—

"The value of imports and exports has shown a marked upward trend during the past 10 years. Although it is obviously impossible to make an accurate forecast of the value of imports and exports for 30 years ahead, it may be considered reasonable to use the average for the four years 1949/1952 for estimating the order of revenue which might be expected under a 2% (maximum) levy."

The estimate is determined and the average yield of £316,742 per annum is arrived at. The paragraph continues:

"This yield of about £316,742 per annum falls short of the estimated recurrent expenditure of £334,185 by £17,443, but against that shortfall the following factors must be taken into consideration:—

- (a) Port revenue derived from warehousing, water sales, tonnage dues and other services estimated at a sum in excess of £35,000 (which includes the sum of £14,000 derived from the present Port charges).
- (b) Indirect benefit to the colony by way of the removal of surcharges and a possible reduction of freight rates due to the reduction of handling expenses by the elimination of lighterage and launch hire charges on imports, which is estimated at £175,000.

By setting against the shortfall of £17,443 the estimated direct Port revenue of £35,000 and similarly by setting the estimated indirect benefit of £175,000 against the 2% levy on imports estimated at £186,000, it will be seen that the 2% levy is more than adequate to meet recurrent expenditure, and the resultant net burden on the community should be less than 2%."

If our imports and exports remain anywhere near their present value, the people of Barbados will be called upon to pay 2% more in respect of this loan; however, the benefit to the people will accrue in another way. We are now paying a surtax on imports and exports of 15% in respect of the freight because it is claimed that our port has not been working satisfactorily, and that ships are delayed in turning around. With the implementation of a Deep Water Harbour, that payment will go, because we will not spend that large sum in paying for facilities here under the existing conditions. That money will be coming back to this island; we will only have to tell the steamship companies that we will not continue to pay that extra 15%. Apart from that, there will be no lighterage, which is estimated at £175,000. Although the people of this colony will be called upon to pay the additional 2% and the sugar industry will be called upon to pay \$2.00 per ton on the export of sugar, they will be getting back some of this money through the facilities of the Harbour. I am satisfied that we can pay for this Harbour and my only regret is that it was not done by some past generation.

When this Report was written the bank rate was 4%; it was reduced to 3½% and two weeks ago it went down to 3%. When the rate was 4% we were told that there was every possibility of our being able to borrow money at 4½%. With the market having been eased, I presume that we will get the good of it. At this stage in our history, with our finances in the shape in which they are, when we thought that we would have had half a million

pounds to put towards the Deep Water Harbour, the money was used for other developments under the Five Year Plan. The money to be spent on this Harbour must come from loan funds; we can go to the London market and expect to get a loan. The Deep Water Harbour would be a development on which other developments can follow and should follow. With the addition of 130 acres of land, 90 acres should be used for industrial development; the land must be owned by the Government and it will remain the property of the Government. It is becoming a habit of these West Indian territories to be offering free ports and we can also offer a free port so as to attract tourist ships which visit the West Indies bringing people with American dollars to buy some of the things which we will produce. Only recently I saw in the *Times Magazine* a development whereby Americans were being attracted to Jamaica for the purpose of purchasing goods out of bond; I do not see why we cannot do the same thing. We have to make our way not only with regard to sugar but also with regard to industries. How what I have suggested is to be done will have to be worked out; I am only drawing the Government's attention to the fact that people in the West Indies are doing it and are attracting dollars. I strongly recommend to the Government that they get ahead with the idea of sounding out the money market in London and see how soon the proposal for constructing this Deep Water Harbour can be implemented.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: I feel that the time has come when we, the elected representatives of the people, should strike the blow which will give this island the necessary Deep Water Harbour. The honourable junior member for Christ Church began his remarks by saying that we are forced to perform a duty which our forefathers should have performed, and I would add that we would have been sharing in, praising them for the step which they had taken. It is time for us to cease hesitating over this momentous step which will put Barbados in line with other developed and civilised communities in the world. It is not what we think, it is not what others think; it is what we can see and hear and what we know is a crying need for the interest and welfare of this community. The decision to take this step calls for sober reflection, but this is a step which we have the ability, the temerity, the nerve and the "know-how" to take without fear and trembling any more.

The matter of improving this harbour looked too big in the eyes of our forefathers and they were afraid to take this step, but we who have been schooled in modern economics can afford to go forward; the time has come when we should stop making one step forward and two steps backward. This proposal is too big for us really to estimate its true value to-day, but if we go ahead with it without any more hesitation, posterity will sing our praises and compliment us for the momentous step we are taking. Away with fear in this modern day and generation! Fear is the promotion of fools. The step which we are taking to-day is one for the improvement of the people in this island in every sense. Changes always merit consideration; fear always underlies every momentous change and step which mankind sets out to make, but mankind has to make the step regardless of fear, after sober reflection.

It is the man of adventure whose name is written on the scroll the world over; let us therefore go forward and onward with the matter. Those who were attempting to construct the Suez Canal were considered as fools, but to-day we have all the evidence of the improvement of the people. I do not want to be tedious but I am happy to associate myself with, and contribute a word of quota to a matter like this;

we should feel highly honoured to take part in this final discussion—I do hope that this is the final decision which we will have to make as to the construction of this Deep Water Harbour. I say; let us go forward without fear, come what may. Without any further ado I want to compliment the Government on having decided to take this step; let them use their ingenuity in putting the proposal into operation at the earliest possible opportunity. I know that there are many honourable members who are eager to add their quota in this matter—the honourable senior member for St. George can hardly wait until I sit—(Laughter) and therefore I will take my seat.

Mr. BARROW: This island in which we live has developed the wonderful reputation for taking progressive steps 80 years after they have become overdue, and I think that the Deep Water Harbour is the *locus classicus* in examples of this kind. We are in the air age and we are now making provision for the proper accommodation of sailing vessels and steamships. As I said, when we were dealing with the Five Year Plan, I consider the construction of a Deep Water Harbour as the mainspring of any economic and industrial development which should take place in this colony. I consider a Deep Water Harbour to be essential, but in view of the fact that I did not take any part in the deliberations or in the shaping of the policy as to the manner in which this whole problem has been approached, I feel that this is the appropriate time for me to make a few observations on the whole approach to the problem of the Deep Water Harbour.

I need not repeat that I consider a Deep Water Harbour to be absolutely essential; we have already reaped the benefits of the Ministerial system and I think that the honourable Minister of Communications has been very well briefed in this matter and he has presented to the House an extremely careful and historical review as to the developments relative to the Deep Water Harbour from time to time. When Barbados first assumed its important role in the Western Hemisphere it was because of its proximity to the African Continent and the European Continent and because it stood directly in the path of the Trade Winds which brought ships to the Western World. It is remarkable that Barbados was able to preserve this initial advantage right up to within living memory, certainly within the memory of all of us here to-night; so that as recently as another war-torn period we were still in an excellent position to command entrepot trade not only for the Caribbean but for almost the whole of the Western Hemisphere here in Barbados by virtue of our geographical location and of all the other initial advantages which we had from the early days.

When around about 1936 the Trinidad Government decided to build a Deep Water Pier in Port-of-Spain, the writing had appeared on the wall so far as Barbados was concerned. One or two honourable members in this Chamber were members of the House at that time, and the Barbados Government should have taken immediate steps to see that it also implemented a Deep Water Harbour Scheme. As it was, the Trinidad Government was ill-advised and placed their Deep Water Harbour in the wrong place and it was not until the agreement between Britain and America during the last war which caused the Americans to establish a base in Trinidad that they decided that the Trinidad Deep Water Harbour was in the wrong place and they established one at Chagaramus. The position of Barbados in this case is the same as the Trinidad Government and it is significant when Sir Douglas Ritchie made his report on that of the engineers he was not asked to make recommendations of his own in regard to all

possible schemes. I feel that would have been the right way to go about the problem but instead of that, we asked him to make recommendations while making restrictions on his recommendations. We should have allowed Sir Douglas Ritchie to make recommendations on all the proposals and then leave the matter to ourselves to say that for social or economic reasons, we have weighed the advantages and the disadvantages of all the schemes and we consider such or such a scheme suitable to our needs today. That is what should have happened but that did not happen. You will see in the Official Report that Mr. Ritchie was asked not to consider any scheme other than the ones which were presented to him.

Mr. H. W. Lawson, a Harbour Engineer, came down during the war to investigate the possibilities of a deep water harbour scheme and it was suddenly discovered that he was in the island after he had been here for some time. He carried out certain tests and a report by Messrs. Coode, Vaughan-Lee, Frank and Gwyther, Consulting Engineers, was submitted in 1948 comprising two alternative schemes. Here again the approach was wrong. We did not set up a public competition; we did not take any advantage of the technical assistance which the United Nations are supposed to place free at the disposal of under-developed territories; we were presented with a *fait accompli*. To the best of my information and belief, the engineers who had been recommended to the Committee of the Deep Water Harbour as being the most suitable persons for carrying out the scheme, were the people responsible for constructing the Deep Water Harbour and other outdoor constructions at Trinidad. It is notorious that the best Hydraulic Engineers in the world are the Dutchmen and it is true to say that this firm of Messrs. Coode Vaughan-Lee, Frank and Gwyther, has some connection with the Dutch, but I do not know if the present personnel of that firm has any experience from that area. It may be true to say that the firm should have some experience of the hurricane and floods which nearly every year cause substantial dilapidations to the harbours of Dover and Folkestone so that enormous amounts of money have to be spent annually on their reconstruction.

According to the report, both the Consulting Engineers and Sir Douglas Ritchie came down heavily in favour of the north scheme which is what I would call an outdoor scheme. This scheme is going to involve the dumping of thousands of tons of rubble and stone into the water and at this stage I would like to warn honourable members that much of the stone that was paid for by the Government of Trinidad to be dumped into the sea did not reach the sea at all. Owing to the nature of the job, you cannot see what you have dumped under the water. I am therefore counselling the Government to realise that besides the supervision by the Consulting Engineers in the carrying out of this construction, Government must also have an adequate measure of supervision, else it is going to find out that the construction is going to cost 70% more than the present figure.

We must also bear in mind that no firm of consulting engineers worthy of its salt is going to give you anything more than an estimate; they do not pretend to be accurate; so if the people of Barbados feel that the construction of the Deep Water Harbour is going to cost only £4,500,000 they are making a big mistake. The very nature of the scheme, besides the fact that it is a big undertaking and in all big undertakings, there is always a certain amount of fraud, will lead you to understand that when the water gets up at Spring Garden during the carrying out of the underaking that you are going to get a lot

of your cement and installations washed away and be of no use to you. That is the working of nature so when you venture out into the deep to put down this construction, you must expect that you will be literally throwing a lot of your money into the water; therefore, you must expect a substantial increase over and above the estimate submitted by the engineers. I am not an engineer but it is a warning which I want to sound. As I have said, from information which I gathered from the Trinidad construction, lorry loads of stuff which were supposed to be dumped into the sea were never even unloaded after being checked in; they came through one gate and passed out through another to swing around the place and return with the same load.

The next point which I want to touch on is in connection with our shipping trade. Since we have lost our trade in Barbados, we must be prepared, if we venture on the construction of a Deep Water Harbour, to provide facilities superior to those which are now in Trinidad and other competing islands in the West Indies in this respect. We should provide a slipway and dry dock so that we would be able to repair ships of a certain tonnage and I think at this time a large number of ships and tankers which are now calling at Curacao and Venezuela where there are no docking facilities go to Trinidad for such facilities and I am sure Barbados can capture some of that trade if we provide adequate docking facilities. We have here in Barbados not only a long tradition for good artisanship, but from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries we have carried out work of that kind. There is no doubt about it; we are losing it at the moment. We should make it possible when we construct our Deep Water Harbour to provide better facilities for dry docking than Trinidad so that we would be able to capture some of that trade. If we allow Trinidad to carry out the improvements it envisages before we embark on our construction and if the Americans hand over the deep water harbour which they have constructed there to the Trinidad authorities, we would lose the little trade which we have now. We are still at a slight advantage now owing to the fact that Barbados is still considered to be the clearing house for ships which ply in the Caribbean and because the storage facilities which exist here are the best in this part of the West Indies.

The next thing which we should consider is that we are now in the air age. Not only are passengers now carried by air and in a greater proportion than those now transported by sea but I visualise that in the next ten years a substantial part of the world's goods would be carried by air transport. We will be reclaiming over one hundred acres of land if we construct our deep water harbour and we will have ninety acres over and above what we require for the immediate needs of the Harbour and Port Authority. I would like to see an airport constructed down there also. There is no reason why we should not have one down there. The 90 acres of land for which there would be no immediate use would be sufficient to construct an airport and there is no doubt about it, if we have an airport and deep water harbour two miles off Bridgetown, that would make Barbados almost unique in these parts. We have the opportunity of making this a reality; let us think of all of these things far in advance; there is no reason why although we have moved 80 years late we should not move in such a way as to put our constructions in advance of the others.

Now with respect to the providing of facilities for the berthing of five ships. Sir, we will not be able to compete with anybody if we provide facilities for the berthing of only five ships. At times,

one can see as many as twelve ships in Carlisle Bay. Berthing facilities for only five ships are hopelessly inadequate if we are to conduct this port not as a dumping ground but as a busy and active port. We should see to it that we make provision for at least a dozen or fifteen ships at a time. Another disadvantage in the North Scheme is that due to the open nature of the scheme, in the hurricane season, every ship that is berthed in the harbour will have to weigh anchor and go out to sea. That is what happens in Trinidad right now and what will inevitably happen in Barbados. When you build artificial piers and works of that kind on the north side of the island, when the wind gets up from the south-west, either the ships in port will have to weigh anchor and go out to sea, or the ships will be destroyed, or the piers will be destroyed by the pushing of the ships against the piers. I have always heard the expression "any port in a storm," but Barbados will be the one port which a captain will not want to put in if there be a storm. The Barbados port will be one which you will have to get out of when a storm comes. I deprecate the fact that Sir Douglas Ritchie was tied to the proposals of the consulting engineers. Some people have suggested that the Deep Water Harbour should be put inside the Constitution Swamp. I do not know if the scheme would have been more successful if that suggestion was adopted. I feel that at least the engineers should have been allowed to express an opinion on the scheme after proper investigation. I have heard from reliable engineers—I do not wish to call any names—in whom this Government has the greatest amount of confidence, that there is no reason in the world why the parish which the honourable members for St. Lucy represents should not be favoured for the location of the Deep Water Harbour. It is a fact that these schemes sound fantastic until you look at the topography of the country and when you realise that it is only a place 21 x 14 miles. It is also a fact that when you consider the cost of harbour installations, dredging and things of that sort, some of these schemes, although at the present date they may look far-fetched, yet in the light of subsequent events they will eventually prove to be feasible schemes and schemes which should be adopted.

Now, as regards the question of whether the deep water harbour should be an outdoor or inland scheme, I can only say that the greatest ports in the world that I have seen, — Hamburg, London and New York—are situated well away from the seaboard—from a matter of two to three miles to 65 to 70 miles inland. The port of Hamburg is between 30 and 40 miles from the seaboard and the port of New York about four to five miles. When one looks at the outdoor scheme at Dover and Folkestone one finds extensive dilapidations going on from year to year and for that reason those ports are used only for the flow of passenger traffic because they happen to be at the end of railway lines.

I want now to say a word about the actual report itself. I was very amazed at the figures quoted by the honourable junior member for Christ Church as to the collection of the 2% levy on imports and exports. I am a bit worried over the two dollars which was supposed to be paid but which was never paid on every ton of sugar and which the Sugar Producers Association from as far back as 1951 agreed to pay in to the Government, should the Government decide to construct a deep water harbour. Taking the average export quantity of sugar as 150,000 tons, that would mean that the Sugar Producers Association should have paid in \$300,000 annually since 1951 which total should be in the vicinity of

\$1,000,000 this year. I do not know why the Sugar Producers Association has not paid in that money. They were the people who signed the agreement, so they cannot say that they were taken by surprise. In 1952, it was said that the decision had been taken only recently but that cannot be said for the succeeding years. I am going to quote verbatim the decision which was made. Paragraph 10 on page 6 of this report by the Committee reads as follows:—

"The Government accepts in principle the establishment of a Deep Water Harbour, but considers it is essential that it should be self-supporting. It is intended to set up a committee to report on its implementation, due regard being given to savings from present costs and the levy of a basic port charge not exceeding 2% on all imports and exports."

Now this is the most important part:—

"The Domestic Sugar Agreement provided that if the Government decided on the implementation of the scheme, a cess of \$2.00 per ton would be payable from and in the year in which such decision was taken (and during the subsequent term of the agreement), provided that the Government shall give adequate notice of the implementation of a Harbour Fund Scheme."

Now, if as Mr. Duffy said, the sugar producers were making a profit of \$8.60 on a ton of sugar, why should they not have paid this levy? The paragraph goes on to state:—

"In view of the fact that the above decision has only recently been taken, the Government has decided not to take action to collect the cess of \$2.00 per ton in respect of the 1952 sugar crop and so leave the amount to accrue to the producers."

What I read is actually an extract from the Government's Memorandum on the Five Year Plan of Development and Taxation.

Do you think the general public is aware of these facts, Mr. Speaker? The decision had been taken by the Government to implement a Harbour Fund Scheme in 1952, yet the Government has decided to kill the sugar producers with kindness by not taking action to collect this cess of \$2.00 per ton from them. Mr. Duffy pointed out that sugar producers made a profit then of \$8.60 on a ton of sugar. He considered that \$4.80 was a fair return to the sugar producers for their capital outlay and advised that \$1.80 should be put into the Labour Welfare Fund and \$2.00 should be paid into a Harbour Fund Scheme should Government decide to implement the Harbour Scheme. Sir, I have talked about this matter already. Certainly, Government is killing the sugar producers with kindness by deciding not to take action to collect the cess.

Sir, in 1951, as early as February of that year, the Domestic Sugar Agreement was signed. Can you say that the sugar producers did not have enough notice in that year? But even if you say that they did not have enough notice in 1951, you must bear in mind that they signed the agreement. I am sorry that the honourable junior member for St. Peter is not in his place to hear this. Now, in 1952, you say that the decision had only recently been taken. Do not tell me that you are now making the decision. Since then, 1953 has passed and that would mean that \$900,000 should have been paid into the Fund by the sugar producers but not a cent has been collected. Sir, this Government has killed the Barbados Sugar Producers with kindness and because of that, \$900,000 has gone down the drain.

The honourable Minister of Communications talks about bank rate. In 1946 when Mr. Hugh Dalton was Chancellor of the Exchequer the bank rate was 2½% and in 1950 Mr. Gaitskell took over the office. This Government of ours should have implemented the Harbour Scheme then, but it did not take into consideration that we were living in a world of rising costs, therefore it did not do so. It should have done so when the interest rate was low. The interest rate jumped from 2½% to 4% as soon as Mr. Butler took office as Chancellor of the Exchequer and it is during his dispensation that we have decided to implement the Harbour Scheme. It means that we would have to pay between 60 and 70 per cent more interest on our loan to implement the scheme than if we had implemented it in 1948. Now that I am talking about interest rate, it comes to my mind that a few weeks ago the Trinidad Government needed \$20 million on loan and the colony's advanced information was so perfect and its timing so exact that it went 15 hours before the bank rate was lowered to get the loan and it was over subscribed in less than five minutes. Three years ago I said in this House when there was all that talk about this colony could not get credit on the English market, that if Barbados wanted \$20 million, it could get it and that the amount could be raised in one minute; but it would be a question of proper timing. This colony is so ill advised by its financial experts that it does not know when it should float a loan or whether it should float it or not. Sir, we should have implemented this scheme in 1948 to 1949 at the latest. If we did so, we would have saved a lot of money.

Sir, it has been said that Barbados has the best constitution in the world but even though we might have the best constitution and we do not know how to use it to the best of advantage to us, it is of no use. If we have a lot of people who persistently give us bad advice and we do not get rid of them, we can have the best constitution in the world; it would not help the people of Barbados. If Trinidad with its "half-baked" constitution can show us how to negotiate loans on the London money market, we should hide our heads in shame. The bank rate has been reduced from 4% to 3½% and I believe it has since gone down to 3%, but with the Butler propensity, if he wanted to readjust or rearrange it next week, it might go up to 4½% again. We have to be well advised and to jump in the London money market at the psychological moment if we want our loan to be floated at our best advantage.

Sometime in 1951, this colony subscribed to a memorandum from the Secretary of State for the Colonies which gives the American Government full power to walk into Barbados at any moment and have territorial jurisdiction to set up any installation as part of the mutual security provisions. In exchange we were told that the consideration which we in the West Indies would get for our agreement to the memorandum was Point 4 and all the different programmes which had been set up for the assistance of underdeveloped territories. This is a very serious matter. I remember speaking on the matter when it came up for discussion in this House and I warned honourable members that we were signing away our rights and the little sovereignty which we had for the very little worth it meant to us. I remember the honourable junior member for St. John getting up and making some facetious remarks and I warned that I had no inclination to disagree to the memorandum but let us make sure that it was not a business of a one-way traffic when we signed away our sovereignty to the United States which country

would have full power to exercise more authority over us than the British Government. The Government of the United States can now come to Barbados and without any notice, without any further signing of any agreement, bilateral or unilateral, set up any installation.

Sir, if we are going to sign away our sovereignty in Barbados, let us see that we get something for it. There is no reason in the world why the Deep Water Harbour Scheme could not have been investigated by one of the associated agencies free of cost to Barbados or why we could not have received a substantial subvention from Point Four or any of the other programmes. I remember well that the honourable Premier told me when I suggested it to him soon after Sir Alfred Savage, who was then Governor of Barbados, had come back from a free trip to Canada at the expense of Trans-Canada Airlines—a thing which an Administrator should not do; he had also visited Washington—that the honourable Premier said he was led to believe that Point Four did not apply to us. I believe Government knows better now. However, within twenty days, Professor Arthur Lewis came back from a visit to Washington, and Professor Lewis said when he asked the members of the World Bank whom they considered as the types most liable to benefit from Point Four Aid and why they were not investing in the Caribbean area the money of the World Bank; they replied by saying: (to use his own words) "We consider the Caribbean area, especially the British Colonies, a classical case for application of these funds but not one single West Indian Government has asked us for any aid," so that is our general debility here in Barbados. At that time, not one single West Indian Government had asked for advice and this colony is considered as a typical place for application of those funds. Is not that scandalous? I can tell you that Mr. Bustamante did not lose a minute after he understood how the West Indies could make use of that agreement, for he applied and got something like \$20 million for Jamaica.

This is a time when we in Barbados should be thinking of ourselves and should be thinking of striking bargains, but we seem to be working in a mysterious way, our wonders to perform. Let us see what can really happen in Barbados; let us leave that long ripping-ironed jacket behind us; we can put our inferiority complex behind us; therefore, let us do so and review the situation in the light of present day conditions. Let us ask for aid now the going is good; if we wait until those in a position to help us annihilate each other, we would not be able to get any aid, neither would we be in a position to help ourselves. Sir, there is not one mention in this report about Point Four. Who is fooling who? How many members around this table know about Point Four Aid? Sir, there has not even been the slightest investigation about that matter; there is no mention in the whole of this report about the possibilities of our getting through Point Four technical assistance or of our getting something from the World Bank. In British Guiana, which is considered as the last outpost of the British Empire, it has been proposed that an enormous sum of money should be granted to that colony free, gratis and for nothing; yet in Barbados where a Deep Water Harbour is not only necessary to cut down costs of imports but is also an economic necessity and as Professor Beasley has put it, something which must be done if there is to be industrial development, there has not been the slightest investigation about getting aid from that direction.

Sir, by my talk you will consider that I am not against a Deep Water Harbour for Barbados, but

I do not want it to go down in posterity that we in Barbados were so short-sighted that we allowed people to write whatever they liked and put before us without our doing something about it.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker. Look at the composition of this Deep Water Harbour Committee. Allow me to criticise its personnel without any reference to any particular member. Let us see how many ministers, how many members of this House, how many naval officers or naval architects or people that had naval training were members of that Committee. There was not one engineer, not one economist, not one architect, nor any person who knows anything of Town Planning on that Committee.

When we come to the economic aspects of a Deep Water Harbour, I would like to say that I have already drawn attention to the benefits which would accrue from the spending of the different sums of money in the several years over which the harbour will be constructed. I notice that the reporters of this House left that out of my debate on the Five Year Plan. What I pointed out then was that if you spent 1.1 dollars on labour, it would generate 3.5 dollars purchasing power. This would mean that the amount which we would spend on the Deep Water Harbour would put about \$42 million dollars in circulation by the operation of the internal multiplier and Government would get back a substantial amount of that from taxation both direct and indirect. No mention was made of that in my speech on the Five Year Plan nor has there been any mention of that in this report by the Committee. As a matter of fact, I consider the work of this Committee merely of the nature of cost revision than anything else because the substance of the report is not a critical approach to the problem of building a Deep Water Harbour. Obviously, the Committee had to accept whatever figures were put before them and it had to abide by the terms of reference. I remember asking Mr. Turner, who was the then Colonial Secretary, why should he restrict the terms of reference of the Committee to:—"having regard to the fact that it was considered essential that the undertaking should be self-supporting." I remember pointing out to Mr. Turner that we had spent over \$1,000,000 on the Seawell Airport and nobody had asked that the Seawell Airport should be self-supporting. I also remember pointing out to him that a Deep Water Harbour to Barbados would be the life-blood of the community because all the nutriments of this community flowed in and out from our harbour; all the arteries of the life of this community would branch off from the Deep Water Harbour, especially in view of the fact that our one-crop economy was sugar.

Sir, we should have a Deep Water Harbour whether it is self-supporting or not. In terms of actual income, you may find that the Deep Water Harbour may make a lot of money but it will not be of benefit to the community. I mean from the point of view of a Profit and Loss Account. On the other side of the matter, you may have a harbour which while losing about \$1,000,000 a year would still be considered as very essential. Sir, we have never made any suggestion that the Seawell Airport should be self-supporting; we should not make such a suggestion on our Deep Water Harbour; we should try to make it as viable as possible. The working of a Port Authority for a Deep Water Harbour is not as an ordinary commercial undertaking; the working of a Port Authority will be for a Deep Water Harbour which will be the heart of the community and which will pulsate for twenty-four hours a day. It will pour blood into the life-stream of the community, therefore, you cannot talk of making it self-supporting. Personally, I do not care whether the Deep Water Harbour would be self-supporting or not; it is a matter of indifference to me. I con-

sider a Deep Water Harbour so essential to our survival that it should be constructed as quickly as possible. I only regret that it has not been constructed before.

The honourable Minister of Communications made a remark in his speech on this matter that the Government had got in touch with the Admiralty to see whether it would be willing to provide docking facilities at this port when we erected our Deep Water Harbour. The Honourable Minister has a very short historical memory because he seemed to forget that the same Admiralty closed down the facilities which it had in Bermuda for such purpose. The honourable Minister seems to have forgotten that a lot of our men had to be repatriated as a result of the closing down of H.M. Dockyard in Bermuda. Cannot the honourable Minister see that they are not interested in us in this respect? What is the point of approaching the Admiralty? There is no point of approaching them.

There is one other observation which I wish to make. I think honourable members will bear with me for a few minutes longer. I would like to say that I think every honourable member should see that I am in favour of the construction of a Deep Water Harbour and that I am in favour of constructing it as soon as possible, but while I am in agreement, I would like to ask the honourable Minister of Communications when are we going to get a Town Planning Authority? I would like to point out that without a Town Planning Authority, you will get complete chaos after you have erected your Deep Water Harbour. You must have someone who would be able to direct you on what should be done in relation to your traffic problems, slum clearance and other matters of that kind relating to the metropolitan area of Bridgetown. I would like the honourable Minister to give us some assurance that from the time we start construction of the Deep Water Harbour, that we will have a Town Planning Authority so that the whole thing could be one co-ordinated scheme in which we would be able to derive the maximum benefit from the expenditure of the vast amount of money which is involved.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for three quarters of an hour.

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

On re-assembling.

CONSIDERATION RESUMED ON BILL TO AUTHORISE VESTRY OF ST. GEORGE TO RAISE LOAN

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave —

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: If the honourable senior member for St. Philip would give way for a while, I would just like to say Mr. Speaker that the honourable senior member for St. George asked me to allow him to proceed with the Bill to authorise the Vestry of St. George to raise a loan and I promised to allow him to do so before proceeding further with the matter which was engaging our attention on the adjournment.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What is that, Mr. Speaker?

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: May I tell the honourable member that the honourable senior member for St. George approached me first intimating that he wanted to proceed with the Bill that was engaging the attention of the House some weeks ago.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to proceed with the Bill to authorise the Vestry of St. George to raise a loan to carry out repairs to parochial buildings. It is a matter of urgency and

I have already asked the honourable Minister of Social Services for permission to do so now.

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

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. George has been granted leave to proceed with Item No. 1 of Private Members' Business: To resume debate on the second reading of a Bill to authorise the Vestry of St. George to raise a loan not exceeding £6,000 to carry out repairs to Parochial Buildings and to erect a Communal Bath and latrine.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I have already spoken on this Bill but I wish you to allow me to say a few words just for the sake of explanation. On the last occasion, I did not agree with the second reading because the Government thought it was somewhat uneconomic to repair the P.M.O.'s residence for the amount set out in the Bill when that amount was considerably more than what it would take to build a new residence suitable for a P.M.O. Since then, Mr. Shilstone interviewed members of the Government and produced a plan which I now have in hand and which honourable members can see to show that what the Vestry wants to do is not exactly repairing the building. He pointed out, as can be seen by the plan, that there would be alterations in which some wooden outhouses would be demolished and would be rebuilt of stone and attached to the residence to be used as the doctor's office and waiting room. Owing to the points that were put forward, the Government has withdrawn its former position and is quite willing to support the Bill.

Mr. BARROW: In reply to what the honourable Leader of this House has just said, I would just like to say that the explanation which Mr. Shilstone gave to members of the Government was substantially that which I put before the House on the last occasion. I am therefore asking honourable members to agree to the second reading of this Bill as it is a matter of urgency and one which I consider very important from the standpoint of the parishioners of St. George.

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

On motion of Mr. Barrow, seconded by Mr. Lewis, Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Smith being in the Chair.

The Preamble was postponed.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:—

"It shall be lawful for the Vestry of the parish of St. George and they are hereby authorised from time to time as they require the same to borrow from any person or persons body or bodies politic or corporate willing to lend the same a sum or sums of money not exceeding in the aggregate the sum of \$28,800 to be applied by them, as to an amount of Twenty-one Thousand Six Hundred Dollars for repairing the Residence of the Parochial Medical Officer as to an amount of Three Thousand Six Hundred Dollars for the purpose of erecting a Communal Bath and Latrine in the said parish for the use of the parishioners of the said parish; as to the amount of Three Thousand Six Hundred Dollars for the purpose of repairing the Rectory of the said parish and the sum or sums so borrowed with interest thereon at a rate not exceeding five per centum per annum shall be a charge on the rates of the said parish until paid."

Mr. BARROW: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. LEWIS: I beg to second that.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I notice that we have for the first time a plan to show what would be done to this residence for the P.M.O. and it is very refreshing to see it because it indicates that some real work is to be done on the project. However, I am reminded of the remarks which I made when this Bill was discussed on the last occasion.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I hope the honourable member would only deal with Clause 2.

Mr. MILLER: I am dealing with Clause 2 of the Bill. I was saying that on the last occasion I pointed to the tremendous sum of £4,500 which was proposed to be borrowed to spend on repairs to this building, and I said that if the idea was to preserve for the sake of posterity that ancient architect, probably, you could spend £10,000 on it, but since in the interest of the parish it was necessary that all of its services should be centralised, then it was unusual that we should be asked to spend all that amount of money on that building because it was not in the centre of the parish. You can very well think of Broad Street or the Belle Gully as the site of the P.M.O.'s residence of St. George as the position where it stands at Buttals, St. George. The P.M.O.'s residence cannot be said to be located in the centre of the parish.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member had the opportunity of discussing that in his speech on the second reading of the Bill. We are now dealing with Clause 2 and I am asking the honourable member to stick to Clause 2.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I am not asking for any latitude, I am dealing with Clause 2 and I will not stray from dealing with that clause. At the same time, I would like to say that I always like to abide by the instructions of the Chair. I was saying that if the idea of the Vestry was to preserve some contemporary art of the Victorian era, or to regard that building as a museum, then it could spend £10,000 instead of £4,500.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable member stick to Clause 2; what the honourable member is speaking of should have been said on the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, what worries me about the whole of this question is that this plan has now come to light. It is unfortunate that we were not given the right to see this plan before. I would like to give some idea of how unserviceable this institution is to the parish by its location. There is no bus service that leads from any part of the parish to that residence, nor is it in the centre of the parish. If you are spending the money on it to preserve it as a museum, all well and good, but I think it would be more advisable to sell that building —

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member is out of order. The honourable member had the opportunity if he wanted to oppose the Bill by objecting to its second reading. The honourable member is now criticising the principle of the Bill.

Mr. MILLER: Sir, I feel it is fair that I should voice my feelings and which I think is the feelings of the parishioners of St. George. It is a pity the Vestry did not decide to spend that money or even more in putting a clinic in some central area of the parish so that the people would be better served, and would stand to benefit more from it. I hope that the honourable Minister of Social Services does not think that I am opposing for opposing sake. I am still saying that anybody can see that it is not the best thing to decide on spending all that money on that building when it is really and truly out of the reach of the poor.

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

Clause 3 was called and passed.

Clause 4 was called.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity of giving some information on this Bill which was asked for by some honourable member on the last occasion. It is this: the existing parish loans are the Parish Loan Act of 1940 for which a loan of £2,500 was raised. The sum of £1,100 has been repaid at the rate of £100 per annum. Then there is the Parish Loan Act of 1948 for £6,000. The sum of £1,500 have been repaid at £300 per annum. The total interest which the parish is called on to pay is \$1,920 per annum and the total commitments of the Vestry as regards these loans are in the vicinity of £12,000. When this Act comes into force, the Vestry will have to pay back £900 per annum on the existing loans.

I beg to move that Clause 4 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. Lewis seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Clauses 5 to 12 inclusive were called separately and passed.

Clause 13 was called. It read as follows:—

"Nothing in this Act declared or expressed shall affect the rights of Her Majesty the Queen her heirs and successors or any person except such as are mentioned in this Act and those claiming by from or under them."

Mr. BARROW: I beg to move that Clause 13 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. LEWIS: In seconding the motion, I would like to ask the honourable Minister of Social Services if the wording of this Clause is in order, as I would not like this House to deal with this matter again.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I think it is quite in order.

The question that Clause 13 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Schedule A was called and passed.

Schedule B was called and passed.

The Preamble which was postponed was called and passed.

On motion of Mr. BARROW, seconded by Mr. LEWIS, the Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

OBJECTION TO LEAVE TO PROCEED WITH ADDRESS

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I am asking leave of the House to proceed with the Address of which I signified my intention earlier today to proceed with at this stage. May I say that it is most unlikely that the deliberations on the Deep Water Harbour Report would be concluded tonight, so I am asking the honourable Minister in charge of the Report to agree to a postponement and the House at the same time to give leave to proceed with the passing of the Address.

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking leave to proceed at this stage with an Address of which he gave notice earlier today and signified his intention of asking for leave to proceed with at this stage.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I cannot agree to leave being granted at this stage. I think this debate on the Deep Water Harbour should

be concluded first. It is a matter of urgency because cables have to be sent at the earliest opportunity in connection with the matter. I know honourable members will be glad and willing to dispose of this debate on the Deep Water Harbour first.

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: Objection having been taken, the question is that leave be granted the honourable member. Honourable members in favour will please say "Aye" and those against will please say "No."

The question was decided in the negative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, Mr. VAUGHAN and Mr. GODDARD—8.

Noes: Mr. SMITH, Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. BRANCKER and Mr. MILLER—11.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY (To Marshal of the House and indicating to someone in gallery of the House during the taking of the vote): Move that man... These things hurt... There should be no discrimination in such matters.

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for the City is disorderly in this Chamber. If I have to make mention of it again, I will name him.

OBJECTION TAKEN TO MOTION OF ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE FOR FIVE MINUTES

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes in order to discuss a matter of grave public importance. The matter is this—

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: (Again to Marshal of the House and indicating to someone in the gallery) Move him; Move him.

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: What is your job in this Chamber? Are you the Marshal? Are you the chucker out?

Mr. CRAWFORD: The matter is this—

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: The honourable member is breaking the rules of this House. I am standing. The honourable member must sit.

The honourable member knows very well that the usual custom has always been that if a member desire to move the adjournment of the House to discuss a matter of public importance that intimation is always given to the Speaker, but no such intimation has been given me. Again, when any such intimation is given me, I pass it on to the honourable Leader of the House and pending on the state of the Order Paper, leave is granted that honourable member. I do not think that honourable members should at any time 'spring' notices of adjournment of this House to discuss matters, however important they may be. The honourable member had ample time to intimate to me that he was going to move such a motion. In the same manner as the honourable member gave me intimation earlier in the day that he wished to proceed with the Address of which he gave notice, he had the same opportunity of giving notice of a motion for adjournment of the House. I cannot imagine anything which could have arisen so recently of such tremendous importance that the honourable member should ask for such leave and the honourable member should not be allowed to do so unless the House gives him such leave. I am putting that to the House now.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have not said for what I am asking leave. If I may be allowed to explain; earlier today I gave notice of an Address stating that it was most urgent that representations be made to

Canada in order to endeavour to get a quota of our unemployed in Barbados to go there and assist in reaping the harvest. I am asking for the adjournment of the House to discuss that matter now because if we waited 90 years for a deep water harbour and it appears as if the debate on that matter will continue for some time; can seven days prevent us one way or the other from getting it? On the other hand, it is necessary that we discuss this matter of public importance now in order that some of our unemployed should go to Canada at the beginning of July at the latest.

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. Philip is asking permission to proceed at this stage with a motion of adjournment of the House for five minutes to discuss a matter of very grave importance referring to consideration of the possibility of workers going to Canada.

Mr. LEWIS: Would Your Honour allow any honourable member to speak on the question?

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: I am putting the question to the House. I must not be interrupted. Unless there be objection, leave would be granted the honourable member.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I am objecting.

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: As long as there is a single objection, I must put the question. The question is that leave be granted the honourable member. Honourable members in favour please say 'Aye' and those against please say 'No.'

The question was resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, Mr. VAUGHAN and Mr. GODDARD—7

Noes: Mr. SMITH, Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. MILLER and Mr. BRANCKER.—11.

MESSAGE RE DEEP WATER HARBOUR REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO MOVE THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE WITHDRAWN

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to move the adjournment of the House in order to discuss a matter of public importance — something which has happened in this House today.

Hon. M. E. COX: There is before the House a motion for the passing of an Address.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am asking leave to move the adjournment of the House to discuss the action of the Marshal in removing from the front pews of the visitors' gallery persons of colour who were occupying those seats which are reserved for Secretaries of Ministers, and then later in the day allowing other persons who are not Secretaries of Ministers to occupy those seats. That is the practice of segregation.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking leave to move the adjournment of the House in order to discuss a matter of public importance. Unless there is any objection, leave will be granted the honourable member.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am appealing to the honourable member not to make a public debate of this matter now when it might only be a reflection on His Honour the Speaker. I do not know if the House has expressed any opinion; I have just heard that those seats are reserved for Ministers' Secretaries.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Those were the instructions which the Marshal said he had received.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I accept that; if the implication of what the honourable member has said is correct, I will be firmer on it than he is; but it is not the best thing to deal with the matter now. (Mr. ALLDER: It is always right to remove segregation). I wonder if the honourable member would walk down Broad Street tomorrow in the pyjamas which he will wear tonight: I am merely appealing to the honourable member to see that he can make his point not necessarily tonight; it is a point which, if the implication is correct, can be dealt with in another way. I am appealing to the honourable member not to proceed with the matter now.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: If the honourable member will deal with the matter, I will withdraw my request; all I want to guarantee is that this matter will not happen again.

DEBATE ON REPLY TO THE GOVERNOR'S MESSAGE RE DEEP WATER HARBOUR

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment, the House was discussing a motion for the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor on the subject of a Deep Water Harbour.

Mr. LEWIS: While honourable members think that it is a good thing for us to be dealing with this matter today, it is also a good thing to know that at present the merchant, the planter and the politician are agreeing that it is necessary for us to have a Deep Water Harbour. I believe that what has prevented us from having a Deep Water Harbour is the ownership by vested interests of lighters for the conveyance of cargo to and from ships. It is therefore a good thing to find that we have those interests now solidly behind the construction of a Deep Water Harbour.

One honourable member made reference to the 15% surtax which is applied to the port of Bridgetown on freight rates; I well remember that when that 15% surtax was to be applied to Barbados alone, the steamship companies applied it to all the colonies or at least to those colonies to which the steamship companies did not intend to apply it before. After the War there is a shortage of ships and the ship owners will take advantage of that. I remember that after we approved of the Five Year Plan and brought down legislation for collecting duty on the c.i.f. value of goods, it was discovered that items of food were being sent to Barbados from Australia at a higher rate than that at which they were sent to Trinidad; we found our Chamber of Commerce objecting to that and the steamship companies making alterations. This matter of high freight rates is something for which I have never seen the figures; even now you have people investigating the matter in Trinidad and it is said that there are bottlenecks in Trinidad and that is because they have deep water harbour facilities and they have a lot of things stored in the warehouses. I am waiting patiently to see what will be the result of this investigation which is being carried out by certain people who are in the area and I believe that they are in Trinidad at present.

This 15% surtax need not be taken as anything about which to frighten us: The honourable junior member for Christ Church did not tell us what that 15% surtax on freight rates would mean as a tax on the value of the goods; what percentage would it be on the value of the cargo? — Absolutely negligible. Therefore, we are not getting rid of any colossal sum of money in so far as charges on the goods are concerned when we levy a cess on our incoming and outgoing cargo. As far as lighterage is concerned this matter of the loss of that amount of money as

wages to the people is something which is to be viewed in an entirely different light from a saving; with a reduction in all these things how can Barbados guarantee that the freight rates to this port will not be increased? We cannot guarantee that; we have no ships and we have no money to embark on shipbuilding which is a costly undertaking. Those are things for big countries; we cannot guarantee that the provision of these harbour facilities will mean any reduction in the freight rates.

I have had some experience as to what is known as the transshipment of cargo from this port and I know that for a vast number of years Barbados has benefited from being a port of transshipment of cargo to other islands, especially to the Leeward and Windward Islands. Can we stand here tonight and plan for having the cargo for the other islands come to Barbados? Are those the islands with which we are planning to federate? I think we should approach the question of our Deep Water Harbour from the point of view of its being an absolute necessity for the needs of this colony; if we go about it in that way we will be working along the right lines. To go about it in the way of taking away the transshipment trade from other islands is the wrong way; we do not want their ports to be reduced to something like a "moses" and then ask them to federate with us. I do not think we should envisage that sort of trade being recovered; those colonies will want the facilities of a Deep Water Harbour as well.

On the question of attracting big ocean-going steamers to bring people to this island, I am wondering if we are not paying too much attention to this matter of people travelling by ships. I would like to see a scheme for the improvement of our airport facilities, because I feel that advancement along that line is what we should make better provision for. At present we have very little accommodation for the planes of the future; that is because, to a great extent, we were fooled by people who claimed that they knew what they were doing by granting us \$1 million for the extension of the Airport. If we could borrow at least £1 million for the purpose of equipping this island with a first class airport and terminal buildings, we would be doing something which is in line with the progress which we see before our eyes. It is all well and good to build a harbour; I do not wish to make any joke about it, but building a harbour is literally throwing money into the sea; and if we go about it in the way of snatching something away from the other people, we may discover that we will have done something which is out of date.

If we decide that the need of Barbados demands that we must have the facilities of a Deep Water Harbour, the great question is; Who will build this Harbour for us? I have seen that in recent years experts have come out here to help us with building our Airport and there was a hopeless failure; whether we thought that those experts were so good that they did not need any supervision or whether it was a question of slackness in our methods, the fact remains that we got a very raw deal at Seawell Airport. Viewing some of the things which came from England are we sure that the workmen up there are as efficient as we have known them to be for centuries which have passed? I sincerely hope that the Government will look around the world and try to get the best possible advice and be not afraid to tell the Englishmen; "If you cannot do a good job please assist us in getting somebody else to do it."

We must remember that this is an outside Scheme: Barbados has not had a hurricane of any proportion for a long time, and if we have the good fortune of starting our Deep Water Harbour soon

but before it takes root we have a hurricane, we will probably have to start all over again. Do not let us run into this matter because it has been talked about for many years; the merchants of yesteryear did not have a Deep Water Harbour and they did not suffer any difficulty from the high rate, but we have to be very careful; the high cost of goods is the means of making a higher profit. This is something which the Labour Party in Barbados will have to watch very carefully. I remember that this Government set out on a very minor scheme in the same region at the Reef; it was just to build a breakwater and when it started to go into the sea, this House had to vote money so as to save the money which had been thrown into the sea. If you start this Scheme, you have to carry on with it.

A loan of the proportion needed for carrying out this Scheme would naturally have to be sponsored by the people in England, and it will have to be raised there. Just before the bank rate went up to its highest peak, some mention was made of the fact that whatever amount was guaranteed for the colonies, the British Government was willing to double that amount; they doubled that amount and increased the bank rate. Barbados has boasted of having taken care if its finances for all these years, that we have been masters in our own house because we have kept our head above water; no matter what was undertaken, there was money in the Treasury. Today Labourites praise the fact that we have always done what we want to do on our own resources; but here there is a departure from that state of affairs and we have to see that it is successful. We have to be very careful to see that the people who will lend this money will not come behind the money and see that it is wasted. An honourable member says that it will not pay them to do that, but if you set out to have Ministerial Status and self-government, this may be a good way of snatching it from you; some honourable members who may laugh at what I am saying might find themselves in such financial difficulties that they will have to be supervised to such an extent that they will lose that responsibility which they can boast of and try to maintain.

That brings me to the point that we should examine sufficiently schemes which do involve the same amount of money but which will not satisfy the needs of this colony. As far as I have heard about entrepot trade, that may not materialise because the West Indian Islands may demand that the cargo be sent directly to them. As far as the relief of unemployment is concerned, if people are being put out of work, it is a very good thing to find that a Scheme of this sort is coming at a time when we can relieve unemployment. But this is not a Scheme which sets out merely to relieve unemployment; that is a merit which it will have as a side line. You cannot set out to construct a Deep Water Harbour merely to relieve unemployment because that is a fallacy and the last position will be worse than the first. I quite agree with the honourable junior member for St. Philip that we have to be courageous; if we fail in our attempt we must have the characteristic of courage on our side to be admired even by the people who come to our rescue. I am warning the Government against substituting foolhardiness for bravery and thinking that it is one and the same thing.

As far as the method of handling cargo is concerned, I do not think that there is anything more calculated to ruin the hearts of people like Netherage but that has, to a great extent, become a thing of the past, and we have seen fit to utilize mechanical means of towing our produce out and

our cargo in. The next thing I would like to say is that we are building in the sea and what would be of importance is the question of the Harbour not being abandoned for want of materials in the case of War within the next couple of years. Would a Deep Water Harbour be of such importance to the Americans during the next War—everybody seems to be looking for it—that they would be compelled to come in and take it over and see that we get the materials with which to finish it? We cannot build this Harbour in the course of a year or so.

I was glad to hear the honourable senior member for St. George mention the question of this "Point Four" assistance; I think a member of the Government said previously that they had approached that source already. If they have done so, that is information which is of paramount importance in putting forward a scheme of this sort and that should have been mentioned today. Do not tell me that the Government forgot to mention that; all the things I have mentioned are things which we will have to bear in mind. Are we being forced into this Scheme now because we have talked about it for a long time?

The next point is in respect of our Town Planning. I notice that we have only recently decided to build our Central Fire Station a good distance away from where we are thinking of constructing our Harbour. There seems to be something in this idea of town planning when you are planning for a project as big as a Deep Water Harbour.

I hope that our attention will not be so diverted to the carrying out of the Five Year Plan that we will leave the Deep Water Harbour absolutely to people who come here without any particular responsibility towards Barbadians, and who will afterwards get in a ship or a plane and go back whence they came like the gentleman who built the runway at Seawell, and we will not know their address that we can write them. Let us see that we get the very best people who not only have the skill and ability, but the familiarity with schemes of this sort. I sincerely hope that nothing like vote-catching will enter into the head of the Government in dealing with this Scheme; if it is a vital necessity to Barbados, it is a dire necessity that we see that it is a success. I sincerely hope that this Scheme will be successful and not lead us to have a financial millstone around our necks—one which may cause us to pay more than anybody else in these parts.

I see that it is proposed to make a levy on the cargo which is coming in. We may find in years to come that our ships will come alongside and discharge our cargo and we will have to pay much more for that than is paid by people who, perhaps, have no harbour at all, but who still make the best of what they have; probably they have concentrated more on air service to bring them not only passengers but cargo. I hope that all our borrowing will not be towards the Harbour, let some of our borrowing be done so as to have a really first class airport in this colony. We may find that our cargo might be coming by plane and it would be well for us not to put all our eggs in this particular basket because we find that the people who were against it on a previous occasion are now for it; they will be just the people who will hope that it will be a means of embarrassing the Government financially and causing Barbados to lose its Constitution.

Mr. MILLER: I am a bit disappointed at the remarks which have been made by the honourable Minister of Communications; somehow we were not told how the Government has planned to finance this Scheme. There has taken place from time to time much discussion about the construction of this

Deep Water Harbour; about three years ago a heated debate took place on the question of the construction of this Harbour. I was hoping that the honourable Minister of Communications would have given us some idea of the plans for getting underway with this Scheme. I feel that this question of the construction of this Deep Water Harbour will cause a lot of discussion in this House, but I also feel that we should reach a decision and get on with the Scheme. It is easy for us to believe that we cannot go on very much longer without a Deep Water Harbour; it is obvious that Federation must come and we will require a tremendous amount of small craft for operation in the area and Barbados will be chosen for docking facilities; therefore when we are deciding on the plans, consideration will have to be given to those facilities.

The suggestion has been made that we should have an airport in the docking area; well, that is something which can be regarded as being misleading. No panel of engineers would attempt to go in a business area and construct an airstrip; it is almost impossible to envisage the use of aircraft in such an area due to the location, because an aircraft must take off and land in the wind.

The longer we wait to construct this Deep Water Harbour, obviously, the more it will cost to construct it; we could have saved about \$8 million on this Scheme if we had decided to carry it out when it was discussed on the floor of this House some time ago. In connection with this Scheme few people would imagine the Government using money from the World Bank, which is only an international monetary Fund. They borrow money at 4%, they take 1% for handling certain things and then they collect 1% on the investments which means a total of 6% and any Government can borrow at less than 6%. No West Indian colony can borrow money from the World Bank unless the loan is sanctioned by the British Government; the sum of \$25 million could be obtained easily at 3% or 3½% and no Government would want to borrow money at 6% because that would be only penalising posterity. It is preposterous to imagine that the Government would borrow money from the World Bank when my children would have to walk with their bare feet on the ground. Children are being turned back from school because the facilities are not there, and we would be adding to the difficulties of the colony by going to the World Bank and borrowing money. Right now the Government should know whence they are handling this money.

This question of constructing a Deep Water Harbour is one of long necessity and I do not see why we should spend a whole day in debating it; our very position will ensure an advantage for Barbados by having this Harbour. I hope and pray that the Government realises that the delay in implementing this Scheme must make the implementation of it cost more. The need for a Deep Water Harbour has now become an emergency; we are committed to this Scheme and any Scheme will be successful if you have enough money to throw into it. The probability is that we may make a mistake as in the case of the construction at Seawell, but the question is; what are we left to do? I regret that the honourable senior member for St. Michael, the honourable Minister for Communications, did not explain to the House what the Government's position is as to getting ahead with this Scheme. I hope that he will be able to throw some light on that matter and give us the consolation that something will be done in connection with this Harbour.

Mr. BRANCKER: I think that the last note which was sounded by the last speaker is the most important in the debate. For about a decade we

have been discussing the question of constructing a Deep Water Harbour and the question is; when are we going to start with this Scheme? Sir Douglas Ritchie provided us with a Report in respect of the Deep Water Harbour as long ago as 1948; in that Report Sir Douglas observed that some improvement in port facilities is long overdue and that the necessity for improvement could be of little doubt. He says:

"Owing to the reduction in efficiency of labour, the rate of handling cargo has been reduced steadily since the war, with the attendant increase in costs."

We realise that we have less and less ships coming to the island and other colonies which have Deep Water Harbours are securing the trade which belongs to us because of our geographical position.

In 1948 the estimated cost of constructing this Deep Water Harbour was £3,185,000 and we find that when the Deep Water Harbour Committee presented their Report in 1953, they suggested that the North Scheme should be used and the cost of construction has increased to the sum of £4,200,000! It will be seen that in the period of time between the presentation of the Ritchie Report and that of the Report of Deep Water Harbour Committee, there is an additional cost of £1 million! That is why I emphasized that the last point which was made by the honourable junior member for St. George is really the only worth-while point in this debate. Something must be done and done quickly otherwise we will have another 32% increase in the estimated cost of constructing this Harbour and we will appoint another Committee to say whether we still need a Deep Water Harbour. As a matter of fact, even if the amount of the loan was ten times as much as what has been proposed, I do not anticipate that there would be the least delay in that loan being floated.

Apart from the fact that a Deep Water Harbour is a necessity for reducing the cost of handling cargo in the Port of Bridgetown, in the past the opposition to the construction of such a Harbour came from the owners of lighters: now, whether they have been better advised or they have been converted—I do not know which it is—we hear less and less objections to our having a Deep Water Harbour coming from that source. What is a matter of concern to us is that although we pride ourselves as being one of the most important of the British Caribbean Colonies, yet if we cruise around the Caribbean we will find Deep Water Harbours; we will find that Trinidad and the small islands of Grenada and St. Lucia have Deep Water Harbours and even in Curaçao and Aruba there are the same facilities; but in Barbados, which is an acknowledged leader in the scheme of things, we find that ships have to remain all the way out to sea I do not think that there is anywhere else besides Antigua where ships have to remain so far out to sea as is the case in Barbados—a Deep Water Harbour is a necessity for this colony. Let the Government make a beginning with this scheme before the year is out so that we will be displaying our awareness of the necessity for a Deep Water Harbour in this colony. I am giving my full support to this matter and I am urging the Government and particularly the honourable Minister in charge of the matter, to make a start with this Scheme; I am sure that the honourable senior member for St. Michael will have no reason for not expediting this matter inasmuch as Bridgetown is a part of St. Michael.

Hon. M. E. COX: There are only one or two points to which I should like to reply. The honourable junior member for St. George has said that I have failed to give the House information as to the manner in which the Government is proposing to

finance this project. I noticed during my speech that the honourable member was engaged in a conversation with the honourable junior member for St. Lucy and did not pay as much attention as he should have paid to what I was saying. I do not know if he was laughing at or with the honourable junior member for St. Lucy; I pointed out early that the Committee recommended that a loan of £4,750,000 should be raised and it was proposed, in the first place, to get a substantial amount of money from the Colonial Development and Welfare Organisation; cables have been sent to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. In paragraph 17 of the Report the average value of imports and exports for the years 1949–1952 has been estimated and under a 2% levy as proposed, there will be yielded an amount of \$1,520,360. On page 20 of the Report I pointed out that the estimated annual revenue from various sources was £351,742 which was an ample amount to offset the recurrent annual expenditure. I pointed that out most clearly when I was putting the matter before the House; there was no question as to how the Scheme would be financed or as to how the recurrent expenditure would be borne.

The honourable senior member for St. George dealt with the matter of the Government having decided to impose a levy of \$2.00 per ton on sugar and then refusing to collect the money and allowing the levy to go "down the drain". However, the Government pointed out very clearly that if and when it decided to construct a Deep Water Harbour, then and only then will it impose this levy on the sugar industry. What I would like the honourable member to know is that this money does not go "down the drain" as he says, because a part of the money is to be paid by peasant cane growers; it works out at 20 cents to 22 cents per ton of canes. When it is proposed to impose this levy, politicians might be against us and they might say that we are imposing this levy on the poor peasants to the tune of 20 cents to 22 cents per ton of canes to do something which we can ill afford to do—to build a Deep Water Harbour which will put people out of work.

The honourable member also raised the question of assistance under the "Point Four" programme; I have not got it in writing so that I could quote it, but I can assure the honourable member that when Sir Alfred Savage was here, he did his best to see whether we could get assistance under "Point Four" in financing this project; but just as the Military Department in the United Kingdom refused to support this Scheme, so we were refused assistance under "Point Four". These people do not get rid of money as easily as the honourable member thinks. I saw a little of them in Puerto Rico and they are very careful as to how they spend money.

I do not think that there is anything more to which I should reply; it is only left for me to thank the honourable members for the co-operation and undivided support which they have given to this matter. I want to assure honourable members that the Government is very keen in getting this project off to a good start and we may soon be able to inform them as to what the position will be in so far as the financing of the project is concerned. The honourable senior member for St. Lucy has said that as long as this project is to be carried out in St. Michael it will be off to a good start; I want to thank him for the compliment which he has paid me, and I hope that he and other honourable members like him will act in a similar manner towards their constituents.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It was not my intention to prolong this debate because my views on the Report are well known and I have already appended my reservation to the Report. While I apologize for speaking after the introducer of the motion has re-

plied, I want to say something with reference to the remarks which have just been made. The honourable senior member for St. George referred to the levy of \$2.00 per ton of sugar in respect of the Harbour Scheme and the honourable introducer of the motion has said that the Government would let it be known when the levy will be collected. I want to say that neither during last year nor during this year were the sugar interests assured that the Government would not be collecting the levy, and last year and this year the sugar interests levied and collected the money expecting that the Government would have asked for it. This year most of the sugar factories are paying \$11.00 per ton for canes; as far as the parish of St. Philip is concerned, the explanation is given by the sugar factories that they have collected the \$2.00 per ton in case that the Government wants it.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I think that that statement is very misleading; before any price was fixed, the sugar producers asked the Government about the levy and the Government said that there would not be any levy imposed.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If the statement is misleading, it is misleading either on the part of the Government or on the part of the sugar producers. The sugar producers have explained that they are not sure whether or not the Government will want the \$2.00 per ton; if the Government told the sugar producers what the honourable member said the Government told them, then the sugar producers did not understand it. It is either that they were told that or they were not told that and they collected the levy. I only rose to state that, because if the Government's statement is correct, the sugar producers should be ashamed of themselves and they should not be allowed to get away with it.

There is this one final point I want to make. I am not sure if the suggestion has been made, but I feel that under the new Harbour Scheme some attempt should be made to create a free zone in the port of Bridgetown; I am sure that honourable members will readily see how advantageous that would be to this island.

Mr. BARROW: Arising out of what the honourable Minister of Communications has said. I think that an explanation is due.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that the honourable member will be allowed to make that explanation now.

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

LEAVE TO MOVE THE PASSING OF AN ADDRESS

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker,—I am asking leave to move the passing of the Address of which I gave notice earlier this afternoon.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: This Address is asking the House to debate a matter on which they have already said that they are not hearing the honourable member. I am asking Your Honour to give a ruling in this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no necessity for me to rule.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am asking Your Honour to give a ruling because my experience in this House is that these things happen more than once.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will not rule.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: There is no necessity for Your Honour to shout at me.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not shouting at the honourable member.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am asking Your Honour to rule at this point; I do not want honourable mem-

bers to think that they can do one thing to-day and something else at another time.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will reserve that ruling; I am not giving that ruling now.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am suggesting that the question be put that the motion made by the honourable senior member for St. Philip be re-considered.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: In view of what Your Honour has said, I am withdrawing my objection. I should like to point out, however, that with the institution of a Ministerial System of Government you cannot pass an Address to the Governor. I am therefore suggesting to the honourable member to put the matter in the form of a Resolution. The Governor cannot initiate legislation; it will become the duty of the appropriate Minister to investigate this Resolution and make his comment in Executive Committee. Whether the House have made a mistake before or not, with the introduction of the Ministerial System of Government, you should not pass an Address to the Governor.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking leave to move the passing of an Address of which he gave notice earlier this afternoon. If there is no objection, leave will be granted the honourable member. There being no objection, the honourable member may proceed.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am objecting to leave being granted, Mr. Speaker. In agreeing with what the honourable Premier has just said, I will say that while it is true to say that not many moments ago we passed an address to His Excellency the Governor, it must be borne in mind that the address passed was the result of a Message which His Excellency sent to this House relative to getting the views of this Honourable House on the construction of a Deep Water Harbour. It was quite a different thing to what is contained in the honourable member's Address.

The question that leave be granted the honourable member to proceed with the Address was put and resolved in the affirmative on the declaration of Mr. Speaker "I think the 'Ayes' have it."

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, this Address reads as follows:—

The House Of Assembly To His Excellency The Governor

The House of Assembly desire to draw to the attention of Your Excellency the fact that there is an acute shortage of labour at the present time in the Dominion of Canada and that both industry and agriculture are urgently in need of additional labour forces.

2. The House desire specifically to emphasize that, due in part, to the tremendous hydro-electric development which has been effected in recent times by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario, farmers in the Niagara belt and in Southern Ontario are experiencing the utmost difficulty in getting crops reaped by the early autumn and that the labour shortage is also being keenly felt during the grain harvest in the West. Organisations of agriculturists in both these areas are clamouring for assistance to relieve the situation and would welcome migrant labour during harvest time.

3. The House would emphasize that there are definite prospects for the temporary emigration of appreciable numbers of both men and women to Canada during the summer and early autumn, and are convinced that Your Excellency should head a delegation which should depart for Canada as expeditiously as possible in order to take advantage of the position.

4. The House would also remind Your Excellency of the possibilities presented by Trans-Canada Airlines for cheap transport under special charter.

I will begin by answering the suggestion that this Address should be changed in its form. On the introduction of ministerial status, I myself enquired of the honourable Premier whether Addresses should be given notice of in the usual manner and sitting in his former position, the honourable member in reply said that "we will continue as we were doing until we are told to change." Since then, we have passed several addresses in this House and they have not been changed in form. It is more than passing strange that this House should be told at this hour that we should change from the present form, and that the form of this Address should be changed. This Address seeks to emphasize in my opinion an important state of affairs. It states that due in part to the tremendous hydro-electric development in the province of Ontario and the consequent increase in fruit, vegetable and tobacco crops, the farmers are finding it difficult to reap their crops before the early frost and it goes on to suggest that His Excellency the Governor himself should head a delegation to Canada to contact a farmers' delegation there in order to see whether we can send some of our workers there before the reaping season starts. This Address is not dealing with emigration to Canada generally. Within the past few months, there have been several suggestions in the local Press urging on the Government the necessity for exploring emigration possibilities to Canada. In the daily *Advocate* and many weekly newspapers this suggestion has been made several times, therefore, any Government in Barbados, if it is worth its salt, by now must have conducted some enquiry with regard to the general position of emigration in Canada. After all, with these suggestions in the Press, day after day, that the Canadian Government be asked to take West Indian labour, it would be absolute ignorance and indifference on the part of any Government if it did not attempt to investigate what are the possibilities.

But I am not touching on that part at all tonight; I am touching on an entirely different situation. This immediate labour question is purely a matter which is on a temporary basis, therefore, when I was told from the Government Bench a half hour ago that the Government had already investigated this matter; that is not the case. I know that is not the case because I have heard from authoritative sources what the Government had been doing in this respect and what Government had been doing had nothing to do with regard to getting an immediate quota of Barbadian workers off to Canada on temporary emigration.

(Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair).

As a matter of fact, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, can you imagine any sort of Government except one comprised of donkeys and blockheads having this information and doing what this Government is doing? The summer in Canada starts in July and we are now at the beginning of June. We have five ministers supposedly intelligent. Would you expect that they, if they had this information, would sit down as they are doing now without investigating it or just by sending correspondence? Would you not expect that some of them would have gone to Canada immediately on their receipt of the information with a view of getting some of the workers of this colony there by the first week in July? If the honourable Premier had this information, instead of wasting time going to British Honduras

to attend a meeting of the Caribbean Commission which he himself said was purely routine, the honourable member would have gone to Canada about this matter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the honourable member should get ahead recommending the Address to this House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I am fully aware that there have been very many suggestions within recent times, not only in the Barbados Press and the whole West Indian Press, but even in Africa and Pakistan at the recent Commonwealth Conference, that the Dominions of Canada and Australia should be urged to change their emigration policy in regard to the coloured race within the Commonwealth. I know that the Jamaican Government has approached the Canadian Government in a general way over this emigration policy because up to a few days ago one of the Jamaican newspapers made comments on it. But, as I have said, that is an entirely different matter to what is contained in this Address. What is contained in this Address is a precise situation of what is happening in Canada at the present moment and it demands precise attention along the terms suggested in the Address. I am not suggesting that this House should call upon the Government to investigate the possibilities of direct emigration to Canada although the Government will have to do that in the not distant future because improving industries in Canada have placed a severe strain on the population there.

As we all know, Canada is a bigger area than the United States of America and it has only a mere 15 million people. The United States of America with its smaller land area has ten times that population, therefore, it is necessary in the ordinary course of events for the Canadian Government to increase its population. At present, that country has fixed an immigration quota at 200,000 a year. In 1951, it maintained the quota and in 1952 the figure dropped by 30,000 and the drop caused members of the Opposition in the Canadian Parliament to question the Government with regard to why it was not doing more to maintain the annual quota; and the Government's reply was that it could not get more people of the type required. It said that 200,000 Europeans were not available annually for emigration to Canada when Australia and New Zealand also wanted emigrants from Europe. My suggestion therefore is that there is cause for the local Government suggesting to the Canadian Government that there should be fundamental alterations in that Government's emigration policy in so far as its specific exclusion of coloured people from benefitting by the need for emigration to that country. But, I repeat, this is another matter, I am not suggesting this at all now. What I am suggesting is that if these big hydro-electric schemes in Ontario which I have explained in detail in the Address have succeeded in extending Canadian fruits, vegetables and tobacco to the extent that the population is incapable of reaping those products before the frost destroys them, it behoves this Government to endeavour to ask the Canadian authorities to allow our workers to come there and reap in the harvest before the frost destroys it and to send our workers back as soon as the harvest is finished reaping. We are not asking that country to change its emigration policy. The farmers are complaining that they cannot get their crops reaped. In order to get them reaped on the last occasion, one family had to help the next family and there was a wholesale emigration of labour from the east to the west in order to get the harvest in before the frost stepped in.

Sir, I have the support of a noted Canadian authority in Barbados that if immediate representations are made by this Government, we can get the Canadian authorities to agree to the emigration into Canada of a certain number of our workers with the expressed understanding that as soon as the harvest is completely reaped, the workers would be sent back home. All of us, I am sure, would like to see them stay permanently but it is no point in pushing that now. Sir, it is not for me at this stage to recount in detail the extent of the unemployed in Barbados, because, as elected representatives of the people, every single member should know the numbers just as much as I. It would be a waste of valuable time if I went into the figures to prove how grave is the unemployment situation in Barbados.

Honourable members will remember that in 1943 when the American authorities found themselves in a similar position to what Canada is in now, the Royal Governor of the Bahamas, the Duke of Windsor, (the former King Edward VIII) left his seat of office and went to the United States to find out at first hand what were the conditions. He himself lent prestige by virtue of his dignity and office to the delegation by heading it, so the Governor of Barbados can lend prestige by virtue of his dignity and office to the delegation which should be sent to Canada immediately to contact a delegation of those farmers and the Government in Ottawa to make this scheme a success. I have it from authority that if this delegation leave these shores in a few days for Canada that this scheme can work. I am suggesting to honourable members that this is nothing to fool around; this is nothing which we should treat in a manner as if it were a political football. Regardless of who bring in suggestions to provide possibilities for the better economic conditions of the country, we should work on those suggestions. This is no time to play politics; merely enquiring or merely stating that you are investigating is not enough. This scheme will not permit for any delay at all.

Trans-Canada authorities fortunately for us are now in Barbados. They are part of the Canadian Government, so we will not have to hurt our heads about transport. They will give assistance in getting our people there in record time; they can get our workers to Montreal in a day; so we will not have to wonder whether we can charter Resort Airlines; that is why in paragraph 4 of the Address, attention is paid to that matter.

There are two other points with which I will deal. The first is that the Canadian authorities may not be as familiar with the standard of work which our men can do as the American authorities are, but there are files in this country containing letters of appreciation sent by numerous employers in America attesting to the high standard of work performed by Barbadian workers under contract work in the U.S.A. and those files can be drawn on in order to explain to the Canadian authorities the standard of work which our people are capable of doing. For instance, Sir, when I was conducting this enquiry within the last week or two, I was asked whether we could send men who could drive motor trucks because that type of transport would be needed to transport the produce from farm to station, warehouse and what not. I was told that a large number of lorry drivers would be needed and my reply was that we could provide hundreds of trained chauffeurs and truck drivers for that matter. I told him that there were files explaining the type of work our people were capable of doing, therefore, these should be placed at the disposal of the Canadian authorities. The second point is that in the main area which these workers are needed now, the climatic conditions are the least rigorous that are

experienced in Canada, where as we all know, is a place with severe climatic conditions but in the Niagara area and in Ontario itself, you have the mildest climate that prevails in that country. In that case, our workers need not be afraid of meeting any extreme climatic conditions in that part of Canada. Of course, if they are needed to go further west, conditions would be different, but when it comes to Ontario, they need not have any fear of extreme climatic conditions.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will say no more at this stage than to say that while we all appreciate anything which has been done so far in respect to enquiring into the possibilities of emigration to Canada, those enquiries can still be conducted without prejudice to the suggestions contained in this Address.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can the honourable member tell the House anything of the shortage of labour there, so that honourable members can get some idea of the number of workers that is needed? Can you also tell this House something of the source from which you got your information?

Mr. CRAWFORD: That information has been taken firstly from Canadian journalistic sources and it was supplemented by my own enquiries and confirmed by Canadians who were over here and who are in some way connected with the Government.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Could you give us the names of any of them?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I would be quite willing, but I will not do so before I secure their permission. Should they assent, I would disclose their names.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Paragraph 2 of the Address points to the difficulty of the farmers getting their crops reaped. I take it that the honourable member has news from that source. Would you state something with regard to that information?

Mr. CRAWFORD: As I have said earlier, the Canadian Government has been endeavouring to maintain a specific quota of immigrants to the country every year from Europe for the last two years in order to relieve the situation. In 1951, it maintained the scheduled number of immigrants but in 1952, the number which is 200,000 dropped by 30,000 and last year, in the Canadian Parliament, the Opposition initiated a debate criticising the Government for not having maintained the schedule of permanent immigration and the reply of the Government was that it just could not get any more emigrants from Europe. I think that answers your question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I hope the honourable member appreciates my suggestions.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I fully appreciate them. Any information which the House needs, I am willing to supply it.

Mr. GODDARD: I have great pleasure in seconding this Address. The mere fact that this information has been drawn to the House should cause an investigation into the matter without delay. Every honourable member is thoroughly aware of the grave unemployment problem which confronts us, therefore, I know that this House would willingly support this Address. It states that the crops in parts of Canada have to be reaped in a very short time and there is an inadequacy of labour to reap them in that time. I Address. It states that the crops in parts of Canada enjoys one of the shortest summers and with its fertile land and big crops, it means that the country has just a matter of days in which it must garner in those crops. It has been drawn to the notice of the honourable senior member for St. Philip that this state of position exists in Canada and I was told in a recent conversation with someone from Ottawa, who although not a Government official is a journalist of some note, that the racial discrimination that peo-

ple in the West Indies consider to exist in Canada was not really there, therefore if we pursue this matter of emigration to Canada vigorously, I am sure that we will be surprised to see that the authorities there may want our people for short periods to reap their crops. Let us find out what conditions for employment of our workers during the reaping season exist there. I have been told that this racial discrimination which we think exists in Canada is not really there. If those farmers—

(A VOICE: I spent seven years there; I know of the racial discrimination there.)

If the farmers in Ontario want their crops reaped before the autumn ends, they will bring pressure to bear in Ottawa so as to allow emigrants from the West Indies to come there and assist them in getting in their crops. This Address is for the specific object of work on a short term policy which I hope may accrue to something bigger. I do believe that if an effort is made vigorously now on behalf of getting our workers there to assist in reaping the crops owing to the fact that we have been told that this problem exists, some good will come out of it. There can be no harm if this Government investigate on the spot the possibilities of our people going there this autumn. As I have said, if what that journalist told me is true, we may be surprised by finding out that our workers may be welcomed on this occasion.

Sir, I have much pleasure in seconding this or any other such scheme as has been suggested in this House before. I think the honourable Minister who holds this portfolio should be so active on this problem that he should have someone cruising about the area from Canada to Brazil regularly to find out if our people would be welcomed in any of the territories within the area. We should be willing to recruit our workers at short notice because we know the benefits which would accrue to Barbados. My belief is that if we pursue this matter vigorously, the people from the other territories would welcome our workers for short periods and then would want them to stay on a long term basis; for that reason, I have great pleasure in seconding this Address.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking for the opportunity to make a short statement on this question now, lest when the five ministers withdraw from this House at the time of the voting on this matter, we may again be attacked in the Press for being not in favour of the Address. In order that we maintain the constitutional position of our ministerial setup, we should do it, and I hope the honourable senior member for St. Philip would see that it is right that we should do so.

Mr. CRAWFORD: But I am not unemployed.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am merely suggesting that the honourable member should see from a point of view of procedure that the Ministers should not take part in the voting on an Address of this nature. I have already pointed out in this House that under ministerial government the Governor is bound by the advice which he receives from his Ministers collectively; I say collectively because there may be individual cases where the majority of Ministers may not agree with a Minister dealing with a particular portfolio. Ministers must advise the Governor on all facts before us on all problems whether emigration or otherwise; therefore, it is impossible to sit down and vote for or against an Address of this nature which under ministerial setup would be passing an Address to ourselves, that is, to the particular Minister specifically and to the other Ministers collectively.

I would say no more about the reference by the honourable senior member for St. Philip in respect of what I said earlier. I know that whatever I say, he would contradict, but I can say that I have never been such a lunatic as to tell anybody that under min-

isterial setup the system of passing Addresses would be the same as before when these were all addressed to the Governor who had the right to suggest to the Attorney General or the members of the Executive that he would like such and such a bill or resolution be sent down to the House. There was nothing then to prevent the Governor from ignoring our advice and telling the Attorney General to go ahead and draft a particular Bill or do a particular thing trusting to luck when it is sent down to the Legislature; but under ministerial system in which the Governor is bound to take the advice of his Ministers—

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I merely want to know if what the honourable senior member for St. Joseph is telling this House—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member has not risen on a point of order; the honourable member may have risen on a point of explanation.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable Premier on the introduction of ministerial system has given us no statement as regards giving notice of addresses. Would he tell us if this is the first address that has been passed by this House in this way? Sir, several others have been passed in this manner since the introduction of ministerial system.

(A VOICE: We passed the Jagan Address in this manner).

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am pointing out to the honourable member, not because we of the Government disagreed with that Address; as a matter of fact, I agreed with all he said then; but that Address was a proper Address; it was a matter for the Governor; but with respect to this Address, the Government is responsible for emigration.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not think that the particular matter referred to was an address at all, it was a resolution.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: It might have been a resolution, but even if it were an Address, it would have been in order because we of the Government could not exclude Dr. Jagan from coming here; that was a matter for the Governor. As a matter of courtesy, the Governor may mention it to the Ministers before deciding himself. Honourable members know that on certain particulars of internal self-government, the Governor must take our advice but on certain matters he has to act himself; if he cares, he may confer with us. All I was trying to convey to the honourable senior member for St. Philip when I got up at first was that he should put this matter with which we are dealing as a resolution, but he is at liberty to take my advice or not. I get up now to point out that when the five of us leave this Chamber before the vote is taken on this matter it is the only proper course for us to adopt with ministerial status. We are supposed to advise the Governor. Even from the time Sir Grattan Bushe introduced his experiment, he said that if the Government wanted to preserve the proper constitutional procedure in matters like this, it was the duty of the Government not to remain in the House to vote or take part in debates such as this. Certainly, if any great event took place in Great Britain as that which took place recently when the House of Commons passed a loyal Address to Her Majesty the Queen, the whole House takes part in an Address of that sort; but one cannot begin to conceive that the Opposition in the House of Commons would think of moving an address to the Queen saying that it is the opinion of the House of Commons that iron and steel should be nationalised again. They would not think of doing it in the form of an address at all; they would try to get it passed as a resolution of the House of Commons.

We are not saying that doing things by way of addresses are impossible. It is parliamentary practice to do certain things by way of addresses but it depends on the nature of the address. As regards an address of the sort with which we are dealing, where the facts primarily concern one of the ministers, even though they may not concern all the Ministers; none of the Ministers should stay in the House to take part in the voting. Bear in mind that our going out of the House on this Address does not in the least bit reflect our views on emigration or on our views of what should be done in this instance or any expression of opinion whatever. I am merely saying that until the Rules of this House are changed, if honourable members persist in bringing forward addresses of this sort, it will be necessary for the Ministers to leave the House. I think I owe an explanation to the House on this question. At the same time, it is immaterial to Ministers of this House whether the wrong interpretation is put to their leaving the House when matters like this are being decided on.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: It gives me very great pleasure to associate myself with my colleague on this Address touching as it is on a matter of such great importance. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we all are aware of the difficulties and the hardships experienced by the lot of our men and women in making two ends meet, therefore, when it comes to our making a way to lessen those difficulties and hardships, I think we are in duty bound to grasp those opportunities in order to bring some relief irrespective of how temporary that relief may be. There is some truth in the Address with which we are dealing to-night and I feel that the honourable Minister of Labour should so bestir himself and so advise the Head of the Administration about it that some action should be taken immediately to see if we can get our boys and even our girls out to Canada if it may only be for a matter of three months. I know that our boys will agree to go, as well as our girls and I am sure if they are given the opportunity they will make good. Under every circumstance they will surmount the difficulties.

I do not wish to prolong the debate but I would like to advise the honourable Minister of Labour to do his best to get our workers out to Canada. I remember in 1943, although I was not a member of this august Chamber, but was taking part in the welfare of my people in another capacity, I attended a meeting held in Queen's Park at which it was urged that the then Governor should go to America in an effort to get some of our workers there and that is how the first emigrants from here got the opportunity of taking part in the industrial life of America. The results of their achievements are on record. I remember on that occasion that my closing remarks were "where there is blood there is motion and inertia is death and the powers that be should show that they are worthy to be numbered in the land of the living." I will end with that and will wait and see whether any good will come out of this Address.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the difference of opinion as to whether this matter should be in the form of a resolution or an Address as it is now is of little matter to me at this stage. I think it is a matter which should be over and beyond any politics at all. I believe every member of this Chamber is as interested in this matter as the honourable senior member for St. Philip who brought it in and therefore I think we all are interested in getting some scheme which would relieve unemployment in this colony. A few days ago, when members of the Government Party were on a march with various banners representing the various divisions of labour, it was significant that there was not a banner to represent those who were unemployed. I think we are all aware of the fact that there is a tremendous num-

ber of unemployed persons in this colony, therefore, we are bound whenever the occasion presents itself to do whatever can be done to relieve the situation. As far as this matter should be in the form of a resolution or an Address, I feel it does not matter to any honourable member; if the honourable senior member for St. Philip insists that it should be put in the form of an Address, I believe even the five honourable Ministers of the Government would vote for it: as a matter of fact, Sir, they are actually bound to vote for it. If it goes to the Governor as an Address, I believe the honourable Premier would lend all the support he can to it even though the honourable mover of it did not accept his suggestion to bring the matter in the form of a resolution. I do not think that would prevent the honourable Premier from giving it his support.

If one reads this Address carefully, he will see that what the honourable senior member for St. Philip is suggesting is that there is only temporary and a specific form of emigration for a period of about three months and is asking the Governor to lend his presence to a delegation with the honourable Premier or somebody else to go to Canada to make enquiries about the matter. I have heard an intimation from the honourable Minister of Labour that no useful purpose is going to be served by going to Canada because Government is already working on the matter but this Address is not saying that Government is not working on something in connection with the matter; it is only suggesting, as I have just said, that a delegation should be sent to Canada at once about the matter and that His Excellency the Governor should lend his presence to the delegation.

I am going to suggest an amendment to the Address and that is that the expenses incurred in sending the delegation to Canada should be met from the \$300,000 which is set down in the Estimates against emigration. Sir, do not let us be at a difference over this matter because it emanated from the honourable senior member for St. Philip; do not let us have a political difference over it which might cause the unemployed to suffer; let us raise this matter above a political issue; let us join in concert to get some of our people from here to Canada. Some time ago, the honourable Premier made some statement in the Press in an interview with a Canadian and I have no doubt that the honourable member would lend his weight to this matter. The honourable Premier earlier to-day said that he was born stubborn; but in dealing with some things we must forget our stubbornness and I am sure that this is one of the things in which he will forget his stubbornness. Certainly, you can walk out of the House when the issue is to be decided if that is the procedure; I will not think that any of the five of you are against emigration because you may do that. If you show people that you are opposed to emigration it will be the easiest thing to make you lose your seat. There may be many things to prevent you losing your seats but—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to remind the honourable member that he is not addressing the Chair.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I appreciate your advice. Sir, the honourable senior member for St. Philip may not have felt disposed to change this matter from an Address to the Governor but I somewhat agree with the point raised by the honourable Premier in respect to the fact that under ministerial setup, the Governor is bound to take the advice of his ministers collectively; therefore, in order for this matter to have the blessing of the Ministers it might be well if this address be changed to a resolution. I feel that we should pass this matter in a calm atmosphere; of course, I am

sure not one honourable member would be so stupid as to raise his voice to say 'no' to it. This is one time that the Opposition can speak with you on all fours. I throw it out as a challenge that you dare not say 'No' to this Address.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not think the honourable member is correct in threatening honourable members.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am saying, Sir, that we dare not say 'no' to this Address. All that is necessary with this Address is to decide on it in a calm atmosphere. It will be infinitely better if the Head of the Administration can lend his presence on the delegation with other suitable persons on the mission to Canada. We suggest strongly to the honourable Premier that he should take this Address seriously and in doing so, he should appreciate the fact that it is not always possible for one to hear of everything first. There are other honourable members in this Chamber and by their position, they are likely to hear of certain things before others. I myself have read of this shortage of labour in Canada from an American newspaper. Sir, what would be better for the population of this island than to hear on Saturday morning that the honourable Premier and other suitable personnel have left the island for Canada to make representations on behalf of getting workers there. Sir, no one wants you to go to Canada to amend that country's emigration laws, but we want you to be on the spot where you can make demands on behalf of our workers personally. A delegation went to California on a similar purpose but although it has not achieved its purpose, the people are satisfied that the money was well spent in sending that delegation. If three-quarters of the amount set down in the estimates is spent on delegates going around to seek about emigration for some of the island's population, the people will be satisfied. I am going to vote for this Address but before I do so, I want to be assured that it would not be necessary for us to deal with a resolution for an amount to meet the expenses of this delegation.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: It is not necessary; the expenses can be met from the vote for emigration in the Estimates.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: If that is the case, I will offer no amendment. This is not a challenge, but I again say that neither of the members of the Government dare say anything against this Address. If they are shown the slightest possibility of getting emigration of our workers on a short-term basis, they dare not refuse to take action on it. Again, Sir, in dealing with a matter like this, it depends on pleasing personalities. I am fully convinced that the prestige of the Governor would lend weight to the delegation and I am convinced that the recent interview between the honourable Premier and a section of the Press about his nearly being a Canadian would also serve some useful purpose. We must bear in mind that we have something to sell—labour—and we must get the best salesmen possible to sell it for us.

I am going to say for the last time that I am supporting this Address. If it is correct procedure that the honourable Ministers must go out of the Chamber when the vote is taken on this matter, all well and good; I know that they dare not oppose it. I will not associate myself with any remarks that the honourable Ministers walked out because they did not want to support it. The honourable Premier has just returned from British Honduras, but he would be surprised to know of the prayers that will go up that he and the delegation cross the Atlantic safely if this Address is decided on. As far as his going to British Honduras, they do not care much about that, but when he leaves these

shores to go anywhere to see about emigration for the people, the old and young, the cripple and the infirmed will be praying unceasingly that his health keeps up and the plane lands safely. Sir, there is no reason why the honourable Premier, His Excellency and other proper personnel should not be leaving these shores on Saturday morning for Canada. It does not matter at the end of this Session who brought in this Address. If you get emigration for some of the people, what difference would it make if this Address was brought in by the honourable senior member for St. Philip or any other honourable member? The members of the Government can say to the people that it was not a matter of who brought it in, they had to support it and Government had to finance the money and to advise the Governor. I am appealing to the honourable Premier to see about this matter himself. I do not pay much attention to the other four Ministers in a matter like this; I feel this is purely a matter for the honourable Premier to decide. I am therefore asking him to forget the little wrangle he had with the honourable senior member for St. Philip over it in respect of whether it should be in the form of a resolution or an address and to give the matter serious thought with a view to doing something about it. I will go as far as to say that with the funds at his disposal, he should use the radio-telephone communications tomorrow for at least three hours in connection with the matter. Let the honourable Premier satisfy himself tomorrow by radio-telephone if there is the faintest possibility and when he is satisfied on that, get together proper personnel to form a delegation to travel by Trans-Canada to see about the matter personally. Tell the Governor to forget some of the sport which he is now enjoying and some of the comfort around him for the time being so as to lend his presence on the delegation for the suffering people of Barbados. Let the Head of the Administration assist by going and using his prerogative and his influence. His Excellency is distinguished by being a Brigadier General and by the dignity of that rank with all the medals that go with it, we know that the presence of Brig.-Gen. Sir Robert Arundell in Canada along with the delegation would mean a tremendous lot in dealing with the personnel on the other side.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member is using the name of His Excellency to influence this House.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Oh no! I think I have used it to the contrary.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I interpret what the honourable member said as trying to influence members of this House.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am sorry if Your Honour interpreted it that way. In conclusion, let me say again that I am supporting this Address and I am hoping that the honourable Premier would use his influence in trying to get something done in this matter as quickly as possible.

Mr. ALLDER: I am very glad to see that this Address seems to be meeting with the approval of all honourable members so I am craving your indulgence to say that when steps are taken as regards the sending of a delegation to investigate on-the-spot possibilities of emigration to Canada that the authorities would see to it that the delegation be reasonably representative of those persons who would honestly do everything to make it a success. I feel, Sir, that everyone does agree that emigration is necessary and if this short-term emigration to Canada must take place, we must act quickly. I am sure that the Government will get some information from the Committee which is now sitting and which has just made some strong recommendations along

these lines. I do hope, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that all efforts would be made to see that success is achieved in this matter.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would just like to say a few words on the debate. I believe every honourable member of this House realises the necessity for emigration so as to ease the unemployment question as well as the question of over population. What worries me about emigration to Canada is various articles which I have read from time to time in the Press. I have in my hand now a memorandum of an appeal made by some of our people there to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration and it contains some rather important information. It is written by the Negro Citizenship Association and is dated 27th April, 1954. It reads as follows:—

**TO THE PRIME MINISTER AND
GOVERNMENT OF CANADA**

"Gentlemen :

In our appearance before you today, it is our desire to call to your attention certain phases of the Immigration Act and the Immigration Regulations which seem diametrically opposed to the high principles of Canadians and to Canadian ideals. We will cite certain sections which seem to offend in this regard, try to show why they offend, and respectfully offer some suggestions for the betterment of same.

The Immigration Act since 1923 seems to have been purposely written and revised to deny equal immigration status to those areas of the Commonwealth where coloured peoples constitute a large part of the population. This is done by creating a rigid definition of British subject: "British subjects by birth or by naturalization in the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand or the Union of South Africa and citizens of Ireland". This definition excludes from the category of "British subject" those who are in all other senses British subjects, but who come from such areas as the British West Indies, Bermuda, British Guiana, Ceylon, India, Pakistan, Africa, etc.

As if this were not enough, Orders-in-Council have been passed from time to time to create more effective measures for the carrying out of the provisions of the Act and Regulations.

Our delegation claims this definition of British subject is discriminatory and dangerous.

It is discriminatory because it creates two classes of Her Majesty's subjects—on the one hand you have subjects predominantly white, on the other, subjects predominantly coloured. The first class are deemed "British subjects" for the purpose of the Immigration Act, the other class, by implication, are not British subjects.

It is dangerous because it instils a feeling in these divided groups, as well as in Canadians, that there are superior and inferior races, and it has the tendency to raise animosity between people born in different geographical areas. Social and biological sciences have established definitely that there are no superior races. The United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights asserts, "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights". And Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth, as recently as December 25, 1953, pronounced herself as dedicated to the concept of an equal partnership of all Commonwealth nations and races—and urged acceptance of this concept upon all countries of the Commonwealth.

It is dangerous because Canada as a democratic nation is committed to promote world peace, and this false feeling of a superior race has already shattered the peace of the world as experienced in the Second World War. We believe Canada will not countenance, in any way, anything which may lead to sowing the seed of race hatred; neither will she act contrary

to the "Canadian understanding of the equality of all people". She must take drastic measures not only to remove race hatred, but to destroy it completely forever.

This classification of British subjects is dangerous to the peace of the world.

While our concern is for equal treatment of all British subjects, our greatest experience has been specifically in the matter of West Indian Negroes. We wish therefore to devote some attention to their particular situation."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member will have to make that memorandum a document of the House.

Mr. MILLER: As I have said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that appeal was made to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration asking for an extension of a temporary stay by some students but they were denied extension. As can be seen from the document, because of colour students in the universities are denied extension of their stay in Canada in order to complete their studies. Apart from that, if scholars from these parts who are now studying in Canadian universities apply for jobs there on completion of their studies, their request will be denied.

The part of the document to which I refer is "Cases of Exceptional Merit." It reads as follows:—

Another regulation provides for "cases of exceptional merit."

"One would assume this category included persons whose skills were needed in Canada. But cases in the last few years indicate that the Immigration authorities have turned down applications for permanent entry of persons whose skills were most desirable: nurses, draughtsmen, stenographers, and graduates of Canada's leading educational institutions have been rejected. Even students in various fields have been refused admission, and in some cases, refused extensions to complete their studies."

However, I will say to spend the money and send whoever you feel would be able to get even one plane load of our workers there even if it is only for a period of two months. As an honourable member has remarked, I know that this House of Assembly cannot change any Act of the Parliament of Canada. I have nothing against this question of emigration; I would go as far as contributing to a fund to get some of our workers away. Although there is some fear in my mind over emigration to Canada, I am yet saying that we should spend the money which we have earmarked for emigration on sending whatever delegation we think would be able to get some work for our people even if it be only lucky enough to get one plane load away.

Mr. BARROW: I would like to make a few observations on this matter, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I remember quite well that on the last occasion when His Honour the Speaker attended a meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Canada and a question was asked whether the Canadian Government would allow the emigration of certain people of the West Indies into that country as workers and domestic servants and in occupations of a similar character, one of the delegates from West Africa made a stirring speech in which he pointed out that West Indians would be welcome to come to West Africa for employment but they need not come in the role of domestics and labourers. I think that it is the greatest indictment on British imperialism and it is causing me to wonder whether we should consider this Address at all. However, this Address is not a question of party politics; it is a question of planning for the survival of the vast mass of unemployed people here.

Sir, we spend a vast amount of money, comparatively speaking, in Canada, yet we hear my colleague informing us of something to which he refers to as a grievous matter in the heart and soul of one who is a British subject. I would like our brothers in that part of the British Commonwealth to understand that we in the West Indies are human beings who would like to exist on the face of the earth just as they are existing and they are suffering themselves when they refuse to allow us to build up their country in the way it should be. Canada is a country which has a rapidly expanding economy but it has not the population to support its expanding economy which would expand to even a greater proportion had there been a greater population. I think it is a short-sighted policy that the Canadian Government should adopt this attitude in relation to their brothers in this part of the Commonwealth. I know all Canadians are not like-minded because one of them has voiced the opinion that the British West Indies should be made an additional province of Canada.

(Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.)

Sir, I was saying that all Canadians are not like-minded because one of them went so far as to suggest that the British West Indies should be made a province of Canada. However, I do not think that we should wait until the day when the West Indies may or may not become a province of Canada or that thought passes the idealistic stage; I feel that in the interest of the Canadian economy, the spreading of the feeling of equality, which the members of the British Commonwealth are always professing but seldom practising to the extent which they should, should be practised in truth and in deed by the Canadians above all other peoples of the British Commonwealth because Canadians are in the excellent position where they can set the lead for other peoples of the Commonwealth to follow.

Whether this matter reaches the proper authorities by way of an Address or any other machinery of parliamentary procedure is a matter of indifference to me. In matters like this where the welfare of the Barbadian worker is at stake, constitutional niceties of the situation are not uppermost in my mind and if they attempt to rise to the surface I suppress them in order to see clearly the broader issues. With regard to the remarks made by my colleague, I may point out that most students go to Canadian universities with the understanding that they would not seek employment there on completion of their studies or during their vacation periods, but I think that is a rule which is observed more in the breach than in its observance. I personally feel that the Canadian Government would do well if it revised its attitude towards students so as to allow them to work during vacation time. With my little experience of students attending universities in Canada, I do not think that while my colleague is universal on almost every single topic, he has the correct interpretation of the Canadian Government's attitude towards students. I think my colleague is misled by the association's misinterpretation of the attitude of the Canadian Government.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of correction, Mr. Speaker, I have only quoted from the document which was sent to me. I have no doubt whatsoever that my colleague would know better than I of the position with regard to students attending universities in Canada.

Mr. BARROW: I was merely pointing out without attempting to go off on an emotional tangent or to be too critical of what I saw when I was in

Canada. I hold no brief for the Canadian Government; I think I would be the last person to protect the Canadian Government; but I do know that a West Indian student who is capable of completing his studies in Canada is not debarred or sent back home if he takes longer to complete them than was thought at first. I think I have already pointed out the position with regard to the student not being allowed to complete his studies by working during the course of his study. I may conclude this point by saying that I feel the economic conditions existing in Canada at present should produce an alteration or rescission of that broad ruling. There are well organised trade unions in those countries and they are run by people who can put pressure on the Government in regard to those rulings. It will be remembered that during the last war that rule was relaxed in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I am looking forward to the day when I would enjoy being a member of the British Commonwealth of Nations; when I would be able to say in truth and in fact "our brothers in Canada" and when I can see them come and go at will as well as they allow "their brothers in the West Indies" to come and work and live in their country. If we must make that a living reality, then countries which are in stronger positions than other countries should set a moral lead in that direction. I am looking forward to the day when Barbadians are free to go to Canada in the same way that Canadians can come to this country. I do know that the situation in Barbados with respect to the unemployed is becoming exceedingly grave. I do not know if the proposals in this Address are practicable in every way, but if they are, this matter is a step in the right direction.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to add a few words. I think we all should thank the honourable senior member for St. Philip for bringing this matter to our notice whether he should have done so in the form of an address as he has done or by a resolution. On my own behalf, I am a Barbadian so I would like as many Barbadian workers as possible to have the opportunity of going to Canada to work even if it is for only three months and because of that, I would say nothing at this present stage which would antagonise the Canadian authorities. As far as I am concerned, I am a firm believer in the policy of the western democracy, but as far as things are going, with respect to coloured people, one wonders what western democracy is doing for their benefit. However, I think one should approach this matter as a statesman, therefore, I sincerely hope that as the Address has urged, the Governor would go to Canada so as to lend weight to the delegation. I sincerely hope that some good would come out of it. This is not a matter of permanent emigration. We know the complex factors pertaining to such a matter, and knowing that, I think the least said on this matter would be the better. I do hope the Government would do everything in its power in this matter and some benefit would result out of the effort. With these few remarks, I give my wholehearted support to this Address.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I was giving this matter some study along the lines suggested by the honourable Premier but I think we should allow it to stay in its present form.

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

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: I am calling on the honourable senior member for St. Philip and the honourable junior member for Christ Church to present this Address to His Excellency the Governor.

Mr. CRAWFORD: As Your Honour pleases.
Mr. GODDARD: As Your Honour pleases.

FIXING THE ORDER PAPER

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: In fixing the Order Paper for the next meeting, Item No. 4 dealing with federation becomes No. 1; Item No. 2, Committee of Supply to deal with resolutions of which notice was given today; Item No. 3, the Resolution to approve the Book of Reference and Plan of the proposed extension of the Waterworks; and the rest of the orders to follow respectively.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to bring forward Item No. 25 of Private Members' Business which stands in my name to Item No. 1.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 8th June, 1954, at 3 o'clock p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to second that. I suppose honourable members will be coming here next Tuesday with the expectation that the report on federation will be considered. In view of that, if we are to give careful consideration to all the particular points, especially those which resulted out of the London Conference, I hope honourable members will forgive me if I suggest to them to pay very great attention during the week to the various reports concerning it so as to come here on the next occasion to give full expression to their views. Especially I would draw honourable members' attention to Clause 10 of the Report because I consider that clause as very important.

I hope honourable members have not only the report of the London Conference but the draft constitution as amended. We should come ready to say whether any legislation should be made affect-

ing the movement of people between the units. I think that question and the question of finance should be paid special attention by all honourable members. We must bear in mind that the financial implications mean the cutting down of Customs Duty by 25 per cent, although it may be amended to 15 per cent. Honourable members should view very carefully what it would mean to this island if 15 per cent. of its Customs Duty taken away.

Mr. ALLDER: Let us drop it.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am not saying that; I believe federation would be a means of making these islands stronger economically than they are now, but it also means at the same time that a unit's expenditure will have to be curtailed and we must view it in the light of our present resources. I hope the House will pardon me for my apparent lecture on this matter but our going into federation is far too important a matter than merely thinking on the broad idea of federation.

Mr. LEWIS: I would suggest that since the form of the proposed Constitution has been amended and the amended form has not been circulated, the honourable member should undertake to summon a representative number of members of the House to meet him before next Tuesday. In the same way as you would refer a matter like this to a Select Committee, the honourable member could give that representative number of honourable members the benefit of what the amended form of Constitution is.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If honourable members can find the Report of the Standing Closer Association Committee, they could write in the amendments to the proposed Constitution.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next at 3 o'clock p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1953-54

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 8th June, 1954.

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

Present :

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Hon. G. H. ADAMS, B.A., C.M.G., Q.C. (*Premier*), Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*), Hon. M. E. COX (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*), Mr. L. E. SMITH (*Chairman of Committees*), Hon. R. G. MAPP (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*), Messrs. F. C. GODDARD, F. E. MILLER, J. A. HAYNES, B.A., J. C. MOTTLEY, E.St. A. HOLDER, V. B. VAUGHAN, and Hon. C. E. TALMA (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

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

PAPER LAID

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker,—I am commanded to lay the following Paper:—

Quarterly Return of transactions in Rum to the 31st March, 1954.

REPLY LAID

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to lay the Reply to Question No. 33 asked by the honourable senior member for St. Andrew regarding the payment of production bonus by certain plantations.

NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Resolution to place the sum of \$737 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1954-55, Part II—Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1954-55, No. 8 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$1,747 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1954-55, Part I—Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1954-55, No. 7 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I should like to ask for leave later in the day to deal with this Resolution because it is for the purpose of paying the subsistence allowance of Hon. Dr. Cato whom the Barbados Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association has selected to attend the next meeting of the Association in Kenya. I hope that honourable members will not mind my asking for leave later in the day to deal with this Resolution; it is a question of having to notify the Parliamentary Association in Great Britain as to when Hon. Dr. Cato will be leaving Barbados and so on.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Bill to amend the Estate and Succession Duties Act, 1941.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Of my intention to move for the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 in order to deal later in the afternoon with the money Resolution of which I have just given notice.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to deal with the other money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

QUESTIONS

Mr. BRANCKER:—To enquire of the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:—Whether his Department is prepared forthwith to take steps to ensure that, before water mains are locked off in any district for effecting repairs, or for any other reason, all residents depending upon such water supply be notified, by means of siren or other suitable device, that such mains are about to be shut off, in order that persons may replenish their supplies before the said mains are definitely shut off?

Mr. BRANCKER:—To enquire of the Minister for Social Services:—Whether Government is giving serious consideration to the establishment at a very early date of a Government sponsored Third Party (Motor Vehicles) Insurance Scheme?

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Estate and Succession Duties Act, 1941, be now read a first time.

Hon. M. E. COX seconded the motion which was agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF RULES 88 AND 89

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Rules 88 and 89 be now suspended.

Hon. M. E. COX seconded the motion, which was agreed to.

DISCUSSION ON REPORT OF THE LONDON CONFERENCE *RE* WEST INDIAN FEDERATION

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph:—To move the consideration of the report of the London Conference on West Indian Federation.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—In moving the consideration of this Report, I wish to apologize to honourable members who turned up on Saturday morning expecting that I would have been present to point out, as I promised to do, in what respects the Federal Plan differs from the Report of the Standing Closer Association Committee of 1948-49. I have discovered that honourable members have not got a copy of the proposed Federation which is the original Federation with the amendments written in. I promised last Tuesday that if honourable members found it convenient to meet me I would meet them last Saturday morning and go through it with them. I discovered that I could not meet them at the appointed time and, unfortunately, the message which I sent did not reach honourable members. I sent a message saying that if they took the Report of the Standing Closer Association Committee and the Plan which I sent along, they would see where the amendments had been made. It was only necessary for someone to read the Federation Plan and place it by the side of the Report of the Standing Closer Association Committee and the amendments would be seen. Of course, in the Report itself which honourable members ought to have in their hands, the amendments are set out, so that if honourable members take the Report of the Standing Closer Association Committee along with the Report which we are now considering, they will be able to see that the Plan is an amended version of the Report of the Standing Closer Association Committee. I regret that honourable members left after I did not turn up without considering the proposals; however, if honourable members have the actual Report they will see the proposed changes as I go on. I shall endeavour to point out all the proposed changes and honourable members will be able to see if they can borrow copies of the Report from the Secretariat.

While it may be unnecessary to tell honourable members or some people in Barbados that we have gone on record unofficially outside this Chamber and in this Chamber unequivocally as being in favour of Federation subject to certain desiderata or conditions, there are nevertheless persons who, I prefer to say, through ignorance rather than malice, suggest that Barbados is wilfully delaying the bringing about of Federation, that Barbados is opposed to Federation and we are watching to see what other colonies, especially Jamaica and Trinidad, are doing. I have no doubt whatever from my knowledge of honourable members in this Chamber, that whatever reservations may exist in the minds of some members of the Other Place or in the minds of Barbadians, as far as this Chamber is concerned, there is not a single member who does not see the necessity of the West Indian Colonies coming together in a single federa-

ted unit in order not only that we may, in the immediate future, be enabled to improve our economic condition, but that, in the long term, we may be able to build up a West Indian nation which, as a separate Dominion, will take its stand side by side with the other Dominions which exist in the British Commonwealth of Nations. We have all voted for the principle of Federation; we have voted for sending to London last April a delegation consisting of a member from this House and one from the Other Place in order to try and hammer out a Draft Constitution which might find general acceptance.

As was originally pointed out in the Report of the Standing Closer Association Committee, it is not to be thought that every member who was present at Montego Bay could possibly agree to every single sentence and suggestion made in that Report. Speaking for myself, and I think I speak for Barbadians, there are things with which I disagreed and with which I still disagree; I still think that the general over-all picture as presented by this Draft Federation is a picture of what is not very far removed from a glorified Crown Colony system. I would ask honourable members to be persuaded that if we want to get something through, we have to give and take. We could not hope to have a Federal or Unit Constitution which went to the extent of that which Barbados possesses; you could not have it in British Honduras or British Guiana; you could not have it in the Leewards because they would not be large enough to run a Constitution such as ours. When I say that I, personally, feel that the general over-all picture as presented by the Draft Federation is not too far removed from a glorified Crown Colony system, honourable members will think that we should not accept it; but we have to give and take and remember that the Crown Colony mentality still exists even among some colonies in the West Indies. As far as we are concerned, it is inconceivable that a Governor could say "No" or "Yes" unless we say "No" or "Yes."

I hope that honourable members will not conclude that this proposed Federation Plan is something which should be thrown overboard; you must give and take; you have to modify your views if you find that there is no general agreement and prefer half a loaf to none at all. Honourable members will see that the Queen in Council can legislate in certain circumstances: She could not do that for Barbados. It would be absurd to insist that we are not agreeing to any Constitution unless that provision was cut out; the Governor-General has powers which he has not got in Barbados, but we cannot insist that that be cut out. I am inviting honourable members to express their point of view as they come to consider the proposals made in the different sections.

We, in this House, were very emphatic—no honourable member was lukewarm—on the proposal to send a delegate to London last year; we were very emphatic that we were in favour of Federation, but we were equally emphatic that we should not agree to any Federation unless there was agreement on freedom of movement of peoples among the units. It seems that it is impossible to have a Federation without that principle being accepted, but, unfortunately, that is not the position in the West Indies today. I shall endeavour to be as impersonal as possible; honourable members will see the way in which one or two things have been framed and it was the insistence of Hon. Mr. Cuke and myself which ensured a few of the things which appear in this proposed Federation. Honourable members will see that the feeling of this House carries so much weight that the

copy of the Plan for a British Caribbean Federation starts out with a Preamble before it says anything about the Federation. It says this:

"The Preamble to the Constitution should recite as one of the objects of Federation that there should be the greatest possible freedom of movement for persons and goods within the Federation."

That point was so clearly established that it was agreed to put it in the Preamble before Federation should come about; that does not appear in the Report of the Standing Closer Association Committee.

Let us face realities. I am sure that I do not have to appeal to honourable members to speak frankly although some of the other islands will attack us for speaking what we conceive to be almost axiomatic. There is no doubt that Trinidad, as a people, does not subscribe to the doctrine that there should be freedom of movement between these islands; therefore it behoves us to be careful in going, as we are, into possibly the greatest adventure which this colony has entered upon since its foundation. I digress to say this; let no honourable member fail to take into account the enormous difference which it will make to these colonies, especially Barbados. If you have a Federation, there should not be any political boundaries between unit and unit; just as there are invisible boundaries between St. James and St. Thomas, so there should not be any political barriers between any two units or among any of the units of a proposed Federation. This debate will help to clear the atmosphere as far as Barbados is concerned; it is not true to say that we are waiting to see what other people are doing; we have been busy with one matter or another and we have not debated this Report earlier for that reason. The principle I have mentioned has been established as far as the delegates were concerned, except that Mr. Hannays, when he came in to sign the Report, wrote the reservation that he did not agree with either this or what I shall come to later on — the placing of immigration, emigration and deportation on the Exclusive List in respect of the jurisdiction of the Federal Parliament.

The Report refers to the background of the Federation; it refers to the S.C.A.C. Report and the Conference in London. It mentions what Mr. Lyttelton said in opening the Conference for general discussion on the Plan as set out in the S.C.A.C. Report and the modifications of the S.C.A.C. Federation Plan, and it reminds readers that the Conference agreed that some changes should be made in the Consolidated Recommendations of the S.C.A.C. Report. In this connection, the Report states:

"These Consolidated Recommendations the S.C.A.C. Report stressed, 'were not intended to be a final draft of a constitutional instrument, but to be clear and unambiguous drafting instructions to the experts on whom . . . will fall the onerous task of preparing the actual instrument itself.' This is equally true of the additions and alterations we have made."

We have got a compromise; we cannot always get what we want and these are proposals with which we can agree with the exception of the matter of the Cabinet.

Reference was made to British Guiana and British Honduras. The Report says this:

"We were informed by the Jamaica delegation that the Turks and Caicos Islands and the Cayman Islands wish to retain their present constitutional relationship with Jamaica."

Originally, the Turks and Caicos Islands and the Cayman Islands said that they did not want to carry the burden of Jamaica, but to be directly under

the Governor-General of the West Indies. They said that they got on quite well by themselves; but they seemed to have changed that idea and now they are willing to come back. I will say that nobody knows what will happen as regards British Guiana; we may have to rule British Guiana out completely. British Honduras has to be ruled out as well; a point was made that Barbados was going to swamp them out by Barbadians. Some cable reached British Honduras to the effect that the Barbados House of Assembly was considering a Bill to send emigrants to British Honduras every year and the P.U.P. said that that is what the British people do.

It was proposed by Jamaica that the designation "House of Assembly" should be changed to "House of Representatives" and we agreed to that. As regards the question of "Immigration, emigration and deportation," in the original proposal it was suggested that this item should be placed on the Concurrent List; however, it was agreed that it should be transferred from the Concurrent to the Exclusive List. I ask honourable members to pay attention to this particular point; it is a general principle which we have put in here, and naturally, you have to make provision for it; but until the Federal Parliament meets and passes legislation either in respect of the Exclusive List or the Concurrent List, the law of each unit remains the same. If there are things on the Exclusive List, the Units can no longer make legislation in respect of those points; if they are on the Concurrent List, the Units can continue to make legislation in respect of them unless a law is passed to remove any legislation which has been enacted. I do not wish to emphasize too much the part which Barbados played, but one might see the danger of leaving the item "Immigration, emigration and deportation" on the Concurrent List if the first Federal Parliament happened to be composed of persons with the mentality of Trinidad forming the bulk of the Federal Assembly. If you cannot get a majority of the Federation saying that there should be freedom of movement, you will have to deposit that \$100; that is why those of us who believe in freedom of movement insisted that the Federal Parliament should deal with "Immigration, emigration and deportation." With the exception of Mr. Hannays we managed to get every delegate to remove that item from the Concurrent to the Exclusive List; that means that it will be necessary at an early date in the life of the Federal Parliament, to have some legislation which the Federal Parliament will pass; if you do not get early legislation passed, the local law will remain in force. We cannot have a Civil War on a question of this sort, but it is reasonable to suppose that we will have Socialists in the main who will be in favour of enactments of this sort.

I should like to throw out a suggestion which I have been making from time to time; it is that before much longer, Law Officers of the Crown of every West Indian colony and some political representatives should meet and prepare a blue print in respect of immigration laws, take into consideration Trinidad's fear, Jamaica's needs and our own needs, and hammer out something to which we can agree and which will become the Federal law. I believe that honourable members will agree with me in saying that there is no reason whatever why we should enter a Federation unless there is freedom of movement. We should be able to go to those colonies which produce the goods which we have to buy; other honourable members who form the Government will agree with me, but I hope that all honourable members will agree that we are not coming into Federation without freedom of movement; however, we are prepared to discuss what modifications of gen-

eral freedom of movement there should be. A criminal should not be allowed to go from island to island, but for purposes of sanitation and so on, each unit should be able to pass legislation so as to keep out undesirables. Each territory should be entitled to legislate as to what is undesirable, but I hope that honourable members will agree with me that as far as the general principle of freedom of movement is concerned, unless it is as free as it is between the parishes, there is no Federation.

Mr. VAUGHAN: May I ask the honourable member for an explanation? He says that we are not coming into Federation unless the principle of freedom of movement is agreed upon; yet I understand that freedom of movement is reserved to the Exclusive List. Does it mean that we should enter Federation and await the passing of legislation by the Federal Parliament?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: That is a good question well put; unless a Federal Law is passed, all laws will remain the same. When a Federal Parliament exists, Trinidad will still be able to keep out 137 categories of workers; but when the Federal Parliament takes upon itself to pass a law which it alone has the right to pass, all the local laws will be wiped out. When the Federal Parliament once moves, the local units have no authority after that: that is the most important of the changes which we have made. We also moved to delete item (xxiv) from the Concurrent List; that item reads: "Movement of persons, alien and other, between the Units." We have altered that and suggested that two separate items should be inserted in the Exclusive List as follows: (i) "Movement of persons other than aliens between units," and (ii) "Movement of aliens between units." I was extremely pleased to think that it was agreed that the former item should be qualified by a proviso that the power to legislate for the movement of persons other than aliens between units shall not be exercised to restrict such movement on economic or any other grounds. That is a strong statement which was due to pressure by Barbados; the honourable senior member for St. John would not like that because he would like to keep out East Indians. Neither on economic or any other grounds can you exclude fellow West Indians. I see the immense difficulty of getting that accepted by Trinidad, but we cannot possibly come together except we say plainly what our point of view is and let them say what their point of view is.

Hon. members will remember that originally in the S.C.A.C. Report, it was suggested that the item "Marriage, divorce and custody and guardianship of infants" should be placed on the Concurrent List, and the footnote to that item was as follows:

"It is not intended that Federal jurisdiction should extend to divorce in respect of St. Lucia, or to matrimonial matters in respect of Hindu or Moslem communities."

That footnote was deleted and a proviso was added to the item that Federal Legislation on divorce, and, so far as may be found necessary, on other matrimonial matters, should not come into force in a unit without the consent of the Legislature of that unit. Any Federal Legislation affecting matrimonial matters must be approved by the Legislature of the particular unit.

As regards item (xxxii) on the Concurrent List relating to scientific surveys, we agreed that that should be widened to read as follows: "Surveys, investigations and research on any matter connected with the economic and social development of the area."

In connection with the item "Agricultural education and advisory services", there was some

objection but we finally agreed that if the Federal Government was prepared to spend money and have experts come into the area to make a survey, no unit should object to that, because it was to be assumed that the persons who were carrying out that service would pay specific regard to the territory with which they were dealing. We thought that that item should be added to the Concurrent List.

I come now to one of those matters to which I drew the attention of the House some weeks ago; we saw the possibility of the Federal Parliament calling for more money from the Units. Honourable members will remember that it was originally proposed that we should give up 25% of our Customs Duties; the figure of 25% in respect of Customs Duties is a huge figure to ask any Government to give up. If we could tax the idle rich to get 90% of our revenue and only 10% from customs, we would do so; but we cannot do that. It is therefore difficult to see how any unit could give up 25% of its Customs Duties to run the Federal Parliament and do very much for its own people at the same time. However, if you read what has happened in the United States and Canada you will see that over and over again in spite of the clamour of State rights, the Federal Parliament has to do more and more, and therefore it must have more and more revenue. If a State asked the Federal Parliament to come to its aid, the Central Government or the Federal Government will say: "All right, but you will have to pay some of your revenue and you will have to give up some of your power. We have therefore to impose Federal income tax," We saw that possibility and therefore we have put in an amendment which reads as follows:

"The power to levy income tax should be added to the Concurrent List, but we recommend that the financial agreements between the units and the Federal Government, to which we refer later, should provide that the Federal Government should not levy an income tax within the first five years and that the position should then be reviewed. This would not preclude Federal legislation unifying the income tax law, as distinct from the rates of taxation, throughout the area. Our intention in making this recommendation is that the Federal Government should not levy an income tax until it begins to assume, with the approval of unit Governments, additional functions necessitating a fresh addition to its revenues."

The Federation at which we are aiming has specific functions assigned to it and you can roughly estimate what it will cost to run the Departments of Government. In order to avoid strife later on, we write into the Constitution now that we are not levying this income tax within the first five years and at the end of the first five years the position will be reviewed. You can postpone that for another five years, but you will have given the Federal Parliament the right to pass income tax laws only for functions which are now set out in the Federal Constitution and assumed by the Federal Government and which have to be paid for. If educational functions are undertaken by the Federal Government then the Federal Government will have the right to levy an income tax. I do not suppose that the Federal Parliament would have the power to enact rates of income tax; we would still have our own income tax rates.

I do not wish to tire honourable members, but I must repeat that we are entering the Federation with our eyes wide open; we are undertaking a heavy financial burden by coming into Federation. Honourable members cannot say that I have encouraged them to come into Federation and did not point out to them the financial implications in so doing. Some mistakes have been made as to one or

two things; Mr. George Hunte who has been giving serious thought to the question of federation, has read a lot about it and is acquainted with one or two useful books, but he has missed the point when he deals with the question of allowing a member of a Unit Legislature to be a member of the Federal Parliament. It is not true to say that this is a Confederation instead of a Federation; it does not mean that a member of this Parliament would have to come back here from the Federal Parliament to get approval in respect of anything. What we provide against is that a person should not be a member of his own local Government and a member of the Federal Government at the same time; he may be the Premier of his own island and be a member of the Federal Parliament in the Opposition. He cannot be a member of both Governments but he can be a member of the Federal Government and not a member of his own Government or *vice versa*. That is as it should be for the first five years. It is not that we lack brains and character and ability, but there is not in public life, enough people who are prepared to give up time and energy to become politicians. Barbados has in it as much brains for its size as any other country; that is a fact and not mere vanity. We could not have lived for all this time if we could not keep our heads above water; however it is reasonable to say that there are not enough people who will be coming forward to fill the gaps which have been left by their fathers and grandfathers in political life.

It is set out in the old S.C.A.C. Report that the Queen can legislate by Order-in-Council. It was conceivable that the Queen-in-Council could pass a law prohibiting, let us say, a Curfew or prohibiting more than a dozen people from meeting, and so on. Some honourable members would be very hard put when they have to hold meetings in their constituencies if by Order-in-Council affecting the whole area, the Queen could make a law prohibiting the holding of a meeting in St. John or in any other country district, or the holding of regatta at Oistins.

We have reduced the life of a Senator from 10 years to 5 years, and there were other minor things dealt with like the period of residential qualification in respect of Senators. In the S.C.A.C. Report it was suggested that Senators should start with a ten-year life; naturally, people who have reached a certain age should be Senators. However, the ten-year period has been altered and a period of five years has been enacted as the period of the life of the Upper House.

There are minor details with which I will not deal specifically. On the question of the Federal Capital, I know that some of my friends in Jamaica will take strong exception to what I am saying now, on the ground that there was a promise by members who attended the Conference that they would endeavour to get their Legislatures to agree to it. There was an undertaking during the Conference that no statement would be made to the Press; I merely say that the *Daily Express* seemed to have had a microphone in the room. no promise could have been made or given not to correct the manifest misconception of the general public as regards what we did. It has been said that we agreed that the Federal Capital should be in Grenada; I think it is only fair to say exactly what happened. In the first place, we have written into the S.C.A.C. Report and the new Constitution that the site of the Federal Capital is a matter for the Federal Parliament; therefore there could not be any agreement beforehand as to the site of the Federal Capital. We could only agree on a temporary capital until the Federation comes about and the Federal Parliament says where the Federal Capital is to be. It is absurd to say that we who met in London or in Trinidad or

in Barbados agreed to a site for the Federal Capital; we did not agree to a site for the Federal Capital. The Jamaica Delegation went there with instructions to vote for Barbados as the site of the Federal Capital, but later they received information to vote for a small island like Grenada or Antigua. Many people put up their own countries as the site for the Federal Capital. For the last plenary session certain matters were held over and one of these matters was the site of the Federal Capital; we could only discuss the question of a temporary Capital and the Jamaica Delegation again attempted to get Barbados chosen as the site of the Federal Capital. One representative mentioned Grenada as a possibility of the site for the Federal Capital; not a single other member said one word about that, either for or against, and the Chairman feeling that it was a reasonable point at which to bring the discussion to a close, decided to go on with another item on the agenda. Grenada has never been chosen as the site for the Federal Capital; in any event, it could not have been chosen as the permanent site.

I am glad to be able to say that since the London Conference certain people have been considering the advantages which Barbados has, such as Cable and Wireless facilities, Educational facilities, and it is the only Unit which has not abandoned Representative Government. Several people have suggested that Barbados is the ideal spot for the temporary Capital of the Federation, and I am no longer going to be silent—it might be mock modesty perhaps—as I have been all along as to the question of the site of the Federal Capital. I will say that an objective view of all the colonies inevitably points to Barbados as the site of the temporary Federal Capital. All Federations have had the problem of choosing sites for the Federal Capitals, but when we have been told that large units are saying that Barbados is the ideal place for the Federal Capital, then I think that Barbadians would be stupid to continue in this latter-day thought of modesty and not push our own claims. We are justified in telling the rest of the West Indies: "Look at what we can provide and where we stand constitutionally", and I hope that honourable members, when they rise to speak, will add their voice in claiming that Barbados should be the site of the temporary Capital for the Federation.

I thank honourable members for listening to me and in view of the extreme importance of the step which we are taking—a step which I commend to them both from the economic point of view and the long-term point of view of building up a West Indian nation—I counsel them to say that they agree in principle to this Report. If any honourable member thinks that any aspect of this Report should be specifically stressed or omitted, I ask him to say so because what we say here now will go to the British Parliament as the expression of the view of Barbados, and the Draftsman of Imperial Statutes will know what we agree with and what we do not agree with. If there are any fundamental differences between our point of view and the point of view of some other colonies, it will be necessary for us to hammer out those difficulties. The majority opinion of the Legislatures of the West Indies must be known and the minority might be willing to come in. Nobody can force any colony to come into the Federation, but if a colony says: "I agree with this compromise", then the Bill will be drafted. We are too important a Unit merely to say; "We agree with the Report". Honourable members must say what their views are; if we did not do that in London we would not have got that Preamble as regards freedom of movement written in the Report. With those remarks, I beg to move that the principles enunciated in the Report be accepted and I hope that honourable members will

move an amendment for putting in any special point with special emphasis. If we say that we agree to the Report we give almost *carte blanche* to the Draftsman of the Colonial Office to work on what has been written here. I do not think I can add anything useful at this stage, but if there is any particular point which has not been sufficiently clearly put forward, honourable members can ask about it. I have before me the Minutes of all our discussions, so that if there is any doubt of what has been said, I shall be happy to help honourable members. Again, I thank the House for having listened to me.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I beg to second that motion and in doing so I must say that I appreciate all that has been said by the Premier, and somehow I detect a changed note in his speech on Federation; I see a new note which was not there on the few occasions on which the Premier has spoken. Today I am impressed that since Federation is so important to the people of this island the few objections which Barbados might raise can be compromised in the future.

The honourable member mentioned the risk of entering Federation without the guarantee of the freedom of movement of persons among the units; I am glad that the Premier has spoken more or less on the compromises which are necessary in order to achieve this most important step. With the advent of Federation I can see the lessening of colonialism, and that is an aspect of the matter which every West Indian citizen should be aware of, and at least it should cause West Indians to be in favour of Federation without having any reservations.

The Federal establishments of the world have not been brought about by the common people: Federation has always been brought about by the leaders of the people. It takes leadership to do that, so that if Federation fails, that would be a failure of political leadership. There is no natural barrier to Federation; it is not a question of geography, it is exclusively a question of political agreement. The mountains of Switzerland were no barrier to the Swiss Federation and distance was no barrier to the Canadian Federation; the leaders saw the value — mostly the economic value — of coming together. As far as the West Indies are concerned, I can see a real economic loss by their failing to come together. I am sure that the United States of America will look upon a federated West Indies more favourably than they look upon them today because they are inherently opposed to colonialism, and anything which promises to lessen colonialism will meet with American approval at once.

It is unfortunate that we have some diehard politicians in the colony of Trinidad who, as we know, are opposed to freedom of entry. It is almost inconceivable for you to speak of a federated country while at the same time there are barriers within the units to prevent the free flow of people one with the other. I do agree that federation should mean as far as travel of persons is concerned that they should be able to move with the greatest amount of ease among the various units. If we have to enter federation without this guarantee, as the honourable Premier has said, we must bear in mind that the Trinidad politicians would not be the only persons who would comprise the Federal Government; there will be Jamaicans, Leeward Islanders, and Barbadians who will also comprise the Federal Government: therefore, I do not see why we should be so fearful of entering federation without this guarantee. Under the Act, it will depend on the majority vote in the Federal Parliament, the Trinidad members by themselves

will be in the minority. It is my great hope that the Federal Government would not for long hold up the free movement of people within the units.

As far as trade and the development of new industries are concerned, I see everything in our favour as far as that is concerned. The establishment at the present of certain new industries is prohibited because one of the reasons preventing their establishment is that there is not a big enough market to justify the establishment of a particular industry in every colony, that is to say, if an industry is established in Trinidad and Jamaica and Barbados, the market for the goods which could be turned out by the three industries if they were working to capacity would not be big enough, but it would be so if the particular industry were only established in one of the colonies. When the entire British Caribbean area is federated into one economic unit, all goods produced in any of the units would be able to flow freely from one part to another; so there will be a big enough market for certain industries which are somewhat prohibitive to establish in some of the smaller units. I therefore can envisage that with the acceptance of federation there will be the development of new industries.

When it comes to economic conferences, the federated colonies would be able to speak with one voice and would be speaking for a population of over three million people so that voice is bound to be heard. That voice is bound to be taken in account more than if it were speaking for Trinidad, Jamaica or Barbados alone. The question of numbers is very important where economic decisions are concerned. I think that the economic benefit federation would be to the units, exclusive to the other benefits which would be derived, is one which West Indians cannot afford to despise. Anything which promises to bring greater economic benefit to the West Indies should be accepted by the majority of people. I do believe that so far as the masses are concerned, they know very little about what federation means, but I am sure that when they realise what it will mean to them, they will be very few among them who would object to the establishment of a West Indian federation. I am hoping, Sir, to see that leadership in the West Indies will not fail the people. Our geography is no barrier to our federating; the only barrier to our federating will be the opposition from the point of view of political leadership of the units. If the honourable Premier of Barbados, the Chief Minister of Jamaica, the Ministers of Trinidad, the leaders in Antigua, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Grenada and the leaders of the other colonies say tomorrow that we will have federation, we will have it. It depends on them. In other words, federation is a man made institution. It is created by politicians and not by conditions; it is an agreement among representatives of peoples; therefore if it fails, it is due to the failure of the leaders. I personally have great hopes that the leadership in the West Indies will rise above the narrowness of their particular units and be as broad as the issue which all of them profess is desirable to the West Indies. I do know that without proper leadership at this time, no West Indian can hope to see federation within any short space of time.

Sir I think it would be most short-sighted if this Chamber reject federation because someone cannot see that Barbados would not stand to benefit from this or that. I would not like to know that I belong to a unit in the West Indies which would put up barriers to the West Indies coming together as a federal unit. We are bound to be respected more by metropolitan countries when we federate and we are

bound to be favoured more by a country like the United States of America if we enter into a federation. We would be looked upon by the U.S.A., in the same manner as Puerto Rico, Haiti, Cuba, the Dominican Republic and other non-colonial places. Our federating must mean the lessening of colonial status and our becoming nearer to independence or dominion status. I cannot conceive of any of these small units that propose to join in a West Indian Federation becoming a dominion by themselves. The only road to dominion status which is the desirable status of all right-thinking West Indians is by the road of federation. I hope and pray that the honourable Premier who I know desires federation as much as anybody else in the West Indies will do all in his power to see that federation of the West Indies becomes a reality. The honourable Premier cannot possibly be a barrier to West Indian federation; at least, that is the impression I got today. I do hope that he will lend his new political status and do all in his power to influence leadership in the West Indies that the time has come for a federal unit of these islands to be political reality. (Cheers).

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

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

On re-assembling.

NOTICE OF ADDRESS

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker I beg to give notice of the following Address:—

*The House of Assembly
To*

His Excellency the Governor

The House desire to draw to the attention of Your Excellency that under the provisions of the Fisheries Act, 1952/23 the maximum loan which fishermen are entitled to borrow without collateral security must not exceed \$500.

2. The House are of opinion that in view of
 - (a) the economic necessity for expansion of the fishing industry.
 - (b) the fact that the minimum cost to provide motor power for a fishing boat is in the vicinity of \$1,600,

that the Act under reference should be amended in order to permit the granting of loans without collateral security at a figure which more approximates this amount.

PETITION

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: May I crave Your Honour's permission to give notice of a petition from the Methodists Trust Association praying this House to pass a Bill authorising that body to sell a property at No. 50, Roebuck Street. The Petition is respectfully worded and appeared in the *Official Gazette* on the 12th, 15th and 19th April, 1954 and in the *Barbados Advocate* on the 24th April, 1954.

The Petition was taken as read.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill in respect of the petition of which I have just given notice and I beg to move that the Bill be now read a first time.

Mr. GODDARD seconded the motion which was agreed to.

CONSIDERATION OF REPORT OF LONDON CONFERENCE ON W.I. FEDERATION RESUMED

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: On the adjournment, the House was discussing the Report of the London Conference on West Indian Federation.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, the item on the Order Paper reads as follows: "To move the consideration of the Report of the London Conference on West Indian Federation." The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has expressed views today which induced the honourable junior member for St. John to say that he had discovered a new note in the approach of the former on the question of federation. That description by the honourable junior member for St. John may well be described as the understatement of the year. To say, Sir, that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has merely succeeded in injecting a new note today in his approach to this question of federation is to express very mildly the fundamental change in the approach to the question which that honourable member has undergone in a short space of time. It is true that the honourable Premier began by saying that he agreed to make certain compromises because half loaf is better than no loaf at all; apparently, the honourable member forgot to mention his preference for both.

It is difficult, Sir, for the average person, I submit, to appreciate the extreme difference between the honourable member's approach to the question a year ago and that demonstrated here today. There are three main points on which the honourable Premier declared his agreement to compromise. The first is the question of reserve power by the Governor-General, the second is the question relating to legislation by the Queen-in-Council, and the third is the question of freedom of movement. In my opinion, this debate should be the final one in this Chamber on this question of federation. I assume that if we adopt this report of the London Conference on West Indian Federation and the other Colonial Legislatures in the West Indies follow suit, one way or the other, the way will be clear for the drafting of the federal constitutional instrument, therefore, the next time that we debate anything on federation here it should perhaps be the draft constitution of the proposed federation, so I suggest that we should be perfectly clear over what we are committing ourselves today and there should be no ambiguity or misunderstanding in reference to our decisions. There should be a clear cut approach to all the problems involved in this matter because if we are not crystal clear in our opinions, it is manifestly impossible for the public to understand where we do stand on this question of federation; therefore, in my opinion, it is not merely enough to state that we are agreeing to compromise in detail what the compromises are and what occasioned them; otherwise we are bound to confuse the public minds.

Last year, just before the London Conference on West Indian Federation, this Legislature devoted some time and attention to this problem and I want merely for the purpose of refreshing honourable members' minds to quote very briefly two or three phrases spoken by the honourable Premier. This is what he had to say on the question of legislation by the Queen-in-Council:—

"I wish to be careful in my remarks because I do not wish to retract anything that I am going to say tonight. Barbados used to be simply blank as to the very principle of federation. That is not true to-day. We have seen Barbadians of all classes expressing

"the views that the principle of federation is a good thing. But after all we are not talking of an intercolonial trade treaty to last for five years and which at the end of that time can be stopped or renewed. We are talking of establishing a Federal Constitution — one of the most difficult things to alter."

The honourable Premier then goes on to say:—

"If I have the honour to be selected to go to the London Conference I would be betraying Barbados which has the best constitution in the British Empire to-day if I agreed to some of the things in the Rance Report. We have a democratic set-up; adult suffrage; no reserve powers for the Governor. In no other colony in the British Empire, do we find all these together. The Bahamas have no reserved powers, but call the name democracy in those two colonies. We have the best constitution bar none in the British Colonial Empire. As the P.N.P. of Jamaica pointed out in a minority report on the Rance Report when the Jamaica Assembly made suggestions for this conference, are we going to agree to a federal constitution less than the constitution we have now? That is what the Rance Report taken as a whole is. It is little better than a glorified Crown Colony system in some respect."

"In one respect I am going so far as to say — whatever may be said about me in the Press of the West Indies—I am going so far as to say invite the House to lay down terms which if not accepted, we will say we are not entering into federation."

And then the honourable Premier goes on to talk about reserve powers in the hands of the Governor-General and then to the question of legislation by Order-in-Council. He says:—

"It is perfectly true that if we see only obstacles we will never get anywhere in life. Still, it is the height of absurdity to walk with your head in the air when the ground beneath your feet is punctured with deep wells. I invite the House to say that they will never agree to that."

The honourable Premier is here referring to legislation by Order-in-Council.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The honourable member cannot help completely misquoting me. I was referring to one part of the Rance Report which has been eliminated. It is impossible to say that the Governor-General should not have reserve powers for defending an area. We are not objecting to that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I would merely state that I am reading from the *Official Gazette*. The honourable Premier goes on to say:—

"It is the essence of Crown Colony Government of the most ancient type, that on the advice of the Secretary of State for the Colonies the Queen-in-Council can make an order for public order or the preservation of law and order throughout the federal West Indies. What she cannot do for Barbados now she will be able to do for Barbados in the future. On the advice of the Secretary of State or the Commonwealth Minister she will be able to make an order prohibiting a meeting in Queen's Park."

(Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Read it out.)

"because she can make an order for the whole territory saying that there shall be no assem-

bly of more than 12 people. That is what has happened in Trinidad and in Jamaica. It has never happened in Barbados; and we are being asked to say after 300 years, that we should make it possible for it to happen here."

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: And that is what I said.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, we have on the April Conference on Federation in Section 19 of that report the proposed alteration with regard to legislation which should receive the signification of Her Majesty's pleasure and also the reserved powers of the Governor-General. Now, in these proposals here, the terms are laid down under which the Queen has power to legislate in council or the Governor-General has reserved powers. I want to ask the honourable senior member for St. Joseph if he really feels to-day that we should accept these proposals according to the amendments here and if he does not still agree that all we are adopting now is a glorified crown colony government. I am quite willing to compromise on certain things but on certain things we are wasting time when we talk of reaching a compromise on them. Let us read the proposed amendment with regard to Bills by Her Majesty. It reads as follows:—

"Any Bill containing provisions which in the opinion of the Governor-General are likely to lead to the need for financial assistance from Her Majesty's Government or to affect adversely the credit of the Federation."

The same sort of thing is repeated with regard to the reserved powers of the Governor-General.

Now, the question of finance is the most important question of this proposed federation. I will begin at the outset by saying that independence has been granted to other colonial powers completely without any prejudice to any aid they may require from time to time from the former imperial power. In other words, you cannot compromise on the question of autonomy, obviously, if you need a grant-in-aid from the Imperial Government or some sort of financial assistance, even though it may be granted, you are not going to allow the Queen-in-Council to say wherein that legislation must be based. If you want to develop yourself economically by retaining complete control over your own finance it may well be for you to seek aid from sources outside of the Empire. There is no reason why a West Indian federation should not be in a position to approach any outside power for financial help for development without having to say that the Queen must agree to that. Obviously, neither the Queen nor the British Government will be willing to agree with that readily. Since the last World War, the Philippines were granted nationhood by the U.S.A., and the implicit terms on which the Philippines were granted political freedom were to the effect that America would continue her grants-in-aid and her financial assistance without any prejudice to the resources of the new Philippine nation. It was a similar thing with Puerto Rico. The new political status advanced to Puerto Rico does not in any way affect the possibility of her getting finance from the U.S.A. nor is the continuance of her financial help contingent by the continuance of control by America in the financial affairs of Puerto Rico. It is important to recall a statement by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Oliver Lyttelton, on this question of financial assistance and grants-in-aid in Parliament as recently as when British Guiana was discussed. And this is what he said: "Some of these British West Indian colonies will never attain independence because they will permanently be grant aided." If we are going to approach federation with the likeli-

hood that we will be forever remaining colonials we may as well scrap the whole thing and finish with it. It is the mentality of the British Government that some of these West Indian Governments will never be able to attain independence because they will ever have to be given grants-in-aid. We have to do whatever we can to remove that conception. Our entire approach to federation and self-government must be conditioned by the assumption that as a federal unit enjoying complete autonomy we can so legislate for ourselves and so direct our economy, that in the course of time we shall be able to maintain a reasonably high standard of living without recourse to loans and financial assistance from the British Government or any government for that matter. If we hamstring ourselves in the very earliest days of our federation by giving the British Government the power to say whether or not we can borrow money or receive a grant-in-aid, it is my humble opinion that it will be a very long time before we will be able to get out of the political domination and control of the Imperial Government. Therefore, I do feel that on this question of legislation by Order-in-Council and matters reserved for the Governor-General, we have to take into full account what are the proposals in connection with these two matters. Sir, does not the statement by the honourable Premier in April last year on these two matters weigh so fundamentally a contradiction from what we are agreeing today that we are forced to ask ourselves the question whether or not in committing ourselves to this report, we are not really continuing the same principle which he so strongly decried, that of perpetuating a Crown Colony system of Government in the West Indies?

Sir, we have to walk very warily on this question of control of finance and what not. At the time we discussed federation in this Chamber some years ago, I remember I tried to establish this point. We have to avoid the pitfall which we are too prone to concede that Great Britain in offering us financial aid now or at any time in the future is granting us a special favour. She is not doing that. We have to bear in mind this escapable fact that our entire economy has been subjected to the British economy and all the imperial regulations affecting our economic development. Our entire economic development has been diminished by imperial regulations. We must always bear in mind that imperial regulations are made, not to promote our interest but the interest of the imperial power. The fact that we have to ask for grants-in-aid is due not to any fault of our own but due to the fact that our economic development has been hamstrung by imperial ethics, so if we remain forever colonials we would always be needing financial assistance. Honourable members should be too well aware of the facts in this connection; we should not need any discussion on that matter to-day. We know that from the point of view of development of industries, import regulations, controls, currency control and everything else, we have been subjected to what is good for Great Britain, not what is good for Barbados or the West Indies, therefore, if we feel that the time has come for us to realise we must stop holding on to the British apron strings and to go on our own, and if the British Government has been compelled to realise that we are no longer children, but that we are approaching maturity; should not we be allowed to go out in the deep sea and paddle our own canoe and at the same time draw on the people who subjected us in the past, for any assistance without giving them full control to say how, when or where this assistance must be expended?

The honourable Premier said that Barbados and the other West Indian colonies have sufficient brains to be able to conduct their own affairs. Do you mean to tell me that if the new federation with all this brains in it has development for another two million pounds and because of that it will have to borrow a quarter-million pounds or half-million that the federation must be compelled to agree completely to whatever terms the British Government may lay down?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Where do you find that?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I find it under paragraph 19. That paragraph is stated as follows:—

“Any Bill containing provisions which in ‘the opinion of the Governor-General are likely to lead to the need for financial assistance from Her Majesty’s Government or to affect adversely the credit of the Federation.’”

If we want financial assistance in the West Indies and we have to borrow the money from the British Government, the Queen has power to say you can develop this or that because the British Government will be lending you the money.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS. That is not true.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If I understand correctly what is written here, that is the position and I cannot imagine anybody but the honourable member reading in this paragraph anything different from what I have just said. It is repeated in the next paragraph with regard to the reserved power of the Governor-General when it states: “For securing and maintaining the financial stability of the Federation so far as may be required to avoid the need for financial assistance from Her Majesty’s Government or to prevent the credit of the Federation being adversely affected.”

Sir, I have already pointed out that this is a completely outdated conception. An imperial power approaches the question nowadays with the complete understanding that it has collected so much for so many years and it would not have dominated unless it was to its own advantage, because no country controls another country for the benefit of the controlled country. The conception to-day is that when you are giving a colony of yours independence, you release it unconditionally, so to speak, and you say, furthermore, it has been to my economic advantage to have you under my subjection for so many years, so I am willing to give you all financial help, if you want it, for a stated period. I quoted earlier that the Philippines in addition to getting independence, grants-in-aid and outright financial gifts, also got from the Americans special terms and conditions for trade; that is to say, although the Philippines were given independence, the Philippines produced sugar was still allowed to enter the United States of America for twenty years under the same conditions as when the Philippines were a colony. The conception here, Mr. Speaker, if Britain is going to give us anything approaching independence, she will cast us out of her sight to go in the cold and unfriendly world without any grant-in-aid, and if she give us any grant-in-aid, we will not be able to spend it unless she tells us how to spend it. If that is so, honourable members can see where we will be.

The next question which I wish to draw attention to is the question of freedom of movement. The honourable Premier may perhaps recall that in April last year, when this question was discussed, at least one person in this Chamber tried to point out the absurdity of insisting on complete freedom of movement as an independent condition within the federation. The honourable Premier got up and

said: "We are not entering federation unless we get it, and the honourable senior member for the City and the honourable junior member for St. James got up afterwards and repeated what the honourable Premier said. I told them then, and I repeat it today, that for me, freedom of movement could never be an independent condition for federation. (Laughter). It sounded absurd to me then and since then, so, I am not at all surprised that the honourable Premier has compromised on that question now. The mere fact that you have in the Preamble of this Report that the Federation must agree to the general principle of freedom of movement means that it may or may not be. One expects that if the Federal Parliament endorses the general principle of freedom of movement that it will pass legislation to carry it out, but it may or may not, and I think that is the reason why the honourable Premier said that it was important in selecting the first members of the Parliament and to ensure that they were men of a certain type.

Sir, let us assume on this question of freedom of movement two things. Suppose we find oil in Barbados, am I to understand that with our teeming thousands of unemployed, the honourable Premier would be delighted to see thousands of St. Lucians, Dominicans or Antiguan, swarming in here to get work in our oilfields at the expense of our unemployed? Would he go on the Wharf to greet them and say to them "Welcome to Barbados"? Even now, there is from time to time a lot of opposition on the part of domestic servants in Barbados and people in similar employment, to St. Lucians, Vincentians and dominicans coming here to compete with them for the little work that is here. I would like the honourable Premier to tell me of any federation within the Commonwealth in which emigration is exclusively a matter for the Federal Parliament. The other day, oil was discovered in Alberta in Canada and my recollection is that the Alberta Provincial Government immediately took steps to see to it that the unemployed of Alberta got first consideration in the oil fields of Alberta and when that Government was fully satisfied, then the Canadians from the other States were allowed to come into Alberta. In other words, in Canada, both the Dominion Federal Parliament and the Provincial Parliament have concurrent power on this question of emigration, the overriding factor being that Provincial laws which are repugnant to the Federal laws would be more or less null and void. I have also searched the exclusive list of the Australian Federation and I see no mention of emigration or immigration in it. Emigration is not in the exclusive list of the Australian constitution, so I am asking the honourable Premier to tell me which part of the Commonwealth, is emigration exclusively a matter for the Federal Parliament. It does not exist anywhere at all; therefore, I repeat, as I have said last year, that for me this talk about freedom of movement could never be. It cut both ways. People will want to go where work is to be found; nobody would want to go to a place where there is no need for workers.

Moreover, Sir, federation presupposes that we are going to plan our economic development on a regional basis. You are not going to put new industries in Trinidad, Jamaica or in one place when there is federation; your Regional Economic Development Department would be entrusted with the responsibility of ensuring that economic development is allocated on a regional basis and in the fairest possible manner. If the matter is approached on this regional basis there should not be the desire for swarms of unemployed of any unit in the fed-

eration to rush to another unit because several industries would be going up there and none in their own homeland. It would not be like that.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see today that although such a hullabaloo was raised about this question of freedom of movement and though this House and the general public were told never to enter federation unless there was freedom of movement, as if Barbados never intends to expand industrially to the point in which it will be able to provide work for its own people, implying that Barbados will always be the poor house of the West Indies and that somebody will always have to find work for Barbadians, that a more reasonable approach has been countenanced and that this question of freedom of movement has now been viewed in its correct perspective. Of course, one is forced to express the fact that so long as the present Government remains in power, Barbadians will always have to emigrate. Under different conditions, Sir, this need for emigration should sooner or later almost completely disappear from the aims and objects of public-spirited people in Barbados. If we had the Aid to Industries Bill sometime previous to when it came into force we would not have to go to Canada today.

One other point, Mr. Speaker, and it is on the question of the Federal Capital. In November last year, there was a meeting in Barbados of the Regional Economic Committee and to my complete surprise and pleasure the Head of the elected Government of Jamaica, Mr. Bustamante, and his Finance Minister, Mr. Sangster, both stated fairly publicly that they would offer no objection to Barbados being the Federal Capital because they realised that Barbados had certain advantages which the majority of the other colonies whose names had been mentioned in that respect, did not possess. I understand that Mr. Bustamante aired these views quite openly at a recent conference in London at which the honourable senior member for St. Joseph was one of those present. It is most likely that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has become acquainted with this changed attitude on the part of certain West Indian Leaders. As a matter of fact, I will go as far as to say that with Jamaica throwing in its weight to make Barbados the temporary Federal Capital, with her 16 or 17 seats and the other votes which Barbados can muster along with its own, it is almost a virtual fact that Barbados would be the temporal Federal Capital and once it starts off here, there is no reason why it would not continue here. It is therefore to be hoped that this attitude on the part of the biggest West Indian colony and others has not been without influence on the new approach to this question of federation. I am not for one moment suggesting that merely because we hope that Barbados would be the Federal Capital we should agree to federation in principle; that would be almost tantamount to blackmail. However, it is not too much to say, perhaps the hope of Barbados being the Federal Capital may have been the sobering influence on certain people who were not recently minded to enter the federation. If the possibility of Barbados becoming the Federal Capital is a bait which would attract each other to abide to better reasoning, let us all push to make Barbados the Federal Capital; let us at the same time exert our best possible endeavour to bring to bear upon each other West Indian colony the point of view that in federation each colony stands to benefit and not Barbados alone if it becomes the temporary capital of the proposed federation.

To sum up, Sir, my main submission is that the London Conference decisions should be accepted with some further modification of the proposals relating to legislation by the Queen-in-Council and the Governor-General reserved powers. If Barbados has been able to keep an even ship of state throughout the three hundred years of its existence without the distinct trappings of Crown Colony paternalism, there is no reason why Her Majesty's Government should not grant the West Indies a federation with Barbados getting a chance to work under a constitution similar to that which we now enjoy with the hope that with the leaven of Barbados and the leaven of the others, Barbados would bring its experience and political training to bear on the federation in the exercise and the control of the finances of the federation. Sir, nothing beats a trial but a failure and while nobody is suggesting we should gamble with our future prospects for federation, I think we would have better hopes for our success if we are committed to start off with the maximum possible control of our finances. With these few remarks of appreciation for the fact that we are not going to permit freedom of movement to be any obstacle, I sincerely hope that we will get on with the job of federation and the next time that this issue comes before the Legislature, prolonged and detailed discussion will be the discussion on the proposed draft constitution for a British West Indies Federation. (Cheers).

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, the points raised today by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph in his consideration of the report of the London Conference on West Indian Federation are concerned particularly with emigration and finance. In that report there have been minor amendments to those questions. On the last occasion, this House came down strongly in favour of putting emigration on the exclusive list as against where it was on the concurrent list; therefore, I was glad to see after our representatives returned from the London Conference that they had succeeded in getting it put on the exclusive list. As a matter of fact, they have gone further and have had it put in the Preamble and have had it made clear that one of the main objects of going into federation should be freedom of movement throughout each territory. I was of that opinion then and am of that same opinion today. It would be ludicrous for us to have a free play of customs between the units and goods produced in one area entering another area as if they were produced in that area and on the other hand labour being debarred from entering for work in the places where those goods are produced. We would be consumers and not producers in that way. We want when we go into this federation that everyone should go in as equals. It may take some time for us to break down those barriers, but evidently it will be better for a West Indian Federation.

As regards the matter of finance, unfortunately, during the period, members of my party did not get hold of the memorandum that was issued by Colonial Development and Welfare entitled "Financial Aspects of West Indian Federation." It is a very interesting document and if members of my party had got hold of that memorandum, I am sure we would have been able to contribute very much more on this matter. From a cursory glance at it, we are told that the cost of federation would be over and above what it was originally estimated to cost. It was estimated to cost in 1948 the sum of £183,000 and it is expected that the cost would be more today throughout each territory although two of the territories—British Guiana and British Honduras—would not be now taking part in the federation. There has been necessarily a reduction because those

two territories would not be going into the federation now; however, though our federating is expected to cost more than it was originally estimated, I do not think it is beyond the ability of these territories to finance the scheme. I do know that throughout this island there are sections of people of all quarters that are against federation because of the financial implications, but I can say that my party comes down strongly in favour of federation notwithstanding its financial implications. If we do not go into federation, where do we go next? That is the question that no one can answer. We either have federation or remain in these small units. As the world is moving today, there is no place for these small units, because, separately, they have not the financial ability to run their affairs; at least, not the way in which we want it done.

It has been stated in London that federation has been welcomed in these territories only by one section of the people and to put it in the words of some people, the sugar barons of Barbados are against it. Whether I represent the sugar barons or not, I am for federation, and if they want me to represent them, they will have to accept that; if they cannot accept that, then I do not represent them.

Many speeches have been made as regards the constitutional issues and I think other honourable members will also give expression to this matter and for that reason, I will not worry to speak on the matter. I would say in conclusion that our party comes down heavily on the side of federation and we will vote that we go on from this stage. (Cheers).

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, from time immemorial, we have been having discussions on all types of Government in the area especially with regard to whether or not we should have federation and I think after almost a century of discussion from time to time in the various territories in this respect, it is now agreed upon that we should not stay as separate and disjointed units in the area but we should come together under a federal head. What worries me as a weakness in all the reports on this issue is that there is nothing under the constitutional setup which states that we should have the greatest possible freedom of movement. At this stage, with the permission of the honourable Premier, I would like to suggest an amendment that when the constitution is written, it should read after paragraph 4 of the S.C.A.C. Federation Plan that there should be the greatest possible freedom of movement instead of having it in the Preamble. We should have that written in the constitution rather than to have it appearing at the top of the constitution in the Preamble. I repeat that I would like to see written immediately after Clause 4: "there should be the greatest possible freedom of movement for goods and persons within the area." I do not think that is asking too much.

I think the first and foremost task lies in assisting the people to gain for themselves a culture of their own. That is something on which federation must rest. I suppose most of the discussions from time to time were on the question of whether or not federation would assist us economically, but I think, we should also be concerned with gaining a culture of our own. This question brings to my mind something which was written by the now famous Professor Simey to the effect that immediately after the emancipation we had a people who were free but who had no form of culture of their own which was necessary in the formation and development of the community.

I have discussed this question of federation with several members of the various legislatures in the area and I have found out after discussing the

matter with whom I might term as the poor relatives, such as Antigua, St. Kitts, St. Lucia and Grenada, the question was whether or not they would benefit from the larger units such as Jamaica, Trinidad and Barbados, and whether those large colonies would be willing to federate under that condition. I regard matters like those as trivialities; I think the question should be: "what we should contribute to federation." With regard to what Barbados can contribute, make no mistake about it, we have a large population which comprises of a large number of skilled workers and I think that is something to recommend us if this question of freedom of movement is provided. I therefore hope the honourable Premier would assure this House that he would seek to have that matter written in the constitution rather than just having it appearing in the preamble. As I said, the question is not what we would stand to benefit from under federation; the question is what we should contribute to federation. If it is the question of what we stand to benefit, we could say like some members of the area that we have our sugar and all is sold; therefore, we cannot benefit from federation. We may be able to benefit from freedom of movement.

Reading the report carefully, I see that the constitution of the Federal Parliament would be much inferior to what we in Barbados enjoy. We are not fully satisfied with that and we hope that we would be given a more improved constitution. The question of having a Federal Parliament which is reduced to nothing more than Crown Colony Government is a very awkward thing for us to think of in this century. However, I do not think that there is anything of more importance to us than freedom of movement of our people; and I hope with that written in the constitution, Barbados will be able to supply several of the other colonies with skilled workers. I therefore hope that the honourable Premier will give us the assurance that this matter will not only earn his consideration but will be brought to bear on the architects of the Constitution—those who are expected to write it.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, listening to the speeches of some honourable members and especially that of the honourable Premier, it seems as if he and I are going in the same direction but only with different intentions and different reasons. I have listened to the arguments for and against federation for the past three or four years and have read the comments in the various newspapers over the matter and I have tried to convince myself of the benefits to be derived from a federation of these West Indian Colonies but up to now, I have failed to be convinced of these benefits. I am very practical, and inasmuch as these colonies, especially Barbados, are pauperised, I am not interested from the point of view of the political change but from the point of view of the economic importance. Viewing it from the economic aspect, I cannot see anything which this colony would stand to benefit by federation. Firstly, the only beneficial part of the federation programme for this colony would be freedom of movement. We feel that with other colonies having larger areas than our own, our people would be enterprising enough to spread themselves all around those areas and make good, but as the honourable Premier has said, it would be left to the Federal Government to decide whether freedom of movement would be indulged in or whether we should maintain our emigration and immigration barriers, therefore, as that is the only benefit which I see under the whole federal structure that would benefit us, and there is not much hope that it will be brought about, I must caution honourable mem-

bers not to take a leap into the dark, because it is a matter so long as you have ventured into it, according to the honourable Premier, you cannot back out of it. In other words, every colony which agrees to its entry into the federation will never be able to change its mind after it has entered on it. It therefore means that whether this change would be for our growth or stuntedness depends on the decisions taken by our politicians in this area, and because of that, I agree with the honourable Premier that our decisions must call for careful scrutiny before we commit ourselves to something which must continue perpetually.

However much the politicians in this area might say that federation of the West Indies would mean an improved political status for the West Indies as a whole, therefore we should indulge in it, we have to weigh carefully whether for that small percentage of improved political status we in this colony might not be giving up a tremendous lot of our economic worth. I am not after this grandiose political advancement which politicians have been harping at for some time; I am after a security in the social life of the people generally, and anything which would maintain that standard I am willing to say "let us indulge in it." I would go all out for that even if it means that we would not be looked upon as politically advanced as might be other nations. In other words, we should direct ourselves to the wants of the community; we should not mind whether a man lives unto himself so long as he is provided with security of life and the respectability which goes along with such stability. It is better to be that way than to be termed as being free, for while you are being free in the sense that you are in a position to make your own decisions, you will have nothing on which to make those decisions, therefore, you will still be in misery.

What I do see in this federation is that it is being forced upon us. It is a fact that the average man in the street, whether he be Trinidadian, Jamaican, Antiguan, Grenadian, or our own people, does not know anything about it. He is not interested in it. There might be a couple of individuals who by their close relationship with politicians, have heard something about it, but the broad masses of the people know nothing about it. I am sure if you were to go around this island, you will find a small percentage—a percentage smaller than two per cent.—of the population that is interested in federation. As a matter of fact, you will find many who have not even heard about the matter being discussed. If the British Government feel for some political reason or the other that these colonies of the West Indies must be federated and because of that has commended it to us and has set up machinery to bring it into effect and even if that is the endeavour of some of the politicians in the area, that does not mean that the people want it because the people know nothing about it; the politicians have not gone far enough to bring to the knowledge of the masses what is the meaning and what are the benefits of federation of the West Indies if it is brought about.

As I see it, we are going to be saddled with a dual set-up of Government in the West Indies by federation—one of the local legislature and the other of the Federal Government. It is going to mean paying a high-salaried Governor-General and bearing the cost of the appendages of such an office such as the various lieutenants and the politicians who have seats on the Federal Government. You also have to bear in mind that these people will have to do a lot of travelling around the area and besides that it would also mean that you must have a commensurate salary scale for the Civil Servants who

will have the dignity of working for the Federal Government. It is also going to mean a cessation in your internal and to a certain extent in your external protection from the British Government and that means that you would have to set up your West Indian Regiment, and as you know, the worst money that you can spend is on maintenance of things of a non-productive character, such as the Army. An army to support is like a leech on the population, because it sucks well everything out of you while it produces nothing good. Besides having to look for finance to support an Army, you will also have to look for finance to support a navy to guard your coastal areas because the British Government might decide to discontinue doing so. Sir, in our desire to enter federation it is like purchasing an ink jug and limiting our ideas to the cost of the empty jug and having no consideration at all for the cost of the ink which we must put into it or the blotting paper and other things which go with such an item.

I might be the only person with such a view, but that is what I can see resulting from a top heavy Federal Government placed on top of the individual unit Governments. The cost must be tremendous for poor colonies to bear, and after you have committed yourself to the system there is no backing out of it; it means that you have to keep going forward and it also means the reduction of a great percentage of your natural wealth for the upkeep of this Federal structure without which we have been doing and without which we can do in the future. It must result in the re-introduction of serfdom in these colonies, brought about through unnecessarily high taxation so as to finance the Federal structure, and therefore a lower standard of living in these colonies. My friends on my left seem to be thinking only in terms of pooling their resources together for the purpose of bartering so as to get a bag of flour cheaper than what they are paying for it now; but looking at the matter from that aspect only involves higher taxation which must be imposed so as to maintain this Federal structure. We can get together on the citrus question as we have got together in bargaining for a higher price for sugar—these things have brought benefit to the West Indian Colonies without an overburdened Federal Government. What is more than the evils I have mentioned, is that as far as the recommendations have shown, we, as Barbadians, do not stand to benefit at all, because all that there was to be gained from Federation has already been husbanded by colonies like Trinidad and Jamaica. As I said when this Federation issue was first brought up, inasmuch as our population is redundant and inasmuch as our people are more stable than many in the West Indies, our land areas are limited and we cannot depend upon agriculture, let us have a reasonable scheme of industrialisation. Let Jamaica indulge in agriculture, let Trinidad indulge in its oil and other productions, let British Guiana indulge in its timber and other productions and let Barbados become the industrial hub of the West Indies; let us have industries which will find employment for people who will become capable of acclimatizing themselves in the factories and workshops in England. I said in the first instance when we were arguing about industries, that Jamaica and Trinidad went ahead and grasped all the new industries which were being brought to the West Indies and now that we are about to pass this Final Report on Federation, there is nothing for us to salvage from this Federation which, in my humble opinion, is being thrust upon us. If one were to reflect carefully on the proposals in this Federation he would be forced to come to the conclusion that

Barbados has nothing to gain from the prestige of political advancement which you cannot carry to the shop.

What is more, we are told that the Federal Government after it has been constituted, will decide whether we must have free movement among units or not. What else is there left for the teeming masses in this island? — Nothing. I am asking honourable members to reflect carefully and see that Jamaica, on account of its 1½ million people, will have the greatest number of seats in the Federal Government. The flamboyancy of Mr. Bustamante must have some weight with the politicians of the smaller colonies to which he is always in a good position to do kindness. Everybody knows that sometimes politicians are bought cheaply; I say that because fancy phrases coming from the Premier or Mr. Bustamante or Mr. Gomes will cause the small-time politicians to change their opinion. If Mr. Bustamante says: "Give sympathy to that Workers' Union led by Hon. V. C. Bird," the latter is liable to say: "Mr. Bustamante is my friend." I am sure that the Honourable Premier is taking these points into consideration. The small colonies will accept the placard and the Federal structure will be placed into the hands of undesirables. At one time the politicians of the small islands are boosting the Premier, and another time they are boosting Mr. Bustamante and at yet another time they are boosting Mr. Gomes; Jamaica being a more wealthy colony than any other, Mr. Bustamante can offer some assistance. He might only do that as an expedient because he wants support and you cannot be vexed with him if he sees the means of getting that support.

There are possibilities that what I am saying might be practised and we should be interested in Barbados and Barbadians first and foremost; the West Indies come next. What I am trying to point out is this; when Mr. Bustamante solicits and gets the support of the small Governments in the West Indies, he starts off with an advantage over a small colony like this, and I presume it is easier for Jamaica and Trinidad to work in unison than it is for Trinidad and Barbados to work in unison. Two wealthy men will find it easier to see eye to eye with each other than a wealthy man and a poor one: Barbados has nothing to offer but souls which other people do not want and if you bring about a Federal structure controlled by Trinidad and Jamaica or by one of them, what hope will Barbados have as regards freedom of movement which is the principal thing which will cause us to enter the Federation? What power have we got to prevent Trinidad and Jamaica from squeezing us? Even after Trinidad agreed in principle to Federation she hunted out thousands of West Indians from her territory, or imprisoned them and threw them out.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: On a point of order. The honourable member is spoiling a good speech from the point of view that it is for the Federal Government to decide whether we will have freedom of movement or not. We are not going into Federation unless that provision is written in the Constitution.

Mr. ALLDER: I notice that the Clause in which they have control for "immigration, emigration and deportation" gives authority to its being brought about after the Federal set-up. If the honourable member is putting that point I hope that he will persist in it; but at the moment it is frightening and hopeless to know that no guarantee has been made along those lines. Even at this late hour I am hoping that the honourable Premier will be going to London again and I hope he will be agree-

ing to something which will come about fifty years hence. I do not mind what the honourable member says; you cannot have a successful Federation of islands divided as these islands are, by hundreds of miles of water. You can force Federation on people because they cannot prevent you from doing so; but if you want a thing you want the best and any force from on top cannot work effectively. I heard some honourable members mention the Federation of the United States of America and other Federations, but these Federations are different from our Federation. West Indians are parochially-minded and while they are called West Indians they are a few small units and they feel separate and distinct; you cannot force me to federate with my neighbour; that has to be a natural process if it is to become friendly. You cannot legislate to draw us together.

I have been trying to find the reasons for this Federation. I have read some article in the *Advocate* where the writer was questioning why we are going to federate and against what we are going to federate? I have listened to the discussion on this issue for a number of years; I have listened to those who are "in the know" and I have not been able to hear any economic advantage which would accrue from this Federation. Even the makers of this Federation idea do not seem to know what they really ought to know. People in Asia and Africa want independence and Dominion Status and therefore we must have it too; but we must realise that political independence will mean to us something which will cost us dearly—something which we can ill afford, something which must reduce the population to a further state of serfdom because Federation does not come as easy as it sounds. Federation costs money and it may cost us more money than we anticipate. So long as we have entered into Federation we cannot come out and we will have something which might hang us; if it comes and bears heavily on the national wealth of these colonies, what have we to resort to but higher taxation? And higher taxation means a greater pauperization of the areas so as to finance a non-productive scheme. Federation is something which will remain with future generations after we have passed on.

To show you the prejudices which obtain in the minds of politicians in the area, even with respect to the Headquarters for the Federal Government the other West Indian politicians failed to give Barbados the consideration which it deserves. If you have the industries, if you have the natural resources greater than what we have and if because of our political advancement and cultural standard we lead public opinion in the West Indies, why can't we be given the Headquarters for the Federal set-up? Other colonies have the land area and their natural resources and all we have is a teeming population and we also have a higher standard of culture and education—we have that stability which cannot be found in any other colony. Even those qualifications have been overlooked and the site for the Federal Headquarters must be in a second grade island like Grenada which is undeveloped from the point of view of modern improvements! We are not given even the Federal Headquarters which would mean that more people from overseas will come to the Federal Headquarters and we will benefit from their coming here. Our artisans would get the opportunity of building this immense Federal structure and the business houses in Bridgetown would be able to pay higher income tax due to the supply of materials and so on. Even in those things they try to do an injustice to Barbados and yet we are still willing to enter Federation blindly! When, for political reasons, the honourable Premier appeared to have wanted Federation badly, cer-

tain prejudices forced people to be against it; if he wants Federation at this particular time, those who do not want Federation say: "Since he has been backing out of Federation, we will force him into it." If the honourable member felt that Federation would have helped Barbados but since the passing of time he has been forced to realise that the benefits which appeared previously do not now appear, let him back out of it now. There are no economic benefits for the people; you saw the economic benefits once but you do not see them now and therefore you can back out of Federation; even the intelligencia have failed to see the benefits of Federation to this island.

We have had the Report of the Standing Closer Association Committee and we have had meetings of the Regional Economic Committee and let us see what benefits these two Organisations can bring to us, because the same thing will work out in the end. Big business amalgamating is different from small colonies federating; big business have amalgamated so as to exploit people. The amalgamation of big business is an evil which should be stamped out; it should not be compared with the Federation of a couple of half-starved colonies.

The hon. Premier has mentioned something about our waiting to see what other colonies were doing. That is the natural thing to do; if you are walking with a group of uncertain companions what must you do? Do not allow them to push you in front where you will meet the time bomb first; let us walk shoulder to shoulder or if you are smarter than I am and stronger than I am economically then you can go ahead. I cannot afford a burden heavier than I can bear to be put around my neck. I do not think the hon. Premier should excuse that; the actions in London have caused me to be suspicious. I am referring to the delegates who went to London with him; they went back to their colonies and did something which people felt was detrimental to Federation by changing the immigration rules. Then we have been warned that we have to give up 25% of our customs duties; the bulk of our revenue comes from the Customs Department and if we are asked to give up 25% of that revenue to the Federal Government I do not think we can afford to do that. There are some politicians who, because they expected that there would have been a rule which would prevent a member of the local Government from becoming a member of the Federal Government and *vice versa*, they are hoping to get a chance to dominate the local Government.

I hope the hon. Premier will boldly say these things to the West Indian people and I am sure that Barbadians will not be vexed with him. We will agree to Federation in the next fifty years if people feel they can federate politically; Barbadians will not be vexed with the hon. member for saying these things: I do not know if the people at Downing Street will be vexed with him.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that the further consideration of this matter be postponed. In view of the fact that one or two honourable members have expressed the opinion that they would like a little further time to study the financial obligations in connection with this matter, I have made that motion.

Mr. BRANCKER: I beg to second that.

Mr. BARROW: It seems to me that we started off this debate without any serious intention of putting either the West Indies or Barbados any further forward in the matter of the Federation discussion. I think that a great deal of time has been wasted this afternoon by discussing these proposals if we are going to postpone consideration of them, because it would then give hon. members and the general public

the impression that the Report of the London Conference of 1953 was discussed in this Chamber today only because some honourable members of this Chamber had said that it would be discussed for the benefit of the West Indian public. I think that sufficient delay has taken place since 1948 for us to decide to go forward now with the final discussion on the prospects of Federation.

The reason for the postponement given by the honourable Leader of the House strikes me as being rather strange because the Report on the financial aspects of Federation drawn up by the Colonial Development and Welfare Organisation has been in the hands of hon. members for nearly a year and it is rather surprising for me to hear the ready acquiescence of the Government to the suggestion by the Opposition that the Report on the financial aspects of Federation was not readily available and honourable members have not had time to study it. I do not think we should start our debate and then watch other Governments; we would not be giving the political leadership which is expected of us in the Caribbean area. The whole issue of Federation has been befogged because of the lack of strong leadership on the part of West Indian leaders and the lack of information in relation to the importance of Federation to the economic and social future amongst the masses of people in the West Indies. I was rather looking forward to this Assembly setting this evening an example which would be followed by the other units in the area by stating in no uncertain manner our attitude towards the Federation of the British West Indian Colonies in the Caribbean. Without entering into the merits or demerits of this Report, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I regard the Report itself. —

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member speaking on the motion for the postponement?

Mr. BARROW: Yes, Sir. I regard the Report itself so important a document that I am rather scandalised to think that we have left it until so late in the day and after prompting and urging on the pro-consuls of the Imperial Government in the Caribbean we are now reluctantly discussing this question at this late hour. To add insult to injury — the insult being to the intelligence of the masses of the people in the Caribbean and the injury being the postponement of the economic betterment to which we all look forward — the honourable Leader of the House has suggested that we postpone discussion of this Report which I consider to be a monstrously inept suggestion; therefore I am asking honourable members to go forward with this matter. The Government Spokesman has spoken on the matter, the honourable Leader of the Opposition has had the Report in his hands for over eighteen months and it is clear that honourable members have not taken the opportunity to familiarize themselves with the contents of that Report; but the fault is theirs and I do not see any reason why the public should be made to suffer from the sins of omission and of commission on the part of negligent members of this House.

The question that the further consideration of the Report be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

On resumption,

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, — I ask leave to take Committee of Supply as the next Order of the Day.

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

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction to the Committee when the House is in Committee, to deal with the Resolution of which I gave notice earlier this afternoon.

Hon. M. E. COX seconded the motion which was agreed to.

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

VISIT TO KENYA OF REPRESENTATIVE OF BARBADOS BRANCH OF THE COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, — The first Resolution with which I propose to deal is a Resolution for \$1,747.00 to be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1954-55. Part I: — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1954-55 No. 7, which forms the Schedule to this Resolution. The Addendum to the Resolution says this: —

The local branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association has accepted an invitation from the Joint Branches of the Association of the Legislatures of the Union of South Africa, Northern Rhodesia and Kenya to send a member of the local branch to a Conference which it is proposed will take place in Kenya from the 7th August to the 10th September, and to take part in the tours of African territories to be arranged by the host branches.

The local Branch of the Association has selected the Honourable Dr. A. S. Cato, member of the Legislative Council, to be the delegate from Barbados.

The inviting branches will be responsible for the transport between Barbados and Kenya, both outward and homeward, for hotel expenses, internal transport, and entertainment in Kenya and the African Countries included in the tour. As usual this Government must be responsible for any subsistence allowance which it considers reasonable that the delegate should receive.

The Government considers that subsistence allowance should be paid and has agreed to the following rates: —

\$24.00 per day while on land;

\$ 9.60 per day while at sea;

\$ 4.80 per day while travelling by air;

together with reasonable excess baggage expenses. according to the information at present available regarding the itinerary, it is estimated that a sum of \$1,747 will be required to meet the delegate's subsistence allowance and excess baggage. This Resolution is to provide the necessary funds.

Of course, if there is no excess baggage, naturally the money will not be paid out. Things of this sort will mean the wearing of formal dress both in the evening and morning. General speaking, I am afraid that too often even the Government is at fault because it knows what the House will say in this matter of subsistence allowance; we are too cheeping and niggardly in giving proper subsistence allowance to delegates who go abroad. If honour-

able members feel that way, the Government has sent down these proposals, but it is open to honourable members to suggest other sums and if they want me to take the matter back to the Executive Committee of course I will do so. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I agree with this Resolution but my memory goes back a little; I will make this observation and I hope members of the Government will remember what took place. I do not think that the sum of \$24.00 per day while on land and \$9.60 per day while at sea is too much. I am very pleased at the selection of the delegate to represent Barbados at this Conference of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. Paragraph three of the addendum to this Resolution says this:

"The inviting branches will be responsible for the transport between Barbados and Kenya, both outward and homeward, for hotel expenses, internal transport, and entertainment in Kenya and the African Countries included in the tour. As usual this Government must be responsible for any subsistence allowance which it considers reasonable that the delegate should receive."

In 1950 or 1951 when I suggested that the then hon. junior member for St. John, Mr. Fred Bethell, whose circumstances were absolutely no different from that of Hon. Dr. A. S. Cato, should be given out-of-pocket expenses, the Government said that he could pay his own out-of-pocket expenses. I have much pleasure in supporting this Resolution but these things come back as a boomerang; Mr. Bethell was selected as the Representative of the Legislature to go to New Zealand and I was poo-hooed because I said that if you select a member to go abroad to represent this Chamber and the Other Place at a Conference of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association you should not merely take into consideration what his circumstances are. I said that his out-of-pocket expenses should be paid. Mr. Bethell was a member of this Party and that was the reason why his expenses were not paid; now that the Representative is Hon. Dr. A. S. Cato the Government is paying these expenses. When the honourable Premier was going abroad a subsistence allowance of £1. 5s. was suggested; I was the one member of this House who said that if you send a Barbadian abroad he should be given a decent subsistence allowance. I know that honourable members said that they would not pay Mr. Bethell's out-of-pocket expenses because he was a white man; I know that was said. In this case I know we are sending out a most suitable man who will represent this Colony adequately in Kenya.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Normally, I am of the opinion that since this meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association will be taking place in Kenya, Barbados should refuse to participate in it as a protest against what is going on there. My opinion is that since we are more or less diametrically opposed in principle to what is taking place in Kenya we should refuse to participate in the proceedings because they are taking place in Kenya. If I do not oppose this Resolution tonight it is merely because I feel that in the delegate selected there is the likelihood that we may be able to get some first-hand information of what is taking place in Kenya. It is true, of course, that the delegates will be carefully guarded from any association or contact with the African natives as far as possible, but Hon. Dr. Cato ought to be interested enough in the welfare of people who look like himself as to talk to the barmen

and others and try and get information which should not be denied to any member of this Association.

Mr. BARROW: A few meetings ago I charged that this Commonwealth Parliamentary Association is rapidly degenerating into a social club at which members of the Commonwealth Assembly foregather from time to time at the expense of the taxpayers of their respective countries with no attempted increase in the good feeling and goodwill which is supposed to exist between member and member of the British Commonwealth of Nations. When the honourable senior member for St. Philip discussed the question of emigration to the Dominion of Canada, I pointed out that the idea of brotherhood in the British Commonwealth of Nations was an idea which was honoured more in the breach than in the observance. I think that the taxpayers of this country should also know—although the present situation is not one to which my strictures directly apply—that the Barbados Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association is in the habit of utilizing these opportunities for the bestowal of favours upon friends. When Her Majesty the Queen was about to visit Jamaica we were invited to send two delegates to that colony in order that this Branch of the Association would be represented at the festivities which took place at the time of Her Majesty's visit; I very much regret to say that I made a proposal that Hon. Mrs. Hanschell and the honourable senior member for St. Andrew.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member must stick to this Resolution.

Mr. BARROW: I am speaking on this Resolution and you cannot stop me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member must withdraw those remarks.

Mr. BARROW: I am suggesting that as long as I am speaking on the Resolution I am quite in order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member must withdraw those remarks.

Mr. BARROW: If your susceptibilities are wounded I will withdraw the remarks. I am not suggesting that the Chair has not got an overriding authority in this Chamber, but I am exercising my constitutional privilege to speak on this Resolution. As I said before, I suggested that Honourable Mrs. Hanschell and the honourable senior member for St. Andrew should be the delegates selected—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the honourable member to keep to this Resolution.

Mr. BARROW: If this Commonwealth Parliamentary Association is really an association of the members of this House and the members of the Other Place, we would not expect to see politics introduced into Resolutions of this kind and, as a result of the lobbying and what not, which took place, while the honourable junior member for St. Thomas can justify his great eminence to his selection I think his qualifications were all right; but as regards Honourable Mr. Cuke, who makes frequent visits, his claims were deemed to be superior to those of Honourable Mrs. Hanschell or those of the honourable senior member for St. Andrew. I think the choice in this particular instance has been a fortunate one; Honourable Dr. Cato is even more fortunate in that none of the potential beneficiaries probably had the courage to make the hazardous journey to East Africa. If this Commonwealth Parliamentary Association is going to function in a democratic manner and if the taxpayers' money will be expended wisely, we must be sure that on every occasion on which we are asked to vote money for this Association to send people abroad, the person selected to make the trip should not be chosen for political, social or personal reasons, that the most suitable

person is sent on each and every occasion and that this business of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association is not used as a system of patronage for good behaviour.

As a matter of fact, this travelling about is becoming quite a disease in the West Indies; there is no earthly reason except for the reason of goodwill and convention that we should send anybody to any of these things, and if honourable members who have the financial means at their disposal are not public-spirited enough as to push their hands into their own pockets and pay their own fare, then we should ignore these invitations altogether because we have people in this Chamber who are fortunate enough to be able to pay their own passages.

I am glad to hear that the honourable gentleman is going abroad because it happens to be that honourable gentleman; I do not want it to be thought that I have any personal affinity with him but I think that some benefit will accrue to the community from his going abroad. However, these trips are not necessary either for the salvation of Barbados or for the relief of the suffering masses of the country who have to hang around the precincts of the metropolitan parish from day to day. We have an inflated sense of our importance; Mr. Chairman, it is not to every singing or every birthday party to which your mother would allow you to go, because this question of going to birthday parties involves the taking of presents, and these Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conferences involve the spending of the taxpayers' money and no value comes to the community at all. As soon as we stop talking about birth control and such things and realize that we have to start creating jobs in Barbados and use every available cent of the taxpayers' money for the relief of unemployment, the better it will be for the good government of this country and the salvation of this island.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—I am happy to contribute a word of congratulation over the choice of the delegate to attend this Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference. What I would like to know is this: Is this delegate duty bound to make a comprehensive Report to this House for the money which we are voting to send him on this trip? Or is it just going to be a joy ride and coming back for him? I am not satisfied about that: we should demand a Report because, Mr. Chairman, our minds are disturbed over the conditions which exist in Kenya and we are sending this delegate there for the sole purpose that he will make a Report on what is happening. He should use his eyes, his ears, and everything else in order to get some information as to the conditions of the people in Kenya. I am supporting this Resolution but I would like the Government to impress upon this delegate that he should bring back a Report to us as to what is happening with my brothers in Kenya.

Hon. M. E. COX: If it had not been for the remarks of the honourable senior member for the City I would not have said anything about this matter at all. The honourable member invited the Committee to remember that when Mr. Bethell went to New Zealand and this House refused to vote money so as to grant him a subsistence allowance. For the information of this Committee I should like to state that no question was raised in this House about Mr. Bethell's subsistence allowance from an official point of view. In other words, except in a speech made by the honourable senior member for the City there was no suggestion—as a matter of fact Mr. Bethell's selection to go to New Zealand was only reported to the House officially and there was nothing asked for by way of

a subsistence allowance for Mr. Bethell. It is not strictly correct to say that because Mr. "A" is white and Mr. "B" is black that we are making fish of the one and fowl of the other. I think I can say quite correctly that we are not interested in colour; as far as I am concerned, colour is just colour. We are supporting principles—not colour; I have no respect for colour; we know that there is some good in colour and there is some bad in it as well. It should not be felt that we are supporting this Resolution tonight because the honourable gentleman is a coloured person.

In reply to the point made by the honourable junior member for St. Philip relative to the presentation of a Report, I expect that the honourable member would have in his possession the Report of the last Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference which took place in Canada. I am quite sure that if he looks up his Reports he will see that he has been supplied with Reports of these Conferences which take place from time to time.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, —The money which is going to finance this trip by the Hon. Dr. Cato has been drawn through taxation from the pockets of the distant cousins of the people in Kenya whose areas are being overrun by a tyrannical European minority group. I do hope that the presence of the genial Doctor on that delegation which will be visiting Kenya does not give further courage to this European minority group to destroy further the lives and properties of those helpless Negroes who are being hunted down through the bush and burnt, bombed and destroyed by means of force which is stronger than what they could ever possess. Let us hope that the presence of Hon. Dr. Cato on such a delegation will not strengthen the courage of the Europeans or make them feel that there are coloured men from the West Indies who have come as guests to see the turmoil which exists, and therefore the Europeans can go ahead and destroy human bodies as they are doing at the present time. We must realize that the presence of this Doctor on this delegation to Kenya will not prevent one bullet from being fired at our distant cousins. I say that because Africa is our original birthplace and if it had not been for the accident of slavery, many of us might have been out there now being hunted down as our cousins are being hunted down by this minority group of Europeans.

I feel, Sir, those of us who have read of the struggle of the slaves, our ancestors, must have felt just as I, that the plight which our ancestors suffered before they were eventually released is being experienced by those people in Kenya looking like ourselves. Although we are free to dominate the Legislatures of these colonies and to make statements which even if their effect on international public opinion in a matter like this cannot help the Kenyans as effectively as we would like, yet we are glad to have these infrequent opportunities, such as this, when we are asked to vote a sum of money for the purpose set out in the resolution, to express our indignation of the suffering which has been forced upon them and to express our sympathy towards them.

As regards the subsistence allowance of \$720 for the Honourable Dr. Cato should he remain in Kenya for 30 days, I feel it is a sumptuous amount, but I presume that it is compatible with his status as a successful practising physician. I therefore do not disagree with the amount. I should however remind this Committee that I have always expressed disagreement against the wanton expenditure of large sums of money for the purpose of giving persons trips which do not bring any benefit, economically or socially, to the people of the colony. While in-

dulging in expenditure for purposes as this, we are likely to forget that the amounts are drawn from the pockets of those who are unable to give themselves proper meals, and often we squander it on those who are capable of meeting the expenditure themselves owing to their occupation. Sir, let us hope that the time is not far distant when this Government would review its whole policy as regards trips and conferences. Besides the isolated amounts which we give our blessing to during the financial year from time to time, there is a substantial allocation in the Annual Estimates for the purpose of financing conferences and things of that sort.'

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, I do not at all disapprove of the payment of subsistence allowance to delegates who attend international conferences; what I disapprove of is the type of delegate that is generally selected to attend such conferences. However, I believe that in this instance, the type of delegate that is selected can benefit from this conference and the people of this island would also benefit by his contributions on the issue owing to his learning things that he could not have learnt by staying here. It takes a certain mind to benefit from travel, therefore, in the selection of delegates we always have to select those who we think would benefit most from it.

Mr. Chairman, it must also be borne in mind that the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association is paying the expenses of the trip from here to London and from London to Kenya of the delegate whom we have selected. All that we are asked to do is to supply the out-of-pocket money for the daily incidental expenses of the delegate. The amount which has been brought down in this resolution cannot affect the economy, or the poverty, or the welfare of the people of this colony. I think that the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association is responsible for distributing to us reports from other Houses of Parliament which, if members of this House read, would be of immense value to their contribution in this House. The fact that the Association is meeting in Kenya on this occasion — I think on the last occasion it met in Canada — is purely incidental. However, I do believe that the Honourable Dr. Cato will bring back a report of the situation in Kenya which will enlighten us. We do hope, of course, that the Mau Mau will not be so close to him as to cause him any mishap. One must remember that members of Mau Mau are not only killing Europeans; they are also killing natives and I think the Mau Mau would have got the sympathy of the Socialist members of the British Parliament if the situation were different, but the British Socialist Party is today as opposed to the Mau Mau as the Conservative Party because of the atrocities which have been committed by the members of the Mau Mau on their own people. However, whether that is a correct statement of affairs in Kenya or whether it is propaganda, the Honourable Dr. Cato should be able to gather and to enlighten us. It is significant that Africans in the colony of Kenya are today fighting the Mau Mau. I am eager to hear from first hand information whether the situation as I have read about it really exists in Kenya and I think it is a golden opportunity for this House to be able to despatch a delegate from this colony to Kenya. I do think that the delegate will be able to give us a true, not necessarily a propagandist report, of the way the Africans and the Europeans in Kenya are handling the situation there.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I do not want to prolong the debate but I think I should reply to the honourable senior member for St. Michael in respect to the remark he made that no mention was ever made of money having been paid out to meet

the expenses of trips by members of the Parliamentary Association to a meeting of the Association except that which was paid out on behalf of the then senior member for St. John. I do not know whom the honourable member was trying to impress, but I would like the honourable member to really know that it is purely a matter for the Government.

I would end by saying that I was really pleased to hear what the honourable Minister said in regard to his visit to England. I would have liked to hear that at least what had been done in respect to the honourable Minister during his two-week stay in England had been done to Dr. Jagan. I know what had been done him has given him the courage to express what he expressed in here this afternoon.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1954—55 NO. 5

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this next resolution is supplementary estimates for the sum of \$26,577 for capital expenditure. As usual we will deal with the Heads of Expenditure one by one. The first item comes under Head IV—Education and it is in connection with the Six Cross Road School. According to the note, for some time it has been realised that the accommodation provided in the District Post Offices is both inadequate and unsatisfactory. When the Five year Plan was being prepared the Colonial Postmaster submitted recommendations for the replacement of most of these Post Offices but it was only found possible to include provision for new Offices at Christ Church, St. Lawrence and St. John. Since the passing of the 1954—55 Estimates it has been drawn to the Government's attention that there will be a substantial saving if improvements to the St. Philip and St. James Post Offices were carried out while other work was going on at these sites.

Provision has been included in the 1954—55 Estimates for the construction of a School on the Six Cross Roads site. It is now proposed to adapt the existing building at the entrance to the property into a Post Office and small Library at a cost of \$1,000. As it was originally intended that this building should be incorporated in the new school, it will be necessary to increase the amount provided for the school by \$5,000 in order to make up the accommodation which will be lost.

Perhaps, it would be better for me to deal with the other items under the other Head now. Honourable members will see the notes to the others. As regards the other Post Office at Hometown, St. James, it will be remembered that an amount of \$29,000 has been included in the 1954—55 Estimates for certain extensions to the Police Station at Hometown. The Colonial Engineer considers that it would be desirable and more economical to incorporate a new Post Office for St. James at a cost of \$13,200 in the extensions which are now proposed for the Police Station than to wait to provide a separate Post Office at a later date.

Provision is also made in this supplementary vote for the new Fire Station at Probyn Street. It was stated in paragraph 7 of His Excellency's Message No. 6/1954 that the total cost of the scheme was estimated at \$281,300 excluding the cost of the land to be acquired by purchase. The estimated cost of the land is \$13,000, so the total estimated cost of the project is now \$294,300. A sum of \$270,000 has been provided in the Estimates for 1954—55 but from a vote last year of \$200,000 the sum of \$15,923

was spent on the purchase of essential equipment. If the total estimated cost is \$294,300 and you have already expended \$15,923 and have made provision in the current estimates for \$270,000, you will find that the difference between the sum necessary and the total estimated cost of what we have considered as sufficient is \$8,377.

As I have suggested, we can take each item separately. I beg to move that Part II—Capital, B—Available Funds, Head IV, Education, Item 4, Six Cross Roads School, stand part.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, may I enquire of the honourable Minister of Education why the Government has persisted in the erection at Six Cross Roads of this elementary school when there has been expressed publicly so much opposition to it? The Government apparently is ignorant of the educational needs of the country and from the depths of its lack of knowledge to what is needed, plans to erect this elementary school in St. Philip. Since then, it has been drawn to Government's attention repeatedly in this Chamber and in the public Press that the parish is already served with elementary schools, more than eight of them within close proximity of the site where it is proposed to establish this additional elementary school; yet the Government continues with its decision to put an elementary school there. Perhaps, there is some reason for the Government's attitude which, so far, has not been made known to the ordinary members of the community. I do feel that if that is the case, the opportunity should be taken to enlighten the public mind on the matter and to give some account of the reason for its persistence in this policy.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I notice that the honourable junior member for St. Philip is about to rise but I hope he will give way for just a moment. The honourable senior member for St. Philip has to talk because it is something concerning St. Philip and that is the only reason why he has said what he did. I have said during the debate on the 1954-55 Estimates that I have not made up my mind as to the number of modern secondary schools needed in the island. I know what Mr. Howard Hayden, former Director of Education of this colony, suggested. I was at pains to say during that debate—and every human being who was listening to me knows that I said this clearly—that I enquired from Capt. Tomlin, the Colonial Engineer whether the present construction for an elementary school could be easily converted into a secondary school should it be decided to make it a secondary school and he said "Yes." The Colonial Engineer is building that school with the idea that if it is decided to turn it into modern secondary school it would be easily converted to that purpose. I do ask the Committee to pardon me for repeating it.

On the other question of making it into a secondary school, I said that I have not yet fully considered the question because from the standpoint of a secondary school with the possibility of having a headmaster and staff and all that means, I am comparing it with, if necessary, giving free subsidised bus service to school children of the parish and the surrounding districts in order that they could go to the Lodge School or the Christ Church Foundation School. Why must we have a secondary school in each parish? It would be sheer nonsense to have a secondary school in each parish. I have not worked out the comparative cost but from the point of view of prices now, I do appeal to honourable members to see that it might be cheaper, *prima facie* to add a wing to the Foundation School and the Combermere School than to build a completely new secondary school in another parish and to staff it

with a headmaster and ten assistant masters at least, if you want a reasonably good secondary school. I think it is far better in a small island like this for Government to subsidise bus services in order to take the children from parts of St. Philip to either the Lodge School or the Christ Church Foundation School rather than to erect a secondary school in St. Philip. That is my conception of the matter although I have not worked it out in figures. As regards the location, I have already given the explanation and I apologise to the rest of the Committee for repeating what I have already told them.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, have you ever heard more undiluted nonsense on the floor of this House than what we have listened to just now? The honourable Minister who thinks himself to be monarch of the universe has not yet decided whether or not there should be a modern secondary school in St. Philip. It has taken him two or three years to decide whether there should be this modern secondary school and he trots out the absurdity of adding a wing to some existing school and subsidising a bus service and asking people to go to it. The honourable Premier has been responsible for the educational policy in this country since the introduction of the Bushe Experiment which is over six years and I am charging him tonight with the criminal act—because it is no less than a criminal act—of placing obstacles in the way of educating the people of this colony. The honourable Premier quotes Mr. Howard Hayden when he knows that the aims and objects of the Hayden policy of education were to place obstacles in the way of people of a certain type so as to prevent them from getting more education. Mr. Hayden felt that certain people in this island were learning too much and because of that, they were, so to speak, getting a menace to the community, so his policy was designed to keep them in their place and the hon. Premier knows that. Sir during the entire term of office of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, he has supported Mr. Hayden's policy. He has supported age-grouping which is the curse of the colony's educational policy; he has supported superannuation and that same policy is preventing the erection of secondary schools in the island and substituting this talk about modern secondary schools which are nothing more than glorified elementary schools. A modern secondary school means a school of the Richmond type which is a glorified elementary school. The honourable Premier has not yet decided; well how long will he take to decide it. Sir, how long did he take to decide to increase the Barbados Scholarship after he assumed responsibility for education. We were spending when he took responsibility for education \$2,000 a year annually on the Barbados Scholarship. How much have we spent on higher education last year? In 1947-48, the money voted for the Barbados Scholarship was \$2,300; this year the amount is \$62,600. It did not take the honourable Premier long to decide to increase it by thirty times the original amount. Just imagine that the amount is now \$60,000 a year for the Barbados Scholarship as compared with \$2,000 six years ago! Now we can afford to spend \$60,000 on the Barbados Scholarship but it takes him years to decide to build another secondary school from the point of view of expense. If he had children he would have decided overnight in the same way as he decided to increase the Barbados Scholarship to suit his own purpose.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I strongly object to the honourable member saying that I have done things for my children alone. I strongly object to those words, they being offensive, and I am asking that they be withdrawn.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Withdrawal hell.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Did you hear him, Mr. Chairman. He has accused me more than once for personal reasons of coming into this House and getting increases for the Barbados Scholarships and demand the withdrawal of those offensive words.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable senior member for St. Philip must withdraw those words.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Withdraw what words? Will the honourable member repeat what I said and he is insisting.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Can you remember saying "Withdrawal hell." I am objecting to those words too.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I said that in 1947-48 the total amount voted for the Barbados Scholarship was \$2,300. This year it is \$62,600. I said if the honourable member had a son or children as thousands of parents have tonight and who are trying to get secondary education for their children, he would not have taken so long to decide whether there should be more secondary or more modern secondary schools because, after all, he would know of the trouble and the worry and the headache people all over the island have today to get their children into secondary schools. They are told that there is no room in secondary schools and all sorts of pretexts are advanced to exclude children from secondary schools.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The honourable member went on to say that when it came to the Barbados Scholarship, increases were made by me for personal reasons. Using a precedent that has been established, I am asking the reporter to call back to the Clerk of the House the words used by the honourable member from: "if he had children —". The honourable member went on in that way.

The Clerk of the House read from a note by the reporter the words:

"If he had children he would have decided overnight in the same way as he decided to increase the Barbados Scholarship to suit his own purpose."

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am still waiting on the honourable senior member for St. Philip to withdraw those remarks that the Clerk just read out.

Mr. CRAWFORD: There is nothing in that to withdraw.

Mr. CHAIRMAN summoned Mr. SPEAKER and reported to him. Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: It has been reported to me by the Chairman of Committees that the honourable senior member for St. Philip, did use objectionable words and after having been asked to withdraw those words he has refused to do so. The honourable senior member for St. Philip has refused to do what he has been asked to do by the Chair.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, the honourable Chairman asked me to withdraw certain remarks and I asked that the remarks be read to the Committee. Certain words were read which I have no recollection of using and which I was told I have not used. Part of the expression quoted by the reporter is apparently an afterthought. I am sure I did not say anything at all about "his own purpose." I can repeat what I said.

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: The honourable member may repeat what he remembers of what he said.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I said if the honourable senior member for St. Joseph had children for whom he wanted places at secondary schools, he would have provided more secondary schools overnight in the same manner in which he provided increased Barbados Scholarships.

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: I will read the words that have been taken down by the official re-

porter of the House: "If he had children, he would have decided overnight in the same way as he decided to increase the Barbados Scholarship to suit his own purpose."

I am not going to argue. Those are the words objected to — unless honourable members want to censure the reporter, though they would have to do so some other time, not in this House — I am accepting the report of the Official Reporter as I have to do.

Rule 133 reads as follows:—

"Any member having used objectionable words, and not explaining or offering apologies for the use thereof to the satisfaction of the House, will be censured, or otherwise dealt with as the House may think fit."

This is important. I consider those words as reported to be objectionable words. Since the matter has reached me, I think honourable members are in duty bound to proceed with some motion of censure against the honourable senior member for St. Philip under Rule 133 and I hope honourable members will familiarise themselves with that Rule. If honourable members want me to repeat that Rule I will do so. Let me repeat that the only thing which this House is bound to do is to proceed with some motion of censure against the honourable senior member for St. Philip; there can be no debate at this stage.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: May I just be permitted to say one word, Mr. Speaker. I am going to suggest strongly to the honourable senior member for St. Philip to withdraw those remarks, but at the same time, I am prepared to say and swear to it that it is most unfortunate to the honourable member that the words which have been read are not the exact words which were spoken by him but it seems as if it suited the reporter for personal reasons to suggest them. I have here written down the correct words which the honourable member used.

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: If the honourable senior member for St. Philip does not intend to withdraw those remarks, he will now have to stand any censure by the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have no apprehension about standing any censure by the House, but since it has been suggested on this side of the Table that the remarks be withdrawn, I have no hesitation in withdrawing them, nor would it interfere with my putting the same words in such a manner as not to offend the sensibilities of this Chamber.

His Hon. The SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee, Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I was saying, Sir, that it is high time that some decision be made with regard to the establishment of more secondary schools in Barbados. All over the island there are thousands of parents who every day of the week are faced with the obstacles and the worries and the anxieties over the lack of secondary education for their children. Within the six years since the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has been responsible for the formulation of the educational policy of the island, the expenditure on the Barbados Scholarships has been increased thirty times. It has increased from \$2,300 to \$62,000. It might have been coincidence; there may be nothing at all by design about it, but to me and other people it was more than passing strange that the value of the Barbados Scholarship was increased from £400 to £600 per year and that increase was made retrospective to date from two days before a certain Barbados Scholar left this colony. Moreover, Sir, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has taken objection to my suggesting that he has personal reasons for increasing either the value or the number of the Barbados Scholarships. Per-

haps, when he rises, he would be kind enough to tell this Committee if his son would have had one of those scholarships if the number were only one. Let him tell this Committee had there not been these enormous increases in the Barbados Scholarship if his son would have won one.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, that is a repetition of those very slanderous and libellous remarks. The honourable member would have to go on oath and prove them. The honourable member has just repeated what His Honour the Speaker has drawn to the attention of the House. I am not going to sit here in accusation of that any longer. Because I have been quiet, the honourable member is going on and on with his slanderous and libellous remarks of me. I object to those words. The honourable member is now suggesting to me that as Minister of Education or the equivalent, in order to help my son, I suggested that more money should be paid for scholarships. That is point blank. I object to those words and I ask that they be taken down.

The Clerk of the House read from a note by the reporter the words: "The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has taken objection to my suggestion that he has personal reasons for increasing either the value or the number of the Barbados Scholarships. Perhaps, when he rises, he would be kind enough to tell this Committee if his son would have had one of those scholarships if the number were only one. Let him tell this Committee had there not been these enormous increases in the Barbados Scholarships if his son would have won one."

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Has the honourable senior member for St. Philip heard those words that have just been read out by the Clerk? The honourable Premier has raised objection to them. Are you going to withdraw them?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Which words he wants me to withdraw?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable member prepared to withdraw those remarks?

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hour is getting late. The reporter does not know what I said. Maybe, in order to continue with what I am going to say, I am prepared to withdraw those words and substitute other words which I sincerely hope the reporter will take down correctly.

Sir, this country can afford another secondary school and if the honourable member thinks that the people are going to sit and wait patiently while he does nothing about it, somebody has to bring him to his senses. Do you mean to tell me that a country which can afford to provide \$330,000 for new Ministerial Buildings—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Now! Now! Now! I am asking the honourable member to continue with the resolution. I am asking the honourable member to keep to the resolution that is in front of him. We are dealing with Head IV, Education. All to that is building a school at Six Cross Roads.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do not think the honourable members would think that I should go on saying all the time "a school at Six Cross Roads." I am saying that the erection of this elementary school at Six Cross Roads is completely superfluous and unnecessary and if we can find money to waste on things of lesser importance, we can find money to erect another secondary school somewhere. If we can find money to provide leave passages for Civil Servants, if we can afford to expend \$330,000 on new ministerial buildings, we can find the money to provide for another secondary school. You are wasting \$42,000 on the erection of an elementary school at Six Cross Roads, St. Philip, because it is

enclosed by a nest of other elementary schools. I do not know who will attend it, whether the sheep, donkeys, or the cows in St. Philip. Within a radius of a couple miles, there are not less than ten elementary schools and none of them is congested. Perhaps, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph wants to put some of his colleagues who really want going to school in it.

I think the educational policy of the Government is part of a policy designed to keep the mass of people in this colony from getting better facilities. The policy was designed by Mr. Howard Hayden and it is perpetuated by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. He is either a tool used against his own will or he does not know what he is doing. It is known that certain people in this island had for obvious reasons been very apprehensive about the educational progress of children of a certain type and Mr. Howard Hayden came here to stop it. He went to Trinidad to do the same thing and the people ran him out of the country. He is now with United Nations somewhere. Read what he said about our educational policy when he came here. He said that we had achieved a considerable lot in education in the space of one hundred years. He himself admitted that, but still he found fundamental reasons to change our educational policy. Cannot you see that he has done it with a subtle design in mind? I tell you, Sir, ten years from now the people assisting in this design will be cursed through the length and breadth of this island by the people because we are producing a bunch of children who are absolutely ignorant. We have children in the seventh standard now at elementary schools, who through age-grouping cannot do addition and they are leaving school after having reached that standard without being able to sign their names and it is merely because of the iniquitous policy of education here. Because the honourable senior member for St. Joseph does not know what he is doing, that policy is being maintained here. The substitution of these modern secondary schools, like that at Richmond, for secondary schools which are the only schools that real secondary education can be taught, is part and parcel of this policy. I say that the refusal to provide more accommodation for secondary education is criminal.

Every time there is some talk about secondary schools, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph gets up in this House and says that he has not yet fully decided whether to subsidise a bus service and to add a wing to Combermere or somewhere else so as to let children come from some parts of the country districts to those schools. Unless his brain is as ponderous as the Himalaya mountains, it should not have taken him so long to decide. Mr. Chairman, you know full well that if your child were given free bus fare to come from St. Joseph to Bridgetown to attend a secondary school, that would not satisfy you because the time which is taken up in transport is wasted; all that time the child should be at home learning his lessons. When your child is away from home, you have to go to the expense of paying for a hot meal for him apart from transport. Nobody would say except somebody on the verge of being mentally defective that you have done something when you give a child who hails from a place like Marley Vale, St. Philip, bus fare to attend a secondary school in Bridgetown. You are putting that child at a disadvantage when he has to leave home every morning and drive 15 or 16 miles before getting to school. I know of a gentleman in the parish of St. Philip who has to rent a house in town paying \$45 a month for it, so that his wife can live in Bridgetown and keep his children

from driving up and down everyday from St. Philip to the secondary schools which they are attending. Shortly after he did so, a school bus turned over. The answer, therefore, is not subsidising bus fares of children from country districts to attend secondary schools in Bridgetown; the answer is to do what the Education Act of 1890 contemplated; that is, the erection of a second grade school in nearly every parish.

I repeat, Sir, that it is vicious and wicked to fool ignorant people that you are studying something about providing better educational facilities for their children when you are doing nothing about it. This land at Six Cross Roads, St. Philip has a building on it already. The Government had it thrust upon them when the British Government offered it to them at a very reasonable price. I am sure it cannot cost \$10,000 more to convert the existing building there into a secondary school. Instead the honourable senior member for St. Joseph talks about subsidising bus fares to bring children from parts of St. Philip to secondary schools in Bridgetown everyday. I do not know if the hon. member lives in Mars so that he cannot see that there are enough children coming from St. Philip everyday, apart from those who reside in the upper parts of St. George and Christ Church, as to provide sufficient accommodation for a secondary school at Six Cross Roads.

Sir, it is not because it is the parish of St. Philip that I am stressing that point. If the same facilities were in St. George or St. John, I would have been as audible as I am now. It is sheer ignorance and persistence on the part of the Government to go on erecting an elementary school at Six Cross Roads, when there is definitely no demand for it and when every single reasonable person in the community has told you that it is not wanted. I would be completely satisfied in my mind if the Government felt like wasting money on erecting an elementary school on the Admiralty area but was also going to erect a secondary school in the upper part of Christ Church or the eastern part of St. Philip. Let us realise our responsibility to the people who put us here. It cannot take three years to decide a simple matter like this; if this matter is taking us so much time to consider; God help us. You may, Mr. Chairman, live to hear, as soon as the full effect of our present educational policy permeates into the minds of the people of this colony and as soon as they realise what is happening to their children, the cursing which will be heaped upon those who are responsible for this policy. I am not asking any favours for myself; before I ask any favour for myself, I would go into one of the institutions. I am only suggesting, Sir, that the obligation devolves upon the Government and those responsible for the educational policy of the island not to tinker and play the fool with this vital need of the community but to tackle it in the spirit and manner which it deserves.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer a word of praise to the Government for deciding to remove the Post Office from its present position and to put a suitable one at Six Cross Roads. I have full knowledge of the building which Government contemplates using in this respect and I think it is really suitable for a Post Office and Library.

I would only ask Government in the reconstruction of the building to make some kind of shelter for the poor old men and women who would be going there to receive their pension.

There is, however, one point which I would like to draw to the attention of the honourable Premier.

The Postmistress of St. Philip is also responsible for the paying out of Old Age Pensions which means that she has two jobs.

It is not the first time that I raised objection to postmasters and postmistresses holding these two jobs. I object to it because there are so many young men and women throughout the island who want a job. I am not raising any objection to the Postmistress of St. Philip holding the jobs, but I am objecting to the principle involved. The Postmistress of St. Philip is now receiving \$1,872 per annum in her substantive post and a little over \$1,600 for her duties as Old Age Pension Officer. I am drawing it to the attention of the honourable Minister of Social Services so that he should see to it that the condition of affairs does not continue much longer. There are many young men and women coming from second grade schools with certificates clamouring for something to do. The Postmistress of St. Philip is a married woman whose husband works in the Government Service. You can very well see the position. The husband is in the Service and she is also in the Service holding two jobs. I do hope that the honourable Minister of Social Services would give some attention to this matter. As I have said, I have nothing against the holder of the jobs but I think this state of affairs should not exist when there are so many other young men and women who want jobs.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: It does appear as if there is no duet to the point raised by the honourable senior member for St. Philip on this vote. Now that the atmosphere is somewhat calmer than it was a few minutes ago, I am going to say something which might be somewhat pleasant to some honourable members. It has been a long time since I have heard the honourable Premier make a more sensible speech and when I say so, I am not thinking from the point of view of St. Philip, I am thinking from the point of view of the island as a whole. I say that for this reason: there seems to be idealists and not realists on this question of finance. I recall very well when we all campaigned throughout this island the reckless and misleading promises some members of the Government Party made to the people of this country. They said: "We are going to give you free secondary education." I think that was a reckless misstatement.

(A VOICE: Untrue.)

We, of the party to which I belong said that we were opposed to it. We said that this island's economy could not afford free secondary education. We were maligned for saying so and the impression created was that we were opposed to free secondary education. I am going to say again that I have not heard from the honourable Premier for a long time a more sensible speech than the one he has made just now on the general question of secondary education. I commend him for it. What the honourable Premier said just now means that the finances of this island cannot afford free secondary education and I am in entire agreement with him.

Sir, you have an administration at the St. Michael's Girls School with less than 350 children. You can go up there and make some additions which would avoid your turning back children from entry into that school. I personally do not agree with the idea of putting a secondary school in St. Philip. You can make provision for their accommodation with the same administration which you now have at Combermere School, possibly with a couple more teachers. Sir, you should see the numbers with Higher School Certificates walking about every day without anything to do. All that they are doing is coming to you asking for a recommendation. I agree one hundred per cent with what the honour-

able Premier said just now. He knows very well the situation, not that he has been converted from his former ideas, but he realises that this country cannot now or will not in the near future be able to give free secondary education unless we find oil which is doubtful. I therefore counsel him to take a realistic approach of what he said by going to the Boys' and the Girls' Foundation Schools, Combermere, the St. Michael Girls' School and making additions to them to accommodate more children. The honourable member also has the right to do the same thing at the Lodge School.

The honourable Premier was responsible for the education of this colony from the month of February. I would never agree that it would be infinitely a better policy to go to St. Philip and erect a secondary school than if you make additions to the existing secondary schools such as St. Michael's Girls' and Queen's College. I have always considered that the acquisition of a little secondary education does not necessarily mean the getting of certificates for your children, especially those persons who are fathers of girls. When children are sent to a secondary school, they also acquire some culture, therefore, keep them in school and in the school uniform; see that they remain children as long as possible, because, let me remind you, the minor portion but the best portion of our lives is spent as children. When you are sending your children to a secondary school, you are not sending them only to gain certificates; when you keep them in school until they reach the age of 17 or 18, they acquire some culture which would stand them in good stead. I hope that the honourable Premier has not merely made that statement tonight; I hope that is his immediate approach to secondary education, and if that is so, I am sure he will have the support of the entire island. I invite him and the other Ministers to visit the St. Michael Girls' School if they are not fully acquainted with what I am saying. Let me tell honourable members that this is the best secondary school in this island since its establishment. If you watch the successes of women not only here but in the United States who were educated at that school, because of the foundation which they received there, you will realise that it has put Queen's College in the shade. Make additions to the St. Michael Girls' School to accommodate more children; when you get 400 children competing for 20 vacancies there annually, it is scandalous. You can make provision there under the same administration for two hundred more children.

These secondary schools in St. Michael are not confined to taking children from St. Michael alone. It is better for the student in my considered opinion when he attends one of these secondary schools and this view I believe is shared by other honourable members owing to recent results achieved by a scholar of the Boys' Foundation School. I think that justifies the money which is spent on these secondary schools.

On the question of erecting an elementary school at Six Cross Roads, there is a lot in the argument by the honourable senior member for St. Philip and the honourable Minister of Education must not mind the little rift between them in this House just now. The honourable senior member for St. Philip made a strong statement when he said that you are erecting an elementary school at Six Cross Roads when right around within a mile of it you already have nearly ten elementary schools. Nor has it been represented to the honourable Minister of Education nor to the honourable senior member for St. Philip that those schools are overcrowded. It therefore strikes me that the statement

made by the honourable senior member for St. Philip should be taken into consideration. If that statement is correct, it strikes me as if it would be a waste of time and money to build a school on that site. If it is not correct, then, I hope the honourable Premier would be able to tell this Chamber something about it a little later.

There is one point which I would like to make. We have to agree that it is not possible to give free secondary education, but it does appear to me that the policy of the Government is stupid, that policy being not to provide more secondary schools. If you have two thousand people who are willing to pay \$8.00 per term for their children, what is the point of allowing those children to remain at home? If you take the figures from the various schools you will find that no fewer than two thousand people have made applications for their children to enter the schools and they are willing to pay for them. The position is that if the Government cannot provide free secondary education the next best thing to do is to provide the necessary secondary schools. The speech made by the hon. Premier has been the best speech which has been made on education for a long time; it was not a speech from textbooks, it was a speech from a hard-headed Barbadian. Let us not forget the idea of modern secondary schools such as have been already established. I am making this last appeal to the Government; if you take statistics in this country you will find that there is an immediate need to relieve the situation where the girls are concerned. It is pitiable to see the numbers of children who are turned back from the secondary schools; if you can keep the children in school then you will assist in reducing the population because you will keep down the birth rate.

Mr. ALLDER: The hon. member has made mention of extending the accommodation in secondary schools in order to take off the surplus numbers who need entry into the schools. Some years ago the Governing Body of Lodge School had worked out a programme and asked the Government to assist them in extending the accommodation at the School in order to cope with the numbers who were applying for entry to the School; but at that time the Government would not render any assistance. Instead of setting up new secondary schools and having to bear the cost of the additional administration, the existing secondary schools could be extended. I can say that the Lodge School suffers very badly because of the overcrowding and there are hundreds of new applicants who have to be dealt with every year. I think that we have got to take the pavilion and use it as a classroom. It is regrettable that the Government did not see fit three or four years ago to spend the comparatively small sum of \$14,000.00 to extend that school to the required size: if that had been done I am sure that the people of St. Philip and the hon. senior member for the parish would not have been so desperate in their bid to get the problem which now obtains up there removed. What I would observe is this; inasmuch as the Government has already acquired an area of land at Six Roads in the parish of St. Philip something has to be done with it. There was some agitation for a secondary school in that area and the Government compromised with a small palliative and they have decided to place an elementary school there. What should happen is this; before any new school is put in an area, an investigation should be carried out in order to see how many potential school children the surrounding areas will produce for that school before any funds are expended on it.

This matter does not seem to have been considered, and as a sop the Government turned the property at Six Roads into an elementary school. Even although the Government might have got away from the expense of running a secondary school it would be bad business for the Government to set up an elementary school in a place where it is not needed; it would have been better to go without the school than to put it in an area where there are already eight schools. I agree with the argument that this additional school would be superfluous. I hope the hon. Premier is taking these suggestions very seriously; I agree with the point which has been made that inasmuch as many children come from St. Philip to the Lodge School and from Bridgetown, Speightstown and all over the island to this School, it will be seen that the demand at the Lodge School is great and the provision of additional accommodation at this School would be a solution to the problem which affects the other parishes of the island. It is economical to spend money at the present time in extending the accommodation at the Lodge School. I presume that the Government is about to rebuild the Foundation School and an attempt should be made to extend its capacity to take in those surplus children in the area who want to enter the secondary schools. If these extensions were to be carried out at the Foundation School and the Lodge School, the Eastern parishes would be reasonably provided for and if the Government were to come down to the schools in the metropolitan area and do the same thing I am sure that that would partly meet the demands at some of these schools. I do hope that the hon. Premier has taken the remarks made by hon. members relative to the extension of the existing schools seriously and he will go into the matter which has already been gone into about three or four years ago as regards the Lodge School. I have heard it expressed that the hon. Minister of Federation does not show any interest in the Lodge School and for sometime now he has not paid it a visit so as to see things for himself. One is tempted to feel that while he is interested in education, when it comes to certain institutions of education he has shown some disregard for their sufferings; however, I am taking this opportunity now to ask the hon. Minister to visit the Lodge School and see the congestion for himself and see its usefulness at the same time.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I thank the two honourable members for the kind things which they have said. If I have not visited the Lodge School yet it is because of the number of schools which have to be visited. I have not visited my *alma mater*, Harrison College, for over a year so it is not a question of neglect; it is a physical impossibility to get to all the schools as yet. As regards the point made by the honourable junior member for St. Philip the amount would be \$225.00 per month for the two jobs; but there is something in what he has said about people having two jobs. The responsible Minister will look into that matter. As regards the pensioners, this particular building at which pensioners are paid has a verandah all round and I presume that at any time of the day some spot is free from the sun.

The question that Head IV. stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD VII—MISCELLANEOUS

Head VII—Miscellaneous — was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head VII stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. M. E. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, the Resolution for the sum of \$26,577 was passed.

SUPPLEMENTARY VOTES FOR GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution to place the sum of \$2,032 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1954—55, Part 1—Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1954—55, No. 6, which form the Schedule to the Resolution. This Resolution is comprised of two Heads which I will take separately.

HEAD IX—PUBLIC MARKET

Head IX—Public Market — was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—In moving that Head IX. stand part of the Schedule I should like to state that, as honourable members will see from the note, Dr. C. P. Stoute retired from the post of Superintendent of the Public Market some time ago, and now that his successor is coming in, the only way in which he can get his vacation leave is to get his salary for the period. In short, Dr. Stoute came to the end of his period through being asked to forego his pre-retirement leave. We wanted his services and now that he is finally going, this Resolution is to provide the salary which he would have earned on leave if he had taken his pre-retirement leave after having worked for the Government. I beg to move that Head IX. stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. M. E. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

HEAD XXXV—HOUSING BOARD

Head xxxv—Housing Board — was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head XXXV stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. M. E. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of three Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox in each case, the Resolutions passed in Committee of supply were read a first and second time and agreed to.

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE WATERWORKS IN ST. MICHAEL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Michael:—To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Book of Reference and Plan of the proposed extension of the Water-works in the parish of St. Michael.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker,—This Resolution is just another of those formal Resolutions which have to be brought before the House, but which ought to be dealt with by the Department administratively without this unnecessary expense and reference to the Legislature. As honourable members will see, the proposal is to lay a 4" cast iron pipe from the existing main of the Waterworks Department at Pipers Avenue and under the Bay Housing Estate for a

distance of 312 yards and fix thereon two standpipes and fire hydrants. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

EXCHANGE OF LAND AT PROBYN STREET

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph:—To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the exchange by the Executive Committee of 5,036 sq. ft. of land at the Corner of Probyn Street and Jordan's Lane for 5,628 sq. ft. of land, the property of Caribbean Theatres Limited, situated due east of the present City bus terminal on Probyn Street.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: In moving the passing of this Resolution I should like to say that this is quite a simple matter. This is a Resolution to approve the exchange by the Executive Committee of 5,036 sq. ft. of land situated at the corner of Probyn Street and a Resolution merely gives permission for the Executive Committee to make the necessary exchange. I think that honourable members have had a copy of the Plan and they saw not only the five lots which we are buying but also those two spots which are being exchanged. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. ALLDER: I know that the House has agreed to put the Fire Station on that site and agree with the exchange of this land; but in this Resolution there are still a number of encroachments which remain in the deal which the Government is carrying through. I had hoped to see the absence of all these things; if the Government intends to acquire land then the land should be free from encroachment by the previous owners of such land. I notice that although the Government will be taking over the land from the Caribbean Theatres Limited they will still have some electrical cable running through their property; this cable will run through the Fire Station leading to some dynamo distantly situated from their existing property. That, I feel, is something dangerous; you have this cable running through the Fire Station and access has to be left for the employees of the Theatre to go through the Government's Fire Station to their dynamo and also to permit a waggon to pass through the Government's property for the purpose of the refuelling of the dynamo at the Theatre. In other words, after the transaction, the present owners of the land will still, according to the Agreement, be in a position to embarrass the free use of the Government's property by Government employees. This is a question of having a Fire Station there and the possibility of the Hose Reel and the equipment being brought out at a moment's notice to attend a call of fire, and you might get at the same time, according to the Agreement with the Theatre owners to allow their vehicles to pass through the Fire Station, some disturbance with the free movement of the Hose Reel.

There is a Clause in the Agreement which will allow the free passage of employees of the Theatre to go through the Fire Station not only to serve the dynamo which is at the other end but the cable to the dynamo will run through the Fire Station and the lorry will be passing there for refuelling the dynamo. I think that this land should be free and unfettered from encroachment to be used exclusively in the interest of the Government; Is there not a possibility for the Theatre people to go else-

where and put down their equipment, which will not confuse the area when the Fire Station is put there and the Firemen have to manoeuvre at a moment's notice when a fire occurs? I am not trained in the law, but the proposal here appears to me to be bad business. A wicket gate is to be placed in the wall nearest to the Fire Station and so on; an important Public Utility like the Fire Station owned by the Government should be free and unfettered from all these things.

I presume I will be told that the Queen's Solicitor had something to do with this matter and that I am wrong and he is right; but it appears to me that when the Fire Station is finished its operation will encounter much embarrassment because of the existing Agreement. I only hope that the Government Bench will satisfy my mind in this matter; the refuelling van might be passing through the Fire Station while the Fire engine is coming out to attend a fire. Even although the House has agreed to the commitment of a new Fire Station, I must say that while you have to bow to the decision of the majority, I am definitely not in favour of carrying the Fire Station to that site and spending the amount of money which it is proposed to spend there.

Mr. MILLER: It is very obvious that this Company is aware of the position in which the Government has found itself when it has decided to use this land for the erection of the new Fire Station, which now results in false economy and the Company is therefore in the strong position where it can ask for all these things. No other Government would want to agree to all the requests made by this Company; in the first place the Agreement says that the Company must be given a right of way for a truck to pass through the Fire Station for the purpose of refuelling their Alternator. That is something which no sane commercial man would want to accept. The next condition is that an underground cable is to be laid from the Company's Alternator to the Plaza Theatre, Bridgetown. That is not normal business; no private concern would give these concessions to anybody. Right within the Fire Station you have a fire hazard—a refuelling station for an alternator! That must entail the installation of a fuel tank and that is a danger; that is something to which no sane rational businessman would agree. I can see things which will be brought to the surface in time; in the life of the present Government they will be brought around to the truth; they will spend a lot of money to show that they are right.

The third condition is that walls are to be erected on both sides of the entire area now or to be owned by the Company; when they are finished, the Government will have bought this land about three or four times. The Government might think that they are right but figures will reveal the truth in time. The Company will tell you that this piece of land which they own in the back must be opened to give access to the Theatre; you could not ask these conditions of any commercial body. The Government want to justify that the whole idea is right as against the fight which we put up in this Chamber.

This condition goes on to say that a certain portion of these walls is to be 6 feet to 8 feet high and the rest is to be 4 feet high. These walls are to have a Pyramid top. They even dictate how the walls are to be built! Imagine the honourable Premier insisting how right the whole idea is! He will shelter from his feelings, but the facts, like the truth, are stubborn things and they will come back to you. I repeat that no private firm would acquiesce to the requests made by this Company. Then the last condition states that the above alterations must be com-

pleted within six months of the Government's approval to acquire the Company's present Car Park. The Hon. Minister of Social Services is asking me to let the matter go through; but this is a sorry state of affairs for a Government to be in. Having decided on the matter they have no alternative but to go along with it; however, it is unfortunate that a Government should be placed in this position. It is not a nice thing for a Company to make these demands; you will have four units carrying a lot of gasoline, because the tanks will carry about twenty-five to thirty gallons of gasoline and easily you will have about a hundred gallons of gasoline passing through an area where you will have a Fire Station! When the truth of the whole thing appears I will remind honourable members in solemn reproach that they were wrong.

I feel that the Government in the first place could have done a much better job; but as long as you have money to throw into a scheme you can have any scheme, and this is one of the unfortunate ones. When these conditions are carried out, you cannot have a proper Fire Station in the true sense of the word. I know in this Assembly that if I shed a tear now the Fire Station will still be put there. I feel it is not too late to change this site, but I suppose the hon. Premier will have to satisfy the whole country.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: In view of the criticism made by the two honourable members who have so lucidly pointed out the shortcomings in this contract, I do not think that the honourable member should force the matter through tonight. Let them postpone this matter and give it further thought. This matter will bring serious repercussions in the near future; this is something which is entirely wrong. I do not see how any right-thinking man in his full senses could agree to these things, especially when this land is wanted for a Fire Station. I do hope that the honourable member will reconsider these implications and postpone the matter. If we sit here and allow the Government to go along with this matter we will be called into question. I appeal to the honourable Premier to postpone the consideration of this matter.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: On some occasion when the Government suggests the expropriation of property we will see the swelling tears of the honourable junior member for St. George. We go to the Theatre people and say, "This spot of land which is next to you is suitable for a Fire Station, but it is not enough and we want a piece of your land." They are giving us nearly 600 square feet of land in the exchange; the land is being sold at \$1.00 per square foot so that we are getting roughly \$600 in the exchange. The two spots of land are not quite the same, the Theatre people say. "We want to carry on our business here," I wonder if we went to an establishment up Roebuck Street and said, "We want this place, you can go elsewhere with your business," and did not pay adequate compensation for it, what would be said! We can tell the Theatre people to go somewhere else but we would

have to pay them £50,000; they say: "We have an Alternator here and it has to be refuelled." Let honourable members say whether the incidence of fire at the Theatre is so great that we are taking an undue risk by allowing these concessions to go through. You tell a man "I would like to build a house here." He says: "I have to get to my backyard" and is it too much for him to ask you to let him continue to get into his place? Do honourable members expect that with the chance of a fire once a month, the Fire Brigade will be blocked by this lorry coming out of the Fire Station? Where is the great probability of that taking place? It is not that the Theatre people have just laid down terms and we had to swallow them; we had our technical experts and we were advised that what the Theatre people wanted done was perfectly reasonable. I suggest as an ordinary member of the public, that you can expropriate people's property but you have to pay them compensation. The actual expenditure which we have to undertake means nothing; if the use of the right of way through the Fire Station or of the wicket gate to provide access to the Alternator were the sort of things which would prevent the smooth working of the Fire Brigade, then one would say that the risk is too great; but I do not see that there is any great risk in this matter.

Does the honourable junior member for St. George think that putting a high tension cable underground means that it will burst and cause a fire to break out? The honourable member should not try to make our flesh crawl in this matter: how often does he know of similar cables causing explosions? Is it reasonable to assume that we will go home now and bar up our windows against a hurricane? I do ask honourable members to see that while at first blush it might appear as if these Theatre people are asking for all sorts of things, yet we are disturbing them in their business and honourable members must bear in mind that we have been advised that what these people have asked for is reasonable.

I would like at this point to pay tribute to the Director of Public Works; he is a man, not a mouse, and if we were wrong he would have told us that we are wrong. I appeal to honourable members to see that in this matter the risk is not really great.

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,— I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, the 15th instant, at 3 o'clock p.m.

Mr. SMITH seconded the motion which was agreed to, and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.