THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1954—55

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 16th November, 1954.

Pursuant to the 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*), Mr A. E. S. LEWIS, (*Deputy Speaker*), Hon. M. E. COX, *Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*) Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P. (*Chairman of Committees*). Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E., Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Trade, Industry & Labour*), Mr. F. C. GODDARD, (*Leader of Opposition*), Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. J. A. HAYNES, B.A., and Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*);

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on November 2nd, were taken as read and confirmed.

DOCUMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Commissioners of Highways of the Parish of St. Thomas a Statement of Accounts for the half year ended 30th September, 1954.

Also from the Commissioners of Highways of the Parish of St. Thomas a Statement of Accounts on Tenantry Roads for the year ended 30th September, 1954.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded by His Excellency the Governor to lay Message No 27/1954 from His Excellency the Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly submitting the Report of Inquiry into Social Security in Barbados by J. H. Richardson, M.A., Ph.D.

The Message reads as follows:—

MESSAGE NO. 27/1954.

His Excellency The Governor
To
The Honourable The House of Assembly

1. His Excellency the Governor has the honour to submit for the information of the Honourable the House of Assembly the Report of Inquiry into Social Security in Barbados by J. Henry Richardson, M.A., Ph.D., Professor of Industrial Relations in the University of Leeds.

2. The recommendations contained in the report are under consideration by the Government.

R. D. H. ARUNDELL,
Governor.

Government House,
Barbados, B.W.I.
10th November, 1954.
(M.P. — 3071/S. 1)

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker,—I am commanded to lay Message No. 28/1954 from His Excellency the Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly regarding markets policy.

The Message reads as follows:—

MESSAGE NO. 28/1954.

His Excellency The Governor
To
The Honourable The House of Assembly

1. His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that the Government has considered the recommendations contained in the Interim Report of the Committee set up to examine ways and means of improving the marketing organisation and storage facilities for green vegetables, fish and meat, and has reached the conclusions set out in the following paragraphs of this Message. Legislation, where necessary, will be prepared and introduced as soon as possible.

2. It is considered that all markets should be not only established but also operated and controlled by the Government, so as to facilitate the development of a marketing organisation as a whole. The only existing market not controlled by the Government is the Eagle Hall District Market; it is proposed that this market should be taken over.

3. It is proposed that the legislation relating to markets should be placed on a modern and satisfactory basis. The new legislation will in particular control the sale of produce by hawkers in the environs of markets.

4. The Government proposes to accept the recommendation for a new Central Market in Bridgetown, and the premises in Fairchild Street now occupied by the headquarters of the Department of Highways and Transport (which are to be moved to the Pine) have been selected as a site. (Reference to this project has been made in Message No. 23/1954). It is proposed that the new Central Market shall deal in all commodities, including meat, and shall be provided with cold storage for short-term storage by vendors. The market building will contain the offices of the Superintendent, Public Market. In accordance with the recommendations of the Committee, it is proposed to provide ample facilities for the display of produce, and sufficient parking space.

5. The present Public Market will be retained to provide slaughtering and long-term cold storage facilities. This market, which at present deals almost exclusively in meat, will also be reorganised to provide general marketing facilities on the "District Market" pattern. The Bridgetown Fish Market will be administered as an integral part of this market. It is hoped to submit proposals shortly for the overhaul and repair of the cold-storage plant, and for the replacement of the present most unsatisfactory slaughter-house, as recommended in a report on the market by Dr. Andrew Fulton.

6. The Government accepts in principle the recommendation of the Committee that additional district markets should be provided, but for financial reasons is unable to implement it immediately.

7. It is proposed that the fish markets at Oistins and Speightstown should be transferred from the control of the Director of Agriculture, to that of the Superintendent, Public Market, from the 1st April, 1955.

8. The recommendation of the Committee in respect of rural markets is accepted in principle; the method of financing their construction is under consideration. These markets will be provided with small freezing cabinets for short-term cold storage of small quantities of perishable produce.

9. The Government accepts the recommendation relating to a market intelligence system, and will implement it when the new Central Market comes into operation.

10. It is proposed that, when the proposed new facilities begin to become available, market fees and charges, many of which have remained unchanged for more than thirty years, should be revised, so that revenue therefrom will more nearly approximate to expenditure.

11. The proposals set out in this Message will entail additional staff requirements in regard to which the sanction of the Honourable Legislature will be sought in due course.

R. D. H. ARUNDELL,
Governor.

Government House,
Barbados, B.W.I.
12th November, 1954.

(M.P. 227/S. 6)

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I am commanded to lay Message No. 29/1954 from His Excellency the Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly informing the Honourable House of the results of the visit to the U.K. of the delegation in connection with building a Deep Water Harbour for Barbados.

The Message reads as follows:—

MESSAGE NO. 29/1954

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 delegation that visited the United Kingdom in connection with building a Deep Water Harbour for Barbados was successful in obtaining the approval in principle of the Secretary of State for the Colonies for the project an a promise that access to external borrowing facilities would be made available

2. Consultations with experts on ports and harbours have, however, disclosed that it may be unsound to construct at the outset wharfage sufficient for four cargo loading berths, and the possibility of providing, initially for two cargo loading berths, one of which could be fitted by handling bulk sugar in addition to general cargo, is being examined by the Consulting Engineers.

3. Before any further progress as to the precise method of financing the scheme can be made, it will be necessary for the Consulting Engineers to visit Barbados for the preparation of the detailed proposals. It would also be advantageous to arrange for a visit by an expert of the Ministry of Transport before making a final decision on the size of the proposed harbour, and in this connection, the interested shipping lines would be asked to express their views. In addition an on-the-spot investigation of the requirements for the bulk loading of sugar is essential and Messrs. Tate and Lyle would be prepared to undertake this at cost. To ensure the best possible co-ordination it will be necessary for these experts to visit Barbados simultaneously.

4. As soon as details are available as to the probable cost of these investigations the Legislature will be asked to authorise the necessary expenditure

R. D. H. ARUNDELL,
Governor.

Government House,
Barbados, B.W.I.,
16th November, 1954.

(M.P. 4373/S. 5)

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker,—I am commanded to lay Statement of Accounts of the British West Indian Schooner Owners' Association (Inc.) for the year ended 31st December, 1953;

The Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations, 1954.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I am commanded to lay:

Report of the Accountant General for the year 1953-54.

Mrs. M. E. BOURNE entered the House and took her seat.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. M. E. COX: Resolution to place the sum of $72,000 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. 26 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution;

Resolution to approve the Regulations entitled "The Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations, 1954."

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker,—I should like at this stage, to inform honourable members, that owing to the urgency of the first Resolution of which I have just given notice, and which has already

been circulated to honourable members, that I propose to deal with it later today. At this stage I shall like to give notice of my intention to suspend Rules 88 and 89 to deal with this Resolution.

QUESTIONS

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: To enquire of the Honourable Minister for Trade, Industry and Labour:—

(1) Is the Government prepared to assist deserving cases of emigrants to the U.K. other than Student Nurses, by way of loan of the passage money or any part thereof?

(2) If the answer to (1) is in the affirmative, will the Government, without delay, set up machinery to go into the matter locally as well as to take care of repayments in the United Kingdom?

(3) If the answer to (1) above is in the negative, will the Government give their reason?

RULES 88 AND 89 SUSPENDED

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Rules 88 and 89 be now suspended.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day is to resume Committee of Supply.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that it be an instruction to the Committee when the House goes into Committee of Supply to deal with the Resolution for $72,000 of which I have just given notice.

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

The motion was put and agreed to.

Resolution For $7,217 For Refurbishing Government House

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the last occasion when the House was in Committee of Supply, we were discussing a Resolution for $7,217 in connection with the refurbishing of Government House.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman,—When this Resolution was being discussed at the last meeting of the House, I was at the point where I said that I did not agree with what the honourable senior member for St. John had said, with respect to the general refurbishing of Government House; because, I regard Government House as an institution which should be well kept. I made the point, that I would like to see a wider scope of the policy of liberalism so far as invitations to Government House on official and other occasions are concerned; and I said, that although the matter did not come within the province of the Mover or Introducer of this Resolution, yet I take it that I should let it be known publicly, how I felt about certain matters of public importance. I do not regard invitations to Government House as private matters; but as something which would merit a system which would reflect the general patterns of the people of this island. There are many respectable people in this community who take a part in public life, and I feel, that they are worthy of recognition for their services. I am not in a position to speak about the details of the expenditure as to say, whether a carpet for $2,000 is reasonable or not: but I do know, that if a house of the size of Government House needs refurnishing as a a public institution then it should be furnished. I hope that in years to come, the policy of issuing invitations from Government House will not be as restricted as it is at present.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: This Resolution is one which in normal circumstances, I would oppose; but I am to say on behalf of the Opposition that this is an occasion on which we feel, that having accepted Her Majesty's sister as our guest, it is our duty to present a face such as will cause the Princess no anxiety and that she should be as comfortable as possible. I have intimated to the honourable senior member for St. John that I did not agree with him on this occasion; but however, one must feel, that the view expressed by the honourable senior member for St John is his own view. In matters which affected Government and the lights without any fanfare the honourable senior member for St. John has always made his position quite clear, and therefore, it can not be argued that anything he has said on this occasion is on account of his wanting publicity.

3.35 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER RESUMES THE CHAIR

At this stage Mr. Speaker, resumed the Chair.

The Sergeant-at-Arms entered the Chamber, and informed Mr. Speaker that His Excellency the Governor was awaiting the House in the Council Chamber.

HOUSE GOES TO OTHER PLACE

Mr. Speaker and the House preceded by the Marshal carrying the Mace, proceeded to the Council Chamber where Mr. Speaker read to His Excellency the Reply of the House to His Excellency's speech delivered at the opening of the Session.

HIS EXCELLENCY'S REJOINDER

His Excellency rejoined as follows:—

Mr. President and Honourable Members of the Legislative Council:

Mr. Speaker and the Members of the House of Assembly:

I thank you for the terms of your respective Addresses in reply to the Speech I delivered on the occasion of the re-opening of the Legislature on 21st September, 1954, and for your respective assurances that all measures submitted to you will receive your earnest and careful consideration.

R. D. H. ARUNDELL,
Governor.

16th November, 1954.

His Excellency presented a copy of the rejoinder to Mr. Speaker.

THE HOUSE RETURNS

Mr. Speaker and the House preceded by the Marshal bearing the Mace returned to the Assembly Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the last occasion when the House attended his Excellency in the Council Chamber, His Excellency was pleased to deliver a rejoinder to the Reply of the House to his Speech delivered at the opening of this Session.

HIS EXCELLENCY'S REJOINDER

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that His Excellency's rejoinder be taken as read.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY RESUMED

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

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I was saying, Mr. Chairman, that I am supporting this Resolution with some reluctance. I should like to say, that in normal circumstances we should certainly have offered our opposition to the expense which seems to be very high, where the provision of carpets and floor coverings is concerned. But having agreed to accept this gracious lady as our guest, we should make things as nicely as possible. This amount of $2,320 is rather expensive for a community like Barbados; and I believe Government members will have to agree that these carpets and floor coverings for Government House are rather expensive. I am asking the Hon. Minister to give a further explanation of this most expensive item. I do not know if it is because of the exchange in the dollar area or what, but I do think honourable members will agree with me that these carpets and floor coverings are rather expensive, having regard to the fact that they must have had carpets and floor coverings up there already.

To deal with the item which seems to have shot off the bomb in this Chamber last week. I do share the view of the honourable junior member for St. Peter, that in discussing a matter of this sort which is really a money Resolution for a particular department of Government, one would have to think that according to the ordinary and elementary principles of debate, one would be entitled to speak on anything surrounding the two items which come under this head. With regard to the method, scope and extending of the invitations to Government House, I too share the honourable member's view. Despite the fact that people may think it to be petty, the occasion now presents itself for the humble people in this colony to take part in these matters. Who else must express the views of these people, if we do not express them? Twenty years ago, honourable members could not express the view which the honourable member has expressed. When I am invited to Government House, I go as a duty, not as a pleasure; I accept the invitation on behalf of the 10,000 people in the City of Bridgetown. For my part, I would prefer to remain at home in my own surroundings. I say that there is nothing personal, or any crave for any honour for yourself. It is the only occasion or opportunity, which the ordinary man in the street has to be represented; the man in the street who is responsible for sending us to this Chamber to have his view expressed. If you hear people saying that the invitations to Government House,—I am not now thinking of official occasions when some distinguished visitor was here, but of normal circumstances when the Head of the Administration can discuss not only with his social equal, but with other persons in the most humble walk of this colony. The Head of the Administration is paid by the people of this Colony, and he must have his own private people; but the occasion must come when invitations should be given honourable members of this House. 3.45 p.m.

Upon the entire matter of this Resolution we agree. As the Addendum sets out, this provision would normally have come in the 1955 Estimates; but because we have accepted this gracious lady as our guest, it is our duty to make things as bright as possible. That does not necessarily mean that the honourable senior member for St. John who has on past occasions said what he has said face to face with the Head of the Administration on this matter, is not conscientious in his views. I cannot agree with them on this occasion.

As I have said, we on this side of the House are in wholehearted agreement with this Resolution; but we do consider, that this sum of $2,320 for carpets and floor-covering is rather high; and we do hope that the Minister will be able to give us more information, and in greater detail, on this Resolution.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I will answer the last question first. The carpets of Government House are so big and are of such a quality, that it would take maybe about £800, £850 or £900 to replace them, depending upon size and quality. I had a chance when in London, to call in at certain firms and investigate the prices of new carpets but I could not avail myself of the opportunity. It was decided that the carpets at Government House are so expensive, instead of replacing the large one in the drawing-room, we should put in three small ones in place of the large one in the drawing-room. The drawing-room carpet has a hole in it; and as I have said, it is proposed to buy three small ones for the drawing-room, and put the present drawing-room carpet in the dining room where the dining table will hide the deficiency.

When you reach that stage. it is a tribute to the critical powers of this Assembly; but not a tribute to the respect, which this House should have for its own institution. A lot of us through poverty, will put a chair to hide a hole in our carpet. I believe that Barbadians, (unless of course it is a question of over expenditure) should try to avoid having to do that sort of thing at Government House. Everyone who goes to Government House knows how disgraceful the floor-carpets are. There is no question of the old carpets being sold. The carpets will be shifted from the most obvious rooms to somewhere else. We are being ultra-Scottish and conservative in our spending especially when we reach the stage where we will have to do what is going to be done at Government House.

As regards invitations to Government House, I will say that people have been in the House of Commons for two and three sessions running, and have never seen the dining room at Buckingham Palace. It may be said that the House of Commons consists of 600 people while the Barbados House of Assembly consists of 24. To suggest, however, because you do not go the rounds and invite everyone to dinner, or let us say lunch at Government House, that you are not doing the correct thing, is nonsense when you examine the figures. We all know, that the late Governor and his wife were among the most excellent people; probably the two best people in that position in the present century But in the first years of office of the present Governor, 4,500 people have been entertained at Government House at parties compared with 4,289 for the previous two years. (A MEMBER: How many were white?) People with an inferior type of mentality always walk around with a chip on their shoulders, looking to see whether a black man or a white man is around them. I hope that the average Barbadian will never reach that stage. I am sorry to refer to the comparative figures I have quoted; because, everyone knows that Sir Alfred and Lady Savage were the most wonderful people. But by comparison, twice as many people have been entertained at Government House by the present Governor.

As regards the lavatories, there are at present one for the maids and one for the butlers; and these lavatories are some distance away from the main house. Honourable members will agree that

additional lavatories will be necessary in view of the increase in staff which will be the result of the visit of H.R.H. the Princess Margaret. Princess Margaret is not coming to Barbados alone. When you add up the equerries, the ladies-in-waiting, and the Scotland Yard detectives, who will accompany the Princess, there will be some thirteen to fourteen people. It is for that reason, and because the lavatories are inconveniently situated, that these additional lavatories are necessary.

3.55 p.m.

When one saw the carpets, the electric lights and all that sort of thing put in at King's House in Jamaica, you could not help feeling that the entire display was a credit to Jamaica; and that they wanted to entertain their Queen as they should. After all, if we have some close friend dropping in to pay us a visit, we do not want them to see the rubbish. The average person, at least tries to make a show. I repeat, I do not consider that enough money has been asked for, when you consider the number of things which need refurbishing and replacing at Government House; or that the amount of money to be spent is too great in order to produce a good show and a general pleasing appearance to Government House. I would say that visitors say that our Government House as a house is a credit to Barbados. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is anything else I should say.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, those who believe in monarchy and misery instead of people and progress, can support a Resolution of this sort; but I am going to vote against it, if I vote alone. My reasons are: in 1948 Government House cost the taxpayers $29,000 to run it; in 1954, after this Resolution has been passed, it will cost the taxpayers in the vicinity of $50,000. If the Hon. Premier continues as he is going on at the present, you will find that Government House will suck up a tangible portion of our annual revenue. This is showering unnecessary blessings on those who least deserve it. When the Hon. Premier suggests that those who know Government House, know that it is utterly disgraceful in the way in which it is furnished, I cannot agree with him; especially when we know that up to last year we voted $100 a month to keep the furniture in Government House in order. Fortunately, it has been reduced to $800 per year in this year's Estimates. But that amount has nothing to do with replacement; it is just to keep them in order. I presume it is for polishing, dusting and things of that sort. How can the Hon. Premier compare what we pay per month for polishing this furniture, with the statement he made last Tuesday, when he said that on a previous occasion when he visited Government House, he found out that much of the furniture there was made of packing cases? Either the Hon. Premier was exaggerating the situation, or something went wrong as regards the allocation of such funds.

What is more, when the Hon. Premier claims that Government House was miserably furnished, I am wondering what are his feelings when he sees the miserable conditions of those paupers' houses which he goes into at present in St. Lucy. I am wondering if he thinks these houses are a disgrace. Certainly the honourable member knows, or should know better than anybody else, that this colony cannot afford this luxury spending on Government House which his Government is now indulging in. The Hon. Premier sees the miserable conditions of people here; he sees them knocking about daily without employment and without food. When he talks about providing new carpets for Government House, these same people will have to pay for it; and these are people who would be glad for a pound of sugar or a pint of rice. I face facts. The Hon. Premier knows that he is doing wrong when he brings down this Resolution. Government House should not cost this amount of money to run it. The Hon. Premier is now saying, that every cent is to be pushed aside for the Deep Water Harbour. That is what he is telling the poor people who would now need help from the Government to go to England. He is saying that, but when it comes to providing these luxurious furnishings for Government House, he is saying something different; and the honourable member can always find special arguments to justify our giving these amounts. Can the Hon. Premier justify the taxpayers of the colony in his action of allowing the running cost of Government House to go up so rapidly as it is now? Did the Conservative Government which held office before, do it? We came in here and found the cost of Government House at $29,000, and now he has pushed it far into the $50,000 brackets. With all of that, you have tangible amounts under "Miscellaneous" and "Incidentals" which nobody knows what is being done with those allocations. The Hon. Premier also knows that the Public Works Department is always doing something at Government House which is not shown under the Head Government House, but which comes out of the Annual Estimates. If the position up there is what the Hon. Premier says it is, it would be a good thing if the charming Princess were to come and see the conditions as they are; because, she would realise that if the condition at Government House is so bad, then the homes of the poor must be a hell-hole.

I hope the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and the hon. junior member for St. George whom I presume will be entertaining Princess Margaret will, instead of showing her the highly paved walks in this City, take her out to the slums. If that is done, I am sure she will use her influence on the British Government to see that some assistance be given to help the teeming mass of unemployed. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the worse the appearance at Government House during Princess Margaret's visit, the better it will be for the Barbadians.

Sir, the hon. set of Ministers, as members of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, have been boasting about their setting up a Committee to investigate wages of domestic servants. About two or three years ago, the Hon. Premier said that the Governor must not pay his own servants, and he brought down a Resolution so that the Treasury should pay three parts of their salary. I will tell you what they are getting now. The head servant at Government House is now getting $7.00 per week without any accommodation. Let the Hon. Premier go up there and investigate it. The amount of accommodation they get up there is as follows:—

> ½ lb. of tea per week, ½ pt. of milk, 6 cts. bread, 1 lb. of sugar, 3 ozs. of margarine and 3 suits of uniform a year.

Does the Hon. Premier expect people who are honest politicians, to indulge in the practices which this Government is indulging in at this institution? Sir, while the Head of the Administration and his relatives are upstairs lying down in luxury, their house servants are down below lying down in misery. They have even gone further. They are eliminating local domestics from Government House and bringing in the Grenadians to do the work.

4.05 p.m.

The Governor must have gold to drink, walk and sleep upon; nothing but the finest furs must surround the walls and floors of the place at

the expense of the poor who are faced with being eliminated even from the small jobs which they used to do up there. The hon. member and his colleagues are in the habit of saying that people are lying on the Government, let them investigate this. I say that the servants should be reasonably paid. Not only does the head servant get $7 a week without substantial accommodation, but those who are under her get $5.75 a week and so on down the scale. The last holder of the post of Governor, never worked his servants as hard as the present holder of the office. When the former Governor used to have his cocktail parties, the servants who worked in the day were never asked to work at night; but now they have to work at night, because the present holder of the office instead of hiring butlers to do work at night when cocktail and dinner parties are held, call on the servants to work at night. Let the Hon. Minister of Labour go up there and investigate the situation. You are paying lower wages than before. Even at the Almshouse the maids are getting better treatment, and more than the servants at Government House where the Government's policy is laid down and set out. I hope that the first person the to give information would be the Head of the Administration who is employing the servants up there. Before they came down for this expenditure that matter should be put right. Relative to the carpets and floor coverings for $2,300 which the honourable member says are needed, what can the servant who has to dust these carpets daily and all the other things at Government House, what can she do with a lousy $7 a week? If she pays $3.50 a week for rent, what is left for her to keep body and soul alive? The Government allows the servants to be paid miserable wages, and the first lady of the land must walk on a carpet costing $2,300 to be paid for by the same servants who have to clean it. I am not interested in the wild implications in which honourable members are indulging. I would be glad to hear that the invitations are limited or that they will become more limited than they are now; because, I feel that the Head of the Administration should not continue to get £1,000 per annum for entertainment. Let us cut it down; the Conservative had it at £500 a year and the Labour Government should not have it up to a £1,000 a year. I have read some speeches made by former honourable members of this Chamber; I read where an honourable member whom I presume could have gone up there and wined and dined, said that if the Head of the Administration wants to stage these cocktail parties, let him pull his own pocket. But a so-called Labour Government says "No," not £500, but £1,000 a year. I hear the honourable member at night telling the poor people in the country districts that he is the only person who is saving them; does he know that this amount of money which it is proposed to spend at Government House, could be used to send quite a few dozen young women to a broader field of occupation? It would start them off on the road to life, and many of them would come back here to uplift this island. Even this pittance as it might be regarded, would bring satisfaction to the homes and hearts of many of these unemployed young women whom you see around the streets, trying to avoid selling themselves for existence. I wonder if the honourable member read the letter which was written to the Press sometime last week by a young woman, explaining to her rulers what the position is with them, because many of those honourable members do not understand what misery is. They cannot see it now, but some of them have had to drink it in the past. If the Honourable Premier continues as he is going on, I am sure that he would be responsible for anything which might happen in this colony. I will repeat, that a hungry man is a dangerous man; and you cannot fool the people with empty promises all the time.

4.15 p.m.

I am hoping that when the Estimates are presented to us in March, we will see a substantial reduction in the vote for the maintenance of Government House. As long as I am here I will continue to fight the honourable member on that. If he had any sympathy for the people who are suffering, he would not feel that the rich should get more while the poor go without.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I think that what has aroused the caustic comments of the honourable senior member for St. John, is more the general tone of the speech of the Introducer of this Resolution, than perhaps the Resolution itself. It is difficult not to resent the attitude adopted by the Introducer, when he said that in his mind, we were not spending enough on Government House. The impression that he gave was, that this was a wealthy country and we have money to spend as we like; and that when it comes to Government House, there need be no limit to making it as luxurious as possible, and spending money on it as extravagantly as possible.

In my opinion, honourable members will be wrong to view this Resolution isolatedly. This Resolution should be viewed in the context of what the entire visit of Princess Margaret would likely to cost Barbados. Bear in mind, that this is only the beginning; and those of us who on the one hand will be willing to welcome her here, will on the other hand set their limit to what we consider reasonable expenditure that this visit should cost.

The honourable senior member for St. Joseph talked about people having complexes. If he has a complex, it is an imperial complex. His complex is to fawn and flatter imperialism and everything associated with it. We know that left to him, we would dry the entire treasury on the forth coming visit of Princess Margaret, and we would still not be doing enough. It is still fresh in our minds, that we picked up $75,000 and squandered it on the Coronation Celebrations without having a concrete pillar erected in any part of Barbados to show for it. Although it was suggested that we might have celebrated the Coronation by erecting a suitable building like a T.B. Sanatorium which we and posterity would be able to use, the money was squandered in all sorts of non-sensical tom-foolery with nothing to show for it. Knowing the honourable member as we all do, we can look forward to a similar extravagant waste of the public money on the visit of Princess Margaret, unless at an early date the House makes a strong standing on the spending of money.

That is why I say, that it is not enough merely to think now in terms of the money we are spending at Government House for this purpose, but also to bear in mind the amounts that is likely to be asked for before the visit of the Royal Princess is over. Therefore, I have a suggestion to make. There have been occasions in the past when we were asked to spend money to improve furniture and equipment at Government House; and the then holders of the office made it their business to invite a Committee of the House to see for themselves, the conditions which wanted improving, before they asked the Legislature to vote the money. I think that in the present circumstances, a Committee of this House should be appointed before the Resolution is passed, to go to Government House and satisfy themselves as to whether or not all this expenditure is necessary. For

that matter, the Committee might also be empowered to get other proposed expenditure in connection with the Royal visit, before the request for that expenditure comes to the Legislature.

Even if honourable members felt that since it is Government House certain things have to be done to it, still I repeat, the general attitude of the Introducer of this Resolution, and his implication that money is no object when it comes to Government House, is wrong. There is something fundamentally wrong in that way of thinking; and therefore, we cannot afford to undertake expenditure of this sort purely on the say so of this Government. Let us wait and see what further extravagant and fantastic proposals Government has in mind in connection with entertaining Princess Margaret; especially when we remember that as the honourable member for St. John has put it, when it comes to vitally important matters, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph will tell the people of this country that every cent that the Government has is committed for the next five years to a mythical Deep Water Harbour. We will be told that we cannot find a single cent for anything else, and we will be left to wonder how easily the Government will get money to spend for this purpose and for the purposes like these.

If we do not put our foot down today on the airy and extravagant ideas of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph in connection with this visit, we will end up with it costing us almost as the Coronation, if not more. In spite of the fact that everything is earmarked for the Deep Water Harbour, we will find money for this; and next year the Government will come down with increased taxation on some sections of the community which can hardly bear it.

I am going to suggest to honourable members, in fact I am going to make a motion that a Select Committee be appointed to examine the conditions of the furniture etc., at Government House, with a view to deciding whether any or all of this furniture is justified. Whether or not we have a precedent, so long as the control of public finances in this particular matter rest in the hands that it does now, we are justified in demanding that these steps be taken. As explained earlier, there is a precedent for it. I think it was Sir Hilary and Lady Blood who insisted on a Committee of the Legislature coming to Government House and seeing for themselves the conditions of the public property there, before they asked the Legislature to embark upon to improve it. By the tone and attitude dispalyed by the Introducer of this Resolution, one should not at all be surprised if very little is needed to be done to these things complained of. But merely because it is Government House, and merely because the Governor and the entertainment of Royalty are involved, the honourable member's views on this expenditure is justified.

4.25 p.m.

Our experience in the past in this connection has been such, that we should consider very carefully before we decide to do anything in a matter like this. For all the years before, the Governors of this country had to provide their own car. After repeated suggestions that Governor's should be given a state car, we gave them a car allowance; but today, the Government in power has not only given them a car allowance but has also given them a state car. In the Government's way of spending.Government feels that there should be no limit to which the state should pamper the holder of the office of Head of the Administration. I suppose, it is merely because they have it in their power to make certain recommendations in certain quarters at the appropriate time.

Princess Margaret is not coming tomorrow, and we can very well postpone this matter for a sufficiently length of time for honourable members to investigate it in the manner which I pointed out. I am sure it can work no hardship on anybody. I find it difficult to understand why merely for this Royal Visit, there should be two more toilets installed at Government House. After the Princess' visit they would be redundant. Are we to understand that the number which would comprise her entourage, would be more than any previous number of visitors who visited Government House? Surely in our time, there has been a larger number of people staying at Government House than what is expected on Princess Margaret's visit; and we have heard of no inconvenience through the number of toilets there. Surely we have had Royal visitors recently staying at Government House with their servants, and we have heard nothing of any necessity to increase the sanitary arrangements there. Now in these times when we are thinking in terms of reducing the pomp, the splendour and all that is attached to Royalty and imperial Pro-Consuls, it does seem absurd to think in terms of spending money to increase toilet facilities at Government House. Government is not now claiming that there are insufficient toilet facilities for the staff.

Sir, it is more than passing strange, that you can find money so easily for all these unnecessary things; and as the honourable senior member for St. John so appropriately put it, when smaller amounts are necessary for needy purposes, they are not available. As the honourable senior member for St. John said, if he were to ask for $150 for some real needy case of suffering in his constituency, you would want to run him out of the House. You would ask him, where is it to come from? You will tell him that you need money for a Deep Water Harbour. Now, you are asking for it for some unnecessary adjunct at Government House. If honourable members feel, that by their refusing to vote for the postponement of this Resolution they are casting doubt on their respect for the Throne, that is their business. If loyalty to the imperial family comes first to them, it is a matter for them; but I do suggest that the right thinking members of this Committee should prefer to think firstly in terms of what is the finance of the colony, and what it can afford, and what is the peculiar economic conditions of the country; and if you think in those terms, we would let the Government's Minister who sponsored this Resolution, stew in the juice of his imperial complexes, and to explain as best as he can the attitude of this House which refused to believe that merely because Princess Margaret is coming here, there should be no limit to the expenditure of public finance.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Premier referred to the toilets and lavatories, and in his reference said that by the reference in the note, it was unreasonable to come to the conclusion that they were put there for the first time. I am asking the honourable member to pay attention to what has been said in this House time and time again: that the Addendum to Resolutions should be properly worded. The people who have to give this information are getting too slack. They feel they can write down whatever they like. Even when it comes to figures, they juggle them and write them down as they like. The Hon. Premier has himself to blame if the House has got the impression that we are providing these toilets for the first time. He should apologise to members that this impression was created.

As far as provision for these numerous items at Government House is concerned, I would like to make this comment: we cannot expect Barbadians to follow pattern with a place like Jamaica with all its

mineral wealth. We cannot expect our Government House to be on the same scale as Government House in Jamaica; I would even say as far as Government House in Trinidad. As far as the upkeep of Government House is concerned, I think it was the occupant of Government House in Trinidad who was complaining that the Government House there was too big for himself and family to upkeep. We were hearing murmurs of the same complaint here. Government House is an extremely big place for very often only a couple and that is why it is so expensive to upkeep.

I must say we have been extremely generous to the occupant of Government House. We have provided him with a State Car and when we expected by providing him with a State Car that the Travelling Allowance would have been stopped, it was not stopped. We have also been very generous by helping him with perquisites. I feel that Government House is our place, therefore we must keep it up to a standard. Of course we should not set too high a standard; but we must have some standard. I am willing to make allowance for the things which are very expensive today and all of that; but I must say, that we had Royal visitors to Government House within the past two years. This visit is not one which has come about from a member of a royal family after say, a lapse of ten or even five years. There have been two visits of Royalty within the last few years. Considering this visit of Royalty following so soon on the previous one. I do not think we should find ourselves with all that dilapidated furniture and furnishings of which mention has been made.

4.35 p.m

Mr. ALLDER: I beg to second the motion of the hon. senior member for St. Philip. And I suggest that in view of the fact that I have raised the question of the wages of servants and conditions of work at Government House, I hope not to hear that they are dismissed; and I am calling upon the Minister of Labour to see that these servants are not dismissed, because their wages and conditions of work were discussed in this Chamber. I know that there is a possibility that such a thing will be done; and I am warning the Government now at this early stage, because the tendency in this colony has been to victimise employees who bring their sufferings up to public consideration. I would like the Hon. Minister of Labour to see that no more Grenadians are brought in to Government House to displace the servants up there; because, the Hon. Minister knows that in Curacao and Aruba our people have had to come back home because the nationals in those colonies are saying that Curacao is for the Curacaolenes and Aruba for the Arubians. Trinidad has just said that all jobs that men can do, must be done by Trinidadians. It is time that we do something in this matter, and eliminate those non-Barbadians from posts in Government House.

Mr. LEWIS: I am in sympathy in this matter, since the revelations which we have read from the hon. senior member for St. John. I am wondering whether any harm would be done if there is a postponement of the consideration of this Resolution, I am wondering exactly how we could go about it. Should we report progress to the House with the recommendation that the Select Committee be appointed to consider it further? If we can get an assurance from the Hon. Introducer that this can be done informally, that it could be done in that way; but from the motion which has been made, I wonder where we will get. If this Committee reports progress with the suggestion that the Select Committee be appointed to go into the matter, I would be inclined to support the motion. If we get the assurance that the further consideration of the Resolution will be postponed, and that unofficially, some investigation will be allowed as was done on a previous occasion, perhaps that would meet the case; but it does strike me that the motion as it stands will not help.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am not giving any such assurance. To do the same thing that was done when we did not have Ministerial Status would be unthinkable, now that we have a Ministerial System. I am to be asked to give an assurance that the House of Assembly which is a deliberate and legislative branch of the legislature of this colony, should take the place of the Director of Public Works and other people, to go up there and see if I am speaking the truth. That is what it amounts to; but I am not giving any such assurance. If this Government cannot be trusted for speaking the truth, then hon. members can get rid of it by a vote of "No confidence". You have statements being made which have no foundation in fact. The head cook gets ten dollars a week; but it does not matter with the hon. member whether he speaks the truth or not.

Mr. ALLDER: I did not say anything about the head cook. In order to answer my charge, the Hon. Premier has to repeat that I am lying. I am given to doubt the veracity of the statements made by the Hon. Premier. My statements are based on facts and information brought to me by those who are involved. Let the hon. member go and investigate the conditions of all the workers. I referred to the maid, not the cook.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: That is not true. When the servants work late at cocktail parties they are given overtime. Why can't the hon. member speak the truth?

Mr. ALLDER: The hon. member has been trying to answer his accusers (whose accusations are based on facts) by charging them with being unable to speak the truth. The hon. member cannot speak the truth more successfully than I can, because he was trained for that. If the servants at Government House send a delegation to me, because they read about what took place in this Chamber on this same Resolution last Wednesday, and they give me the facts, I do not know; but I am saying now, that what I have said came to me by way of information by some people who know. All I am saying is, that if my statements are incorrect you can go and investigate them; and if they are correct, see that the Head of the Administration treats those servants fairly and squarely according to the principle and policy of your so-called Trade Union.

4.45 p.m.

The hon. member has on several occasions, (in fact even at the present time) been telling lies on me when he tells the people of St. Lucy that I abused his son and his wife. (*Mr. Chairman raps gavel*). The hon. member, Mr. Chairman, has been doing that; and other people know that he is lying and he knows it too. He is only trying to create sympathy in the parish.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. member not to refer to another hon. member's wife.

Mr. ALLDER: All right sir. If I have made a statement in this honourable Chamber which anyone would feel is not based on facts, I must say it is not my intention to mislead this ancient chamber. I only pass on to the Government, information which I get from persons involved in the running of Government House. If it is a lie, it would not be my fault. I am only the medium through which those people are working, to cause the Hon. Premier of Barbados

to know that while he is upstairs laying down policy, they are downstairs suffering.

Mr. CRAWFORD: No one is suggesting, sir, that the constitutional point raised by the Introducer of the Resolution is untenable. All we are saying is that we are not concerned with whether in his opinion this furniture wants improving. We are concerned with his attitude in here to-day, and with our interpretation of that attitude. Those of us who think differently, should think and act differently.

I agree with the hon. member for the City that the correct thing, (since we have got no assurance that the Introducer of the Resolution will accept a motion for reporting progress and asking for a Committee to investigate conditions there) is to vote against the Resolution. If anyone wants to interpret it as a vote against the visit of the Princess Margaret it is up to them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member withdrawing his motion?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am going to withdraw my motion and vote against the Resolution. The only way I could act otherwise, is if we had the assurance of the Premier about the appointment of a Committee which he has failed to give. In the present constitutional position of the Government with its Ministerial Status and what not, the House must either take what they say or reject it. If the House accepts this, and the hon. member feels like interpreting it as an endorsement of what he said, he is mistaken. It will only be because some other people for their own personal reasons, do not want it to be felt that they are giving offence to Royalty; and because people will be stupid enough to feel that if you do not drain the Treasury in connection with the Royal visit you are insulting Royalty, or that Barbados is disloyal. They are also people who feel, that inasmuch as you have accepted the Royal Lady's offer to come here, you should accept everything Government brings down in that connection.

In my view these are two extreme view points. The visit of the Princess is one thing, and the reasonable amount of money which the island should spend on entertaining her is a different matter. In other words it does not follow, that because you have agreed to her coming here, you should drain the Treasury and further impoverish the country to entertain her.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to act as a referee in any disputes which may arise on the floor of this House from time to time. I consider it to be Your Honour's function to preserve good order in this House. But I think that in fairness to the hon. senior member for St. John, I should say, that I have no recollection of him saying anything about a cook at Government House. I say that now because on a future occasion, some one may take up the official reports of the Debates of this Chamber to prove that he used the term "Cook". I want to say now before the Debates come out, that members of this House have complained already that there is interference with Reporters of this House; athough I have defended them on a previous occasion. After reviewing some of the *Official Gazettes* during last week and seeing the alterations clearly made at the instigation of some person inside or outside of this Chamber, I want to warn them that they should be called upon immediately to review the words of the hon. member for St. John, so that no one could have any justification for any recrimination indulged in, in this Chamber to-day. In my recollection, the hon. member never used the term cook. It is a favourite trick to misquote someone and then to attack that person on the misquotation. I think it is only fair that someone should go on record as saying that the hon. member never used that term at all. My only reason for rising to my feet at all, is to make sure that it goes on record, that members of this House have no recollection of the hon. member referring to any particular servant that he is alleged to have referred to.

Leaving that point aside, I would like to inform the hon. member for St. John, that the servants at Government House would have the same remedy, if this were a democratic community and the Trade Unions of this country were organised on the basis in which those in the U.K. are organised, relative to the servants at Buckingham Palace who are getting £2. 15s. a week when they went on strike. Every servant who had a stipendiary office went on strike about two and a half years ago.

I suggest to the hon. member, and to those members who are Trade Unionists, that these servants have a remedy; and we need not discuss it here. As regards the Resolution itself, it would appear from the Addendum, that these repairs would have been carried out next year in any case. At least, that is what the Addendum says. On the other hand, strictures were levelled against the Vestry of the parish which I have the honour to represent, when a Resolution came up before this House for voting money for repairs to the Medical Officer's residence and some other works which were to be carried out. Many members on this side of the House criticised the Vestry for allowing the dilapidations to reach such a stage. I understand, that the carpets at Government House have holes in them. I also understand that the walls are mildewed over and above the amount that one would expect from the climatic conditions obtaining in any one year.

4.55 p.m.

It seems to me, that it is a very serious indictment on the persons who are responsible for looking after the upkeep of Government institutions, if they allow the carpets to develop holes to the extent where they become unsightly and dangerous; and, secondly, if they allow the lavatories or the other furnishings at Government House to fall into an utter state of disrepair and dilapidation to the extent that they have to come to the House of Assembly for an enormous amount to make good those dilapidations. I would like the assurance of the honourable member who is responsible for this measure, to say they are not slipping any new luxury furnishings at Government House under the guise of this Resolution for repairs and replacements. When I say new, I mean that as distinct from replacements.

There is one other matter to which I would like to draw the attention of this House. It is with respect to the substantial amount of money which was voted a short time ago for electrical installations at Government House. I think it is a great pity, that the opportunity was not taken at that time to run the wires in proper conduits underground rather than overhead; because, it is known that overhead wires are perishable, they being subject to rapid deterioration by the weather. Sir, if the Government feels that there should be a new carpet at Government House, I suggest that it may not be necessary for the Government to purchase a new one. I am sure one of the business houses in the city of Bridgetown or one of the agencies in the city, would be quite prepared to lend or rent one; and I think there is precedent for it. Then that carpet could be possibly put in the show window of a particular store where it may be possible for people to view it, and contributions could be solicited, (say in the aid of disabled War Veterans) from those people who might care to walk across it. I know there are certain people who would pay anything to be associated in a mat-

ter however remotely, with Royalty. There are some people who would like to touch the hem of Your Honour's garment. I do not think if the money is purported to be devoted to some deserving charity, (and of course I mean after defraying expenses of the individual firm,) that the Royal prerogative would be abused if that suggestion were adopted. My suggestion is, that the carpet should be rented and returned to the business house, and then some contribution made to a charitable fund by some people who would like to say that they walked on the same carpet which was used by the Princess.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I would like you to permit me to call your attention to something in the Addendum. You have inserted in one place that an additional flag pole will be required, and in another place you have inserted "Additional flag poles and fittings $150." I hope that that is not a means for someone to add another. I hope that only one flag pole will be erected, and after the Princess has gone they will take it down. I say that for the reason that in the Estimates, there is a considerable amount of money voted for maintaining flags at Government House. What is written in the Addendum to this Resolution is at variance with what is set down in the Schedule. I will therefore ask the hon. member to cut out the plural, because it is at variance with what is being written in the Addendum proper. There are people who would take a thing like this and make use of it.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The protocol says that when a person of the rank of Princess Margaret is in residence, there should be flown a flag of her own standard; and an additional flagpole would be necessary for that purpose. When Princess Margaret leaves, of course the flagpole will be taken down and put in the backyard.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. Cox, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. HODLER, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. BARROW, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MILLER, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. BRANCKER, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. VAUGHAN, Mr. HAYNES, Mr. E. K. WALCOTT. Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY and Mr. GODDARD—19.

Noes: Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. ALLDER—2.

5.05 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox the House was adjourned for half an hour.

5.10 p.m.

On reassembling,

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY RESUMED

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES NO. 24/1954

Head XXI—Science and Agriculture

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The next Resolution Mr. Chairman, is for the sum of $2,301. The specific items appear in the notes on the opposite page of the Heads of the Schedule as usual. I think that the notes are fairly full. These notes give enough information, but naturally, if hon. members want more information, I invite them to ask for it under each Head. I now beg to move that Head XXI, Science and Agriculture, stand part of the Schedule.

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

The motion was put and agreed to.

Head XXIII—Maternity Hospital

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The next Head, Mr. Chairman, is Head XXIII (8) Maternity Hospital. I beg to move that that Head stand part of the Schedule.

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

The motion was put and agreed to.

Head XXVI—Pensions

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The next Head, Mr. Chairman, is Head XXVI—Pensions. I beg to move that this Head stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: In connection with this question of pensions, I asked a question during the last session, but no answer was given. However, when it comes to this question of Pensions, if an answer can be given to my question now, that would save some time. I would like to know what is the position with regard to the War Service Credit which has accrued to some members of the public? There are those who served in the War and they have had War Service Credit; but there are others who have not received any, and some of these people have been asking me about the matter. I should like to know why is it, that some people have received their War Service Credit and others have not received anything?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I must interrupt the hon. member. The hon. member has asked a question which has to be answered, and it will be answered in due time and debated if necessary.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: It is within my province, Mr. Chairman, to put a question like that; and the hon. member can reply to it at the proper time. I do not know if it is in his place to interrupt me just for the sake of saying what he has said. or for the sake of interruption. In the Legislature I have as much right to ask a question of a member of the Government, no matter who the person is.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: It is the common, ordinary, everyday, practice (I almost said childish practice, I mean a practice which a child ought to know) that if an hon. member interrupts another hon. member who is speaking, that hon. member, can say "I am not giving way." The hon. member has asked the question, and I say it cannot be answered now; because, the question has to be gone into. And he wants to make a row about that.

Mr. LEWIS: The Note to this Item says this: "The rates of Death and Disability Awards paid to Ex-servicemen have been increased by the War Office. On the suggestion of the Secretary of State West Indian Governments have decided to adopt the revised rates and the date agreed upon for them to become effective is 20th August, 1953."

I take it that this amount is not only in connection with pensions; this is going back to August, 1953. I know that on occasions when they increased salaries, they just "let the dead past bury its dead" or something like that. If we are going back in 1953, and if there is anything like Death Awards to be paid, I am wondering if that will be covered under this amount. The Legislature usually gets the im-

pression that it will be covered under this amount. The Legislature usually gets the impression that it has voted money to cover these cases, and then we hear some smart Civil Servant interpreting it as not being the intention. Does the payment of Death and the Disability Awards come under the head of Pensions? If there is any benefit to go to any ex servicemen, I hope that the increased rates will be applied to cases like that.

The question that Head XXVI stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XXVIII—Subsidies and Grants

Trade Commissioner Service in Canada

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The next Head, Mr. Chairman, is Head XXVIII—Subsidies and Grants Apart from what is set out in the note, honourable members will have known the history of this matter. It is not a question of money being lost; and it might have been carelessness on the part of the people who are responsible in this case. The Trinidad Government saw about the accounting and so on. This mat ter is perfectly straightforward, and honourable members are entitled to criticise the people who are responsible for it; but to put it mildly, it would be extraordinary if we alone who belong to the R.E.C were to stay out. I do not think that there is any further information which I can give honourable members and which I could not give them on the last occasion. I did not anticipate the extensive criticism which took place on the last occasion. I did not give extensive information at first, but I gave it later on.

Mr. LEWIS: I have had the opportunity of being given some information in connection with this matter; and I am very glad that the honourable member realises the insufficiency of the information which was given last time, and the way in which the information was given. If nothing has been lost, it is useless and stupid to come to the Legislature and say that they discovered irregularities, in order to justify a trip of two people to Canada. If you have lost nothing, somebody has been using your money in a smart way; because, you had several funds and kept them in several banks, and somebody has been getting interest free loans to carry on their private business. If you have lost nothing by it, there is no necessity to tell the Legislature that, but it is not correct to say that it did not cost us money, because we had to spend $10,000 in order to discover that there was an overdraft of $17,000. We lost money which, if the honourable member was in a different position, I would like to hear him criticise. What business man would pay $10,000 in order to discover irregularities to that extent? I am saying that the people responsible in this matter should be made to pay this money. However, our share is only $1,374 and I suppose that it would be a little invidious for us to stay out as the honourable member has said. Since then, you have allowed the Trinidad Government to sign something on our behalf, and there is the same Regional Economic Committee and the same very island. Not only did they send up their Financial Secretary, but we had to send up the Executive Secretary well. He did a very good job: he is here on secondment, and if you have not got somebody with organizing ability the system will lapse again.

5.55 p.m.

I am asking this Government, this Labour Government of Barbados, to take a matter of this sort to heart. They are famous for refusing point blank to account properly for money which is voted out of the Public Treasury. There are several funds, no proper accounting for which is given to the people's representatives; and this is a case in point. If they were insisting on proper budgeting and keeping of accounts, and seeing that other people carried out the duties they had pledged themselves to perform, we would not now find ourselves in this mess. This is a small sum of money, but for Barbados it represents $10,000 in the West Indian currency, and the using up of some of our hard currency. This is very bad business.

It is inevitable, if you look at the Estimates, that some sort of accounting must have been done. In the Estimates you will find the Item Trade Commissioner Service in Canada. After the Estimates are passed in March, they will come back in July and say they have discovered that we must vote some more money to make up. They could not tell the Government that, unless there had been some sort of accounting. How could they come to the conclusion that they needed so much and so much more money, unless they had gone into the accounts and seen they would need more money? As a matter of fact, in one set of the Estimates there was a note which said that they had gone very carefully into it, and for the next two years it should be so and so.

There must be some sort of accounting, unless some trickster is asking for money to cover up his tricks. I understand that there has been a certain amount of extravagance. That depends to some extent on the particular nature of the person you have running the Service. If he has to make himself popular, he will have to spend money; and perhaps it may have done us no harm if he entertained lavishly. However, it has been spent already.

What I am saying is, that someone in this Government should have been keeping their eyes on it. How do we know how many more of these cases there will be in the future? How do we know that a lot of the things going on, were not copied from someone else who was carrying them on 10 or 20 years ago.

The question that Head XXVIII stand part was put and agreed to.

Head XXIX—Miscellaneous Services.

Funeral Expenses of Captain Dove

Head XXIX—Miscellaneous Services. Funeral Expenses was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head XXIX stand part. The note makes the matter very clear. The honourable junior member for St. George, I think, knows more about the matter than I do. The owner of the boat went to the Fishery Officer. He was told what it would cost to bring the boat back. It is not as if we are doing something that we should not do. It is like when fishing boats go adrift and money is provided to bring them back, in cases where the owners are unable to do so. Unforseen expenditure was therefore incurred. It is felt by this Government that it would be hard on the owner, to have to pay for the funeral which was paid for by the St. Vincent Government. That is why we are asking for this money.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that I sincerely hope that this small sum ($27.00 for the funeral of this fisherman) does not represent the class of "turn-out" given to this man, merely because no one was responsible at the time. As you would know Sir, that sum would not represent a very

elaborate 'turn-out' in Barbados. Sir, I hope, as I have said, that he was not given this class of 'turn-out,' because no one was responsible at the time, and now his family are aggrieved over the fact that he was buried in this way. If, however, it represents a reasonable 'turn-out', we should thank the St. Vincent Government that it is not more money. I do not know of any other place where funeral expenses would come to $27.00 for a reasonably good 'turn-out.'

The question that Head XXIX stand part was put and agreed to.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS moved, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox that the Resolution for $2,301 do now pass.

The question was put and agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1954-55 (CAPITAL) NO. 26.

Offices at Pine for Highway & Transport and Public Works Department, and Ministerial Buildings at Bay Street

HON. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman,—The next Resolution is for the sum of $72,000 to start work on the construction of the Highways and Transport Department offices at the Pine, and the Ministerial Offices in Bay Street. The House will remember, sir, that on the 20th September, a Message was sent to this Chamber by His Excellency the Governor pointing out that it was proposed to construct a building sufficiently large to house the Department of Highways and Transport and the Public Works Department, and also a workshop at the Pine.

The cost of that job is approximately $350,000, and the Director of Public Works has pointed out that he can spend approximately $60,000 between now and the end of the financial year on that job Consequently we are asking the House to agree to vote that amount.

6.05 p.m.

I should say that the reason why this Resolution was brought to this House so hurriedly, is because of the fact that quite a number of persons (including persons who are unemployed at present) have been approaching the Minister of Labour and myself, asking that something be done in order that they may be able to work for a few shillings to stop a hole during this coming festive season. As a result, I got in touch with the Director of Public Works and he has agreed to start these works immediately. When it comes to the present site of the Highways and Transport, that will be used for the construction of a Central Market.

Now, Sir, in this Resolution you will also see, that we are asking for a sum of $10,000 in order that houses which now occupy part of the site on which it is proposed to erect Ministerial buildings, can be removed and be sited elsewhere. Part of that $10,000 will be used to carry out that work; the other part will be used to continue with the siting of houses as is done throughout the year.

If you look at Note 2, you will see that it seeks permission to use part of funds which were voted in the Annual Estimates for the construction of roads on Government estates, such as roads which are to be constructed at Knights Land which the Government recently purchased at Cave Hill. The Note in the Estimates is rather restricted; it only deals with the roads at the Bay Estate and the Pine; and as it is so restricted, we are asking for permission so that we can extend that provision to the construction of roads at Cave Hill. I may say, that the money is there; and it can be spent for that purpose.

I do not know whether honourable members need any further explanation, but I think that the Addendum to the Resolution sets out very clearly the purpose of the vote. I should however mention, (as members have been told when Ministerial Status was about to be ushered in) that the present Ministerial Offices will be used by the Auditor General and some other officers of the Government when new Ministerial buildings are erected. We are hoping to move out as soon as possible, in order that the Post Office will be extended. It is proposed that the Post Office will occupy the whole of the bottom floor of this wing of the Public Buildings. The Savings Bank will be taken back to the place where it formerly occupied, and the Government Offices in that part of the other building will be taken up-stairs to the offices which the Ministers now occupy. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am in general agreement with the Resolution judging from what is set out in the Addendum; but there is some information which I would like, and a point which I would like to make. Before I proceed with that, I should say in passing, that the Hon. Minister in charge of this Resolution should be more careful about his letter writing to the House. He should not sign letters to honourable members of this House with his initials only. His signature should not be M. E. C. I do not know if that is because the horn was on its way down. Anyhow, it is elementary practice that we do not write letters and just sign them with our initials. As I have said, I believe it is a case where the horn was on its way down; and therefore, that is the reason why his signature was not completed.

Sir, I have already spoken on this matter which I am about to put before this House; but it seems as if I should speak on it again. It is with regard to the question of making provision for roads at Knights Land in Cave Hill. The note to the Item specifies, that "provision will be used for work at the Bay and Pine Estates and at Chelston. During the year an area of land at Cave Hill was acquired by the Government for Aiding Self Help and other housing development. Houses are now being moved from overcrowded areas to Cave Hill for which it is necessary to construct roads. Funds can be made available for this work from the provision of 1954-55 Capital Estimates, but in the view of the restrictions in the Note, approval is required for expenditure (apart from those relating the Aided Self-Help houses) being met from this vote."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I never agreed with the policy of using the Labour Welfare Fund for the purpose of purchasing areas of land; unless, you were buying those areas of lands from that Fund and using that land for the purposes of the people who are engaged in the Sugar Industry. Here it is stated, that this place was acquired by the Government; but I think I am correct in saying, that it was acquired by the Government out of the Labour Welfare Fund. You are now taking houses from other places and putting them at Knights Land in Cave Hill. I do not regard that as something which you should do out of the Labour Welfare Fund. That Fund was not meant to be used for a general housing programme. I do not know if all the peoples' houses which are to be removed to that area, are the houses of people who are engaged in agriculture. I want to say, that is was not the intention of the Government to buy areas of land or existing tenantries. out of the Labour Welfare Fund, and using that Fund

as a means of bringing people from over-crowded areas to other areas. That Fund was meant to be used for people who are engaged in the Sugar Industry only. I would be in favour of what is done at Cave Hill, if it were done in an agricultural district. As a matter of fact, this land has been bought already out of that Fund; but I want to say, that when you did that, you were stretching the elastic in the spirit of how the Labour Welfare Fund should be used, a bit too widely. It was always the intention that this Fund should be used for the people who work in the Sugar Industry; and that it should be a means from which they could make loans, either for the construction or for repairs to their houses. I feel that if the Government wants to depart from that policy, it should state it. It has not been stated.

What worries me, is that there are so many other places in this island which could have been acquired, but which have not been acquired. It does seem strange to me, that you should buy land in Cave Hill which is definitely not an agricultural tenantry in the sense like other places such as Rose Hill in St. Peter, and the Mount in St. George which were selling out recently. The tenantry at Knights Land in Cave Hill is one of those regular tenantries which was set up for sale in house spots and three acre lots. I think this method which you have adopted is a decant from what you had in mind at first.

What is stated in the Addendum, is that houses are now being moved from over-crowded areas to Cave Hill for which it is necessary to construct roads. That means now, that on the area of land which you bought out of the Labour Welfare Fund, you are now moving houses which you ordinarily would have moved in your general housing programme. You are now doing that out of your Labour Welfare Fund. That seems a bit strange to me. I am not accusing the Government or the Minister concerned, though this is in the constituency which he happens to represent; but it does look, even to a blind man on a trotting horse, to be painting the lily white. You have already bought Belfield, the Bay Estate, and the Pine Estate for housing. I do not know if the Bay Estate and the Pine Estate have been fully occupied, but it does seem strange that you should buy another area in Cave Hill, and particularly so, when this was a tenantry that was selling out in house spots.

I do not want to bring other members to their feet by mentioning that. I am only saying, that I do not agree with Government being asked to buy land, because it is for sale. If the Government does that, it will find itself acquiring all the land that is set up for sale. As you can see, in St. Michael alone the Government owns land at Waterford, along with other places which I have mentioned already. I do not know if it is the Government's intention that the land at Waterford should be used for agricultural purposes, now that it has decided to extend the Hospital on its own site.

6.15 p.m.

Therefore the Government could have used the land at Waterford and carry the people up there To-day, the Government owns this land; and obtained it at a cheaper price than what they paid for land at Cave Hill. There could be no harm in the Government embarking on the use of agricultural land. I should like to know, what is the reason for the Government not using the land which they have at Waterford; that seems to be strange. It is not the right thing to do; and I do not think, that the Government should have been driven to buy the Cave Hill tenantry out of the Labour Welfare Fund. It was not agricultural land and Government need not have bought that land; because, the tenants there would not have been placed in any worse position than tenants elsewhere. If it gets around that all you need do is to give tenants a notice of ejection, and the people will go to their representatives and place them in this position where they ask the Government to buy the land and if in St. Michael you can get the Government to buy land, why could not the people in St. James for instance get the Government to do the same thing? I would not ask any member of the Government to buy land in St. Peter so as to satisfy my constituents, on the basis that you will get a vote. I must stand on a sound basis. The man who cannot get a vote on soundness or merit, will eventually find that he will not be able to get a vote at all. The Government cannot help facing the fact that they have accepted a precedent which is a dangerous one; and they cannot with justification, refuse to do the same thing again. On the last occasion the Hon Minister said that they were buying areas of land, but this is an area of land which was bought because it was put up for sale.

The Hon. Minister has spoken about the erection of Ministerial buildings; and we are fortunate that we have a Director of Public Works who is an architect. I hope that he will erect suitable buildings. The proposed site is a good one but it is somewhat out of town. It is in a very nice atmosphere, but as a layman I would say this: I understand that the St. Michael's Infirmary has a pipe line which runs through the area in which they intend to erect these buildings and you cannot remove the Infirmary's sewerage pipe line so easily; I do not know what difficulties will be encountered when they have to build foundations which they do not now require. The sewage system runs under the Bay Street Boys' School and I do not know what is going to happen there.

My last point is this: what about the Central Foundry site? I drive a motor car, but I do not expect any Government to buy land £24,000 in the heart of the City for the purposes of a car park. You now have a car park in the heart of the City, where you have acquired land at £3, (I think it is) a square foot. It is known that the Legislature would not have acquired that Central Foundry's site, apart from the reasons which had been given for acquiring it. It was a fire hazard to keep the Central Foundry's Gasolene station there; but it was agreed that the Government should erect a building on that site. At one time this site was spoken of as the site for a Post Office, if this Chamber had agreed to the $6,000 which was asked for in respect of the expenses of the architect Mr. Anthony Lewis. I want to know, what are the good reasons for not utilising that site, instead of allowing the public to believe that it is a car park for them. The Government is erecting a very palatial building in the name of a fire station, which is near the waterfront; and I cannot understand why they cannot erect a building on the Central Foundry's site. I believe that it is for the reason that advice was given that it would not be a good site for the erection of a building. However this site is an eyesore to people who now say that it is a car park. Even if you went to New York City, I do not think that you could find an area of land like that being used as a car park; it is too expensive a site. I hope that I will get some information in this connection from the Hon. Minister who is responsible in this matter.

6.25 p.m.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, sooner or later this question of the acquisition of land by the Government will have to be faced. Right now, over the past several months, I have been told by the

Manager of the Housing Board and by no less a person than the Hon. Minister of Housing, that it has become increasingly difficult to acquire land in St. John for Housing. As far back as when a document on Housing in the West Indies was published by the Colonial Development and Welfare Organisation, they said that land prices in the West Indies were a standing obstacle to the expansion of Housing Schemes; and that Governments would be compelled to put a price ceiling upon the acquisition of land for this very fundamental social purpose of Housing.

If you are going to correct certain traditional wrongs, you are going to offend and doubly offend certain classes in the community; but if you are going to carry out the purpose of housing for the people, you have got to face that factor. You cannot have the money to carry through your Housing Schemes, if you are going to pay these extravagant prices for land.

All of us will admit that in a congested community like Barbados, land acquires a value which is prohibitive to the average person. The money that people have to pay for a small plot of agricultural land, effectively prevents them from carrying out proper cultivation of that land; because, the money that they should be spending on cultivation, they have to spend on the purchase price. It is a millstone about their necks for the balance of their lives at least; and consequently, they cannot make effective agricultural use of that land.

This Government must be prepared to face, not confiscation, but paying a set price for land, beyond which Government will not budge; and that price must not be so prohibitive, that the Government will effectively fail to provide the Housing needed. Why is it that in the past several years there has been no attempt to set up a Housing Scheme in the parish of St. John? In the villages of that parish, many of the houses are dilapidated and in a disgraceful condition; and are dangerous to the health of the community. They are as dilapidated and dangerous as any in the worst slums in the city. It is not because it is the country, that houses are less necessary. I am a Barbadian born and bred. I have gone abroad on a few occasions and have seen bad housing for the poor, especially in St. Lucia. But when I was canvassing in St. John for the last Elections, I was literally stunned at the dilapidated houses I saw in Welch Town. I wondered if I were in Barbados. But unless the Government is prepared to establish a ceiling price for land, these conditions will continue.

It is no excuse to say, that an owner asked £1,000 an acre and therefore we cannot get on. You cannot make that excuse if you are to have a housing scheme. In that Colonial Development and Welfare Document, they emphasised the fact that West Indian Governments must introduce land legislation of such a nature, as to make Housing Schemes a social practicability. As far as I know, such legislation has not yet been introduced into this colony.

It is no use to go on talking about Housing, unless you are prepared to settle the difficulty of land acquisition at the start. As a matter of fact, if this is gone into, I believe it will be discovered that one of the reasons why Housing Schemes in this island are comparatively much worse than such schemes in other communities is because of the exhorbitant prices we pay for land. If you must pay these prices, you cannot do much with housing.

I emphasise this, because it is almost a crying shame that up to this time no public housing scheme has been undertaken in a parish like St. John. There is one other thing I would mention while I am on this question, and that is, the ejections which still take place, the ejection of agricultural tenants on the slightest provocation. There are managers and managers. They are some still live in the 17th Century. There are some still liberal enough as not to think of ejection, even in the most extreme case of offence; while, there are others who think of ejection on the slightest provocation.

There was a Labour Conference held in this island some time ago, and I remember that the Report of that Conference mentioned that all Labour Governments in the West Indies must reach a solution of this estate tenantry business. In this 20th Century, a labourer should not be left to the discretion of any single individual for his residence. There are labourers who have lived on these tenantries for 20 and 30 years and who are given notice, because one planted a cane contrary to the manager's conception of how it should be planted. I do not say that every manager is like that; but the Government should make it impossible for any manager to be like that. This is the 20th Century and some of these managers still wield the big stick. The Government must make that impossible by a land policy which is equal to the times, and equal to the social progress of the community.

Where the question of Housing is concerned, the land is most important now; because, there can be no question of Housing unless the Government is prepared to put a ceiling on the price of land. Unless that is done Housing must come to a halt. Where you should build an hundred houses you will have built ten. Government must face that issue.

6.35 p.m.

At the first Labour Course held in this island, members emphasized the problem of these estate tenantries and the bad conditions of the residences of the labourers. They recommended that the Governments of these Caribbean colonies should institute once and for all, and immediately, a land policy for these estates tenantries. It was also stated that we cannot go on leaving these people at the mercy of bad housing conditions, which have been theirs from generation to generation, because of the land policy which suited the seventeenth century.

I will finish as I began. You have got to displease some people and displease them badly, in order to carry out this policy. It means that you have to offend a certain class; but if you are to defend another class socially, you must be prepared for that offence. I will ask the Hon. Minister of Housing to bear all that I have said in mind. I hope he will think on it, and bring to the notice of the Government the essential necessity for bringing into line a modern land policy in this community.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I hope that the points made by the honourable junior member for St. John, my colleague, will not cause the Government to feel that the transactions which are being carried out between the Housing Board and the owners of Colleton Plantation should be hampered. I have visited the district and the Governor has also visited that district; and he and others would like that district to be used as a housing area. Now the price which is being asked for that land is £500 per acre; and I want to say, that not only is that price set on that particular land, but it is also set on other areas. Wherever you go, owners of land are asking a similar price per acre.

The situation is very acute, Mr. Chairman; and inasmuch as the Government and the housing authorities have bought large areas in St. Michael for the purpose of extending the housing scheme, (and they have even bought some parts without getting the

sanction of this Chamber) I feel that they can also purchase that site at Colleton in the same manner. Mr. Chairman, I am not mixing matters; nor am I influenced by the remarks by the honourable junior member for St. Peter about your buying land for people, from the point of view of getting votes. The point to which we should look is, that with conditions as they are in the rural areas, we feel that the Government should act immediately on the purchase of that area, and because of the fact, that it has something at its disposal. It is a fact that there is suffering, misery, unhappiness and uncertainty in the hearts of people who are living in that area, owing to their having to remove their houses at a moment's notice; and they do not have the means to acquire the land or alternative spots on which they can carry their houses.

I must say that when one looks back at the housing progress of this colony, one would have to say that it is exclusively situated in the metropolitan parish of St. Michael; therefore, I am forced to come to the conclusion that because of the hon. senior member for St. Michael who was also one of the housing authorities in this island, preference is given to St. Michael in the housing programme, without consideration for the needs of the rural areas. Sir, we have the Belfield, the Deacons Road, the Pine Estate and the Bay Estate Housing schemes in St. Michael, and now we are getting the Cave Hill Housing Scheme.

Mr. Chairman, this question has nothing to do with party or politics. This is a question of removing the misery of the people of Barbados. These people pay money by way of taxation into the Treasury, and that is what you are using. You should spend it to alleviate the needs of all of them, even if you do not spend it on all in the same proportion or at the same time. You have the means at your disposal; that is, you have the revenue and you also have the means to carry out that work. You have labourers who want to work. When you look around the colony you will see that all the housing projects are in St. Michael. You will see them at the Bay Estate at the Pine Estate; but there is none in the other areas; you only have a half-baked one at Clinketts in St. Lucy. I do not think members of the Government realise it is their duty, comprised as they are, to serve the island as a whole and not individually. For some months now, the Government has been negotiating with the authorities of Colleton Plantation to buy about five or six acres of land, and up to now, the transactions are not concluded. I would like the Hon. Minister to know that I have discussed the matter with the Head of the Administration and he is favourably inclined towards the acquiring of this area by Government.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—The hon. senior member for St. John is persistently referring to the name of the Governor for the purpose of influencing this debate. He is breaking Rule 126.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,— I have discussed the matter with the Governor. Do you mean to say, I cannot say that? If you want to acquire that area of land, and they know that the need is very pressing, they should go ahead and acquire it at once. It is no favour they are granting me. It is a service for the people of Barbados. If over-night they can go and acquire a property of several acres without even notifying the Legislature, in a matter like this where only a couple of acres of land is involved, they can acquire it in a shorter time than they are taking now. This Government should know that the tenantry on which these people's houses are situated has been sold; and unfortunately, these poor people have no money to buy the spots on which their houses stand nor to buy any other. People have bought spots on which some of these people's houses are situated; and those unfortunate people are asked to give up the spots, but they do not have the money to remove their houses elsewhere. If Government fails to do the things it should do for the people, it is resorting to a Government of tyranny; and I charge them with it.

6.45 p.m.

There is another point which I want to stress; I heard the hon. senior member for St. Joseph say that he does not intend to use arable land for housing purposes. I might agree with him if it were an island wide policy of the Government. But I believe in the principle that inasmuch as the economy of the peasants is very low, if the Government is going to rehouse them, the best and most suitable thing to do would be to give them a house spot at the back of which they could plant potatoes, yams and cassava and other vegetables to supplement their finances and assist them to cope with the high cost of living. While the hon. member is saying that he would only use rab land for housing purposes, yet he is permitting the rich Americans and Englishmen to purchase ten and twenty acres of good arable land and chase off the tenants, and then plant the whole area in cactus, palms trees and so on. That is putting good land out of production, whereas the poor people cannot even get a couple of cane holes of arable land. That is the policy which is inconsistent with progress; and the hon. member does not see those things. And when these things are brought to his attention he cold-shoulders them, although it is progressive to put them into practice. I will say this now for the landowners in this island: as my colleague has said, sooner or later we have got to reach the stage where we should have to bring about policy of the redistribution of the landed area in this colony. People are not birds to live in the air, nor are they fish to live in the sea; and inasmuch as they are too heavy to live in the atmosphere, they have to live on the land.

Most of the arable land is owned by a few families, and the policy of the Government must be able to bring about a system of redistribution of land. I would suggest to the land owners of this island, if a small area of land is needed for public services in the respective parishes, that they they should give up that area of land voluntarily. Let the Government buy it; and do not let these landowners refuse to sell land for the service of the people when they are asked to do so. If they refuse to sell 10 acres they may compulsorily have to sell 500 acres. If you try to retard the demands and progress of the people you will not be able to save yourself eventually. I would ask those who have relationship with the landowners of this colony to co-operate and sell wherever possible, land for the service of the people; so that these people can accommodate themselves with their rapid expansion. Do not wait for the day when forces will have to demand them to sell. Facts are facts; you cannot monopolise all the land and refuse to sell some of it for the accommodation of the people. It is only fortunate that we are weak-hearted, and that we are not particularly interested in relieving the situation. I do not want to help the Government to use the excuse about the cost of land being too dear. The landowners of this island seem to have agreed that wherever the land is, you have to pay £500 per acre for it. I have found out that land in St. Lucy costs £500 per acre and land in St. John also costs £500 per acre. (Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: That is not true.) I am telling you that land is sold in St. Lucy for £500 per acre. Wherever we went the price of land was £500 per acre. Even at this

stage the Government might consider, that the payment of £500 per acre for land is extravagant; and inasmuch as you have not got a ceiling price on the statue book for land, you must buy it. The happiness of the people cannot be measured in terms of £. s. d. I am saying now that there is a feeling that the present Government would not worry themselves with relieving the present situation which now obtains in St. John, due to the fact that they have adopted a policy of not serving the people, but serving individuals who co-operate with them in doing what might be either right or wrong.

6.55 p.m.

The Hon. Minister for Housing has already started to terrorise Civil Servants for trying to be hospitable to representatives of various constituencies. The Hon. Minister has been questioning these Civil Servants as to why they invited such and such a member to assist in the selection of sites and things of that sort. It is true. It has been reported to me.

Hon. M. E. COX: I would like the honourable member to say who reported that to him.

Mr. ALLDER: I do not want the officer to be further victimised; and I will not call his name. The honourable member knows whom he has questioned as regards inviting me.

Hon. M. E. COX: I know nothing about it. Unless the honourable member can explain what he means, there is nothing more I can say about it. The honourable member talked about servants at Government House who gave him certain information. They were poor and humble people. Why can't he not mention the person who said I questioned him?

Mr. ALLDER: I am not asking the Honourable Minister to sit in judgment on anyone. I am accusing him. I am not asking him to investigate the behaviour of someone else. We have to be careful that victimisation does not become an ingredient of the Government in power. When the Minister can question the Head of a Department for doing something which he is expected to do, we have to be careful.

The next point I will mention is, that in the Five Year Plan the Government exhausted the revenue of this colony in non-productive schemes. You only have to pass Probyn Street, to see what I mean. I warned the Government over and over again about that. I was a member of the Committee which advised the Government on the scheme for fire protection for Bridgetown, and the minority report of the Chairman of that Committee took precedence over the report of the majority. I want the Government to consider whether it is sensible today to put up such a massive building in Probyn Street, a building costing over $350,000, to house fewer than forty men. The Government has been advised over and over again that as much as this is a tropical colony, you will not need all these massive structures; because it eats out all your wealth, and you have nothing remaining to spend productively on schemes like the Agricultural Department which would produce more food, or to assist people in cultivating their land and producing more.

The only colony that has not allocated a substantial sum in productive directions like agriculture, is this colony of ours. We are the most poverty-stricken and starving of all the islands, because we have to depend on them to produce while we consume. Our last pound is spent buying what we could produce for ourselves, if the Government had vision enough. Colonies which are more independent than us have allocated two and a half million dollars to agriculture. But the set of Ministers whom we have are allocating the whole wealth of the colony to the putting up of massive structures which the poor can only look up to with empty bowels. The Government wants vision. They are too spiteful, that is all. Their policy is wrong; and all we can hope is that they will get an Englishman to pass on the proper ideas to them, because we are only wasting time trying to pass on these ideas ourselves. The mere fact that the ideas come from some of us, will cause the Government to immediately refuse to accept them.

We should not be spending $350,000 to put up a building for forty firemen; nor do we want the Ministerial offices costing $350,000. We do not want to abandon the present Bay Street Boys' School and put another one further up Beckles Road. What we want to do is to expand the existing accommodation at that school; it will cost less to do so. But the Government want to spend money in a grandiose scheme, regardless of whether benefits come to the public or not. But these schemes have to be stopped soon. Those are the things which are running the country into a worse state than it has ever been in. Sufficient people are not benefiting. With all the money they are spending, few people can get jobs.

They have put in the Addendum of this Resolution, a phrase about the necessity for providing work because the Christmas season is coming on. That is only a catch phrase to cause us to do something which we would not otherwise do. I am sure that in the course of the discussion of the Five Year Plan, we said we were not interested in the Ministerial buildings, or Parliament buildings costing this amount; but that is what the Government is actually doing. Soon there will be a Resolution for building an alternative school; and then they will come in for another amount; and before long, we will have agreed to do something which will be no benefit to the community, and which we said we will not need. This piece-meal business is only wasting time, and as my honourable colleague said we have experience of it.

Land values are so high that more or less, it takes a life time before a man can get out of the clutches of the solicitors and the land dealers. The price is so high, that if a peasant once stop cultivating his land he will give them a chance to sell him out, because he will have failed to pay the interest and the annual instalment. The peasant just mortgages his life to say that he has a piece of land and is therefore a real Barbadian. The Government is oblivious to these things.

7.05 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I could begin my few remarks by quoting the old proverb: "Where there is no vision people perish." Before I offer any suggestions on this Resolution, I have got to answer one or two points raised by the two ambassadors for St. John.

Mr. Chairman, I say ambassadors, because strikingly strange in this particular case, their speeches have been concentrated purely on St. John and nothing else. I was amazed when I listened to the honourable junior member for St. John; because his criticism was with respect to the price of land and not criticism of the Government in not acquiring that land. He must have forgotten his colleague's tirade when they were asking the Government to buy Rosegate Plantation. I do not know about the offering for sale of land of Colleton Planation to Government; but I believe that I know what everybody in Barbados should know something of, and that is, that land value in any community must go in relation to the economy of the community. Therefore, land value in this community must go in relation to the price which we get for sugar. Everybody would like to get land

as cheaply as they can. You are proposing to buy this land at £500 an acre. Just a little more than last week you bought Blackman's House, and after the deduction of what the house would cost, you can say that you paid £500 an acre for the land which is attached to it, and which was less than five acres. If I understand correctly the criticism of the honourable junior member for St. John, he said that the price which was put up to the Government for the purchase of land at Colleton Plantation, is too expensive. The honourable member before he said so, should have made a comparison; and if he had done so, he would have seen that you could not secure a site like that at a price of less than £500 an acre. One honourable member for St. John is saying that the Government should acquire the site; the other is saying that the price is too expensive. If they feel that is the way St. John should be represented, that is a matter for them. They are those of us who like to become ambassadors and not only legislators. I am not prepared to say as the Hon. Premier has said. I will not be so harsh with the honourable junior member for St. John, because I believe his intentions are good. He should not have made such a sweeping statement without finding out what are the true facts. I believe he has been mislead. It is quite possible for him to be mislead, when somebody tells him land is sold at 3c. a foot. I would like to ask him how many square feet make him an acre. I told him previously how many square feet make an acre. It is just a question of remembering everything which has been told him. That, so far, is my criticism of what the honourable junior member for St. John.

I shall now proceed to deal with the Resolution. There are one or two things which I am not supporting, and some things which I want the Government to answer. I want the Government to accept the criticisms which I shall make in good faith. I shall deal with Item 3 first. Let me say that I am whole-heartedly in favour of removing the Department of Highways and Transport to another site on Government land, so as to prevent the Government from buying land in the City which is very expensive for the purpose of erecting a market. I am therefore supporting that idea. We did see a letter in the Press which supported that idea. I think it was written by a stranger. We are fully aware that because of the changing of the Bus Stand to the Old Railway Site, that a market in the place where the Department of Highways and Transport now stands would be a very good place.

However, I do know you are going to feel peculiar when we of the Opposition suggest to you, that of the three ideas which you have put forward in this Resolution, we are praising you for only one. If, therefore, we elect to praise you for one, do not become pig-headed if we do not agree with all you have here; and do not say that because you have it down here, it must be so. After all, you must bear in mind that there is always some wisdom outside of that of members of the Government. I say again, we heartily agree with your removing the Highways and Transport Department from its position at present, and more especially so because we know that accommodation there for the staff, is atrocious. It is something terrible.

Let us take Item 1. I am going to ask the Hon. Minister: who on earth has suggested that you should take your ministerial offices out of Bridgetown. Who on earth has suggested to you that you should go up Bay Street, pay out money to remove some people's houses from a certain place, pay out money to build some roads, and do all that just for the sake of putting your ministerial offices up there. I do not agree with that suggestion no matter who suggested it. Let us say that there is not enough accommodation for ministerial and government offices at present. Is it not a fact that you have paid $27,000 for the Central Foundry site and alongside that site, you now have a building which houses the offices of the Income Tax Commissioner and the Public Works Department? Is not that a beautiful site to build a four-storied building which would prevent you from going out of town to erect buildings to house your ministerial offices? You would then have all your property housed around this area. Why go up Bay Street and remove people's houses and interfere with Bay Street Boys' School, when you have a most convenient spot around here on which you can erect a fine building?

Sir, you are in the fortunate position now that among the three English officials who are really giving Barbados something, you have the Director of Public Works. He is doing good work and not stealing the money of the people of this colony. You should appreciate that statement coming from me all the more, because if they were not any good, I would curse them and citicise them. Because they are good, I praise them. You can really say that your Director of Highways and Transport, your Waterworks Engineer, and now your Director of Public Works are not stealing the people's money. They are not getting drunk like other officers.

7.15 p.m.

I shall now address my remarks to the Hon. Premier.

I want to ask the Hon. Premier something, before anybody can get me to vote for this Resolution. I have made up my mind as to the removal of the offices of the Department of Highways and Transport. I do not know what is meant by the initials M. E. C., on this Resolution; I do not know why the "O" and the "X" were not put on. (Laughter). The Hon Minister regrets that this Resolution has had to be introduced at such short notice; but despite the phraseology which has been used, I say that I will not make up my mind to vote for this Resolution until the honourable member can tell me what other use they proposed to make of the Central Foundry's site. The City of Bridgetown is growing in the sense of business establishments and so on. Does this Government not see that they have got to utilise their space by going up on their buildings? Are they limited to erecting two storey buildings? Has it not been realised that if you want to use your 500 ft. space you have to go up more than two storeys, and if the Ministers are too heavy they can get elevators to take them up? I know that the Government has a vicious habit of listening to honourable members and then saying "question"; and then they aggravate the position by saying that honourable members can only get up on their hind legs and bray. Of course when I get up and bray long enough and there is nothing forthcoming, I will kick! (Laughter) I want to say this, if you want to aggravate the people of this colony tell them about erecting Parliament buildings; I say that they dare not come down here for any Parliament buildings.

On this question of Ministerial offices, can you tell us why you make the decision to go up there rather than have them here in Bridgetown? I am wondering if they are going to have air conditioning, because this country is becoming too hot for the Ministers. The general public feel that the Ministers are attempting to isolate themselves from the people; whereas, the position is that when people come to town and want to see the Ministers they should be

able to see them easily. We are of the opinion that the Central Foundry's site could be used for the erection of Ministerial offices instead of going up to the Bay Estate. It is the feeling of the general public that this Central Foundry's site is more desirable than the site up there. You cannot afford to use a site costing £30,000 for a Car park.

I do not know if the Hon. Minister of Housing will tell us something about what I see in this Resolution. Many things are being done at the various Boards and nobody knows what is going on. I see in this note this statement, "during the year an area of land at Cave Hill was acquired by the Government for aided self-help and other housing development. Houses are now being removed from over-crowded areas to Cave Hill for which it is necessary to construct roads." I should like to know where the over-crowded houses are being removed from, and how many houses have been removed? When you speak of over-crowded areas you refer to such areas as Nelson Street; (Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Cat's Castle.) and we are often reminded of Cat's Castle. I should like to know how many houses have been removed to Cave Hill and whence they have been removed.

7.25 p.m.

Before I offer any further criticism on this, I would like to draw the attention of the Hon. Minister to a misleading statement in Paragraph 2 of the explanatory note. It says in part that "funds can be made available for this work from the provision in the 1954-55 Capital Estimates but in view of the restriction in the notes approval is required for expenditure on roads (apart from those relating to Aided Self Help Houses) being met from this vote."

I do not like these kind of statements. They may creep in by mistake; but do not give the House these misleading statements. I shall await a statement from the Government clearing up this Cave Hill business, and informing the House and the public generally, why they have bought the Central Foundry land for £27,000. We are not now quarrelling over the purchase price; but we want the Government to tell us what they will do with that land before we vote money for the Bay Estate. We want the Government to tell us whether it would not be better to erect a proper building right here in town where people can reach the Ministers easily, rather than going to the Bay. If the Government can satisfy me that they will use the Central Foundry land to do something of greater importance, I will agree with going to the Bay.

I would like to say, on the other hand, that I am not merely supporting this idea because of Ministerial offices. As I go into the Income Tax Department I see that it is overcrowded. It is not right to have such overcrowding in a department where people are dealing with figures, and where people are sitting at one table discussing private business with one taxpayer while another taxpayer, three feet away, can hear what is being said. If the Government is looking for offices generally, there still is no justification for going up by the Bay. There is a more justifiable argument for coming down here, (taking off the roof and seeing if the foundation is good,) and going up some more storeys and erecting a proper Income Tax Office, a Highways and Transport office and Ministerial offices and many of the other offices which the Government now pays a high rent for.

It is not good enough merely to sit and feel that you should go to the Bay, or to let someone tell you so, because they feel that it would be nice to go. One Governor felt that the best place for the Parliament Buildings would be in Government House yard. Government should use its own initiative. Do not let anyone tell you to go to the Bay, when you have £27,000 in land lying down in the city.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to tell the Hon. Minister of Housing that I too share the view that he should sign the letters that he sends out. The next thing is, that while I appreciate the circulation of this Resolution before the meeting of the House, I must say that the last three lines of the letter contain something that is out of place; and I wonder if Mr. Speaker really gave the information that is there. It says that the Speaker's permission has been obtained to deal with the Resolution through all its stages "at next Tuesday's meeting of the House." That cannot be true. The Speaker might have been informed that the Government was going to deal with the Resolution through all its stages; but to put the Speaker in the position of having given permission for this to be done is very, very wrong. I hope that in future such mistakes will not be made.

To my mind, the most important part of this Resolution is the significance of our agreeing to the preparation of sites for the removal of houses from the Bay Estate. If we agree to a Resolution for the preparation of these sites now, we are automatically agreeing that the Bay is the place to put the Ministerial buildings. That is what we are going to have thrown at us. I warn the House that this is the most serious part of this Resolution.

The note starts off by telling us that it is proposed to start work as soon as possible on the new Ministerial Offices at the site reserved at the Bay Estate, to which reference was made in His Excellency the Governor's Message No. 23/1954 to the Legislature. So by agreeing to this Resolution for the preparation of sites for the removal of these Houses, in spite of all the debate that took place on a previous occasion, we are in a round about way being asked to commit ourselves to putting Ministerial Offices at the Bay.

Even if the Government wanted to catch us like that I am in a position to tell members that plans for those buildings have been in existence for months. I have been continually saying, that when the Government has such plans, they should be exhibited first of all to the Legislature and then to the general public. Otherwise we will find ourselves in a position where we will be agreeing to certain things, and the money to do them will be tucked away in the Estimates.

Mr Chairman, I now beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER takes the Chair and the CHAIRMAN reported accordingly.

ADJOURNMENT

On the motion of Mr. BARROW seconded by Mr. SMITH the House adjourned for three-quarters of an hour.

7.35 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Committee of Supply Resumed

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

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the adjournment the honourable junior member for the City was speaking.

Mr. LEWIS: As I was saying at the adjournment, Mr. Chairman, we should make it clear whether or not we intend to agree to the clearance of the site at Bay Estate; and by so doing, we are saying we are agreeing to the putting of Parliament Buildings on that site. We should make it very clear. I myself think that the site for these buildings should be made a subject of special debate. I believe it was even promised to the House that that was to be so; and it can be proved from the debates. We are hearing this afternoon that Ministerial buildings would be built on that site.

Now, with regard to the Post Office, I do not know what structural alterations are to be made, but certainly the ground floor of this building is far more suitable for Government offices than for the General Post Office. For a General Post Office where you have everybody engaged in the same business, and where you want to have a Post Master in a position to see his staff and to supervise certain things which are necessary in a business like the Post Office, (say like the urgency of the shipping of mails,) I think that this ground floor of this building is most unsuitable for that purpose. I am sorry that it is the considered opinion of the Government to leave the Post Office where it is.

There are one or two things which can be profitably done with the Central Foundry site. Let me say, that there are other people who are building as near or nearer to the water edge, than where the Central Foundry site is. The name Colonial Engineer was a misnomer to the late Colonial Engineer; he was not an engineer. One wonders whether he did not do the island a harm by accepting that post. Of course, that was a period when it appeared as if the Head of the Administration wanted to go slow with building schemes. It appears as if somebody had in mind this policy: "let us not get this administrative, professional and other technical staff but let us increase salaries first; let us agree to invest the surplus every year; let us put out a report that you cannot get a Director of Public Works, a Director for the Highways and Transport Department and this, that, and the other." The reason why I say that is, you got those officers immediately after you had increased the salaries. That seemed to be a plot which was successfully hatched. After you got those things, you got someone to look after things properly. Previous to that, every site that you went and bought you heard the late Colonial Engineer saying you cannot get any foundations there. There were no foundations at the General Hospital. As a matter of fact, proposals were put before the House for the extension of the Hospital and when we thought that the Government was informed that there were foundations there for the proposed buildings, it was only after the proposals were passed by the House that the then Colonial Engineer said there were no foundations there. In those days there were no foundations to be found on any site; and it seems as if somebody had told the late Colonial Engineer to say so. It has caused us to pay probably an increase of 20 or 30% or even more than that, for the buildings we are now getting. As I have said, we should have a special debate on this subject of Parliament Buildings; and when we are doing so, we should have the plans before us. We vote vast sums of money for buildings without having any plans of these buildings to guide us. That to my mind, is a very wrong thing to do. There should be nothing to hide.

In Note 1, I find that the money voted for 50 sites has now been expended. Sir, I hope that 50 site have been prepared with the money. I would like to know that, because at least in Mr. Crowe's time, we voted money for 22 houses of which eighteen were only built; and the Government came back to this House with a Resolution for money to provide twenty-two more. I would like to know that the money has been expended. And not only that, but that the fifty sites were prepared with the money.

With regard to the matter of a token amount of a dollar, I feel there should be a lot more explanation to that. You have put in a note here for a token amount of a dollar for the purpose of rescinding a note which appeared in the Annual Estimates. You are saying that the vote of $20,021 have not been used entirely, and you have discovered that the amount was too much for the purpose for which it was voted. All of that is mixed up in this token vote of a dollar. I do not believe it should have been done this way. We are saying here, that, "The Notes in the Estimates against this Item specify that the provision will be used for work at the Bay and Pine Estates and at Chelston. During the year an area of land at Cave Hill was acquired by the Government for Aided Self Help and other housing development. Houses are now being moved from over-crowded areas to Cave Hill for which it is necessary to construct roads. Funds can be made available for this work from the provision in the 1954—55 Capital Estimates, but in view of the restriction in the notes, approval is required for expenditure on roads (apart from those relating to Aided Self-Help Houses) being met from this vote."

Now, the only time that the House would know something about Cave Hill, is now that Government wants money for doing the roads. I have heard that this tenantry was bought out of Labour Welfare Funds. Of course the Government feels that it is their money, and they can spend it as they like. They bought that Tenantry at Cave Hill, and there was never any public mention of it. The Government did not even have the courtesy to tell the House that it was acquired. I never saw one public statement on it. I am warning this Government that that is a dangerous policy. The time will come, when they will get something bad stuck on them, if they continue to adopt that policy. Did the Government anticipate what was told them tonight, that the only place they were buying these sites was in St. Michael? And that they were being bought to satisfy a set of the constituents? With similar funds the Government bought a place in Country Road, and they refused to tell anybody what they paid for it. It was only after I asked a question in here that it was disclosed. Is that the way you should conduct your business? The same thing happened with the purchase of Blackman's House. I think that is a very serious state of affairs. It is a policy which should not be practised, especially by a Government like the one we have.

8.40 p.m.

The position is the same in respect of Blackman's House. I think that this is a very serious state of affairs. It is a policy which should be dropped especially by this Government. You should not only be honest in your public dealings, but you should appear to be honest; you cannot overemphasise that. We had to vote money tonight

in connection with this secret business in Canada. Everybody knew who was responsible for it, and no accounts were rendered. You have had three different purchases, and neither the Legislature nor the public know anything about them; you have to ask a question if you want to know how much a property has been bought for. A Government like this will fall on those misdeeds. This is the first intimation to this House that this property was bought. If they did not have to come to you to get the roads built, you would not have known anything about the purchase of this property. Nobody has said: "this property has been acquired, and I take this opportunity to bring the matter before the House." Nobody has said that it comprises so many acres and we have paid so much for it. The Labour Welfare Fund does not belong to the Government; it is money which is collected through an Act of Parliament. I think that the Government should make all their dealings public as soon as possible. I would like to hear some of them criticising people who acted in that manner. They might have made a bargain; the property might have even been given to them; but let us share in their joys.

It appears to me, as if this $20,000 was put in the Estimates in connection with roads at the Pine and the Bay Estate; but all of that has been abandoned. Now you hear that with that same money a property has been acquired and they can build roads. No explanation is given for that at all. Have you abandoned the roads which you intended to build at the Bay Estate, or did you put this amount in here just to make a show at the time of the Estimates? Do not say that you voted money for a purpose and now you want that purpose extended. Let us have a clean picture of what is happening. Instead of paying attention to that matter honourable members are talking about buying land; but there is nothing in this Resolution about purchasing any land.

Everybody agrees with the third item, but I sincerely hope that they are not carrying the Highways and Transport Department too far away. Certainly the alternative use for which the spot is intended is a very good one. Long ago it was said that this site would serve the purpose of a market. I must say it appears to me that a great deal of building is being done. We have only four months to go for the financial year to be closed, and I hope that we are not voting money which will deal of speed in the erection of some of the buildings, and I also hope that there will be durable buildings and not merely buildings erected in a hurry for the purpose of making a show. I hope that these buildings will stand up. I do feel that some pronouncement should be made by the Government as regards the Central Foundry site. You can justify the money which you paid for that site if you will erect a proper building there. I am not recommending that we should go in for any four or five storey buildings, because, I feel that we are in danger every year of getting a hurricane, and I am not recommending any sky-scrapers in the area. However a building can be erected on that site sufficiently large to accommodate the Post Office and the Savings Bank on the ground floor; and I think you will have sufficient space above on the first floor for use as the Government Offices; and if you say that you should have three floors, your Parliament buildings should be placed there. Even if you do not amalgamate the Savings Bank and the Post Office you should keep them in close proximity.

The next thing is that you could take down those old buildings which are really a disgrace to the city and leave the site as an open spot which you could beautify, and you could justify the money you paid for that site. It would be possible to claim that you are enhancing the value of the buildings around; I do not see any reason why the Government should not get back some of the money which they spent; and if you enhance the value of people's premises then you should get some money out of it just as you would appreciate the value of people's land by the construction of the East Coast Road. The value of people's property would be enhanced if you leave this site as an opened spot, for which you should collect a commensurate amount for the appreciated value of the properties around. I hear of people talking about preserving the value of their land by buying the land surrounding it.

8.50 p.m.

I do agree, with all the building which is being done, there still seems to be a lot of unemployment. I do not know if it is a matter of just keeping some artisans employed continuously, while they were out of work before.

As far as carrying the Parliament Buildings and Ministerial Offices up Bay Street is concerned, it might be a nice vacation for the occupants of those offices, because of the fact that they will be able to look at the sea through the palm trees. As to whether it would be really a wise thing to do is another matter. It might be advantageous to the Government to throw it open to debate. If the plans have been made, I think it might be well for the fact to be made known, and that these plans be exhibited. The Government has got into the habit of trying to keep everything secret. That is wrong. The Legislature is not being treated with the confidence with which it should be treated by the Government. There are too many things for which a block vote is given. Buildings are going up, and no one ever had an opportunity of seeing the plans. Civil Servants can say they are building a post office and community centre at Oistins and they are undertake to change it up, and come back and get more money voted for it. It is all right when you have got someone who will change it up for the better; but that may not always be the case. The only thing you will get then, is more money being spent.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, in the Estimates for 1954-55 the sum of $135,000 was voted for Government buildings. If Your Honour will refresh your memory by reading the notes of the particular amount voted under that item, you will see that it was a preliminary estimate of the cost of new offices for the Registrar, Provost Marshal and other officers.

Only a couple weeks ago the House was asked to vote an amount specifically for the Registrar for additional accomodation at the Law Courts and for the Provost Marshal. When you put such a small sum as $135,000 in the Estimates and you put in other officers, (I am reading from the note) I take it that the "other officers" must be with the Provost Marshal and the Registrar. Everyone will understand what I mean. When the $135,000 was voted, there was no suggestion that the Department of Highways and Transport and the Public Works Department would come under that heading at all.

This is what I am suggesting: in view of the fact that a sum, probably in excess of $135,000 is going to be spent in Coleridge Street under Item No. 9 of the Miscellaneous part of the Estimates, this House never made any provision for the Highways and Transport Department and the Public Works Department at all. That is why the Government had to come back for an additional vote

under this Head for the purpose of erecting these offices. There is no supplementary provision as such voted for this item.

Now when we were discussing the Five Year Plan in 1952, we were setting out the blue print of our expenditure over the ensuing period. That is what we were led to believe. It seems to me, that we are now making nonsense of the whole idea of planning, especially if we are going to insinuate Resolutions of this nature for sums already expended for offices and buildings of a nature completely different from those contemplated by this House at the time the Estimates were passed.

When we come back to Note No. 3, it seems to me, that we are now acquiring premises for the introduction at a later stage in the session of an enormous capital vote of $750,000 or something in that vicinity for Parliament Buildings and Ministerial Buildings. I want to get my premises clear right now. In November 1952 in this House, several members disagreed with the proposition that in an island like Barbados with its high level of unemployment, we should indulge in the luxury of new Parliament Buildings or that we should spend a sum of $750,000 for that purpose or for any such purpose.

The general feeling at the time was, that with the over-crowded and insanitary conditions under which the majority of the inhabitants of this island have to exist, and barely exist, it would be a very bad example for the Legislature to give the impression that we are only concerned with the erection of monuments which would be a lasting liability on the taxpayers of this colony by way of maintenance and upkeep. Now we are only clearing premises as far as this Resolution is concerned. We are clearing premises for the removal of houses from the Bay for the erection of magnificent buildings at what cost? The approximate estimate is $750,000.

In other words, sir, taking the figures of the Manager of the Housing Board ($800.00 per housing unit in the Clinketts Scheme) the amount you would spend in building these offices for five Ministers, for the Attorney General and the Chief Secretary would build approximately one thousand housing units.

9.00 p.m.

One thousand houses can be built with that money; but we are now clearing a place with that money. I believe in three weeks' time we will be asked to vote $140,000 for the erection of Ministerial buildings; and I am telling you in advance, that that amount would be for Ministerial Buildings; therefore, it has nothing to do with the $750,000 for Parliament Buildings.

Look at the timing of this. It is now three or four months before the new Financial Year begins. I believe I can explain to the members of this House why the Ministerial buildings and the Parliament Buildings are one and the same building, and why they are going to dig the foundations for the whole lot now. If what I am saying is not true, why was not the plan from the Highway and Transport Department brought in and laid on the Table of this House for members to see? Now, is it true or not true, that it is not going to be a three-storey building? Are you going to waste that space? Is it going to be a one-storey building? I understand that a distinguished personage is going to lay the corner stone of that building; and before you know what has happened, you will have voted the whole sum for the erection of a one-storey building. It is carefully planned. You are only clearing the site now. Why not put your cards on the table and come to the House and say here are the plans, out of this $750,000, we want $50,000 to put down the foundations to this Parliament Building so that we would have a nice marble corner stone laid in February next year. Why do it under the Housing Board? If you look back at the Annual Estimates you will see that this is not done under the Housing Board expenditure. What is being consolidated under Housing Board expenditure is what should be spent in the direction of getting new houses for the people.

I would like to ask the Minister for Communications a question. Perhaps, I have been talking too fast and the Official Reporter cannot put down correctly all that I say. I say that, because if I refer members of this House to what I said here tonight within the next six or eight weeks, they will see that it is not put down in the Official Gazette because it is expurgated by somebody else or because of instructions from higher ups. We are now dealing with expenditure to clear houses from the site on the Bay Estate so as to start buildings for new Ministerial offices, but in truth and in fact this money is for new Parliament Buildings. I do not see the reason why the Housing Board should be burdened with this expenditure because it is part of the cost for erecting a new building. We are concealing that under the guise of removing houses from one part of Bay Street to another place.

I am going to issue a note of warning, because I happen to know that the two are only one building. The Ministerial offices of course, will go up first; but while the Ministers are in their offices, the Parliament Building will be going up next door. It will not be a separate building with a little alleyway. It will be one building for the two, and the corner stone will be laid in February next year; and when all the flowery speeches have been uttered, it would be disloyalty on our part to turn it down and vote against the Parliament buildings. If you come to the House comprised as this, to ask for the sum of $750,000 for Parliament buildings, you are giving people like the honourable senior member for St. John and myself, and even the more affluent members of the Opposition, the opportunity to say like the Hon. Minister of Agriculture who said during his speech on the Five Year Plan, that this money should be better spent on Housing. I will give you the text of his speech in a moment. You will be giving members the opportunity to say that this money should be better spent on one thousand $800-units for the people of this island who are so badly housed. May be I have a suspicious mind, but my association with people has also made me suspicious. I have to be suspicious over public monies which are to be spent because these monies do not come out of the pockets of one individual member of this House, but out of the pockets of the taxpayers. The old Conservatives did not like to tell you that everybody is a taxpayer. In old times they used to say that the only people who paid taxes were the people who owned land. At any rate that saying is ludicrous today, because everybody is paying taxes.

If you turn to page 762 of the Official Debates of the date November 7th, 1952, you will see that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture used the following words which I am sure, are words which voice the opinion of every member of this House outside of the Ministers of the Government. He said: "As regards the Parliament Buildings, the money proposed to be spent on the erection of these Buildings could be more beneficially utilised in assisting the working classes in getting more houses."

9.10 p.m.

The honourable member went on with these words: "I caution this Labour Government that the parish of St. Michael has been taken care of to some extent in this matter of housing." These are the

words which were used by an honourable member over there; and he goes on to say this: "But everybody does not live in St. Michael and this parish cannot give the Hon. Leader of the House a majority in this House; in order to get a working majority in this House you have to satisfy the needs of the people." That was the warning which was given by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture at that time. He goes on: "We have to be practical; the average person who is not as well informed as certain honourable members are can only understand things in a practical way."

That is what appears on page 762 of the Debate of 7th November, 1952, in connection with the Five Year Plan. I do not like to accuse people of saying things which they have not said five minutes ago. I have had the support of honourable members in this matter, honourable members who are now on the Government bench.

I also expect that I will be told that we have approved of this expenditure in the Five Year Plan. I expect that we will be told, that by voting for the Colonial Estimates under the Head "Ministerial Offices" under capital expenditure, we have been already committed to this expenditure. I now want to quote the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. On page 808 in the same debate, but on the 12th November, 1952 the following words were used in answer to the criticism of honourable members on this side of the House, criticism which was made by honest people like the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and others. In answer to that criticism Mr. Chairman, these words were used by your colleague, and you will remember, Mr. Chairman, that there was no question of choosing anybody for the Bay Estate and putting Government offices up there. The questions were, firstly, whether these offices should be built at all, and the Hon. Minister had some doubt about it; secondly, whether they should be built at Government House; and thirdly, whether they should be built in Queen's Park. Your colleague, Mr. Chairman, said this: "The reason why we thought that Government House would be better than anywhere else for erecting these offices is that this Government does not want to buy land if it can avoid doing that. As between the two alternatives—Queen's Park and Government House—the Government has chosen Government House." I do not know if Government House has been removed into Mr. Lashley's Office. I am saving the honourable member from a lot of trouble, from the trouble of saying that we are tied down to this expenditure. I am now going to quote the honourable member; he said this: "If honourable members vote in favour of this Resolution, they are not tied down either to Government House or to the expenditure of $750,000; nor are they tied down to the project without modification. On the last occasion when there was a proposal before the House for building offices and parliament buildings the amount proposed was $250,000; that was in 1939, but what we have done is to multiply that $250,000 by three and we have said so in the memorandum."

You multiply that amount by three and you get these buildings for three times as much. The honourable member went on to say this: "If we go into figures and an architect tells us that we cannot get these offices and Parliament buildings in the next five years they will not see the light of day unless we strike oil."

I would like to ask this question: have we struck oil yet? Is this Resolution the official intimation from the Government of Barbados that we have struck oil? The words which I have quoted are the words which were used by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph; and that is exactly how I feel about this matter. The Opposition was categorically told on more than one occasion during that particular Debate, not to get too hot about the proposed expenditure of the $750,000, because we may never have to strike oil. I want to say that within a stone's throw of this building you have the most deplorable slum conditions in Barbados; the estimated expenditure on new houses under the Five Year Plan was in respect of 60 houses and, as I said during the debate on the Five Year Plan, it was a question of one house a month for the next five years in an island the population of which is increasing at the rate of between 3,000 and 4,000 people per annum! The whole Housing Scheme has been inflated (as the honourable junior member for St. Peter and the honourable junior member for the City have reminded the Government today) by the inclusion of Labour Welfare Funds and putting on, (to my recollection) the sum of $3½ million. That was done in 1952.

9.20 p.m.

Therefore, sir, that had nothing to do with new Housing. So the total actually spent by this Government on Housing, would be equivalent to one house a month during the next five years. A simple mathematical calculation will show, that the $750,000 for Parliament Buildings and Ministerial Offices would provide approximately 943 houses at the estimated cost of a unit under the Aided Self Help Scheme.

Any Government, when it comes to the expenditure of money would consider the alternative cost of different schemes to be much more important than the actual cost in terms of pounds, shillings and pence. Therefore, any Government which is considering the expenditure of a sum of $750,000, has to consider that that scheme is costing the poor people of this island 943 houses, which they could have got if this amount were not spent at the Bay for putting up one building.

That sir, is the principle on which socialist egislation should proceed; not on the question of pounds, shillings and pence, nor on the scale of profits; but on the basis of the alternative social cost to the community. The social cost to this community of the continuation of the appalling slum conditions which exist, cannot be calculated in terms of cash. The social cost will mount up in the statistics on juvenile delinquency and the hospitalisation of people suffering from the diseases, which are attendant on overcrowding and malnutrition. The alternative cost of this scheme is 943 houses and the actual cost is $750,000.

I resent this attempt to insult the intelligence of this House. This is my personal reaction. This has nothing now to do with my social thinking. I think it is an insult to the intelligence of the House to try to insinuate a $750,000 scheme in a Resolution of this sort. If you pull down a building and put up a new building on the site, the cost of pulling down the building is the cost of putting up the new one. This is not a question of housing. You are not housing anyone; you are just removing people who probably do not want to leave Beckles Road, and sending them two miles out where they will have to pay more bus fare.

There is one more observation that I would like to make. I would like to know, how many of these houses which are to be removed from the Bay Estate, belong to landlords and not to the people who live in them. Do these houses which are being moved, belong to people who live in them? I would like the Hon. Minister to answer that question. If the Government is going to put down groundsels for these people who are charging poor people exhorbitant rents, the Government is defeating the whole principle of a Housing Scheme. Make the landlords pay

some of the cost of removing these houses; because, the value of these houses will be enhanced by being in the salubrious atmosphere of the place that the Government has acquired, and also because of the proximity to the distinguished person of the Premier himself. The value of these houses defies the imagination when they are placed in the high elevation of Cave Hill.

It is my duty, sir, to voice my opinions in this House whether or not they are unacceptable to the members of the Government. Whether these opinions please them or not, is a matter of supreme indifference. I do not want to be uncharitable; but the Hon. Minister of Communications made a statement which was sent to the members of this House about this Resolution. The statement was to the effect that the money was to be voted so that there could be employment at Christmas. Apart from infants in arms, I would like to know what is so special about Christmas to a man who has not had a job all the year round. It might be a good gesture on the part of the Minister; but after Christmas what are these people going to do?

It would be more advantageous to this community, if this money were spent, not only for the relief of seasonal unemployment (because once the building is built there will be no further need for labour) but in some productive capacity to relieve permanently the unemployment situation of this island. If the Minister contemplates the building of Ministerial Offices for Christmas, I do not see how that will be a solution to the problem. The only unemployment situation that this will relieve for more than three months, is the unemployment of members of the Government because they will have offices. That is the only kind of employment that this will create apart from the short term aspect of the matter.

These are hard facts, Mr. Chairman, and we have to face them. It is much easier for members on my side of the House to come in here and form fours and agree to everything and get the plaudits of the crowd who are uninformed of what is going on in this country, than to make yourself *persona non grata*. But there are still some persons for whom principle is more important than expediency. I am fortunate enough to be numbered among the persons who do not have to rely on the good graces of the Barbados Government to work for a living here, or in any part of the world. It is my duty to put the facts before the public and let them be the arbiters.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,— I am sorry to say that I was sleeping most of the time that the last two hon. members were speaking. I do not withdraw one single word of what I said; nor has the Government altered its views. It is characteristic of the last honourable member to take one thing and add something else to it.

It is a matter for the Minister to reply; but inasmuch as the hon. member has quoted me, I will say that I have not abandoned the things that I said. We thought and still think, that new Parliament Buildings would be useful. We thought at one time that it would be a good thing to have them at Government House. I made it clear, however, that there were certain priorities, and that we would not, in view of the general feeling of hon. members, dream of putting up Parliament Buildings until the very last year of the Plan; and that in any event, we might not build them at all. It is not any question of $750.000. That is what the Ministerial offices plus the Parliament Buildings will cost. None of us has gone back one jot from what we said then. Who is asking the House to put down Parliament Buildings at Bay Street or anywhere else?

8.30 p.m.

We said it then, and we have not changed our views; but Ministerial Offices are a vastly different thing. Talk of going up Bay Street, I feel we should go further! Let me say, that I have no intention of wanting to remain in an office, (doing the most serious work that can devolve on any man—the work of any Minister) sitting down every working day of the year around here, with the sort of traffic that passes by. We have not changed our views; and to say that, is utterly fallacious. I repeat, the building of Ministerial offices is not necessary connected with a Parliament Building. I repeat what I said then; and what the hon. member read out. We may not even in this Five Year Plan, go on with the construction of a Parliament Building; unless, we have a lot of money. Because, we may discover that we must concentrate on this, or that, or the other thing; and in-as-much as we have the Public Buildings, the question of a new Parliament Building would be very low down in the scale of priority. I got up to say, that I have not changed one iota from my policy; neither has the Government.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman,— Although what I am about to say is not part of the Supplementary Estimates and not part of the Estimates themselves, yet as you know, these Supplementary Estimates were accompanied, when they reach members of this Chamber, by a certain communication dating 12th November, 1954, with certain initials which look like M.C.C. but which turned out to be M. E. C. In that document, emphasis is placed on the desire of the Government to relieve unemployment over the difficult period before the commencement of the crop season; and it is stated that the Director of Public Works can commence work on the construction of the departmental offices at the Pine and also commence clearing the site for the new Ministerial buildings at the Bay Estate at once. What I am referring to is in the document which accompanied this Supplementary Resolution. You are speaking of relieving unemployment, and believe me you can do nothing better; but you are creating a precedent which I trust will be followed every year, because this question of relieving unemployment before the commencement of the crop season does not come only at this season of 1954. You will find that you have to relieve unemployment in 1955 over this same difficult period; and the same thing will happen in 1956. There was and there will always be a difficult period before the commencement of the crop season.

The emphasis placed by the Hon. Minister is, first and foremost, putting into effect the very laudable idea of relieving unemployment over this difficult period; and that being so, and if you are out to relieve unemployment, then you should spread employment as much as possible. The conception is, that only a limited number of persons are being employed by the Government, particularly by the Public Works Department. On the one hand, the reason for that is to ensure that certain people who are regularly employed would most easily qualify, for pension, and all that sort of thing. That is very praiseworthy; but on the other hand, you cannot overlook the fact that by keeping only a certain number of persons employed, you are also keeping a large number who are equally efficient out of employment. Mr. Chairman, this Resolution accompanied by this letter, is emphasizing the desire of the Government to relieve employment as much as possible over this difficult period.

I am submitting, that what should be ensured in this relief of this unemployment, is that the persons who are efficient but who cannot now obtain work with the Public Works Department, be given a look-in. There should be no question of discrimination when all these large projects are being put into effect to relieve unemployment. Let the members of the Public Works Department who have shown partiality in distributing jobs, understand that these unemployment schemes are being put into effect to relieve the unemployment of people from the eleven parishes of the island, and not only the metropolitan parish. Let us bear in mind, that the parish which would least qualify for this relief, would be the metropolitan parish; because, as the Hon. Minister has said, it is the desire of the Government to relieve unemployment as much as possible over the difficult period before the commencement of the crop. People who are unemployed at the close of the crop, are the people in the rural parishes. That is the principle according to the wording of the communique. It would be interesting to find out when people are employed on these schemes, what is the percentage from the metropolitan parish and what is the percentage from the other parishes which suffer more from unemployment outside of the crop period. The Hon. Minister is forewarned; let him be forearmed.

The document says again, that the Director of Public Works can commence work on the construction on these schemes at once. Let me say, that the Department of Highways and Transport has made way for the Bus Stand and putting the Bus Stand tion there, has made way for a market to be put there. I cannot conceive of a more admirable place for a market than next to a bus terminus. You will be able to get out of the bus and go next door to the market and get everything you want, and then get back into the bus. I cannot imagine a more suitable site for a market than adjoining the bus terminus. I know of certain information, that there should be a market in Prince William Henry Street where the car park is. That is not a bad site either; but that site will be for people who have motor-cars. From the stand-point of the vast majority of people who have to travel by the democratic omnibus, then next to the omnibus terminal is the most suitable place for a public market.

As has been said, the departments which employ perhaps the largest number of people, such as the Department of Highways and Transport and the Public Works Department, (both of which admirably and efficiently render at the present time better service than has been in my time) deserve proper accommodation; and it is right that they should have it. This scheme has been decided upon at this time of the year, and the Government will appreciate at this stage of every year, that there is this dearth of unemployment; therefore, Government would appreciate that this is a good precedent which it is setting this year, and one which they cannot fail to follow every subsequent year. Government realised, that it must provide work at this time of the year for people from the rural parishes by initiating these particular schemes at this time of the year, when unemployment is most rampant.

9.40 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Before you put the question, Mr. Chairman. I should like to reply to a few points which have been made by some hon. members. First of all, the hon. junior member for St. Peter questioned the policy of the Government with regard to the purchase of land on which houses, (Aided Self-Help and otherwise) will be erected out of Labour Welfare (Housing) Loan Funds. I think I am correct in saying that for some time now, many hon members have expressed the view that for Aided Self-Help housing, loan funds should be extended; and not to be confined as they are now, to persons who work directly in the sugar industry, in view of the fact that almost every individual has something to do with the production and reaping of the crops. As a result of that expression of opinion, on the 14th April, 1953 this House passed the following Address:—

The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor

The House is of the opinion that owing to:—

(a) The rapid extension of building areas or sites in the parish of Christ Church; and also, in some of the rural parishes, and

(b) The unfortunate practice of victimisation yet adopted by certain Plantation Owners and/or Managers;

that the time has come when this Government should take practical steps by way of acquiring suitable lots of land in each parish (but more especially in the parish of Christ Church, by virtue of the density of the population) to rehabilitate displaced tenants.

2. This House respectfully suggests that this would be a means of providing security of tenure to numerous landless tenants; and that such Housing Schemes should be financed out of the Labour Welfare (Housing) Funds.

3. The House requests that Your Excellency take the necessary steps to implement this Address at the earliest possible date so as to relieve the hardships and inconveniences now being experienced by numerous old and impecunious residents of the various parishes and of the parish of Christ Church in particular.

That was the Address which this House passed, asking the Government to use Labour Welfare (Housing) Loan Funds for the purpose of purchasing land and so on, for the accommodation of the people of this island.

As hon. members know, the House has given the Governor-in-Executive Committee authority to administer these funds; and that Address is a request by this same House which has given the Governor-in-Executive Committee the authority to administer these funds. On the 5th May, 1953 a question was asked in this House as follows:

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

1. Is the Government aware that the owners of an area of land situate at St. Stephen's Hill and Hill, containing by admeasurement 21½ acres, have decided to sell out the same area in lots in the open market?

2. Will Government consider the advisability of purchasing this land for the purpose of (a) securing the tenancy of the 62 families now occupying the same and (b) further developing the area so as to accommodate some of the hundreds of applicants for whom no house spots are available at the Pine and Bay Estates."

Mr. ALLDER: What about Rosegate?

Hon. M. E. COX: Rosegate wants a representative! Since then, Mr. Chairman, this question has been engaging the attention of the Government. I do not want to say much, because I do not want to put the hon. junior member for St. Peter on the spot; but it is true to say, that when these negotiations took place during 1953, the hon. member was a member of the Executive Committee; and I want

to show hon. members that at no time was there any question of his objecting to anything like that. (Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: What! The Hon. Premier and I objected). It was agreed that this land should be purchased and the agreement was made on the 13th January. Since that time the land was purchased. As to that part of the matter I am not worried; what really worries me a bit, is the point made by the hon. junior member for St. Peter and also the hon. senior member for St. John, who actually intimated or rather insinuated that concentration was being made on the metropolitan parish, and nothing was being done for the rural parishes.

Before I go further, I should like to say this: when the Aided Self-Help Committee was formed I was made Chairman of that Committee. In late 1952, and it was functioning, (it does not function now as a Committee) but one of the first matters which was put up at the time, was this question of Aided Self-Help housing. It was suggested that the first scheme should be started at the Bay Estate; but in view of the fact that people had shown an interest in erecting these houses, there and then I said that it would be far better in my opinion to start the scheme in St. Lucy, where we have already purchased land, and where there was a parish for which nothing in the way of housing had been done. We did start there, although it was pointed out at the time, that Aided Self-Help Housing schemes must not be started in a parish just because housing is lacking in that parish; but that it should be started in places where people were interested in the scheme if you want it to be successful.

9.50 p.m.

Now this is what happened during that time. I suggested to the Manager-Secretary of the Housing Board to get in touch with the representatives of the various parishes, so as to get around and see whether they could select some sites in the parishes for the purposes of erecting these Aided Self-Help houses. They went to a good few sites, such as Ellerton, the Mount Plantation, Walkers, Warrens, the Pool, Colleton, Clifton Hall, Silver Sands, Silver Hill, Lowthers and a good number of places) where investigations were made for purchasing sites to erect these houses.

I have told some members already that with the exception of two sites in Christ Church, no other plantation owner has shown any willingness to have to pay £500 per acre. The Manager-Secretary has been negotiating; and the last thing that I remembered happening, was that I suggested that the Queen's Solicitor should approach the plantations owners again, and if they failed to sell the land, then we would have to resort to the Compulsory Land Acquisition Act. It is not true to say that we have concentrated more particularly on St. Michael because I represent St. Michael.

When the honourable junior member for St. Peter talks about catching votes, I would like to say here and now, that the only man who does not want votes is the man that does not want to come to the House of Assembly, or one that is going out. I am sure, that when it is taken into consideration that the parish of St. Michael has approximately one third of the population of Barbados, it is absolutely necessary to provide lands for the expansion of housing, and for the cleaning up of the slums in the City area.

Now the question was raised by the honourable junior member for the City about the Government not disclosing the price paid for the land, or even the information that the land was being purchased. I agree that that information could have been given to the House at the time; but I want to assure the honourable member, that there was nothing clandestine about it, nor was there any sinister motive behind the purchase of this land, or as regards the purchase of the property in Country Road. The purchase price was $50,222. It was sold at £500 per acre.

As some honourable member have pressed for a liberalization of the Labour Welfare Fund, the Government felt that it was reasonable to do what it did; and not only did we purchase a site in St. Michael, but we purchased one in Christ Church out of the Labour Welfare Fund. And there are two Aided Self-help schemes going on up there now; and we intend to purchase sites throughout the island out of the Labour Welfare Fund for the purpose of erecting houses. I am sure that members will agree that at least in the rural districts, the majority of workers are sugar workers. It is not a question of giving free land to individuals who do not qualify under the Labour Welfare Fund. An individual who erects a house on a plot of land, has still got to pay land rent.

Now sir, I agree with the honourable junior member for St. John who made the point that there should be some legislation governing the policy of purchasing land throughout the island. I want to assure him that that is a pet subject of mine. For many years, I have felt that land in Barbados has been too expensive. The price of land jumped up because of the fact that the population is increasing year by year, and the space is not increasing; and therefore more people are forced to live on the same amount of land. Landlords knowing this, have taken advantage of the situation, and poor people are charged exorbitant prices for land. I want to assure the honourable member that I have been pressing for that for some time. It will be remembered that there was an amendment to the Public Health Bill, and I said during that time that it was not good enough and that there should be some governing policy in the purchase of land. Until we get that done, people will be at the mercy of unscrupulous real estate agents.

As regards the question of the Highways and Transport Department and the erection of a market on the site, the honourable senior member for the City referred to a letter which appeared in the Press. I would like him to know that before that letter was written, the Minister of Agriculture, the Premier, and myself along with the Minister of Social Services, got in touch with the Director of Highways and Transport, and made some investigations. After looking at some sites, we felt that the Pine would be an admirable place to remove the Department of Highways and Transport and the Public Works Department to, so that we can put a market on the site vacated by the Highways and Transport Department. As the honourable senior member for St. Lucy has said, there is the bus stand there and people could get out of the buses and conveniently go to the market.

10.00 p.m.

That is not an idea from any member of the community; although it is the kind of thing on which members of the community sometimes do really make some valuable suggestions, and which suggestions are accepted and worked upon.

With regard to the question of the Central Foundry site and what we are prepared to do with it, (the point was raised by the honourable junior member for the City) we have not yet taken a decision on it. As honourable members know, there was some drilling done there by the Gulf Oil Co., and those borings were not unsatisfactory, nor were as conclusive as we had hoped; but it did appear, that to erect a building of three or four storeys as was suggested by the honourable junior member

for the City, would be a very expensive item, because it seems as if you would have to put almost as much structure into the ground as you would have to put on top. The Director of Public Works has also made a survey of this area; and as you know, there are plans for a two-span bridge which would carry four lanes of traffic comprised of cycle tracks and side walks between the Central Foundry and the Old Bridge. It is also expected that some of the open space now occupied as a car park, would have to be taken up to widen the road on that side. As I have said, the borings were not conclusive; and Government cannot really decide at present what will be done. I think the honourable junior member for the City made an admirable suggestion when he said, that it should remain as an open site; because there is at present no open sites in the City. If the site were to remain open and beautified, I think the inhabitants of the island would be very pleased with it.

The honourable senior member for the City also referred to cheap land in Church Village for sale; and which is suitable land to erect buildings. I will like to tell him, that before the Government considered the question of erecting a market on the present site of the Highways and Transport Department, members of the Government investigated the selling of that land; and he would be surprised to know that it is not as cheap as he thinks it is. The owners have asked something like $160,000, for that site.

In the Addendum to this Resolution, it is pointed out that some houses are now being removed form overcrowded areas to Cave Hill, and that it is necessary to construct roads there. I am afraid I cannot answer the question of how many houses are removed to that spot, and from where the houses are removed. As everybody knows, the Manager-Secretary of the Housing Board is an officer who is very honest and conscientious, and he is the person that put up this Note. I did not question him on it. I took it in good faith. Further I must say, that he is considered as a very efficient and up-to-date officer by the Government; therefore, as I have said, I had no reason to question whether that statement is correct or not. Since the point has been raised by the honourable senior member for the City I shall go into it, and at a future date I will give him the information.

Now, the honourable junior member for the City also asked about plans, and intimated that there is something fishy in this House not receiving them. Only to-day I tried to get those plans from the Director of Public Works, because I know that the House would like to see them; and because I know it is customary for us when we are coming to the House about the construction of a building, to bring along the plan. I want to assure the honourable member that the absence of the plans to what is to be done, is nothing purposely done. I did try to get those plans from the Director of Public Works to-day, and he told me that they were not ready; he had a sketch of them and he was working on them at present. That is the gospel truth. He has not finished the plans for the new buildings for the Department of Highways and Transport, nor the plans for the Ministerial Building; but as soon as they are finished, I will promise the honourable members to bring them in and let the House see them.

Now, the same hon. member wanted to know if the fifty sites were really prepared. There again, I must tell him I have not checked on it. I believe Mr. Chairman, that they have been prepared; and that the fifty houses are sited on them. Again, I will promise the honourable member to check on the matter. However, the honourable member must know that there is quite a lot of work which a Minister has to do. Some people and even some honourable members feel, that they have nothing to do; but these people will be surprised to know how much work we have to do. Sometimes Ministers have to carry home files and peruse them when other honourable members are asleep. Truly, we do not always have the time to run around to see that everything is done.

10.10 p.m.

Now a mistake has been made by the hon. senior member for St. George who said that these houses which were removed nad been pushed to Cave Hill. We are hoping to site some of these houses at the Bay Estate and others at the Pine. In the case of the site of the new fire station, we had to remove some houses aback of the land there and put them at the Bay Estate, in order to get the area developed as we wanted it developed; and the expenses were charged against the same item.

The hon. senior member for St. Lucy has appreciated the principle which has been adopted in providing work for people at this time of the year. I want to thank the hon. member very much for the kind remarks which he has made, and for the support which he has given to this idea. I want to say here and now, that this is nothing which has been done for the sake of any cheap popularity, or vote-catching, or anything like that. As I pointed out when I introduced this Resolution, quite a number of people have been going around to the Ministers and asking for help over this period. We got in touch with the Director of Public Works who did not feel that he could start any works now because of inadequate staff, and I suggested to him that he should have some assistance. That is why one saw an advertisement in the Press calling for an additional engineer.

I should like to assure the hon. senior member for St. Lucy that as long as I have anything to do with this matter, I shall always try to get some sort of capital works started around these months, in order to provide work for people.

In so far as the recruitment of labour is concerned, I want to assure the hon. member that I have absolutely nothing to do with that matter. There is no man who can say that I have tried to get work for him or for anybody else. I do not go in for that. I have told everybody that the Employment Agency is there and they can register their names. It has been suggested that everybody should be recruited from the Employment Agency; but I have been told that it is not always in the interest of the Department to recruit all its labour force from the Employment Agency, because it will not get the best workers from there. In so far as casual or unskilled labour is concerned, that can be recruited easily and successfully through the Employment Agency. I am hoping that people from St. Lucy and even people from St. John will be able to get work under this set-up. I would like to tell this Committee, that you have in the Public Works Department in Bridgetown, people who own motor lorries from St. John, St. Philip and other parishes; and it will be seen that there is no question whatever, of anybody trying to get work for people in any particular area. Although we have laid it down as a principle that wherever work is done in rural parishes workers are employed in those parishes, yet workers are also recruited from other parishes. The question of the percentage of workmen being recruited from the rural parishes does not arise.

I think I have answered all the questions which have been asked. I want to assure hon. members, that in putting forward this Resolution, the Govern-

ment has absolutely no intention of erecting any Parliament Buildings at this stage. This Resolution is not intended for that purpose. We come to the House and ask hon. members to vote money for the erection of Ministerial offices, and the site selected for the erection of these buildings does not in any way interrupt the working of the Bay Street Boys' School; because, it is really behind the wall on the Beckles Hill area. There is no question of any Royalty coming here in February, as was stated by the hon. senior member for St. George, and laying the corner stone of any building.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I did not say that. I said I understood that some distinguished personage from abroad is going to lay the corner-stone of the Building. I did not say anything about Royalty doing that. The hon. member must have had that on his conscience.

10.20 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: This building, Mr. Chairman, is for Ministerial Offices. Hon. members will see the plans. I promise that. The Parliament Buildings do not arise at this stage, because we have not planned for them. We cannot, like some members, fool people and fool the House. We have to come here with the truth. We account ourselves responsible people in the community. We represent the people faithfully and well at all times, and we can put the truth before them.

Before I sit down, in order not to cause any confusion relative to the point which I made about the hon. junior member for St. Peter being a member of the Executive, I will say, that it is a fact that these things are more or less secret, and I would not be in a position to read out what took place. I merely want to say, that the hon. member was a member of the Executive up to the 30th January, 1954.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The Hon. Minister has just said that they come here with the truth, and do not, like other members, fool the people. Like the Pharisees, he is thanking God that they are not as other men are. There are two points that I made relative to the Resolution; one was the purchase of the site at Cave Hill. I said that I did not agree with the principle of acquiring land out of Labour Welfare Funds for that purpose; that it should be acquired for people engaged in the Sugar Industry. That is our policy. If the Hon. Minister does not know that, I will show him by chapter and verse.

The other point was the question of the Central Foundry site. In attempting to score a point, what did the Hon. Minister say? Even the Premier and the Leader of the House had to look at him. He said that I was a member of the Executive when this matter came before the Executive, and that I made no objection. I am going to deal with that later.

I do not want to disclose any decision or discussion that took place in Executive Committee when I was a member. I have gone so far in my private life as to undertake to burn all Executive papers in my possession; so that no one would get a chance of seeing what took place in Executive Committee. That is what I have done; although, I sometimes pass and see public documents lying in Ministers 'cars near Restaurants in the City. That is only in passing.

I will deal with the point made by the Hon. Minister about an Address being passed by this House Let us be clear about it. The hon. senior member for Christ Church introduced an Address which was passed, dealing with the question of land, after the land at Dover was sold out; because, the hon. member for Christ Church was worried about his constituents being ejected. The hon. junior member for St. Michael also asked a question in this House about Knights Land. The hon. senior member for St. John brought in an Address asking Government to buy Rosegate. I was a member of the Executive Committee then, and the four of us said we did not agree with that. Because the House passed an Address asking the Government to buy Rosegate, were we obliged to take public funds and buy it? It is common knowledge that an Address passed by Parliament does not bind a Government to carry out the intentions of the Address. If Government could be bound that way, no Government could function under those circumstances.

Now I want to say what is our Party policy. On page 8 of our Manifesto, dealing with Agriculture, Food, and Industry, we see that the Party is preparing legislation to provide for security of tenure for Agricultural Labourers. The hon. junior member for St. George in the last session also introduced an Address dealing with security of tenure. We do not have to act upon any Address; security of tenure is part of our policy, as I have just quoted.

In our Manifesto we also said that over 2,000 sugar workers had received loans; and that the Party had fought and succeeded in giving legislative effect to the proposals under the Domestic Sugar Agreement, whereby over $1,000,000 would be allocated to the Labour Welfare Fund for a year's crop. We said that while the Electors Association were on political platforms advocating the giving away of money from this fund, they had in the Assembly, opposed the proposal whereby that much needed money could be added. The Manifesto went on to say, that the Party would take steps to build up a revolving fund which would assist workers and peasants, not only in obtaining proper homes and producing more food, but would early in the New Year provide a Housing Loan Fund for all Civil Servants. The Manifesto added, that the Party had already in this year's Estimates provided for loans to artisans and others who were not eligible for borrowing money from existing funds.

There was no question of any Government acquiring land under the Labour Welfare Fund for general workers. In addition to that, the Hon. Minister of Housing made a statement in the House on the Government's Housing policy on the 26th July, 1954. It dealt with loan funds for Housing; and contained the following figures: Civil Servants, $500,000; General Workers, $750,000; Aided Self-Help Housing, $500,000; Labour Welfare Fund, for Sugar Industry Workers, $3,000,000. Further, when I ask the Hon. Minister questions on that, he said there was no intention of deviating from what is the normal practice.

Today, when I raised this question about the Labour Welfare Fund, I said that the whole intention had always been clear to members of the Party. We said we would require land for Sugar Workers under this fund. The idea of the Labour Welfare Fund was not to acquire land for all and sundry. That was our original policy. The Hon. Minister cannot come and say, that because an Address was passed or because a question was asked, therefore the Government must act in a certain way. That only happens when there is no Party system.

10.30 p.m.

If I may deal with the specific point, (I am going to make no apology whether Government brings out every file or not; let them accuse me of wasting time) I will say any man who can be so calculated in making that statement without any disregard for the truth——

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, what does the honourable member mean by saying "without any disregard for the truth." I said, that the mem-

ber was a member of the Executive Committee up to the 31st January, 1954.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Oh, No! Mr. Chairman, he never said such a thing. To quote him, he said, "the honourable member was a member of the Executive Committee when this matter came before the Executive, and he never objected." His whole idea was to portray to this House of Assembly and to the general public, the feeling, here it is, he is objecting to the purchase of this land today, but when he was a member of the Executive he did not object to it. Sir, I objected to the buying of Cave Hill from the very beginning. The Hon. Premier was not here. I know the Hon. Premier was lukewarm about the idea; and as a matter of fact he never decided on that matter at all.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I rise on a point of Order, Mr. Chairman. I am appealing to the honourable member who is now speaking, to see that you cannot show any sense of responsibility when you go up to Government House and kiss the Book to keep Executive secrets, and then you come out and trot them out. Whoever does that is wrong.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I agree with the Hon. Premier, Mr. Chairman, I would be the last man to do that. But, it is not fair for the Hon. Minister of Communications to get up in this Assembly and say what he did, when I made no reference to any Executive Committee matter. If I were as ignorant as he, I could get up and express my views. I was a member of the Executive and that is one thing which I ever avoided. I have in my short lifetime, read something about Parliamentary and Constitutional Government, and I would never mention anything that was done in the Executive. The Hon. Minister of Communications in this debate tried to bring out an Executive Committee secret on the basis that I agreed to something in Executive Committee. In these issues I take a greater sense of responsibility than any other honourable member. I can say however, that the Hon. Premier was sick when I left here. I never attended an Executive Committee meeting without the Hon. Premier more than on two occasions this year. The Hon. Minister of Communications is now suggesting that, when he knows the truth of the matter. Mr. Chairman, I would never have said anything about this matter at all; but it is a dangerous thing when you have men who want to dishonour secrets. I am sorry about it. The Hon. Premier said a man with any sense of responsibility would not go to Government House and kiss the Book to keep Executive Committee secrets, and then come back and trot them out; but he knows the damage that a statement like that (which the Hon. Minister of Communications made) can do. The Hon. Minister of Communications said what he did, more than once. His whole idea was to impress this House and the public, that I agreed to something done in Executive Committee but was objecting to it here. I would not prolong this argument any longer, but it does show the depth to which people would sink in order to put over a debating point. If members are in a fight, they should fight cleanly. That suggestion by the Hon. Minister of Communications is most dishonourable. I cannot find adjectives in the appropriate parliamentary language to describe his conduct.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded in each case by Hon. M. E. Cox the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

BILL TO AMEND INTERPLEADERS ACT 1891

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: second reading of a Bill to amend the Interpleaders Act, 1891, with reference to claims in respect of good and chattels taken in execution.

Hon. G. H. Adams: Mr. Speaker, I think honourable members have had this Bill for some time. The objects and reasons to it are very clearly set out. Every honourable member knows, whether he is associated with the courts or not, that the Interpleader system which we have is an absolute farce. It is true to say that it makes work for Lawyers; but certainly, it lends itself to debtors defrauding creditors. You do feel sympathy for the debtor who honestly tries to pay his debts, although he cannot afford to do so; but it can be said, that the Act itself lends to debtors defrauding creditors.

It is therefore felt that the law should be brought up-to-date. The Interpleader Act of this colony is a very old one. I suppose honourable members are acquainted with a joke in connection with it, which was made years ago. I suppose honourable members have heard of a certain man who used to file Interpleader claims with the persons whose names and addresses were from Westbury Road. He used to take the name off a tombstone and put it down as a claimant for the house or property levied on. That is in passing. As I have said, the Interpleader Act has been a good source of income for Barristers; but it has helped debtors to get away with murder. It is about time that Creditors get a look in too. I am not going to say more. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture has studied this Bill thoroughly, and he is acquainted with the ways of the Court; therefore, I am leaving it to him to second the motion and to deal with the points which honourable members may put before the House. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

10.40 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: In seconding the motion for the second reading of this Bill, I would just like to add that the object of these amendments is to put a stop to fictitious claims, and to prevent in certain extreme cases even dead men from filing claims, as has been the practice in the past. The work of the Provost Marshal's office and of the Courts is seriously impeded through the lodgement of fictitious claims whenever executions are levied against chattels. This is the way which is laid down of either defeating, defrauding or delaying creditors.

This Bill is one of a series of Bills designed to remedy this state af affairs, and it seeks to give proper consideration to the claims of both creditors and legitimate claimants. Under the proposed amendments, and additions to the Interpleader Act 1891, claims by third parties to goods taken in execution must be lodged before the date originally fixed for the sale of the goods; and the claims must be lodged in Court by written notice giving details and address for service. Service on the claimant may be by registered letter addressed to the address for service.

The Court will take notice of equitable interest under Clause 10C and under Clause 10D. When there is a claim by a third person the officer charged with the Execution must take possession of the goods or chattels, and not allow the judgment debtor to retain possession.

Provision is made under Clause 10 E for lawful interest to run on the judgment debt, from the date of lodging the claim or from the date when leave was granted to lodge the same. Under Clause 10 F provision is made for a person in the Island to file a claim on behalf of an absent claimant, by filing an affidavit sworn to by himself deposing to the fact in support of such claim, and to the fact that the person entitled to make such claim is out of the Island. That matter will be referred to the Court of Common Pleas if there is reasonable evidence to support the claim.

Under Clause 10 G the Court has power to make the necessary order including orders as to costs as may be just and reasonable; and may order the subject of the suit to be sold. The fee payable to the proper officer of the Court is $2 in each case of (1) filing a claim (2) application for leave and (3) filing an affidavit.

Those are the main amendments to the Act. I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for the second reading of this Bill.

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. G. H. ADAMS, 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.

The three Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

BILL TO AMEND THE PROVOST MARSHAL'S ACT

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Honourable Premier: To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Provost Marshal's Act, 1904 in respect of the law relating to property taken in execution and incidental matters.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is consequential on the passing of the Bill to amend the Interpleader Act 1891. Although some hon. members may be laymen, I do not think they need to be told that when there is an Interpleader Claim affecting land, the Provost Marshal sees after the sale of it and so on. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, 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.

The eight Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

On motions of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

10.50 p.m.

BILL TO AMEND DISTRICT AUCTIONEERS ACT

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the second reading of the Bill to amend the District Auctioneers Act.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend the District Auctioneers Act, 1904, in respect of distraint or levy on an estate, be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that. In doing so, I would like to say that the main amendment is to Section 9 of the principal Act. As is stated in the objects and reasons, the Bill seeks to make certain amendments to the District Auctioneers Act, 1904. It is sought to amend section 9 of that Act, which gives a judgment debtor the right to elect to remain in the possession of personal property levied on in execution until the time of sale. As a result of an amendment to the Interpleader Act, 1891, to be made by the Interpleader (Amendment) Act, 1954, section 10D of the Interpleader Act, 1891, makes the right to elect subject to the duty of the officer charged with the execution, to take possession of such property where there is a rival claim. Clearly, in the case of conflicting claims, the property should be in legal custody. This amendment seeks to make it clear that the right of the judgment debtor to elect to remain in possession, is only where there are no rival claims.

The question that the Bill be now read a second time was put and agreed to.

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS 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.

The Five Clauses of the Bill were called and agreed to.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA the Bill was read a third time and passed and the title was called and agreed to.

BILL TO AMEND CHATTEL BUILDINGS SECURITY ACT

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Chattel Buildings Security Act.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the last of these allied bills is one to amend the Chattel Buildings Security Act, 1913, by making provision for claims in respect of buildings, mortgaged in accordance with that Act.

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

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

The question was put and agreed to.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded by Hon. R. G. MAPP the CHAIRMAN reported the

passing of the Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA the Bill was read a third time and passed and the title was called and agreed to.

RESOLUTION TO ACQUIRE LAND AT JESSAMY LANE

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, — I am asking leave to take Order No. 9 as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection leave was granted.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Jessamy Lane.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I think that hon. members may remember that when we were discussing the Fire Brigade proposals, it became evident that we were exchanging some land belonging to the Governor-in-Executive Committee for another piece of land. In consideration of the fact that we were getting more than we were giving, we agreed to do certain things for Caribbean Theatres Limited. To do that, it was necessary to purchase certain plots of land—Hence this Resolution.
11.00 p.m.

This Resolution seeks the approval of the House in the compulsory acquisition by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of all that certain parcel of land situated in Jessamy Lane and Golden Square, in the City of Bridgetown, containing by admeasurement 2,300 square feet as has been set out in the Resolution. It is said that the owners are Maude Burrowes and Inez Burrowes, but they do not reside in Barbados.

The Addendum points out that the Queen's Solicitor advertised in June last inviting the owner or owners of the land in question to communicate with him; but the advertisement brought no response. In order therefore that the construction of the New Fire Station shall not be held up, it is proposed to acquire the land under the Land Acquisition Act, 1949, so that possession by the Government can be established as soon as possible.

No reply having been received, it is necessary to make this provision under the Land Acquisition Act, 1949. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move—

LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO MR. F. L. WALCOTT

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Before you move the adjournment, I would just like to take the opportunity to ask leave of absence for three weeks for myself, as from next Tuesday.

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

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next 23rd November, 1954, at three o'clock p.m.

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

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday next at three o'clock p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
11.10 p.m.