

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1954—55

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 25th January, 1955.

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

PRESENT:

His Honour K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (Speaker), Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M. (*Minister of Social Services*); Mr. W. A. CRAWFORD, His Honour 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.; Mr. F. C. GODDARD (*Leader of the Opposition*); Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. J. A. HAYNES, B.A., Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN; Mrs. E. E. BOURNE; and Mr. J. C. TUDOR, M.A.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meeting of the 11th January, 1955, have been printed and circulated among honourable members, and unless there be any objections the Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I agree, subject to a correction on page three changing the amount appearing as \$23,760 to \$23,752.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Clerk will make the necessary correction.

The Minutes as amended were taken as read and were confirmed.

DOCUMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Financial Report of the Accountant General of the Colony for the month of December, last year.

PAPERS LAID

The following Papers were laid by command of His Excellency the Governor:—

Mr. Alder entered the House and took his seat.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Message No. 1/1955 from His Excellency the Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly submitting a list of Acts assented to in the name and on behalf of Her Majesty The Queen.

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

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to submit for the information of the Honourable the House of Assembly the Report of the Commissioner appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee to enquire into the supervision, management and control exercised by the Board of Guardians of the parish of St. Andrew for the year, 1953-54, in connection with the Almshouse of the parish and the general conditions existing at the Almshouse during that year.

2. The comments of the St. Andrew's Parochial Authorities on the Report have been invited, and as soon as these comments have been received, consideration will be given as to what action is to be taken.

R. D. H. ARUNDELL,
Governor.

Government House,

Barbados.

25th January, 1955.

(M.P. 6631 S.1)

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Message No. 2/1955 from His Excellency the Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly submitting the Report of the Commissioner appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee to enquire into the supervision, management and control of the St. Andrew's Almshouse.

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

MESSAGE NO. 1/1955.

The Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable House of Assembly that the following Acts have been assented to in the name and on behalf of Her Majesty the Queen:—

The Harewood Trustees (Sale of Land to Executive Committee) Act, 1954. (1954-37).
 The Saint George's Parish (Barbados) Loan Act, 1954 (1954-38).
 The Rum Duty (Amendment) Act, 1954 (1954-39).
 The Merchandise Marks (Amendment) Act, 1954 (1954-40).
 The Estate and Succession Duties (Amendment) Act, 1954 (1954-41).
 The Customs Tariff (Amendment) Act, 1954 (1954-42).
 The Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) (Amendment) Act, 1954 (1954-43).
 The Sugar and Fancy Molasses Production and Export Control (Amendment) Act, 1954 (1954-44).
 The Wesleyan Property (No. 50 Roebuck Street) Act, 1954 (1954-45).
 The Department of Highways and Transport (Amendment) Act, 1954 (1954-46).
 The Sugar Industry (Labour Welfare) (Special Levy) (Amendment) Act, 1954 (1954-47).
 The Fishing Industry (Amendment) Act, 1954 (1954-48).
 The Income Tax (Amendment) No. 2 Act, 1954 (1954-49).
 The Estate and Succession Duties (Amendment) (No. 2) Act, 1954 (1954-50).
 The Local Government Act, 1954 (1954-51).
 The Public Health Act, 1954 (1954-52).
 The Public Assistance Act, 1954 (1954-52).
 The Public Assistance Act, 1954 (1954-53).
 The Special Registration of Voters (Validation of Subsequent Elections) Act, 1954 (1954-54).
 The Mortimer Hall Pension Act, 1954 (1954-55).
 The Civil Establishment (Amendment) Act, 1954 (1954-56).
 The Post Office (Amendment) Act, 1954 (1954-57).
 The Chaplains and Printing Committee (Amendment) Act, 1954 (1954-58).
 The Harbour and Shipping Master (Amendment) Act, 1954 (1954-59).
 The Vestries Extension Act, 1954 (1954-60).
 The Interpleader (Amendment) Act, 1954 (1954-61).
 The Provost Marshal (Amendment) Act, 1954 (1954-62).
 The District Auctioneers (Amendment) Act, 1954 (1954-63).
 The Chattel Buildings Security (Amendment) Act, 1954 (1954-64).
 The Dental Registration (Amendment) Act, 1954 (1954-65).
 The Seawell Airport (Amendment) Act, 1954 (1954-66).

R. D. H. ARUNDELL,
 Governor.

Government House,
 Barbados.
 18th January, 1955.

Hon. M. E. COX: Statement of Post Office Advances for payment of Money Orders to 30th September and 31st October, 1954.

Mr. Crawford entered the House and took his seat.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Resolution to approve the salaries payable to House Officers at the General Hospital.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$42,930 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1954-55, Part I, Current, as shown in Supplementary Estimate 1954-55 No. 39 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS (for Hon. R. G. MAPP):—Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921.

Hon. M. E. COX: Bill to amend the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with the Money Resolutions of which notice has been given today.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Private Members' Notices were given as follows:—

Mr. CRAWFORD:

*The House Of Assembly
 To*

His Excellency The Governor

The House are of the considered opinion that in order

- (a) to put B.W.I. capital to the most effective use within the area;
- (b) to permit economic responsibility to keep the pace with political responsibility;
- (c) to ensure that the profits derived from enterprises in the area remain, as far as possible, to assist in the agricultural and industrial development of the area, and that the proceeds of locally-produced commodities be used to promote credit for the area rather than to build up international credit for other countries,

that the Government should recommend to the B.W.I. Regional Economic Committee the necessity for the establishment of a B.W.I. State Bank with branches in the individual colonies.

2. The House would emphasize, in so far as Barbados is concerned, the advantages of having the funds of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank, the Peasants Loan Bank, Sugar Funds, Housing Funds, and indeed, all central and local government funds operated by a State Bank and respectfully request that Your Excellency will take the necessary steps, at the earliest date possible, to give effect to the recommendations herein contained.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Of the following Address:—

*The House Of Assembly
 To*

His Excellency The Governor

The House desires to draw to Your Excellency's attention that it is their conviction true problems of population pressure and unemployment make a more dynamic approach to the economic development of the country imperative, and respectfully request that appropriate action be taken in this respect in the minimum delay.

2. The House also desire that steps be taken to investigate the possibilities of:—

- (a) establishment of a sugar refinery for Barbados.
- (b) considerable expansion in the textile, garment and shoe-manufacturing industries and would point out that there is reportedly, a large amount of machinery for these purposes, lying idle in Manchester, Lancashire and elsewhere in the United Kingdom.

3. The House is of the further opinion that her services of the Colonial Development Corporation, the World Bank Professor W. Arthur Lewis, Ph.D., of the faculty of Manchester University, and Dr. Eric Williams of the Caribbean Commission, should be solicited for the purpose, in conjunction with a local Development Committee, of preparing a basic programme of Agricultural and industrial development for the Colony.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

Re Vacant Post of Messenger and Library Attendant

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, as the senior member for the Select Committee appointed to report on the applicants for the vacant post of Messenger and Library Attendant of the House of Assembly, I beg to present the report of the Committee.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, the Bill to amend the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, the Bill to amend the Motor Vehicle and Road Traffic Act, 1937, was read a first time.

Mr. Holder entered the House and took his seat.

STATEMENT BY HON. M. E. COX

Re Spa Road, St. Joseph

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I intimated to Your Honour earlier today, that I had a statement to make in connection with the criticisms which were levelled against the Government on Tuesday fortnight relative to the construction of the Spa Road in St. Joseph. The Statement reads as follows:—

“On the 21st January, 1953, at the request of the Highway Commissioners of the parish of St. Joseph the then Acting Governor, Hon. R. N. Turner, Hon. M. E. Cox, M.C.P., member of the Executive in charge of roads and the then Acting Director of Highways and Transport, Mr. D. M. Thomas paid a visit to St. Joseph and met Mr. Allan Cox, Mr. L. L. Gill, who was then Chairman of the Highway Commissioners and Mr. James A. Mapp, Road Inspector of St. Joseph, who accompanied us to the Ridge Road, Parks Road, Cane Garden, Frizers Road and Spa Road.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are making that a Document of the House?

Hon. M. E. COX: Yes sir.

“The Commissioners stressed the need for funds to put these roads in proper condition. As a result a Resolution was introduced in the House of Assembly on the 27th January, 1953, for the sum of \$6,488 to

repair these roads. This Resolution was subsequently passed.

At a meeting of the Highway Commissioners of the Parish of St. Joseph on the 16th March, 1954, a petition was introduced by Mr. J. A. Haynes as follows:

BARBADOS:

To the Commissioners of Highways of the Parish of St. Joseph.

The Humble petition of the undersigned Rate-payers of the Parish of St. Joseph sheweth.

1. That your Petitioners are residents and land owners of the district known as the Spa in the said Parish of St. Joseph.

2. That the road leading in to the said district is in a serious state of disrepair, and is impassable in so far that the residents are unable to get to Church or to Market.

3. That exceptionally great hardship is experienced during the reaping of the crop, as is presently the case.

Your Petitioners therefore Humbly Pray that your Board may see fit to effect repairs to the said roads without any undue delay so as to relieve the hardships at present being experienced and your Petitioners will ever pray.

Rosita Cools	Estina Sobers
Mary Ward	Solomon Lowe
Benjamin Bovell	Rose Sealy
Cyril A. Lewis	Stephen Seales
Edwin Maynard	Priscilla Carrington

The Highway Inspector was instructed to forward these roads to Government including The Spa; Brewsters Tenantry Road, Chimborazo; Bowling Alley and Surinam.

I should mention at this stage that all the other roads had already been repaired, and the only one outstanding was the the Spa Road.

On the 16th April, 1953, the Highway Commissioners asked the Government to advance funds for the construction of Spa Road as a tenantry road. This request was not granted in view of the fact that the Spa Road did not qualify as a tenantry road in accordance with the interpretation given by the then Attorney General, Mr. Whyatt.

At another meeting on the 28th April, 1953, the Director sent a letter to the Board asking to submit priority list of tenantry roads for reconstruction in the year 1953-54. The Inspector reported that he had already sent in the list for the same roads. The Spa, Brewsters Road, Bowling Alley and Surinam.

On the 11th of May an inspection was carried out with the Director of Highways and Transport, and his Assistant Mr. Thomas along with the Commissioners and it was agreed that the amount to be allocated the Commissioners for carrying out road construction would be \$17,000 for Parish Roads and \$7,000 for tenantry roads.

Information was also received from the Department of Highways and Transport. It is as follows:—

“The Spa Road, St. Joseph, is an alternative route, bound up with the trans-island communications problem, and forms part of the scheme to improve the communications between Bruce Vale, St. Andrew district and generally in the area.

“In addition, it is intended, in due course, to improve Cattlewash Frizers to Mellows Hill, to Melvin Hill, Highway 3A. This programme of road networks and improvements will ultimately link up the future East Coast Road. It will be observed that the schemes, as a whole, will finally be an important link providing alternatives to the road settlement problems in Spring Vale and Ridge Roads.

In the case of the present works, the cane traffic will ultimately gravitate down into the Bruce Vale area, and remove the necessity of haulage against the existing extraordinary steep gradients in the area. The present works are only the initial stages of much more works to come, and is far removed from the Parochial aspect, as these schemes have inter-communication values, spreading beyond the area of the parish.

It appears to me that the problem revolves round the long term policy or the short term policy. In this matter, I have advised the Government to accept, the long term policy will ultimately provide greater facilities for the residents of the Parish, and serve the trans-island communications as well."

Messrs. Brancker and Bryan came into the House and took their seats.

I should like to read from the file something which will further satisfy honourable members as to what is going on.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: On a point of Order. I do not think that honourable member is allowed to do that; because, that would be further argument of that Statement on which we are not allowed to comment. The honourable member should not be allowed to read from the file.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am backing up the Statement by something from the file.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that the Rules of the House preclude that from being done.

Mr. LEWIS: I should like to say that reference to our Rules will show, that a Statement of the kind which the Hon. Minister is making is a personal statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is making a Statement on behalf of the Government; he is making a Statement in his right as a Minister. Otherwise, he would not have been able to make the Statement.

Mr. LEWIS: Is a Statement by a Minister debatable?

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not debatable. The Hon. Minister may proceed.

Hon. M. E. COX: It was on the 10th December, 1952—

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The Hon. Minister cannot do that.

Hon. M. E. COX: The honourable member cannot say what I must do.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister must address the Chair. He should not think of addressing any other person. Doing that brings a whole lot of trouble. If the Hon. Minister is reading from any document which he does not think it expedient to make the property of this House, he must desist from doing that. I have no ruling to make on this matter; I have only now to guard the Rules of the House and defend them.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Is Your Honour making a Rule or general application?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am citing Rules of this Chamber and the ancient rules and practices. I am defending them most profoundly.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: With the greatest possible respect to Your Honour, I will say that it would be impossible to do any Government business with or without Ministerial Status, if Ministers were to be prevented from making reference to the files in making statements; because if they read two lines from the files, it would be necessary to make the portion which they read as Documents of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Communications had my permission to make a Statement on behalf of the Government, and he was on the way in making that Statement. The Hon. Minister knows the Rules of the House; and if he intended to cite

any document he should have had copies of the Documents produced so that one of them could be made the property of the House. Whatsoever is read in this House can be claimed to be the property of the House; and when the Hon. Premier talks about the so rigid adherence to the Rules of the House, that will always happen as long as I am the Speaker of the Chamber.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, you have already ruled that a Statement made by members of the Government cannot be debated in this House; therefore, I take it that if this Statement cannot be debated, no supported Statement to a Statement should be allowed to be read, unless it is a prepared Statement. Because, what the Hon. Minister proposes to do is not to place the supporting Statement before the House, but to read from the files something supporting this Statement which he has prepared. If he is allowed to read something from the files, it should be the subject of debate at some time. I take it that that would not be permissible because it has not been put in as a document of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister has been allowed to make a Statement. Now he knows it is my ruling that he cannot read from a document unless he makes it a document of the House. He can postpone the making of the Statement and accommodate the House with copies of the supporting document. That might satisfy the House; unless the Hon. Minister is prepared to do that, he should desist from making this Statement. I hope the Hon. Minister is listening to what I am saying, and that his attention is not taken up otherwise. I am perfectly willing to give him permission to carry on the making of that Statement, provided that he is willing to accommodate the House by making copies of the document from which he might be reading and also to make it a document of the House. I do not think the honourable member should spoil the Statement by interjecting points of order which have already been settled. 3.45 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: I take it sir, that honourable members want to know the facts of the case. I did not know that honourable members would ask for the facts and then try to stifle the giving of those facts. On the 16th April, 1953, the Highways Commissioners of St. Joseph wrote and asked that this road along with other roads should be repaired. The other roads which I mentioned earlier are all repaired, and this is the only road that has not been repaired; and that is, as I said, due to the fact that it was not eligible under the rules laid down which I shall read at a later stage. I am referring to a ruling given by Mr. Whyatt in 1950.

As regards the alleged inconsistency of the policy of the Minister which was mentioned by the honourable senior member for St. John re the refusal of the Minister to allow the Highway Commissioners of St. John to continue the reconstruction of Welch Road to Pot House Road, this road continues for a distance of 1,117ft by approximately 14ft. wide through the estate of a Mr. Hinkson, who owns approximately 90 acres of land on both sides of the road. There are no houses on either side of the road.

Under a ruling given by the Hon. Attorney General this road does not qualify, and therefore cannot be repaired out of tenantry road funds. The Highway Commissioners were advised to repair this road out of parish road funds which is the appropriate Head under which it should be repaired.

I am prepared to leave this Statement with the House. This arose Mr. Speaker, as a result of a dispute as to what constituted a tenantry road and

a road eligible to be repaired out of Government funds.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of Order. The Hon. Minister is saying, that "this arose out of a dispute." There is nothing being debated in the House. The Minister has been called upon to make a Statement. The words, "This arose" could only come from something that has proceeded before. The Minister is using argument, but we want a Statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: I find no objection in what the Hon. Minister is saying. A thing can arise consequent upon some issue. I see no objection about that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: As far as tenantry roads are concerned, that did not arise in the debate. The Hon. Minister is supposed to be making a Statement on something that arose out of a Resolution last week.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is entitled to say "that arose."

Hon. M. E. COX: This ruling was given 21st January, 1950, and is as follows:—

"A duty is imposed by statute on the owner of land let in tenantry to keep the road of the tenantry in good order. (Section 52 (10) of the Public Health Act, 1908). Consequently such roads are not "eligible for repairs at public expense."

"There is, however, another type of tenantry where the original owner, has got rid of his spots by selling them to the chattel house proprietors. This is known as "selling land which is already let in tenantry." When this happens there is no longer any statutory obligation on the original owner to keep the road in repair — naturally because he is finished with the whole business, nor is his obligation transferred to the spot owners. Consequently there is no one responsible under the statute for the repairs of the road, and therefore, in practice, the Government has to assume responsibility."

Mr. LEWIS: On a point of Order, Mr. Speaker. I call attention to Rule 115 of this House under which the honourable member is supposed to be making a Statement. The Rule says:

"By the indulgence of the House a member may explain matters of a personal nature although there be no question before the House; but such matters cannot be debated." That is the only Rule which allows this Statement to be made.

Mr. SPEAKER: Since the introduction of Ministerial Status, we have been following the convention which applies in other countries where there are other Ministerial set-ups. A Minister is allowed to make a Statement, and there can be no debate following upon that Statement. Objection has been raised in this House on more than one occasion in the past, and I have pointed out that honourable members are still possessed of a means of debating any information given in a Statement, through moving the adjournment of the House for a special reason. That is why no debate is allowed on a Statement; so that Rule 115 is not pertinent now as applying to the indulgence given to Ministers.

Mr. LEWIS: I submit sir, that while all that you say is true, the information that is being given the House today should have been given previously when the Resolution was under consideration. But that information was withheld. It is now being brought in, in a manner that cannot be debated. Ministers are allowed to make a Statement on Government's policy. This is the subject matter of a debate that took place in this House, and the Hon. Minister withheld this information although the Resolution was under debate for two weeks. He is

now bringing it as an argument in favour of the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think I see what the honourable member is driving at, but I think it will take some time before the Hon. Ministers get on to the tactical policy of making a Statement; and I think that the House at this time should be well disposed towards receiving such Statements. I agree that these Statements are not exactly what they should be at present; but this will have to be developed. I do not want to do anything that will hamper the style of the Hon. Minister.

3.55 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: It is only on the last occasion, that the honourable senior member for the City asked for a Statement. He said that sufficient criticism had been levelled as regards the Resolution for the Government to make a Statement.

The Statement goes on to say; "As regards the alleged inconsistency of policy of the Minister by the senior member for St. John re the refusal to allow the Highway Commissioners of St. John to continue the reconstruction of Welch Village Road — Pot House Road, this road continues for a distance of 1,117 feet by approximately 14 feet wide through the estate of a Mr. Hinkson who owns approximately 90 acres of land on both sides of the road. There are no houses on either side of this road, and under the ruling given by the Hon. Attorney General (page 15 of M.P. 55001 Vol. IV). This road does not qualify and therefore could not have been repaired out of tenantry road funds. The Highway Commissioners were advised to repair this road out of parish road funds which is the appropriate designation."

In the circumstances the allegations are without foundation and are therefore regarded as worthless and unworthy of note."

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the closing paragraph of that Statement be expunged from it.

Hon. M. E. COX: I have no objection.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister has agreed that those words be expunged from his Statement.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, may I ask for the information of members of this House, whether something in that Statement relating to the honourable senior member for St. John—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot now speak on that Statement.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: All I want to know is, if Your Honour permits the names of honourable members to be quoted in Statements.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it with a measure of propriety. The orthodox part of it can be developed and will have to be developed.

ORDER NO. 1 POSTPONED

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone Order No. 1.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Order No. 2 is to move the House into Committee of Supply. On the last occasion, when the first item was introduced I did so on behalf of the Hon. Premier who was absent. It stands in my name now, but since he is here I am asking that he take charge of this Order when the House goes into Committee. I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave for the Hon. Premier to take charge of the first Resolution.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1954-55 NO. 37

Auditor General

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this is the usual Supplementary Resolution. The Notes to the various items are clearly set out. We will take the items Head by Head. I beg to move that Head IV—Auditor General stand part.

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

Mr. E. D. Mottley came into the Committee and took his seat.

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

Head XV—Police

Head XV—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head XV—stand part.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I see here under subsistence allowance to N.C.O.'s and men on special duty and men attending courts, the sum of \$700 is to voted. Has something extraordinary happened? Do N.C.O.'s move about more often then before and as a result the cost for their attending cases has risen? I think you need some explanation to that. It says here, "supplementary provision of \$700 is needed as a result of the increase in the number of cases requiring the presence of policemen at court, as well as the investigation of important cases outside their districts, and occurrences of a similar nature."

I would like to know whether in some way these expenses cannot be dealt with by the Police Department. Surely, these cases must have cropped up before; they must know something about this; but they have done as if it is something new. Are they keeping an N.C.O. in one district for so short a time, that the moment he gets a case he is moved and they must send him back to conclude the investigations? Is this increase due to the shifting around of these people too often? I think an explanation is necessary. I cannot imagine that there are more cases requiring policemen. Is it that as a result of the 999 system, more policemen are brought into contact with cases? It is true that it is only \$700, but if the procedure and the ordinary internal working of the Police Department can avoid this additional expense, surely it should be avoided. Surely, it is becoming very unusual.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: This item is far from being unusual. Obviously there is a method by which policemen are transferred from one district to another. It is a fact that some policemen and N.C.O.'s would come very useless, if they were confined month after month and year after year in one district. In this case, it may be that a policeman has more than one case to cause him to travel more. It may be that a policeman may be moved during that month. It may, however, be that a policeman is moved and happens to be a witness at the other end of the island, and he may have to go back to the district. However, the Commissioner of Police has assured the Government that these are matters over which he has no control. He cannot know of these things and

obviously, he cannot know when a policeman happens to be investigating a case and at the same time happens to be moved from the district. As I have said, this is not unique; we have come to this House several times for supplementary votes of a similar nature. In my recollection we have done so every year for the last four years. Sometimes it is owing to the cases at the Court of Grand Sessions being prolonged. I do assure honourable members that the Commissioner of Police specifically made it clear that none of the expenses could possibly be avoided.

4.05 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable member must realise that he is saying something which would apply to any other year. This note says that "this supplementary provision is needed as a result of the increase in the number of cases requiring the presence of the policemen at Court as well as the investigation of important cases outside their districts and occurrences of a similar nature." If the honourable member could state some circumstances which would apply to this particular year, one could understand; but this argument is an argument which could be used in respect of any year, and provision should have been made for it. In 1950-51 policemen might have had to go from one district to give evidence somewhere. I should like to ask whether this provision is required as a result of the working of the 999 system? That might have been the explanation. I think that the service which this 999 system renders the community is valuable, and if that is the explanation, then it is alright; but this explanation which the honourable member has given could be applied to any year. The explanation which the honourable member has given is not good enough; it does not square with the explanation that it needs something unusual because of the circumstances of this particular year.

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

Head XX—Public Library

Head XX Public Library was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head XX stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. LEWIS: This item of the up-keep of the Six Roads Branch Library is something on which we will all like to spend money as it is for the education of the people. It is of no use taking up the time of the Executive Committee and this House, because it seems that from a particular month, there had been a phenomenal increase in the number of borrowers; they have not given themselves the chance to see whether the numbers would increase still more. From the statistics which have been given, it would appear that there was a phenomenal increase, and right away they have asked for this money. Has the number of borrowers still further increased within succeeding months? If the number has been increased it would mean that you will have to come for further supplementary estimates under this Head. What we have here is gratifying as to this phenomenal increase.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What might have been helpful would be, if the Addendum had given us some idea of the rates payable to other people in similar positions at other Branch Libraries. While we have been given the figures for membership and the circulation figures, we have not been given the figures as to the remuneration of other Supervisors; therefore, we cannot make any proper comparison.

The honourable junior member for the City may rest assured that these figures will continue to rise until more or less saturation point has been reached, and when there are no other adults or juveniles in the parish who want to read books. This parish is a very enlightened parish, [MEMBER: Hear! Hear!] and the people take an intelligent interest in what is going on, and they are very avid readers. As a matter of fact, before the Library was established up there I drew the attention of the House and the Government, to the fact that the people of this parish were the most avid readers in any rural area of the island, and I got the figures from the Public Library in Bridgetown in order to substantiate that contention.

In June 1950 I Tabled this Question:—

“To enquire of the senior member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House of Assembly:—

“In view of the general advantage to the community to be gained from expansion of facilities for free reading of books, and of the deep and appreciative interest demonstrated by the people of the parish of St. Philip in the colony's Public Library Service, practical evidence of which can be seen from the comparatively high members of registered borrowers and of Library Books which are circulated in the parish the figures for the Juvenile Department being the highest for any rural area in the colony—will the Government at the earliest date possible arrange for the establishment in the said parish of a Branch of the Public Library?”

Therefore, there is reason to assume that even before they had the Library there, the figures especially for the juvenile department were the highest for any juvenile department; and now that the Library is there and within easy reach of the people the figures will continue to increase, until the maximum number of borrowers has been reached. There is something in what the honourable junior member for the City has said; we will have in the near future to review the emoluments which has been proposed for these people. I still regret that there is nothing included in the Resolution to give some idea as to the basis on which the remuneration is paid to Supervisors, and Assistant Supervisors of Branch Libraries throughout the island.

Merely to say that because the Supervisor and Assistant Supervisor at this Branch Library have had much longer hours and more arduous duties this increase is necessary, is not good enough. We should be given some idea what the others are paid, so that we can determine whether the proposed increases are justified.

4.15 p.m.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: For the information of the honourable member I will say, that the rates paid to these people are on a basis of the rates paid to similar people at the Public Library.

The question that Head XX stand part was put and agreed to without division.

Head XXII (5) Board of Health

Hon. G. H. ADAMS moved seconded by Hon. Dr. CUMMINS that Head XXII (5) — Board of Health—\$50—stand part.

The question was put and agreed to without division.

Head XXVI — Pensions

Hon. G. H. ADAMS moved seconded by Hon. Dr. CUMMINS that Head XXVI—Pensions—stand part.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: On this question of Pensions, sir, I would like to suggest at this stage that the Government should pay serious attention to the Act, as it stands, with a view to amending it in order that when a member of the Public Service dies and he or she has accrued to her or to him more than a year's salary, some provision should be made in order to rectify this anomaly. What I mean is, that a person may work in a Public Service for 34 or 35 years and the day before he retires, he may have accumulated an amount of \$3,000, \$4,000, or whatever the amount of gratuity and pension would likely to be; he may have committed himself to something like the building of a home, and if he dies before he retires he is only entitled to one year's emoluments.

A position like that should be rectified. No one with any social conscience would agree that when anyone has to his benefit money out of the Pension scheme, his beneficiaries should lose because the man died before he retired. That should be investigated. Not only would it be a source of grievance, but it is an anomaly that could be rectified without harm to the amount of money to be paid out.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I am asking the Hon. Minister for some more information. It does seem that an awful lot of money is being asked for at one time for Pensions. I think that a further explanation from the Hon. Minister would be welcome at this time.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am afraid I cannot give the honourable member the exact number of people who are to receive these pensions. I asked whether these figures were checked and I have been told yes. They were made up in the Accountant General's Office. It did appear to us also to be a big figure. I just cannot tell the honourable member how many policemen there are. We saw that these figures were high. It may be because of the nature of their duties, but policemen seem to get sick quicker than other people.

Mr. LEWIS: These figures would be interesting from this point of view: let us know how many people are leaving before they reach the retiring age. If this is the normal period for these people to retire from the service, almost everything should be covered in the vote that is put in the Estimates. Nobody puts on ten years of their life in one year. Regardless of how they look, they cannot alter their birth certificates. Someone must have slipped up in this case. They knew that these people were reaching the retiring age, and they did not provide for it. If that is not so, it is incumbent on the Government to tell us the figures; and to say that out of twenty, ten are normal retirements which someone forgot, and ten are early retirements.

As far as the Police and Fire Brigade are concerned undoubtedly because of their work, they are more susceptible to sickness and early retirements. They have to work night and day and in all kinds of weather. They are some other Government servants who can escape the rigours of the weather.

Do you mean to tell me, that out of the \$320,000 you have \$96,000 as a Supplementary Estimate? An explanation is necessary. This House should be told the reasons for these people leaving the Government's employ. Is the Government allowing people to retire too early? You do not hear of people retiring every day. People just do not retire because they want to retire. These must be resignations. I think sir, that with the great increase asked for, the obvious thing to do is to give us the figures. Tell us what retirements are normal and what are abnormal or early retirements.

As far as gratuity is concerned, I really do not claim to understand the point made by the hon. junior member for St. Peter. I thought that gratuity was calculated on an entirely different basis. I thought that it was calculated on the basis of a person's salary. I thought it was some part of the pensionable salary so that a person could get a gratuity with a consequent reduction of pension. I know that at one time the Government gave gratuity on the basis of twelve months' pay. I know they have altered that to one month's salary for every completed year in service.

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

Head XXX—Income Tax and Death Duties

Hon. G. H. Adams moved seconded by Hon. Dr. Cummins that Head XXX—Income Tax and Death Duties—stand part.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, anyone who visits the Income Tax Department must admit, that there is not enough accommodation for such an important department where people have to go to discuss matters of a confidential nature. No one in Barbados particularly, likes other people to know what income tax he is paying. Those of us who have to pay income tax and who cannot in any way avoid paying the correct amount, do feel embarrassed when they have to go to discuss their private affairs in a Department where the next person can hear the questions asked by the Inspector who is interviewing you.

I do feel, Mr. Chairman, that some consideration should be given to this department so that when you have to be questioning those people who are not fortunate to have the Commissioner of Income Tax calling them inside his inner office, and they have to face up to the position of being interviewed in the open, their business will not be heard by others. I feel more accommodation can be made in that department in order that people may be interviewed in a manner becoming to such a department.

4.25 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to ask a little question on the interviewing of persons for the post of Income Tax Commissioner because I have heard from someone who knew a gentleman in England who wanted to apply for the post of Income Tax Commissioner of Barbados, that he was told that only retired persons need apply. Perhaps, if that were known before, it might have assisted in reducing this expense. Here is someone who knew someone who wanted to apply for this post, and the condition that was told them was that only retired persons need apply. That was told them after they were interested. If that kind of mistake is going to be made continually, we are going to have additional expenses in every case. I think if that is the intention of the Government it should be made known, so that it will reduce the number of candidates to be interviewed and likewise reduce the expenses.

The next thing I would like to ask is this: are we in the habit of interviewing candidates up there for the post? It is regrettable that the amount should be overspent. I think if the conditions were made known in the advertisement or whatever else, it would save some of this expense. That was brought to my attention.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I think it would take a lot to convince the honourable member that that was not true.

The question that Head XXX—stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XXXIII — Airport

Head XXXIII—Airport was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head XXXIII—stand part.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the additional expenses called under this Head are due to the fact that there has been an increase in the number of visitors who make use of the facilities there, (including the operational staff of the Airport) for longer hours, and the payment of additional staff. I want to say that this is money well spent; and we are only too willing at any time that conditions warrant it at the Airport, to spend more money on it; because, if it costs more money to run it under normal conditions, it means that more people are coming here and the island is benefiting from the increased traffic which passes through the Airport.

While I am on that point, I want to say that it should be the policy of the Government to ensure the widest possible use of the Airport. Sir, we want to have an Airport costing three times as much as the cost at present, because one will assume when it costs three times as much, that three times as many planes are coming there and three times as many passengers are passing through the Airport; and the wider the use of the Airport, the greater the revenue we get from it. The Government's aims should be to ensure that other Airlines beside B.W.I.A., B.O.A.C., and T.C.A. should use the Airport frequently. In other words, there should be some effort on the part of the Government to have Pan-American and other airlines who want to call here; and the greater the trade, the greater would be the advantage to be derived from the colony through the use of the Airport. It is not good enough (with the colony so badly in need of economic expansion in whatever direction we could find) to have the use of the Airport restricted to the few Airlines which now use it. At neighbouring Piaseo in Trinidad, it is very satisfactory to sit there and watch the regular hum of activity and the considerable number of people coming and going, and in that way bringing revenue to the country. Airlines do not use Airports free. These facilities have to be paid for; and it would mean a lot to this country if we got a few Dutch Airlines using Seawell along with the other Airlines calling there. We do not care what it costs. Let us hear that we are spending three times as much on Seawell and that three times the number of planes and three times the number of visitors are coming to the colony through the Airport.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: On the last occasion that this matter was discussed, some sort of explanation was given as to what was meant by overtime. It was said that overtime relates to food; therefore, it equates to the time given a man for a meal. Now, I have understood that some discrimination was meted out to some workers at the Airport. I will say at this juncture, that I know the caterer at the Airport is a very affable gentleman; he is also the caterer to the House of Assembly. It has been drawn to my attention that some little discrimination took place at the Airport with respect to some workers getting a drink, and I would like to draw the matter to the appropriate Minister. I would like it to be known that because a worker may happen to be in dirty clothes, that he is doing a job on the part of Government, and we will not tolerate any semblance of discrimination practised against him.

4.35 p.m.

I am not suggesting that any privilege should be extended to the workers; what I am saying, is that

they should receive their normal rates. I want to say this: I think that those of us who travel must admit that in order to be a Barbadian today, you will be at a disadvantage when you are travelling. You will find in travelling, that it is easier to go from London to New York and Jamaica than it is to go from London to Barbados. We find that because the B.O.A.C. planes cannot land at New Orleans, therefore, the Pan-American cannot land at Seawell. We are happy to know that we can be compared with New Orleans as an Airport or some other big Airport, but as Barbadians, we do not like the question of not being provided with convenience. You cannot make a direct flight from New York to Barbados in the same way that you can make a direct flight from New York to Trinidad or Jamaica. I cannot see why we should be spending money on the Airport, and we cannot get other than the B.W.I.A. operating a shuttle service which we have to take. We know that people have difficulty in getting from New York; they have to go to Bermuda and sometimes a B.O.A.C. plane does not come in for two days. I am referring particularly to people who are travelling and who are ill. In that case it is not so convenient for one to be kept at an Airport for hours before you can get a flight. I am not making any plea for any Airline; I am making a plea for Barbadians who are travelling, because I do not think we should continue to have the inconvenience which Jamaicans or Trinidadians have not got. We have the inconvenience of changing from this plane to that plane before you can go on. I do not think that this inconvenience would work against us, and we cannot have the opportunity of discussing what are the reasons for it.

I cannot subscribe to the view that Pan American planes cannot fly here because the United States do not give the B.O.A.C. the opportunity of landing at New Orleans; B.O.A.C. lands at New York but Pan American planes do not land here. I feel that the travelling public of Barbados who have to pay the expenses of the Airport should have a better service, now that we have the Airport which we have up there. I feel that the time has come when we should protest against our not having a proper service. B.O.A.C. is not giving us a service which can accommodate us; we can only travel on one day a week by this service, and it is cheaper for people to travel to New York via Puerto Rico than by B.O.A.C. going the other route. The flight from Puerto Rico to New York is the cheapest flight anywhere in the world. However, I do feel that some attempt should be made to open up the gateway to serve Barbadians, and we should not pay this high price on the altar of the Cabotage Arrangement.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I hope that that speech will not be repeated. What is the good of continuing like that? If it pays B.O.A.C. to run flights every day, we will have them; if it pays B.W.I.A. to fly in and out of St. Kitts every day, then we will have them. What is the good of saying that you are part of an international system and your country has made an international agreement? I go further and say that it is all very well to talk about it; but I do not want to say more than I could say as regards the United States and its adherence to the letter and the spirit of the International Agreement. The Barbados Government and the British Government have said over and over again, that Pan-American Airways have never made any application to consider coming to Barbados. Even when a host of Pan-American directors came here, they never said anything about making application either to the British Government or to the Barbados Government about coming here. It is notorious that the Pan-American Airways Company, after the American policy swayed from one approach

to another as to whether the United States Government would help a particular Airline or not, the United States Government subsidised the Pan-American service and the result is that Pan-American has a lead over everybody, because of the subsidised area.

After the war the French and the Germans gave us better service in the West Indies for the same reason; that reason being, that the French and the Germans lines were heavily subsidised. Therefore why is it said that we should get more flights or that Jamaica and Trinidad have more flights than we have? Is not the reason obvious? If Pan-American could get enough people travelling from Jamaica and Trinidad, they would have had a service. If it would pay Pan-American Airways to run a service here, they would come and there is nobody to stop them; they could fly every day if they want, but they would not run a service which does not pay them. 4.45 p.m.

To say that this Government can do something about it is not correct. Pan-American Airways is not coming here if it does not get the necessary traffic. No one is stopping them from coming. I would like to hear of a Britisher sanguine enough to believe, that Pan-American would agree to drop the Cabotage Agreement. When the American Government says that B.O.A.C. can fly between New York and Chicago, we will also do it.

I repeat, there is nothing to stop Pan-American Airways from coming to Barbados every day provided there is enough traffic. But the fact is, that the traffic will not pay them to do so. When we constantly hear that the Barbados Government should do this, that or the other, the reply is two-fold. The U.K. Government and the Barbados Government made it quite plain, (and more than one person here in this Chamber besides the three Ministers present know this) that Pan-American can come every day within the International Agreement.

When the honourable senior member for the City gets up and talks, I will ask him to use his influence on his American friends to let B.W.I.A. run between New York and Chicago. We are supposed to be encouraging a West Indian service to link these islands up. B.W.I.A. is losing money year after year. B.O.A.C. loses money; but the cry we hear today of which we have heard on other occasions, is that we should let Pan-American Airways squeeze out B.W.I.A. still more. If P.A.A. takes passengers between Barbados and Trinidad, B.W.I.A. will fold up like a Concertina. According to the International Agreement, whether it is the U.K., the U.S.A., Germany, France or any other country, you agree that a foreign Airline will fly into your territory and drop passengers, but it cannot take up any one between two points in your country. In other words, an Airline cannot take up passengers between two points in a foreign country.

In spite of that, the British Government and the Barbados Government are to be accused because they do not say to a rich Airline like P.A.A., that we will allow you to take away all the trade from B.W.I.A. If honourable members will examine their arguments, they will see that it is utterly impossible for this Government to do anything which will enable an American Airline to pick up passengers between two British ports, unless the U.S.A. is prepared to give a similar concession to a British Airways. That is according to the Cabotage Agreement. It cannot be done, unless you can satisfy the representatives of the particular Government. I have had experience of that on at least two occasions.

Let us say that we deplore the fact that there are so few passengers between this island and somewhere

else; but do not blame this Government or the U.K. Government, which is perfectly prepared to allow P.A.A. to come here if the U.S.A. will do the same as regards the British Airlines. As I have said, it is a good thing for all honourable members of the House outside of the Government to deplore the fact that you do not have more transportation; but let us face reality and say why this is so before we blame any Government of our own, or any foreign Government.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I never knew that what I said would bring forth such statements. The statements of the Premier are very illogical. At one moment he spoke about P.A.A. not being allowed to carry passengers between British territories, and at the next moment he said that there is not enough British territories, and at the next moment he said that there is not enough traffic. If there is not enough traffic for them to come to Barbados, there can be no argument about the Cabotage Agreement.

Even in the U.S.A. Pan-American Airways cannot run between Chicago and New York. You allocate certain areas to certain Airlines. We did not expect that in 1955 the Barbados Premier would get up here and in defence of B.W.I.A., rather than in defence of the public which he represents, talk about the Cabotage Agreement. We are not dealing now with the Cabotage Agreement. He had no more to do with the Cabotage Agreement than I had something to do with the jet-bomber that went down in the Mediterranean. Why bring in that argument?

This imperialist idea of saying that whatever Great Britain does in our behalf is right, is monumental nonsense. We know that there is this International Agreement. We are also saying that planes from other territories can go to Jamaica and Trinidad. We are saying that if those planes do not want to come here, we cannot make them come; but do not say at one moment that Pan-American can come if they want to, and at the next moment say that there is this International Agreement.

The Hon. Minister may be thinking of those people who defend Pan-American Airways. I am not doing that; nor am I defending B.W.I.A. Before I can defend B.W.I.A. they would have to employ people looking like me in executive positions, and not just put someone looking like me as a director in order to fool the people. Go into the B.W.I.A. office even here in Barbados, and you will see the kind of people they employ.

You have to face these issues. I am asking that Barbados be included in these flights, whether they are by P.A.A. or any other Airline. I am not one to go around looking for people to defend. Who am I to defend P.A.A. which is one of the richest Airlines in the world? What I am saying is, that Barbadians flying from New York or from Europe should have the privilege of flying direct to their country like the Jamaicans. Jamaica is a British territory too. Even in the case of Antigua, P.A.A. planes fly from New York to that colony. Why cannot Barbadians be treated like that? The Premier says that they can be. Do not say that and then tell me, that you are using the argument, that if they come here the Americans should allow B.O.A.C. to make flights from Chicago to New York. The honourable member knows that P.A.A. cannot make a flight like that not even in Europe. In Britain P.A.A. cannot fly anyone from London to Prestwick 4.55 p.m.

Why should Barbados in this whole gamut of International conventions, be made a glorified king pin? That is to say, the only way in which these planes can be allowed to land in Barbados is if the United States agreed with Britain. What I am representing

is what people who travel want represented. Any man who travels in America by plane, knows that one of the reasons why they choose to go by B.O.A.C. is because they do not like the idea of having to stay over at Puerto Rico. It is a fact that they have to stay over at Puerto Rico for about eight hours if they travel by B.W.I.A. They do not mind that they have to pay more money travelling by B.O.A.C. directly, because they can get what may be termed a semi-through flight. We have heard the honourable member using an argument in support of the two private companies; he is saying that B.W.I.A., is in straitened circumstances and you should not try to allow a rich American Company to squeeze out B.W.I.A. Let me say that B.W.I.A. is a subsidiary of B.O.A.C., it is not in the sense, a local company. Sir, I am speaking as a Barbadian, not as a Britisher. I bet you if it were something in London where the British public could not travel as freely and conveniently as they would like, there would be a protest. Why should I not say something for the people of the country whom I represent and to whom I belong. I do not subscribe to the argument that the International Cabotage Arrangements should work to the detriment of little Barbados. If we say that we should open up our ports to all, to whosoever will may come, let us do so. If they say we do not have sufficient traffic, B.O.A.C. would never have put on a flight here. That company put on a flight as soon as it heard the argument of Pan-American Airways coming here. Trans-Canada Airlines has also put on a flight. The whole argument has been, that because of some International Cabotage Arrangements between the United States and the United Kingdom, therefore Barbados must pay the penalty of it.

Mr. Chairman, my argument was not an argument between the two companies; my argument was that Barbados should be allowed to have Airlines coming here so as to accommodate the people who are travelling to and fro.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, speaking under this Head Airport I am wondering whether the Government has under consideration the doing of something whereby more revenue can be had from the buildings at Seawell. What I am thinking about is, if you make the Airport building a two-storied one with a gallery, you could obtain some revenue from it.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If the honourable member would just give way for a minute, I would like to say that that is what the Government has under consideration now. Government is planning to build a two-storied building, and for the reason that we hope to make revenue from it by the people who merely go there to have a look on Sunday afternoon.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am glad to hear from the Hon. Premier that Government has planned to erect a two-storey building so as to get some revenue from it. The Opposition has been saying so for a long time; the Hon. Leader of the Opposition actually made that suggestion two years ago. In other countries at Airports, there is a place where people can go in the verandah free then there is another place where spectators have to pay if they want to go there and they can also be served with drinks and lunches. All that is a means of getting in some revenue. I am very glad that the Government has it under consideration.

Apparently the Hon. Premier threw a challenge out. My first answer to that is, how can anybody expect that an unlettered insignificant politician like myself, would ever get (beyond being a representative of the people on the floor of this House) to represent an Airways Company.

5.05 p.m.

I do not mean to give any offence, but I would say that such is usually given to the lawyer-politicians. Seldom if ever, has the ordinary individual as a politician got that opportunity. But I want to say this: in the Honourable Premier's reply I thought he would have stated actually what happened to the Address which was tabled in this House and which was actually passed, asking not only that P.A.A. lines but also K.L.M. and any other international Airways company to be allowed to run their service to Barbados. I have listened to a rather illuminating speech by the Hon. Premier, and I am not at all surprised; but I will be somewhat disappointed, unless he clears up what I call a wilful and reckless misstatement, (to use his own words). As I have said, the statement is rather misleading; and I hope he will clarify it or try to make me understand it later on. About two years ago when the Address was passed, (I believe I can appreciate some argument at times made by the Hon. Premier) he has said that there was a sort of international agreement relative to having P.A.A. and other international Airways coming to Barbados. But this is what I am at a loss to understand: we have been fooled into the fact that we have been given all of this independence; we are on our way to some sort of nationhood. And I am going to order copies of that speech made by the Hon. Premier tonight in this House of Assembly, and I will see if I cannot get it published in every enterprising newspaper in the West Indies; because, that speech damns the whole idea of nationhood for the West Indies. [Mr. CRAWFORD: Will the speech be reported as he made it?] It will be reported as he made it. There are certain agreements which Barbados must really adhere to as the honourable junior member for St. Peter has mentioned; but if it is seen and shown that peculiar to Barbados with its position of trade and business with the North American continent, if it is peculiar to Barbados with its one-crop economy — We must depend upon the development of the tourist business which the Government has seemed fit to adopt recently, and doing all to foster. I will say a little of what happened to the average Barbadian. Although we have this agreement we cannot say "to France with this agreement, we will do this or that!" We will have to tell the Premier that it strikes us that that Airport must be made to allow international Airways companies to come in. Let us make representation to the British Government saying that that is the feeling here; but what I have just heard from the Hon. Premier this afternoon is not at all surprising to me—that if Pan-American can get enough people to travel between New York and Barbados they can come and they will go. I hope that that would be blazoned throughout the West Indies; because as I understand it, it is not a statement of fact. If Pan-American can get sufficient business between New York State and Barbados direct they would come and they would go, says the Hon. Premier. I say categorically that that is not a statement of fact. I hope however that the opportunity would be given the Hon. Premier to qualify that statement, because it is not a statement of fact.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am afraid that I did not hear what the honourable member said, about what I said being not a fact.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The honourable member has said that if Barbados can get sufficient business to bring traffic direct between Barbados and New York, the Pan-American Airways Company would come and would go.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I must interrupt the honourable member. If that is not a statement of fact, I would like to know why it is not a statement of fact.

I say again that any Airline can come to this island within the International Agreement, so long as it comes through this territory and their territories, and so long as it does not pick up people from all points within the territory.

5.15 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is very shrewd of the honourable member. For five or six times he did not say "within the International Agreement." He said that I should get my American friends to do so and so. The American friends I would have to get, would be passengers who get kicked about in Bermuda.

Now Mr. Chairman, an Address has been passed here some three years ago; and it seems peculiar to the minds of the Government's members to think that as soon as anyone of us in the Opposition attempts to do anything of this nature, (anything connected with big business, or private enterprise, or semi-private enterprise) the feeling is that there is something sinister about it. But the only interest that one could have would be to bolster the economy of Barbados. It has been represented to me that a direct flight by P.A.A. between New York and Barbados would bolster the tourist industry in Barbados.

If you have a community like Barbados where people are unemployed and hungry and starving, representation should be made to the British Government that because of our geographical position and our business with the North American continent, there should be some relaxation of this Agreement relative to P.A.A. coming here. The Hon. Premier would have us to believe that they can come and make a direct flight between Barbados and New York without any relaxation in the Agreement. In the next breath he asks if they come here, will you ask your American friends to let B.W.I.A. have similar concessions in American territory.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I did not say that. I said if the Barbados Government or the British Government is going to allow P.A.A. or any other foreign Airline to fly between two British Cities, then ask the Americans to allow the British and everyone else to fly between Chicago and New York.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The honourable member knows that I have always said that anything we do, should be done constitutionally and with high regard for the British Government; but he is carrying this a little too far. There are times when you have got to stand up and remember that you are a Barbadian and not an Englishman. There are times when you must remember that you rose to your present position through underprivileged Barbadians, whom you attempted to fool that you would do everything for them.

I agree with the Hon. Premier that there are international agreements in which the British Government holds Barbados as a pawn, saying, if you want me to give the U.S.A. Airline this concession the U.S.A. will have to give us a similar concession. It is only because I am on the floor of the House that I will not tell the Premier what I feel about this statement, made to fool the House and the whole public. The British Government holds Barbados as a pawn. Those are the plain facts. Let the Premier deny that.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I absolutely deny that Barbadians are so vain that they think that Barbados is unique. What I have said applies to every single British Caribbean territory. It pays P.A.A. to go to Antigua because that colony is on the direct flight. Trinidad is a hop to Brazil. If it paid them to come to Barbados they would do it too. The honourable member says that I am making a misstatement of fact. Let him cite one case to prove

that what I am saying is not true. There is nothing to prevent any plane on earth from going to any West Indian colony, (not Barbados alone) provided it does not pick up passengers between two British ports.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: That is the way the honourable member makes a statement because of his ability as a lawyer, and tries to mislead the members of the House. I am still saying that what the honourable member said is not a statement of fact. I say it and I mean it. I repeat that we are in duty bound to do everything in a constitutional manner. The fact is, that representations have been made by P.A.A. If that is a lie, the Colonial Secretary of this island told it. Barbados is being kept as a pawn. The honourable member says that that is not true.

The honourable member is saying that if P.A.A. want to come they can come if they can get enough traffic. It is all right to say that they can bring in passengers from New York to Barbados; but must they go back empty? I tell you with the same, if not a greater sense of responsibility than the Premier, Barbados is being kept as a pawn.

This is my criticism of the Government. If the Government appreciates the position between Barbados and the U.S.A., and what it must mean to have a direct flight for (a) tourists and (b) the inhabitants of this colony who are pushed about, not only in Puerto Rico but in Bermuda, (in some cases rightly so, because it makes them know their places) then I say it is the Government's duty to make representations to the British Government and to say that as far as Barbados is concerned, we can appreciate that as Britain is the Mother Country these things are necessary, but in the case of Barbados there must be some relaxation of the agreement.

Now, Sir, people can leave New York and go to Bermuda, and then come in here by B.O.A.C. If there is one service that is unsatisfactory, it is B.O.A.C.'s service between Bermuda and Barbados. P.A.A. runs to Trinidad; P.A.A. runs to Antigua. The honourable member says it cannot take up passengers between Antigua and Trinidad—between two British ports. You cannot buy a P.A.A. ticket in Antigua for Trinidad. I understand that that is correct. But there are circumstances in which you can do it. I am telling the honourable member that now.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Who said that that is not so? I have said that it has happened in my case; at least twice. The honourable member should remember that this is not election time. I said there are special circumstances. When those circumstances arise you have got to make a statement to the American Consul General, or if you are a foreigner you make it to the Chief Secretary of the particular colony. It is possible to go by P.A.A. from Antigua to Trinidad if a B.O.A.C. flight is not available, if you can make out a case of special circumstances. I have done it myself with special permission. I said so in my opening remarks.

5.25 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: There again, like many of us you feel as long as something is done for you, you do not matter what is done to somebody else [A VOICE: Address the House of Assembly; you are not addressing people in Cats Castle!] Some of the minds in Cats Castle are much more subtle to reason than yours! What I say is this: I do not think the Government can stand up to that argument which it made, because if you have direct communications or a direct flight between New York and Barbados, it must bolster the tourist industry in this colony. Therefore I am not going to deal with the tourist side of the question; I am not going to touch

on that point although the tourist industry is a secondary industry, and one to assist the economy of Barbados. I say God help a lot of us, if we had to get a passage between Antigua and Trinidad. Thousands of Barbadians who go between the United States and here annually, have to spend anything like eight to twelve hours in Puerto Rico; especially around the months of December. I have seen some of them staying as long as three or four days. The honourable member says, if that Airline can get sufficient business it can come in under the International Agreement, but Sir, to come under that agreement would simply mean: what will you give us for allowing you to come into Barbados? The honourable member says that that is not correct; but that is an absolute fact. The honourable member says that if B.O.A.C., which now runs once a week connecting New York with Barbados, can get sufficient traffic between St. Kitts, Antigua and Barbados, they would run everyday.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: That is nonsense.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I excuse the honourable member for saying so because he is in the habit of making a statement one way today, and making it another way, another day when it suits him. Despite the fact that the B.W.I.A., attempted to put a gentleman on the directorate who is a Trinidad lawyer, it is a fact (as the honourable junior member for St. Peter said) that in the employ of B.W.I.A. there are the most snobbish, the most unmannerly, and the most illiterate type of West Indians. Imagine the honourable member speaking with so much pride of B.W.I.A. service. That service is a racket. Every now and then they are telling you that the company is making no money. Everybody knows the history of the B.W.I.A., everybody knows that it is a company which was started as a racket in high places. This company started in Trinidad—Trinidad above all places—and because this company is run as it is, because it runs a direct service from Trinidad to Jamaica, are we to say as the honourable member suggested: ask your American friends to tell the American Government to allow B.O.A.C. to pick up passengers between Chicago and New York? The inference is that because the B.W.I.A., cannot go there and pick up passengers between two American ports, then Pan-American Airlines should not be allowed to come in. Of course I know that there is an International Agreement on these matters.

During all the discussions which I understand went on in this matter at a very high international level, it was represented that Barbados would be no paying concern to Pan-American coming in and bringing a passenger traffic direct from New York to this colony; but the whole question concerning this matter is what would we get in exchange. Can you imagine Mr. Bertie Gomes in Trinidad falling for that type of argument? Or would you rather imagine Mr. Gomes making all sorts of threats. I am going to say this, Mr. Chairman: when the Hon. Premier made that speech here today, he did let down the people of this colony.

5.35 p.m.

I cannot remember when I have heard the Hon. Premier make a speech letting down the people of this colony, like the one he has made this afternoon. Of course you must be loyal and you must have a sense of responsibility; you must acknowledge all these International Agreements; but I say that no man should make the speech which the Hon. Premier made without realising first his responsibility to the people of this colony, and have these Regulations relaxed so that passengers can be brought direct from New York to this colony without having to wait

sometimes for three days in Puerto Rico. Bermuda seems to be preserving its tourist industry, and people are somewhat disappointed when they land there. Once in every three months the B.O.A.C. plane is on time; the B.O.A.C. cannot cater to the traffic with one plane! and they are only interested in carrying people between this colony and England. It is only the monied class who can leave here and go to England on holiday; you go to Seawell, and you will see that. It is the service between New York and this colony where the invisible income to the people comes from annually; it is that service which we are thinking of. That service is neglected, and I believe that the Hon. Premier on reflection, is bound to see the force of what I am saying. I hope that what the honourable junior member for St. Peter has said will not come true, but I fear that it will come true. After the Trade Fair is over and the Princess has left and the members of the aristocracy make representations, you will see a relaxation of the Regulations, but that will have nothing to do with how the matter affects the average person in this colony, who wants to travel between the United States and Barbados. I know, Mr. Chairman, that you have had a lot of patience; but I am warning the Government that these are the small things which count.

As for the British West Indian Airways, I should like to say that the only thing West Indian about them is, the fact that they operate through the West Indies. When you see the stewardesses, the aviators and the like, you can only come to the conclusion that this is a European Airways service, not a British West Indian Airways service. I have already said that in this House; and since that speech was made they have broken the ice and they have had to go out of the way and put some coloured people in their office; in Barbados at least. However, as regards some of us, as long as my son and your daughter and your daughter's friend get served, and you get things done, that is alright; but other people can go—you now where! Well, some members of the Government say that they can go to St. Lucy. (LAUGHTER). Mr. Chairman, I hope that this Cabotage Agreement which is going on and which is holding West Indian people as pawns, will be stopped. The B.O.A.C. is subsidised by the British Government and they should help this little unit out here with its traffic. Lest it be thought by the Hon. Premier that we are fighting a case for Pan-American Airways Company, and since he argues that if the B.W.I.A. can run a service between Barbados and New York, let them run it. [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: They are running a service as soon as they can get a plane.] The honourable member says that they are running a service. However I do not know—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am sorry that I made that aside. If the "Viscount" were ready, the B.W.I.A. would run a service to New York in or around February this year. Unfortunately they cannot get the "Viscount" put off: it may not be ready until October. Perhaps it might be in June. 5.45 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The position really is, that you are interested in a direct service between Barbados and New York, but you are keeping off Pan-American until the B.W.I.A. can get a plane. The honourable member is an advocate of state-owned business, and he is protecting the B.W.I.A., that is what it really means. The honourable member has admitted that there is the necessity for a direct service between Barbados and New York, but why should we let this big subsidised Airways Company do this business when the B.W.I.A. can do it?

This statement is entirely new to me; B.W.I.A. is a private company.

This is a private company. It is nothing to do with Barbados, nothing to do with Jamaica; and I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that the interest which the Premier is taking in representing this private company is amazing. This is a private company which, although a row was made, and which although we have all these agreements which say that no one must compete with it, cannot see its way to employ as a stewardess one coloured West Indian girl. That is the sort of company that the Premier is defending, and saying that we should not let P.A.A. come in to squeeze it! Some people do that because they may be fortunate enough to get a passage on any plane they want, and they do not care if the other people die. So it does not matter. It does not matter that during this season you are having your Trade Fair, and the Princess is coming, and that there is therefore an opportunity to boost the tourist trade from America. No, in spite of all that, you must protect B.W.I.A.

If B.W.I.A. belonged to the West Indies of course I would agree. I say that I find the Premier's defence of this company amazing. He is saying that if B.W.I.A. could have got a 'Viking' they would have started a service between New York and here. That is an admission that there is the necessity for such a service; but this Government is not prepared to let P.A.A. or any other service come in as long as this British Company, this company that from its inception you have not been able to get one red cent of taxation from, this company with regard to which racketeering went on in high places in Trinidad, this racketeering company is running this service. Must the Premier be interested in putting money in a few people's pockets at the expense of the ordinary man in this community? Must he do that and then fool people by saying, that this Government is protecting the small fellow?

After doing that, sir, the Premier makes a misrepresentation of the fact which is calculated to fool people, when he says that P.A.A. can come in if they want to. Is it fair to us, especially at this stage of our constitutional development to be fooling us along those lines? We are always being told about our constitutional development; but the British Government is giving us constitutional development and at the same time holding us down by economic strangulation.

The Government cannot see its way to allow P.A.A. to come here and bring people and money to Barbados. P.A.A. coming here would mean a tremendous lot of business. But no; B.O.A.C. will come. I will tell you what B.W.I.A. does in Puerto Rico; at the B.O.A.C. office in New York you can in the month of August make five bookings. They tell you they can take you on the 10th of December; that they have room on the flight coming up from Jamaica. I had the distinction of having one of the directors come down on his knees to me and beg. They know they have one plane running but they take 50 to 60 people and put them off in Puerto Rico and keep them there day after day. I had a talk with the Hon. H. A. Cuke who is a director. They put these people off in Puerto Rico, more especially Barbadians—Racial discrimination! I was not afraid to start cursing right and left. I know that they are afraid of going to Court, because you may ask them to produce their books. I warned them. School teachers from this country were coming up from America and they had to remain in Puerto Rico for four days. Planes were coming up every day and special people like the Premier, (people who had bought their tickets later than those who were stranded) got seats while

those to whom I have referred had to remain in Puerto Rica for four days at great inconvenience to themselves. That is the sort of company the Premier is defending, trying to put money in the pockets of a few people in Trinidad and may be some people here.

If I had stood here and defended the Telephone Company or the Electric Company, I would be accused of defending free enterprise; and I would be called an enemy of the people. But to say that we should wait until B.W.I.A. gets a 'Viking' so that they can make the direct flight between New York and Barbados, is not that the same thing?

I am saying, sir, that if all these regulations are in force, representation should be made to have them waived or relaxed so that other services (whether it is P.A.A., International Dutch Airlines or any other) can come in because money is being paid by the people of this country too; and it is not good enough that merely a few people can say that they can get the service when they want it. The people of Barbados should be able to get a direct service. I am not referring merely to tourists, but to the ordinary man of this country.

5.55 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, an Address was passed by this Chamber in connection with this matter some time ago, and the Governor and his advisers did not have the common decency and courtesy to reply to the Address. That is the sort of thing you get in here. The Address contained everything. It stated that the House of Assembly was of the opinion that in view of the fact that Pan American Airways and the Royal Dutch Airlines known as K.L.M., are operating an air service in the West Indies, that it is in the interest of this colony that these companies be asked to include Barbados as a regular port of call in their itineraries, and particularly to ensure that a direct connection by air between Barbados and New York be established. We thought that that Address was weighty enough. We passed the Address and sent it to the Governor. Why was it held up we did not know. It is obvious today why it was held up. The Hon. Premier has told us.

I will tell the people of this colony that in matters of this sort, they must watch their Government. You ought to be suspicious of what is going on. I feel the people of this colony are being taken for a ride to satisfy a few share holders in the B.W.I.A. company. They are taken for a ride, whether it is by Mr. Cuke or Mr. Anybody. When an election is on or the Government finds itself in difficulty, the remarks of the members of the Government are "I will take into consideration all that the Opposition has said," but when they make up their minds to do something, it is a matter of indifference to them what the Opposition might say. Even Back-benchers of the Government cannot make them take heed. I am not going to fool the people that the four members of the Opposition can make the Government heed something, when inside of the Government's own party it will not heed to the majority. Members of the Government are surveying a dangerous road. The writing is on the wall.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, lest it be thought that the voice of the honourable junior member for St. Peter is one crying in the wilderness with regard to what he said about the discrimination which took place at Seawell on Sunday before last, I rise to support his statement. I was one of the first persons to whom the matter was referred, and I have since taken it up with one of the officials concerned. If a B.W.I.A. pilot objects to sitting in the Canteen and taking a meal, while in that same part of the building they were employees of the Government taking a drink, the sooner we make the B.W.I.A. to

understand we do not tolerate that kind of thing the better. Certainly, someone taking a drink at one table cannot prevent another person from enjoying a meal at another table. I was made to understand that after these two coloured persons had been refused a drink in that part of the building, a person of another complexion was served a drink. I mentioned the matter to an official of the B.W.I.A., and I think I have put a certain amount of fear in him. I do not think it would happen again.

The other matter which was discussed, is the question of the opening of the facilities of Seawell Airport to other Airline companies than B.W.I.A. Even if this matter is one of international conventions, (and I concede it is) that convention can be revised. It is an easy thing to revise; and there is no reason why we should suffer because of that convention, because Trinidad and Jamaica do not suffer on account of it. Pan-American Airways as well as any other Airways should be able to use our Airport under similar conditions as they use Palisadoes or Piarco. I remember very well that everyone of us supported the passing of that Address mentioned by the honourable senior member for the City. The principle contained in that Address is one with which no one can find any fault. It is not a matter of facilities provided for distinguish and illustrious personages; I want to see every privilege affecting them be available to the poorest, humblest and blackest of Her Majesty's subjects in this island who want to have similar facilities. We do not want to have things for a privileged few; we are supposed to have passed those days; but it seems as if that is not appreciated. After all, we know how notoriously prejudiced are the B.W.I.A. people. It is a fact that of all the suitable people in the Caribbean, that company cannot find anyone to work as a Hostess who even approximates a Brunette from the European standpoint, far less a coloured person. Furthermore, this company's service is unpunctual; it is not one to boast of; and the Directors do not even treat intended passengers with courtesy by putting through a message over the Rediffusion so as to let intended passengers know when a plane is delayed. The people are allowed to drive up there and then they hear that the plane will be two or three hours late. We hope that the discrimination which took place Sunday before last at the Seawell Airport, will not happen again.

6.05 p.m.

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

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, the Resolution for the sum of \$126,970 was passed.

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 question was put and agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

6.08 p.m.

On resumption.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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.

INSTALLATION OF GENERATORS

Hon. M. E. COX: The next Resolution Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution to place the sum of \$1,050 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1954-55 Part I, Current, as shown in Supplementary Estimates 1954-55, No. 38, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

As the Addendum points out, a part of this \$1,050 is for the removal of three Lister Generators from Six Cross Roads, and also for the purchase of a Transformer for these Listers. The Committee will remember, that in March last year the Government purchased the property at Six Cross Roads belonging to the Admiralty, and included in the property were three Lister Generators. It is proposed to hand over one of these Generators to the Police Department for service in case of an emergency such as a Hurricane or any disaster which may cut out the electric supply, one set is also to be installed at Seawell Airport in place of the generator which is now being used, and which is out of date and uneconomical to run. As to the other Generator, although no firm decision has yet been taken, consideration is being given to passing over that Generator to the Police Training School which is being constructed to serve the area. As I have said, no firm decision has been taken and the matter is still under consideration. The Addendum explains quite fully the object of the Resolution, but if honourable members want any further information so as to clarify any point, in so far as I have it in my possession, I shall be quite willing to give it. I now beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I note that the Government has been giving some consideration as to how best to use these Generators, but what I want to know is, whether this Addendum has been worded correctly. I should like to know if in the fourth line of paragraph two of the Addendum I must read, that the Government Electrical Engineer has recommended that these Generators should be allocated to the "Police Department/Airport", or "Police Department and Airport." The type is not quite clear as to how it is proposed that these Generators are to be utilised in respect of the Police Department, the Airport and the Police Training School. However, it is true that the Government has said that they were in some difficulty as to finding use for these Generators.

I would like to know what is the present position at the Six Cross Roads? Do you have enough lighting equipment that you do not need these Generators? If you have not, why is it that the Government has come here for this amount of \$1,050? If this new scheme there will be on a West Indian basis, why has this Resolution been brought down so hurriedly? If you are putting this new scheme on a West Indian basis how are you going to be reimbursed for it?

I would like to know three things from the Hon. Minister. The first is, how do they propose to light the new school and the area they propose to build up at Six Cross Roads, if they do not need a standby there? It seems to me that if you are going to put these Generators in the Police Department to be used in case of a hurricane, (a hurricane is only a period in a year) it seems that you will not have much use for them. The Government may as well decide to sell them, or see if greater use can be made of them in another department. You cannot take expensive

things like these and keep them to be used once a year; they will deteriorate on you. We had the same experience at Seawell. It seems to me that it is better to sell some of these things and get some money in the Treasury. If an emergency arises then, you will be in no worse position. If a hurricane comes, the Government has power to commandeer equipment belonging to any private employer and make use of it.

As far as the Police Department is concerned, I do not know that you can make use of a Generator being kept there. I do feel that you can make better use of these Generators.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, my criticism is much along the same lines. Government has found itself with these three Generators. Unless they have some very good reason for keeping them and using them as proposed, I think it would be better to dispense with them and acquire others when you need them. Two years ago, no one would have sold a Generator because the state of the Electric Company was such, that even firms were buying Generators as standbys for emergencies. That was so because these emergencies were often the general rule, there being so many breakdowns, shut downs and the like. But today I understand (and I do know that the Electric Company's power has improved tremendously) it is proposed to have a further expansion. I think that the Government can get from that source all the power they want.

When all is said and done, sir, if you can use the company's power it is cheaper. To use Generators in any scheme, you will have to have a 24 hour a day service if it is to be of any use, because electricity must be available 24 hours a day. That is what the Electric Company provides.

You are going to put one of the Generators at the Police Department. It seems to me as if the Government circularised their various Heads of Departments to see in which departments these Generators would be of any use, and that they got back a reply from the Police Department saying that they could use one. They said they would use it in an emergency. At the Airport you must have a standby. There is one there already. If it is in such a state that you need another one, and one of these that you now have is the right type, I will say provide it out of one of these.

The same thing applies to the Police Training School, if and when it comes. The company's power is always there, and I am sure that they will be able to continue their lines from Seawell across to the school which will only be a couple of hundred yards away. I do not see the necessity of keeping one of these Generators for the Police Training School. It is better to sell these things if you have no use for them. Let someone buy them; if not in Barbados, in some other colony. If you want these things definitely, keep them; but I cannot see in any of these schemes outside of Seawell, the necessity of keeping the other two.

It will cost money to install them and keep them in order. Electrical equipment if not used, can deteriorate quickly. I know from experience that when you come to install them in an emergency you will have to spend a lot of money on them. It is cheaper to buy your power from one central source, that is, the Barbados Electric Supply Corporation.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, when these Generators were being taken over I asked, whether we could get some information as to whether they could be used in getting water for the people. They may not be the right type of Generator to do that; but if they are I suggest putting them to work at the Belle and using the Electric Company's power as a standby. We have just heard from the honourable junior member for Christ Church that the Electric

Company is offering an excellent service; therefore it will make an excellent standby. You can always depend upon it.

What I would like to know is what did the Generators cost. As far as I remember, it was a lump sum of money and they got these Generators thrown in. They were to go to Seawell. When the Government decided to buy that place from the Admiralty, they brought in a Resolution to get the money as soon as possible; therefore, what was the delay that is mentioned in this Resolution that we are now discussing? Who caused the delay? When the Government came for the money they got it in a hurry. They said the Generators were going to Seawell. Now we hear that owing to a delay in negotiations, other arrangements had to be made at the Airport. That cannot be a statement of fact. The House did not delay voting the money; it congratulated the Government on getting the land at the price at which they got it. Now we are told that there was some delay. It seems to me that that has been brought in merely because you have three Generators and you are spending \$1,000 on them. It seems to me that if we are going to have these standbys, we will have to spend something like \$1,000 a year to look at them and see if they will work at all. The longer you put them down and do not work them, the worse for you.

The Resolution reads: the Police Department—Airport. Do you mean that? If you do, do you mean to tell me that the Central Station would not need a Generator if there is a hurricane? Will you provide one at Seawell where there is electric current already?

It seems to me that the Government should withdraw this Resolution and give this matter more consideration. If they do not have any use for the Generators, turn them into money and get some more when the time is ripe. This is going to be recurrent expenditure of at least \$1,000. It is costing you \$1,000 to install two of them now. We were not told that before.

As I have said, the Government should withdraw this Resolution and give it more consideration. It is obvious that they have been looking around for something to do with these Generators instead of turning them into money. Even now you are putting them down and waiting in one case for a project to start and putting down one to use as a standby. The Generators will therefore be degenerating instead of generating, and the taxpayers must put up \$1,000 for their overhaul and soon after that, you will hear again that they are worn out.

You have two Generators at Seawell, and it is supposed to replace these two Generators at Seawell with one of those at the Admiralty; I wonder if the makers of the two at Seawell have not got a case against the Government. What the Government is saying is that one of those Generators from the Admiralty is worth two of another make.

6.55 p.m.
Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: This is a very important matter, and there is much in what the honourable junior member for the City said. I want to say that there is too much callousness when you ask questions of members of the Government; it is bordering on discourtesy. There is too much of this callous view by members of the Government; and they do not care whether they reply or not. This is parliament and when members of this Chamber ask questions, we do not ask them on a personal basis. This is a case where \$1,000 of public money is to be spent, and it is being pushed through without members getting replies to questions they have asked on it. Why should we be treated in this way? What we want members of this Government to understand is, that parliament is still parliament.

Hon. M. E. COX: I rise on a point of Order, Mr. Chairman. I was just waiting to see what members wanted to speak. Where did the honourable member get the idea from that the Government was not going to reply?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: It is either that the Hon. Minister was willing to reply, or that the Hon. Chairman was not willing for him to reply. I take it that the Chair always gives Government the opportunity to reply; but the Chairman was about to put the question when I got up.

It seems to me, that on looking around to find something to make use of these Generators, (and I believe that is what the Government also did) that the best use for these Generators would be to carry them to some place which you have built up to give the people there some light. My reason for saying that is because I believe, better use would be made of them in that manner. The Government now have three generators on hand; they are not going to be used continually, but still there are a lot of people in need of light in some of your areas. [A VOICE: That would be illegal] Some member has said *sotto voce* that it would be illegal for Government to provide light in some of the districts. I do not know the legal issue on that. However, I do hope that greater use would be made of those generators.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, what I have been wondering is, whether the decisions made by the Ministry would serve the purpose hoped for; for instance, to use one of these Generators for the Police department. It is true to say that there is a small Generator and equipment at the General Hospital, but I am wondering if the Government would consider using one of these Generators there. According to the Notes, you are putting one of these Generators at the Police Training School. Now, there will be all adults there, and if it comes to a point, storm lanterns can be used. Again, you are talking of replacing the two International Harvester Generators at Seawell by one of these three Lister. You have spent a considerable sum on the two units which you have there and you must also bear in mind that they are only standby equipment. I am really wondering if enough thought and consideration were given to the use of these three Lister Generators. It would appear to me as if there was some rough decision as to whether they should be laid down, so to speak, or whether they should be brought into service by maintenance. I see no reason at all why Government should accept the plan that the Police should have a standby Generator in case of emergency or in cases of failure of electricity through a hurricane. I am really wondering if these three Lister Generators could not be used for a better purpose than what is stated here.

As you know Sir, we have the Cassava Factory at Lancaster, St. James. Due to its location, you cannot get electricity for industrial purposes. It is not within reach; you are now using an old gasoline engine there. I am wondering if the Hon. Minister of Trade would consider taking one of those Generators there. I am also wondering whether he would consider taking one of them to the St. Michael Alms-house, rather than to have it tucked away somewhere at the Seawell Airport. I do believe that Government can make a special grant of one of these Generators to that institution. I have no doubt that the Medical Centre can probably benefit from such a plan. However, I do not think you should replace the two International Harvester Generators at Seawell by one of these Lister. I hope the Hon. Minister will say something on this matter. It would appear as if there was some difficulty as to how to make best use of these three Generators, and some *ad hoc* decision

was made to carry one to the Police Station, to carry another to the Airport, and to put by one for use at the Police Training School. I will be very happy if some of the reasons are given as to some of the alternative schemes which were operating in the mind of the Minister of the Department concerned. 7.05 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, you knew you were going to acquire the property at the Admiralty, and you knew that you had these three Generators there; why then was the delay in buying this property, so that you could have acquired those three Generators and the other equipment to utilise at Seawell? Why did the Government unduly prolong negotiations or delayed them, when they knew they had to buy these Generators along with the property?

This is all carelessness; these Generators are not things which we can use readily. The Electric Supply Corporation has its franchise and you cannot use it for lighting purposes, and the Government should have known that outside of Seawell, it was extremely unlikely that the Government could readily find use for Generators. If you did not want to waste the taxpayers' money after stupid negotiations, you should have had these Generators released and try to find some use for these Generators. It might be better to sell them rather than try to waste money to install them, and another sum of money in maintaining them for an emergency which might never arise. I sincerely hope that the Introducer of this Resolution will tell us why they have allowed this long time to elapse between the decision to buy these Generators, and the actual acquisition of them, and why they have spent money at Seawell which could have been saved if they had simply expedited the negotiations.

Hon. M. E. COX: In reply to the first point which has been raised by the honourable junior member for St. Peter, I think I said at the outset that there was no firm decision taken in the matter. Perhaps I should say that this Resolution is partly for the removal of these Generators; and the removal of them was pressed upon us in view of the fact that the Director of Public Works wants to clean up the area at Six Roads at the earliest opportunity. These Generators were housed in a building on the same site as that on which the Police Training School is to be situated. At any rate, these Generators will have to be removed from that site; and it has been decided to remove two of these Generators to Seawell. No provision is made in the Estimate for the Generator which it is proposed to transfer to the Police Training School.

The question of turning over one of these Generators to Seawell has not been decided upon, and the Government Electrical Engineer has advised that one of them would be very useful to this Training School; but of course, as I have said, no decision has been taken in the matter. As to the question of handing over one of these Generators to the Police Department at Headquarters, it was asked that one of them should be kept there as a standby in case of a hurricane. I feel that it would not be economic to have one of these Generators lying there only waiting for a hurricane, but I am sure that honourable members will agree with me that if a hurricane did take place and poles were blow down, and there was no communication, the Government would have been criticised for not having some sort of stand-by there.

In so far as the other Generator is concerned for the Airport itself, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition spoke about electric current being around there, and suggested that it might be better to have the company's current supplying electricity rather than this Generator; but surely the hon. member will ap-

preciate the fact that you must provide that power. You may have a plane coming in and the Electric Company's power may go off —

Mr. GODDARD: On a point of Order. That is the very reason why I said that it was necessary to have it at the Airport only.

Hon. M. E. COX: However, it is essential that one of these units be kept at the Airport as a standby. I think that it was in 1953 when the Government Electrical Inspector wrote that the alternator of one of the stand-by Generators had developed a fault, and after he pointed out that it was sent to be repaired, (I am not in a position to say what caused the delay) the Government Electrical Inspector advised that it was necessary to equip the Airport with proper Generators. Since then he has suggested that the type of Generators at Six Roads was much better than those at Seawell, and that they should be substituted for the ones at Seawell.

I should like to tell honourable members that the Government is asking the various Departments to say where the best use can be made of these sets. We are trying to get the best use made of them and we did not ask the Police Department anything. They have asked for one. It has been pointed out that one of the Generators would be equipped to carry the load which it will be necessary to carry in the case we have a break down at Seawell.

7.15 p.m.

The matter has been gone into very thoroughly; and as I have said, we have come to the conclusion that the best use that can be made of the Generators at present, (if we are prepared to keep them) is to put one at Seawell, one at the Police Training School and the other at Police Headquarters.

A point was made by the honourable junior member for St. Peter relative to using one of these Generators in Housing Schemes. I thought of that very early; and more especially in connection with the Aided Self Help Schemes, because it is difficult for those people to work under gas lights at night. But there again, we were faced with the fact that these Generators are not portable. You have to make solid beds for them, bolt them down etc., and so we had to abandon the idea.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest to the Minister that the Government cannot light up places like the Aided Self Help Housing Schemes unless they change the Act. Let them change the Act. What could be better for the people living in these Schemes, than to have generating plant operating under the same authority? I agree that there should be provisions for a hurricane; but if a hurricane comes, there are a lot of things that we will not have in our private homes. If we have to use a lantern or a storm lamp we will have to use it. We are not in a position to provide in full against a hurricane.

I would suggest that it would be a very good thing for the Government to use at least one of these Generators in a housing scheme. I believe that it would be a means of making the Electric Company get up off their haunches and do something. If you have to move these Generators afterwards, they will still have served a useful purpose. What would be better than for these people in St. Lucy to have a little light? I suggest to the Minister to explore that possibility. I believe that today there are enough people in that area who can make use of a Generator.

On the other hand, if the Government does not have any real use for these Generators, they should sell them. Do not put them down waiting until a

hurricane comes around. Explore the possibility of using one in the Clinckett's area.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, there are four of these units at Seawell. If you are having this Lister to replace them, I am wondering what the Government will do with those four units. It is true that the Lister is not portable, although it is a comparatively simple job to make it portable. I would like to know what is the voltage of it. [Hon. M. E. COX: 230 volts]. That is the power, not the voltage. However that is not important. If the Government feels that it could use one or more portable generators in their housing schemes, I wonder if they would consider the use of one or more of those units which they have at Seawell.

I do not like the idea of the Police requesting these generators for use in a hurricane. More often than not, the first flash of lightning sends to bits the very equipment that is to be used, and then you will have to have a standby against the equipment that you are using as a standby. If you put down alternators and let them be exposed to the moisture and the weather, you will have to be constantly spending money on them.

Will the Government consider the use of these two International Harvesters? I agree of course that it would be better to have the company's power; but if the people engaged in the construction of these houses work by night and you can help them with a generator, by all means do so.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I did not hear the introductory remarks of the Minister. I feel that in a matter of this sort, the best advice that the Government could be given has not been given. I personally feel that you should sell two of these Generators and keep one. It is true that you will soon have a change over. Under your Local Government Act, local government in St. Michael will see after its own lighting. They are the only persons under the Act who can do that, and practically sell current to local consumers. While that is so, I do not advocate the use of these Generators for the purpose; because from what I have been told by people who know, it seems that it would be much cheaper to buy your current from the company than to operate these Generators. When you buy your current you pay for what you use, but when you use the Generators you have to meet the operating costs etc., it is much more expensive.

Now I am always hearing a lot about these hurricanes. I am one of the few members of the Vestry of St. Michael who have openly refused to serve on the Hurricane Committee. I am not one of those people connected with the Government who are hypocrites. I have heard a lot of talk about these hurricane committees; there are a lot of people who want something to do; they want to be able to strut about and tell you what to do in case of a hurricane. I know that if a hurricane comes, the Premier himself will stay at home and see after his family first. After that he will see what he can do to assist someone else.

Everybody tells you that you can do all sorts of wonderful things short of turning back a hurricane. There are some Government Departments which have nothing to do but write a lot of things on paper. There is this talk of keeping one of these Generators in case of hurricane and putting one at the Police Training School. I do not know where you are going to put the Police Training School. Unless they are going to put it at Morgan Lewis Bay, I do not see that you will need one of these Generators.

The suggestion about putting one of them at Half Moon Fort is a joke. The honourable member

knows well enough that even if they would have put one there a few months ago, you could not expect the present Government to put one there now. I like to be reasonable. I know my Government so well that I realise they would not put one there even if we were getting the light for nothing.

7.25 p.m.

To be a little more serious Mr. Chairman, I do not see the necessity of keeping these Generators. If you are going to keep one as a standby all well and good. Why put one at the Police Training School? For what reason are you going to put it up and equip it? You have electricity running along there already. In case of a hurricane and the poles are blown down by the time you start to put up your Generator to get light, the lights from the Electric Company will be put back on.

There are enterprising people not only in Barbados but in the West Indies, who will be willing to purchase these Generators for their various developments. In Barbados recently, I knew of a company which had to go outside to get one of these Generators. I believe one of them will do well at the Spa, St. Joseph to develop the pottery business there! (Laughter) Be quite serious; I am saying that you have already bought them, and it would be infinitely better to sell them rather than to use them for the purpose here stated; and it is a fact that there is difficulty in people obtaining them. You have bought them fairly reasonable; why not sell two, and keep one as a standby?

I have not heard the speeches of all the honourable members on this question. I know it is a waste of time for the Opposition, merely to make suggestions to the Government. The Government is going to say "Your suggestions are worth something; I shall pay due regard to your suggestions, and see if that can be done;" but that is all. I feel if something is wrong that I should vote against it. If we oppose, we should not oppose for the sake of opposition. We should vote against it. I am going to move that you postpone this Resolution. There is no point in making a speech opposing this thing, and then sitting without doing anything. The Hon. Premier is always saying that we want all the money we can get for Social Services. You have bought these things, (not because you wanted to buy them) but because you had to buy them; now that you have them and you find that you do not need them, sell them. There are many people in this area who would buy them from you. What is the point in putting them down to rust? There is really no point in that. As I have said, I know that the new brick industry in this colony had to buy one for between ten or fifteen thousand dollars from the neighbouring colony of Trinidad. There are other people who are interested in these things. It would be cruel to sit and agree with the Government putting one of these Generators at Seawell and one at the Police Training School. Naturally, by the time a hurricane is finished the Electric Company is going to start promptly on putting back up the fallen poles.

Hon. H. G. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the honourable member exactly how long the next hurricane will last?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, this very Resolution shows that Government knows how long the hurricane will last, because they are providing for it.

7.35 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that this Resolution is a result of Princess Margaret's visit. This is a kind of a Resolution similar to those for Princess Margaret's Visit; because the building in which these Generators are at present had to be clean-

ed up for that occasion. The Resolution does not say that they will be able to take them away; they can put them wherever they like. This Resolution is for the installation of Generators. I do not see how you can use this money as you would like. I will suggest that if you can install them for \$1,000 you can move them for \$500.

To suggest that a review of this Resolution would be to bring down the whole Government or the country. Let us say that this money is for the removal of these three Generators from Six Cross Roads; it is of no use moving the postponement of this Resolution, because the Government has got to get the place cleaned up. Let them store one at the Police Department and one at the Airport; but this is a question of spending money for installing them. I am suggesting that if you vote this money some of it will lapse. The Estimates are coming up pretty soon and after the visit of Princess Margaret, they can start the installation of these Generators. I beg to move that this Item be altered to read: "Removal of three Generators from Six Cross Roads," and there would be a reduction of this amount by \$500. I do not want the House to be charged with the removal of these Generators at a cost of a thousand dollars; the Government may be able to remove them for nothing. They may have equipment at the Public Works Department or the Department of Highways and Transport to remove them.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I beg to second the motion of the honourable junior member for the City, my colleague. I do hope that the Government will carry out these suggestions, and that they will take a little more time to decide what they will do with these Generators instead of using them in the way suggested in this Resolution.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am appealing to honourable members not to vote for the reduction of this amount. The honourable senior member for St. Philip has asked about this delay in getting these Generators over to Seawell, and although I did not have the information to give him at the time, I should like to say that the present state of these Generators at Seawell is not, (as I pointed out) up to standard. As you know, these things have to be ordered. In the Resolution there is this Item "Purchase of One Transformer" and that has to be ordered. In a report on these International Harvester Generators, it was stated that these sets are deficient and local agents cannot supply any spares, and the engines have to be started by hand cranking which should not be used in an emergency. All I am pointing out to the House is that we should not wait to order something which would take nine months to arrive; in the meantime something might happen. The question as to whether we will install one of these Generators at the Police Training School and one at the Police Department at Headquarters can be decided at a later date. On the question of installing one of these Generators at the Police Department, that is a point on which I am not strong upon; and it may be, that one of these Harvester sets, (old as they are) may be of some use to some other Department. I am appealing to honourable members to leave the matter to the Government; the suggestions and proposals which have been made by honourable members will be carefully considered.

Mr. ALLDER: When you find yourself with something which you really do not want, it gives you much trouble to keep it and decide what use you would put it to. If the Government had not found itself in possession of these three Generators attached to that property at Six Cross Roads, the Police Department would never have wanted one of them; be-

cause the Government would not have committed itself to the purchase of one for the purpose for which the Department wanted it.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of Order.

Mr. ALLDER: The Addendum to the Resolution states that it has been suggested by the Government Electrical Engineer that the Police Department should be given one of these Generators. I do not know how far the Government has committed itself, but the fact that this statement has been made in the Addendum to the Resolution gives rise to the feeling that there is a possibility of that Department succeeding in getting one of these Generators. The Hon. Minister has said that the Government will not acquiesce in the suggestion which has been made by the Department; but every Head of a Department, when he finds that he can get something from the Government, will try to get it so as to add a little more improvement to his Department.
7.45 p.m.

It is the business of the Government to decide whether these Generators are necessary or not; but I do not see any useful purpose being served by giving the Police Department one, if it is the intention of the Government to do so, nor do I see the necessity of putting one at the Police Training School when it is set up at Seawell. Inasmuch as it is said that there is already an alternative system of lighting at the Airport, it shows clearly that there is no use for these generating sets. I agree therefore with those honourable members who said that the Government should sell some of this surplus material.

I would also like to suggest that the Government should pay some attention to the remarks of honourable members on this matter. If it is not their intention to do so, I have an alternative suggestion. I believe in doing things that will give the best service to the most needy. The Government has something to do with schools, and it also has something to do with the maintenance of churches and vicarages. There is a district in this island, (and it is not in St. John, sir; it is in St. Lucy.) [A MEMBER: Worse still] It is in St. Clements.

There is this district, sir, and I do not think that any of us will live long enough to see the company's current carried thus far. In this area you have a church, a vicarage and two large schools. Those schools are very much used by people of the district, due to the fact that this district is actually cut off from the social activities which are found in other parishes. I can testify that that area is very much used at night by the Old Scholars Association, the Church Girls' Brigade etc. and it would be a good idea if the Government could at least offer one of these Generators to the Vestry of St. Lucy if the latter would be willing to pay the running cost of the equipment, so as to light these buildings owned and used by the public. St. Lucy's Almshouse is also lit by lanterns and you can scarcely see the patients at night. It would be better to offer one of these Generators to the Vestry of St. Lucy, (even if the Government does not get any money from the disposal sets) a parish where they are much needed.

What would really happen is, that there would be a saving; because, if you put them at places where they are not really needed they will deteriorate from lack of use, and you will have to be constantly spending money on them.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I want to point out that there has been no firm decision by the Government. The suggestion just put up by the honourable member may be considered. I hope that honourable members will not lower the amount. I do not think that the honourable member for the City should

urge that a hurricane may be over in a matter of a few minutes. One does not insure, hoping that one will have an accident; one insures and hopes that no accident will occur. A hurricane skirted us closely recently. Knowing that there is the possibility of a hurricane, what sort of Government would we be not to have a standby?

The Government itself is not sure whether it will use one of the Generators at the Police Training School. I am giving the undertaking that the suggestions of honourable members will be taken into consideration.

Mr. LEWIS: I am asking the leave of the Committee to withdraw my motion. I would still like to say that I do not like the idea of the Government not having made up their minds yet. The Government has taken a firm decision, (we have been told) to send one to Seawell and not to the Police Training School. Therefore there are two that we are in doubt about. I ask leave to withdraw my motion.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I would just like to say that from the time that we got Ministerial Status in this country, I have been at pains to say from this side of the table that whenever a Minister gets up and makes an appeal like the one that the Premier has just made, the decent thing to do is to withdraw. But I want to assure him now that I will vote for this if I vote alone. When the Premier makes a statement like the one he has made, it is a different thing coming from him than from one of his Ministers. I make no apologies for saying so. But since the occasion when we dealt here with the vote for the Princess—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member has got to be very careful. Do not go on to discuss the Princess under this Resolution.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I know, sir, I am not going too far. The Premier gave me an assurance on that occasion, and a result of that, I voted against the Opposition. I voted with the Government because the Premier gave the assurance that he would carry to the Executive the suggestions which we made here, and that not only would he carry them, but he would press for them. He did not do that. I am saying that he did not do it. As long as I have a seat in here, and I happen to have a certain view, no amount of that sort of soft-soaping will impress me; since it seems that you cannot take a person's word—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I strongly object to that. Not only is it not true, but if it were true the honourable member could not know it. I have stressed many things. It is disgraceful for the honourable member to say that. No one could tell him that I did not press for it at the Executive Committee. 7.55 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I do not want to have any debate with the honourable member. If the honourable member is telling us that not only did he carry those suggestions to the Executive Committee but that he pressed for them and they were not carried, he is admitting that he is no use on the Executive Committee. Let me tell the Hon. Premier that I have time and time again tried to convince him on certain points; and when he eventually gets up and says, he will do so, I would then say "Give him a chance." I am saying now that I am not taking his word. The Chairman told me that I must take it. As I have said on previous occasions, if the Hon. Leader of the House tells you that he is going to do something, you can be sure he is going to do it. The Hon. Premier asks me to mention the instance; it is the question of treating all of the school children or none

Mr. CHAIRMAN; I am not going to entertain anything of children.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I bow to your ruling. I would have been glad if you had allowed me to mention it; but as you have not, I bow to your ruling. However, for the Hon. Premier's information, (if he says that I am not speaking the truth when I said that he did not carry out his promise that he would press for it) I now say categorically that he did not press for it.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I profoundly object to that remark. The Committee did agree to the point made by the honourable member. He has stated a deliberate untruth, and he has said he did not care.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is difficult for me to give a case because of Your Honour's ruling, but I will again say that he never pressed for it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the honourable member to stop that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: It is a very easy thing for him to say I made a false statement. I said, and I repeat again, that what was suggested here in the House, the Hon. Premier got up and said he would press for it. Speaking personally, I would have voted against the Resolution were it not for his remarks. I went along with him because he said he would press for certain things. We can see that that was not so because the report is out; the whole programme is out.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am again appealing to the honourable member to stop with that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am only saying, that we have reached a stage in this Chamber where when Government's members are thin, the Government will conveniently get up and make you promises, but in their usual dogmatic style as soon as they see they have a full Chamber they will get up and say "if you like you can vote against it." I have tried to be reasonable in any matter which the Government brings; but I object strongly to any honourable member, least of all the Hon. Premier, when you make remarks in here, they tell you that your suggestions would be taken to Government House and then they come back in here and make laughing stock of members of the Opposition. The Hon. Premier made a statement promising to do something and then refused to do it.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Every time the honourable member uses those remarks I am going to give him the lie direct. The honourable member cannot possibly know everything. The honourable member is lying deliberately.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am ruling that both honourable members are out of order. They must take their seats immediately.

(Both members took their seats).

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, can I speak again?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking you to desist from making those statements; speak on the Resolution before us. I am not going to entertain any more of that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The reason why I am not prepared to give in, or to vote for this Resolution is because—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have said that a dozen times already.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: It is my right to say it a dozen times and more if I like. You cannot rule that I am out of order on that. That is my right; and I can talk from then until now and until then. It is not for you to say whether I spoke long enough. If you are tired of my talking, you can get up.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am objecting to the honourable member saying: if I am tired, I must get up. I am asking the honourable member to withdraw those remarks.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I withdraw those remarks. But I object to your suggestion that I have spoken too much on this matter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I never said any such thing.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Sir, members make promises in this House and then make laughing stock at the Opposition. As far as I am concerned, I am opposing the Resolution as it stands.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I do not want to prolong the debate unnecessarily, but I do want to tell this Committee that at any time they are ready to go back to the country, we are ready. As I have said earlier, we have not fully decided as to what we should do with two of the Generators. This is no question of appealing to honourable members. In view of the fact that we will have to buy transformers for these Generators, we came down now with this Resolution. 8.05 p.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: What the Hon. Minister must bear in mind is this: on this Resolution you do not have to come back to this House and tell us that you have changed your mind, because this vote is a vote for installation; the Government can install these Generators wherever they like. What the honourable junior member for the City has pointed out relative to an assurance, I will say that if you give an assurance, you must stick to it. I think that my memory is fairly good; do not let the Hon. Minister come back here and tell us that they have put this Generator somewhere else, because we will be able to challenge the Government as to how they said they would use it. The Hon. Minister must be prepared not only to say something, but also to abide by the consequences which will arise if he does otherwise.

Mr. GODDARD: I should like to refer the Hon. Minister to the first paragraph of this addendum. It says this:

"The Government acquired three Lister Generators with the purchase of the Admiralty property at Six Cross Roads. It was then decided that these Generators should be used for the provision of lighting facilities at Seawell Airport, but due to a delay in negotiations other arrangements had to be made to equip the Airport with generating sets."

What other arrangements did you make? They have made arrangements that the Company should light the Airport; they only wanted a standby and they said that the stand-by was in good order. I do not see the necessity for one of these Generators at the Airport; these Generators are something which you should get rid of.

Mr. LEWIS: There is no bullying where I am concerned; the man who is trying to bully me has a good job. I would like to say that the first part of the second sentence of the first paragraph is an absolute lie. This note says: "It was then decided that these Generators should be used for the provision of lighting facilities at Seawell Airport." That is not true, because at the particular time, these words were used by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, the Hon. Premier. He said that the Generators are urgently needed at Seawell as a safety stand-by in case the Electric Company's current failed. If you say that these Generators are going to generate electricity, you are only taking them over there for that purpose. Have you made other arrangements for a stand-by? It is misleading to say that this Generator is needed as a stand-by. You cannot make a statement that you want this Generator to generate electricity, when you want it as a stand-by. However I am perfectly willing to withdraw my motion. I have an appeal to make to my colleague and he might

agree with me; I think he will agree with the following items: (1) Purchase of one Transformer, \$493. Transportation of 2 Generators to Seawell \$150; and preparing bed at Seawell \$225, which makes a total of \$868 which is nearly the whole amount to be voted here. With the leave of the Committee I will withdraw my motion, and if my colleague makes another motion for the voting of \$868 under this Resolution I will support it. This \$868 is needed for the use of the one and the use of the other.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: All that I have said, I got straight from the horse's mouth. This is what I was told at Seawell itself; it is better to use the Electric Company's power and keep these Generators as a stand-by. I went up to Seawell myself and saw things for myself.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I think that my colleague is quite right; I think that we are bound to agree with him. We must have proper lighting facilities at Seawell and have a stand-by. I beg to move that the figures "1,050" be deleted in order to insert the figures "868".

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

The question that the figures proposed to be deleted stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:

Ayes: Mr. MILLER, Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. M. E. COX, Mrs. BOURNE, Messrs. HOLDER, BRYAN, F. L. WALCOTT; VAUGHAN and ALDER.—9.

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

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

8.15 p.m.

On motion of Hon. G. H. Adams, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, the Chairman reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee.

Mr. Speaker, resumed the Chair, and reported accordingly.

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

ADJOURNMENT

On the motion of Hon. G. H. Adams, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox the House adjourned for three quarters of an hour.

8.20 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Resolution to Approve Waterworks Plan

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 4 as the next Order of the day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister for Communications, Works and Housing: to move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution to approve the Book of Reference and Plan of the proposed extension of the Waterworks in the parish of St. Michael.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is to approve the Book of Reference and Plan relative to the laying of an extension of the Waterworks main in the Bay Estate area. The proposal is to lay a 4-inch cast iron pipe from the existing main at Beckles Road under the Bay Housing Estate for a distance of 224 yards, and fix thereon one fire hydrant. The proposed extension is shown on the

plan submitted on behalf of the Governor-in-Executive Committee by a blue line. The cost of the proposed work is estimated to be \$2,240.

This, sir, is for the Aided Self-Help Housing Schemes which are going on at the Bay Estate at present, and it is in keeping with the policy of the Government in providing those individuals with private taps. The laying of the main would also facilitate those persons in the construction of houses I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. VAUGHAN: I would just like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister for Communications, Works and Housing, that every now and then new tenancies are created in the countryside. Where only broad lands existed before would suddenly be sold out, and the people who buy up those lands would go and settle there, but no water service would be nearby for the simple reason that nobody ever lived there before. Such a tenancy is now existing under Newcastle Hill. There are many houses there and the residents have to travel very long distances for water. The question therefore arises of the removal of a pipe, and the erection of one for their convenience.

What I would like the Hon. Minister to do is, in the Annual Estimates which will soon be introduced, to put down something for the removal of the standposts in that district. Let me say again that the people who live there have to walk great distances for their supply of water for domestic purposes.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, may I ask if the Hon. Minister has the plan of this work to be undertaken? Speaking on the last theme, (that is, what the honourable junior member for St. John spoke on) I think the Government will have to declare a policy on these new estates that are being developed by enterprising real-estate people. It is common knowledge that these people cannot provide water-mains or standposts before or immediately after they have cut them up. If you go into the country, you will see some suitable sites which are earmarked to get the authority of the Board of Health to cut them up. I see the Minister for Communications is apparently paying attention to what I am saying. This matter is being directed to him, because he is responsible for the laying down of these mains and erecting standposts in suitable areas. I will say again that it is common knowledge that before enterprising real-estate people can get permission to sell their land in lots, they must assure the Board of Health that any lot of land must be within a quarter mile of the nearest standpost. The question is, who is to put the standposts? In many cases the people themselves are willing to pay the Waterworks for the extension, but they cannot put up a standpost; they have to apply to the Government or the Vestry, and when they do so they are told that because no houses are there, no standposts can be erected. Which should come first, the egg or the chicken? That is something which you will have to resolve very soon, because it is holding up the development of certain areas. Let me say again, that the people are quite prepared to pay for it, but they cannot turn in water on the land before it is sold and tenanted. As you know, all land is not sold with the Waterworks service, and the General Board of Health will not grant you permission for the cutting up of land unless the very farthest lot is within 440 yards of a standpost. This matter has to be resolved very soon, and I will therefore ask the Hon. Minister of Public Works to give it immediate attention. As I have said, I know that there is some hold up over that matter now, and I am sure that the Hon. Minister of Public Works will

be approached by some of those people very soon over the matter. I take this opportunity of letting him know in advance that it is a real problem which will have to be resolved very soon.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, I will take this opportunity to make a suggestion to the Hon. Minister of Works. There are many standposts which were laid down many years ago, but which do not serve any useful purpose today in their present stand. It would be cheaper in the overhauling of the water system of the island, if some of those standposts which are situated far from tenancies were to be removed and put where the people now live. I will draw one instance to the Hon. Minister. If he will go up Clinkett Hill which is just beyond Waterford, he will find on the rising of the hill that there is a standpost at Mr. R. E. Gill's residence, but he will find that the residents of the houses which are situated near the corner of Hothersal Turning, have to walk all the way from there to draw water. If that standpost were removed to the centre of the area where those houses are, it would accommodate those residents. That is a very important matter; and there are other places which I have noticed where those pipes need removing, because there are very inconvenient to the people who live near by. I hope the Hon. Minister will bear that in mind.

As regards to the point raised by my honourable colleague with respect to a new tenancy which has been taken up under New Castle Hill, I will take the liberty to say that the honourable member need not have raised that matter here now; because, he could have informed his newly found friends about what is wanted in the parish. In their private confabs together, such information could be passed on. I say that because the Hon. Minister who is responsible for this department in a statement to one of my constituents, intimated that the reason why those residents did not get the laying of a pipe there, was because they failed to vote for a member of the Labour Party.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I must object to that nonsense. If the honourable member wants to make a statement, that is not the way. I have had no discussion with him; and it is unkind to say before the House that I said something like that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Minister denying it?

Hon. M. E. COX: Is it a proper thing for members of this House to make bald, wide statements like that? Can a member say that some member or some person said that?

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member can say that.
9.20 p.m.

Mr. ALLDER: It was not unexpected that the honourable member would take umbrage at that statement. I am trying to caution the honourable member, and to ask him to desist from making such irresponsible statements and to desist from making such petty displays. What I am trying to say is this: the responsibilities of Ministers are too great and onerous for one —

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member may not deal with the duties and responsibilities of Ministers.

Mr. ALLDER: What I am trying to suggest, is that I dislike very much for my constituents to tell me that because a particular project is being carried out in the parish, a Minister comes to them and tells them: "You did not get it before because you voted for Mr. 'X' and not for Mr. 'Y.'"

Hon. M. E. COX: That has no foundation in fact. Petitions came from these people a few months ago and mains are being installed.

Mr. ALLDER: I hope that the Hon. Minister's statements are not based on fact. I caution the honourable member not to do such a thing, because it reduces his status as a Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the honourable member has developed that point quite a lot; and I hope he will now refrain from making tedious repetition.

Mr. ALLDER: However, sir, I hope that the Hon. Minister will still consider the first suggestion I have made, that is, that these standposts which are not serving their best purpose be removed nearer to the houses of the various occupiers. Another point I must make is this: I do not know what has happened recently with the materials which are imported for use at the Waterworks Department; I have a pipe which has to be rewashed every week. It is a new cock; it was bought from the Department. I should like to say that the reason why these taps have to be repaired so often, is on account of the fact that the material which is ordered is not proper material. I am suggesting that such equipment be obtained from the best manufacturers; it is very annoying when one has to telephone the Waterworks Department and ask them to send up a man to carry out repairs.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have been asking for the Plan; I do not want to put the Hon. Minister in any awkward position, but I wanted to see the plan. I am a member of the Housing Board but I still want to see where it is proposed to lay this four inch main. I would be glad if I can see this plan; but in the meantime I would say that since the Hon. Minister has been in charge of this Department, he has always been bringing these Plans. This Resolution says this: "This Plan is submitted to the Legislature for approval in accordance with Sections 12 and 27 of the Waterworks Act, 1895-1." The Resolution is therefore out of order if the Plan is not before honourable members.

Hon. M. E. COX: In order to save time, I will say that when I introduced this Resolution I deposited the Plan with the Clerk of the House. The Regulations say that you must deposit the Plan and it has been so deposited.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister might appear to be annoyed, but he has to produce the Plan anyhow.

If he says that the clerk is responsible for it, I have tried to check with the Clerk about this Plan. The Hon. Minister seems to be getting annoyed with the honourable member insisting on the production of the Plan; and a very impertinent message has been sent to me. I perceive that the Hon. Minister's ire is up.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am awfully sorry if I have caused any embarrassment; but if I must make my points on this Resolution I must have the plan. Surely, the Hon. Minister who introduced the Resolution could hardly be annoyed because I have asked for the plan. On the other hand, the Hon. Minister knows me so well that I think he should know that it makes no difference to me if he is annoyed or not. I am just asking for your guidance sir; the Resolution itself says that the plan has been submitted to the Legislature for their approval. I can only speak once on this Resolution before you. I am not in a position to speak on it intelligently unless I have the plan which is necessary, according to Section 12 of the Waterworks Act; and as I have said the Resolution itself says that the plan is submitted to us for our approval. Therefore I am asking you to rule that this Resolution be postponed until the Plan is sub-

mitted. I am sorry if any one is being inconvenienced.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have been given to understand that the plan was here but that it has been sent to the Barbados Advocate Printing Department, to be printed I suppose, for circulation. I am only saying what the Officers of the House have informed me.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: That is news to me, sir. In all my seven or eight years as a member of the House I have never received a copy of a plan copied by the Advocate.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not insinuating that the intention of sending the plan to the *Advocate* was that the honourable member could be shown a copy. It was sent to the *Advocate*, (surely not for safe keeping) and the obvious conclusion I drew was that it was sent to be copied.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I think we should be very serious on this matter. Surely, the *Advocate* does not print copies of plans. Under the circumstances I am asking Your Honour to direct that this Resolution is not properly before the House, and that members cannot develop their arguments because the plan is not here, and that therefore this Resolution must be postponed until the plan arrives.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am saying that the Hon. Minister will postpone further consideration of the Resolution according to the law of the island. It is not a question of ruling; that is the law.

9 40 p.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Paragraph 12 of the Waterworks Act, says: "It shall not be lawful for the Department to proceed in the extension or establishment of any waterworks hereby authorised unless they shall, previous to the commencement thereof, lay before the Legislature for their approval a plan showing the limits of the part of the proposed waterworks, prepared on a scale of not less than three inches to the mile, and a plan and sections showing all works for obtaining and storing the water, in detail, with a book of reference thereto for the better understanding of the same; and the said plan when approved of shall be deposited in the Colonial Secretary's Office of this Island, and the Colonial Secretary shall permit all persons interested to inspect the same at all reasonable times and to make copies thereof, or to take extracts therefrom, on payment of one shilling for every such inspection, and after the rate of sixpence for every folio of ninety words copied therefrom."

That has nothing to do with the *Advocate*. I do not know what authority they have for sending this plan to the *Advocate*, because the laying of this plan is not laying it on the Table of the House; it means laying it for the approval of the House. It is an error if this plan were sent to the *Advocate*; because, it has nothing to do with the printing of debates or documents. We are only providing the *Advocate* with money unnecessarily if this plan is sent there for printing.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already given my ruling.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am not protesting against your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: I say again, that it was not on the direction of the Clerk that this plan had been sent to the *Advocate*; it may have been sent to the *Advocate* by mistake.

LEAVE TO TAKE ORDER NO. 10

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 10 as the next Order of the Day.

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

PUBLIC OFFICERS HOUSING LOANS BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister for Communications, Works and Housing: second reading of a Bill to amend the Public Officers Housing Loans Act, 1952.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is very simple. It will be remembered that in 1952 the House passed a Bill to provide loans for officers who wish to construct their own houses. Unfortunately, they were not able to get going due to certain defects in the Bill, and also because of the fact, that members of the Board after the Bill was passed wanted the Government to make this Department a corporation. As a result, the matter has been gone into thoroughly and the Public Officers have agreed for the time being, with the provisions as were originally suggested under this Act.

The Objects and Reasons. Mr. Speaker, are as follows:

Under Section 7 of the Public Officers' Housing Loans Act, 1952, it is intended that a loan shall be secured by a legal mortgage of the land and buildings in respect of which the loan has been made. Section 7 of the Act requires such a charge to be made by way of "memorandum of agreement in the prescribed form." Government is advised, however, that "memorandum of agreement" is not the proper description of an instrument intended to effect a legal mortgage as required by section 6. It has also been pointed out that the form of each instrument may have to vary considerably due to differences in the title to the lands offered as security, and that therefore a prescribed standard form is inappropriate.

Clause 2 of this Bill seeks, therefore, to replace the reference in Section 7 to "memorandum of agreement in the prescribed form" by the words 'mortgage executed in such form and containing such covenants, conditions and provisions as the Governor-in-Executive Committee may require.' These amendments necessitate changing the marginal note to this section and the deletion and re-enactment of this section with the above amendments is considered the proper course. Opportunity has been taken to correct an error in this section by replacing the reference therein to section five by reference to section six.

Clause 3 seeks to make consequential amendments to Section 8 in similar respects as Clause 2.

Clause 4 of the Bill introduces a new section into the Act containing provisions as to how a charge on a public officer's gratuity (as required by paragraph (c) of Section 6) is to be effected.

I may further say that the provisions of loans for Public Officers has been hanging fire for a very long time. As I have said, those people could not have had loans before owing to the provisions of the Act. It will be remembered that provisions were made for loans to Public Officers in the Government's Five Year Plan of Development and Taxation. Now that we have been able to get this going with the assistance of the Civil Service Association, it has been decided to allocate loans to Government servants at a rate of 3% interest. It has also been decided that the period in which those loans should be repaid should be twenty years. As far as the maximum amounts in the various categories to be granted to these Officers, it has been decided with the assistance of the Committee of the Civil Servants, that senior clerks should receive a maximum loan of \$6,720, Clerks, \$5,040, Male Qualified Teachers \$5,040, other Male Teachers \$2,880, Constables \$2,400, Postmen \$2,280, Messengers \$1,800, Cantoneers \$1,080. Those are the maximum amounts suggested, recommended and

agreed to by the Civil Servants Association; and those amounts have also been accepted by the Government. 9.50 p.m.

As honourable members will see this Bill is pretty straight forward. It is just an amendment to the Act and with few exceptions it is similar to what the Act was before. I do not know whether honourable members need any more information, but if there are any points raised, I am quite willing to explain them in so far as it lies in my power to do so. I would like to ask honourable members to pass this Bill tonight; because since this portfolio was passed on to me, I have had calls morning, noon and night from Civil Servants and many requests have been made to speed up this Bill into law as quickly as possible in order that they can take advantage of the opportunity which is being offered them. Let us get this Bill through as quickly as possible, so that we may be able to get ahead advancing loans to Civil Servants along the lines of this Bill. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. BRYAN: I rise to give my support to the passing of a Bill of this nature. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that in 1949 I had the privilege of bringing forward an Address dealing with loans to Public Officers. The Act was first brought down in 1952 and I think that the sum of \$5,000 has been put down in the Five Year Plan for this purpose. An allocation of \$2,000 was set out in the Estimates for this purpose but, unfortunately, we have not made any headway in the matter. Tonight we have been given the reasons for that. At the Annual General Meeting of the Civil Service Association, the President enquired of His Excellency who readily offered his assistance in getting this scheme underway. I was told that there was some difficulty about the regulations; I, like the Hon. Minister, have been approached by people in all categories as to how soon this scheme will be put into operation; and I am sure that other honourable members have also been approached in this matter, and they can readily appreciate the eagerness with which people have been waiting for this scheme. I am wondering how soon the Regulations will be laid before the Legislature. I have heard about Heads of Departments —

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of Order. I have never said anything about any Heads of Departments. I mentioned the Senior Clerks.

Mr. BRYAN: I stand corrected on that point. However, when the scheme comes into existence, it appears to me that you will find some difficulty where the allocations are concerned. I think the Government should set out the allocations as to how many people will be allowed loans per year, so that the money will not be swamped up in any particular direction. I think that we should follow a form of allocation which will cover as many categories as possible in the service, so that we will not find that the entire sum of money per year is taken up by only one class of people. I throw out that suggestion to the Government because I feel, that that form of allocation will give more satisfaction to people in the service than if the applications for loans were left entirely open.

Mr. VAUGHAN: In connection with these commendable schemes which the Government introduces in this House, very often the representatives of the people whom the schemes concern, have to make enquiries insistently. I would therefore like the Government to advertise for general information, the classes of people to whom loans will apply, so that those who want to make use of loans will know where to go in order to make their applications,

and whether they have to go to the Housing Board or anywhere else. It is necessary in this scheme, for the Government to make the position known as widely as possible; so that the people concerned will not have any difficulty in realising where they qualify. You will have categories of Government employees asking whether these loans apply to them, or whether they apply to this, that or the other; therefore, it would be of much help to publish a list of the persons to whom these loans will apply. I would ask the Hon. Minister of Housing to consider the suggestion I have made as a means of enlightening those who may be entirely ignorant of what is being done here tonight. I have seen how Government schemes abroad are advertised, and they are advertised for the benefit of those whom they would like to take advantage of them.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What is more important, sir, is if the honourable Introducer of this Bill had stated on what basis these loans would be extended. It does not mean that every Clerk or Police Constable can on the passing of this Bill, go and get a loan. There must be some basis on which these loans will be advanced to people, and there must be some basis as regards priority or selection of the people who are getting loans; because, obviously the amount allocated for this scheme could not advance loans to the entire Service at one time. Therefore what is more important, is that the Hon. Minister should explain the method under which Civil Servants in the various categories will be selected for the advancement of these housing loans.

10.00 p.m.

Now so far, we are advancing money for housing to the Sugar Industry workers. Under the proposed legislation we will be advancing loans for Housing to Civil Servants also. It will be argued by a very large section of the population that Civil Servants have already security of tenure, in many cases tolerantly good salaries, sick leave, retirement pensions and what not and that therefore by comparison with certain other sections of the public, they are fairly well treated. So that if you are going to advance loans now to Civil Servants, there is reason to believe that the general public will feel that people outside the category of Civil Servants or sugar workers should also be entitled to loans for housing on the part of the Government. There is no reason why carpenters, or masons, or clerical workers, or small shopkeepers or business men should not also be entitled to loans for housing under certain specified conditions.

The sugar workers get their loans from a special Sugar Fund, and it is proposed that Civil Servants should get theirs from Government revenue which revenue is contributed to by the entire population. So I want to submit, that neither one section is more entitled to assistance of this sort than the other section.

Now the incidence of repayments of Government loans by all the people entitled to them, is fairly high. The peasants who borrow from the Loan Bank and the fishermen and the sugar workers, all prove that in all these cases the incidence of repayments is high. The Peasants Loan Bank have lost more than 1/2% of the money advanced during all the years of its existence. In other words we have to deal with an honest community, with people who endeavour to the best of their ability to repay money advanced to them by or through Government agencies; therefore, the Government can with confidence, as long as it can find money, embark at the earliest possible date on a scheme for the advancing of loans for housing to people other than Civil Servants and Sugar Workers.

I suggest sir, that no better source for the requirement of the capital needed for the general housing loans to the entire population who qualify, than that the moment that some of our foreign investments become due, to call them in and utilise the amounts so recovered in housing loans. It may be argued that these monies are now invested in what is known as gilt-edged securities; but their rate of interest is hardly more than 3% or 4%, and that is the same rate you will get from Civil Servants or sugar workers to whom loans are advanced. Therefore as I have said earlier, I think a case could be made out for saying that although the advancing of money to the average person for housing is not in itself a gilt-edged security from the rate of repayment, it may be classified as a fairly good investment and the return will be no less so from the point of view of interest.

You will have the additional advantage of putting money into circulation locally and employing people, adding to no small extent, to the money in circulation and increasing the general revenue. The money that we invest abroad may be regarded as a safe investment; but that is about all there is to it. It means that the profits or surplus monies in the community are sent outside to develop foreign countries to the detriment of our local development.

I repeat that you can with confidence, advance loans to all sections of the general public on the same basis as we intend to advance them to Civil Servants. It would be a mistake for anyone to think that because of what we are doing here tonight, every Civil Servant and every Cantoneer will qualify at the same time. It is equally not to be expected that every single person in the community who qualified for a loan would get it because of what I am suggesting. Whatever the basis is, it will apply to the various sections of the population when the money is available. It does mean however, that provided the normal conditions are satisfied, provided that we have reasonable security, unless some extraordinary moral perversion takes place in the community, and as long as the present normal standards of honesty remain, we shall not be running any undue risk or committing any irresponsible act, if we took up surplus money entrusted to the Government and loaned it under stipulated conditions for the purpose of housing.

Sugar workers, as it is well known, both factory and field, have taken the maximum advantage of the facilities offered for housing through the Sugar Industry Labour Welfare Fund. The pity is that there is not more money accruing to that fund than there is in circulation, in order to benefit an even greater number of people than now benefit under the scheme; but by and large, the reputation built up by varying sections of the population for integrity and a prompt desire to meet their commitments with the Government, will justify any extension of credit facilities for housing to the general run of the population.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, when the Hon. Minister for Communications was about to sit after he had moved the second reading of the Bill which is now under consideration, he looked very pleased; and he made an appeal to the House to pass this measure as rapidly as possible so that Civil Servants who were long awaiting it, might be encouraged to take advantage of it as quickly as possible.

I for one would be quite willing to help him and shall do so; but I was wondering if the Hon. Minister had as much grounds for being pleased as he appeared to have. This is not a lot of money that he proposes to lend out. As far as I remember, a half million dollars have been allocated for this purpose in the Five Year Plan; and last year's

Estimates contained, I think \$200,000. As I understand it, a Clerk can get \$5,000 if he wishes it. It does not need much figuring to see that if forty Clerks qualify for loans, they will use up a whole year's allocation of this money.

If this is the way it is going to be done, and there is no means of saying to this or that person, "they are more people than you; wait your turn," you will very soon find that within the first few weeks of every financial year, the amount allocated for that year is completely exhausted; and it would I think create a lot of hardship among other members of the Civil Service who will have just as much right to apply for loans, and who will have to be told that forty people have already had \$5,000 each and the whole allocation has been swallowed up.

Of course until the Minister tells us how he proposes to arrange it so that each category of Government servants can get his share of the loan, we are not at liberty to believe that there will be any general satisfaction about it. I think that what is wrong with the scheme is, that not enough money is allocated. Obviously not. When a man can borrow a couple of thousand dollars and he is only charged 3% interest on it, and he needs not bother about paying it back until the twentieth year, it is an opportunity which you cannot expect him to miss. The easy terms that you offer are an incentive to borrowing, and one wonders in this age when this Government is so accustomed to spending money recklessly whether they are not now finding another way of getting rid of the money, (perhaps in a better way than spending it recklessly) by inviting all and sundry to come and borrow. If you are encouraging borrowing, at least I think you owe it to the people to make sure there is enough to be borrowed; so that you do not appear to be encouraging people, merely to disappoint them at the end.

As I said, the whole trouble is that there is not enough money. But there can be enough money. The honourable senior member for St. Philip made a good point when he suggested that perhaps, since we are advancing this money out of current revenue, sooner or later you might have to decide about bringing in money from abroad. That is, as you know sir, a sore point with me, and I am looking forward to hear the Hon. Minister of Finance when he makes his budget speech, give yet another justification for that curious policy. I shall be willing to take him up on it at that time or even before. But I do think that if there was one good reason for abolishing any policy of creating surplus funds this, I think, would be the reason.

If you are willing to trust your own people to the extent of letting them borrow from you for twenty years at 3 percent, obviously you consider them a good and safe investment; but if you are not putting enough at their disposal to satisfy them, then you are defeating a very good purpose. What therefore you should do, is to see to it that all the available money that you can use for this purpose, (to show your faith in your own people) should be used. It would therefore do no harm if what you put aside in your budget every year as Revenue Equalisation against a rainy day, (a quarter or half million dollars) was put into these loans to be advanced to the people whom you wish to help in this admirable scheme.

I say that because it must be said, that this scheme as long as it is properly worked, will benefit the minority but the majority will be left out. Clerks, Police Constables, Postmen, Messengers and Cantoners from a very sizable proportion of Government workers, and if they are all to benefit, and if you are prepared to trust them to the extent of giving

them such easy terms, you have no justification whatever for not putting larger sums at their disposal; unless of course, it is a wish of the Government to confer a benefit and to create a hardship at the same time. Nothing that they have said in this Bill so far leads me to believe that; but if you do not wish to create a hardship simultaneously with conferring a benefit, then you have got to reconsider your whole policy about the sum allocated for this excellent purpose. Put some more money into it; to put \$200,000 is not enough.

You cannot ask a whole lot of Government Servants to believe that there is something there for them, and when within the first month the sum is exhausted, and only a few are served, and expect the others to assuage the disappointment with the fact that Government had good intentions. I do not know of course what the Government proposed to do about this matter in the next financial year. It may be that they have seen the need for increasing the allocation; but if they have not seen it, I wish to bring it to their attention now. It is not enough and to leave it as it is now without making it more in the next financial year, is to create a hardship; because, as I have pointed out you are going to lend money to such large numbers of people, I think that for the sake of arithmetical convenience you will find it easier to lend \$5,000 than \$5,080. The money will divide itself more easily.

10.20 p.m.

Obviously, the Clerks and the Police Constables are going to hear of it; perhaps not merely first, but with more persistence than the others, and you cannot blame them if they rush and take advantage of it. When this year's allocation is all gone, and the next year when this same amount is allocated, you will then have the unpleasant task of telling other people it was a good scheme, but unfortunately the people who wanted greater sums than you used it up quicker than you because, they heard of it first and they were more energetic than you. However, if nothing more can be done between now and the end of this financial year, it is a matter which the Government should take very seriously, and should make sure that in the next financial year there is much more money put at the disposal of all those categories of Government servants whom I feel are deserving cases. I will counsel Government that if it finds that it is difficult to grant this money out of Current Revenue, they need not hold it up, but make a start by holding back what they actually sent out and putting it into this most estimable scheme.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I very much regret that the amendment which is now before the House will not go far enough into the question. I remember on the occasion of the introduction of this Bill in 1952, I suggested to the member of the Executive Committee who was in charge of the negotiations for the passage of that Bill through the Assembly, that the Bill as it stood did not completely fill the aspirations and suggestions made by the Civil Service Association. I also pointed out at that time that although it was a good practice to emulate legislation which was enacted in other colonies, prior to the consideration of any kind of Bill whether of this nature or otherwise, one should always view the particular clauses of the Bill in the light of the peculiar conditions which obtain in the colony of Barbados. I also pointed out that every other colony in the British Caribbean had a relatively large quantity of Crown Lands, which made it possible for the Government to lease land for a very long period, say for 75 or 99 years. These conditions are obtainable in the islands of Dominica,

St. Vincent, Trinidad, Grenada and St. Lucia, and I know that from my own personal research in those territories. I also pointed out on that occasion that to ask a Civil Servant to acquire his own land before he could be considered for a loan to build his own house, was surely not adopting a realistic approach to the problems in this island; in view of the fact that the Government would have a first lien or mortgage both on the land and on the building which the unfortunate Civil Servant might in the distant future erect thereon. I need not add that Civil Servants would hardly be able to buy an acre of land within the vicinity of Bridgetown or even ten thousand square feet, which would be the average size plot which a Civil Servant would want to build a home because the cost is in the vicinity of £500, and with the salaries which the lower branches of Civil Servants now obtain in this colony, it is unlikely that any Civil Servant unless he was fortunate enough to win a first, second or third prize in the Barbados Turf Club Sweep, would be able to buy a parcel of land of appropriate size, and to have it free of any incumbrances.

If he had a mortgage on the land he would first have to pay off the mortgage to the person from whom he borrowed the money before he could acquire a loan. The Government is asking not only for a first charge on the house which has to be built, but they are also asking for a first mortgage on the land. The Civil Servant therefore must first have a gift of land, or he must be in such a position that he is able to acquire a parcel of land to the value of some \$2,400 before he can approach the Government for a loan. It means that only people in the top bracket of the Civil Service who are in receipt of salaries in the region of £1,000 a year and over and with relatively small families, would ever be in a position to acquire a parcel of land other than by gift or by some other means other than purchasing it out of his own salary. I pointed out at the particular time, that although it is good to emulate some other colonies in the drafting of Regulations when it comes to Civil Servants housing loans it is an entirely different approach in Barbados from that which you find in the neighbouring West Indian colonies. Therefore the Bill as it stands, even with the amendment now, is a Bill which can only be of benefit to the particular people in the Service who are not now in need of salvation, to put it in that way.

10.30 p.m.

My recollection is, that the Hon. Leader of the House at that time said that he would consider the point; but we do not know what has been the outcome of his considerations up to now, because it has not been vouchsafed to us. I have talked with some of the officers in the Civil Service and they have reported that it was the principle of the Government, that loans should be made in respect of both land and in the erection of buildings on lands for Civil Servants housing. I remember putting an alternative suggestion to the members of the Government, which suggestion, would obviate the necessity for drafting any amendment to the Bill as it stood at that time. It was this: the cost of 100 acres of land (even at the exorbitant price at which land is now being acquired in the parish of St. Philip) would be approximately \$120,000 — a mere bagatelle when we consider the extravagant disbursements which are made by this Government. One hundred acres of land scattered at convenient distances from the City of Bridgetown, in the suburbs which are now being established in the parish of St. Michael and beyond, say in five or six different locations of approximately 20 acres each

could be acquired. The land which has been surreptitiously acquired at Whitehall in St. Michael (acquired at a price of even \$2,000 an acre) should be leased to Civil Servants at an economic rent, and there would not be any necessity for the Government, if they acquired approximately 100 acres of land, to amend this Bill so as to give Civil Servants the power to borrow money from the Government for the purchase of land; because we would be falling in step with the other West Indian islands where the Crown lands are used for this purpose, *inter alia*. One hundred acres of land would give room for approximately 800 houses; and that is even with the wildest anticipation of the scheme which was then before us, an amendment to which we are now considering. The sum of \$200,000 was allocated in the Estimates under the Capital vote in 1953-54 for this purpose and it was revoked last year because it was not used. That money would have vested in the Government, an amount of approximately 100 acres of land which would be used for the fulfilment of the scheme which they envisaged.

I do not think that the Government should be so recalcitrant as to reject suggestions emanating from the Government's Bench and try to put forward a scheme such as I have suggested. I must say that I would be failing in my public duty if I did not draw to the attention of the Government, the suggestions which I made on that occasion and the promises which were made at that time and the proposals put forward by the Civil Service Association and their objections to the Bill as it stood, in addition to the fact that not one single Servant up to date has been able to erect a house under this scheme although it has been in operation for over two years. I feel it would be pure churlishness and a complete disregard of the wishes of the people most intimately concerned, if the Government does not do something to implement the suggestions which have been made on the floor of this House in that respect.

Hon. M. E. COX: Before you put the question Mr. Speaker, there are one or two points made by hon. members to which I want to reply. In the first place I would like to say that this amount covers property rather than houses, even although it might be small. Land, as you know sir, is fairly expensive in some areas at present, and in other areas we may be able to purchase a lot on which a dozen houses can be erected at a reasonable cost. But the point was made not long ago, that the members at the top of the Service will absorb this money and those at the bottom will be denied loans. However, I want to assure this House that there will be no such practice. The money as far as it can be done, will be as evenly distributed as possible.

A point was also made by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy about the amount allocated for Civil Servants, which is \$200,000 in the 1954-55 financial year. I should like to say that this matter carries us back as far as the Five Year Plan; and it must be admitted that some members of the House even opposed that Plan which included the sum of \$500,000 for loans to Civil Servants. They felt at that time that we were overburdening people with taxation. As a result, some honourable members voted against the passing of the Five Year Plan and some of them absented themselves from the House. It should also be borne in mind, that the amounts allocated to the various items, Works, Housing, Roads, Water, Schools, Hospitals and so on were, as far as the Government could have seen at the time, in conformity

with what was expected to be the revenue which would be collected within these five years.
10.40 p.m.

Therefore if we do not allocate a few million dollars to this Scheme it is not because we do not want to see every Civil Servant build a house, but because the finances of the colony would not allow it. So Sir, small as the amount may appear, it is as far as we can go, taking into account the Five Year Plan since, as honourable members will remember, in that Plan while Professor Beasley advised that we should budget on a crop of 130,000 tons of sugar, Government decided to budget on a crop of 150,000 tons and allocated money to various items accordingly.

As far as the workers at the bottom are concerned, (Postmen, Cantoneers etc.) it should be obvious to members that those persons can also fit in with the larger housing scheme which the Government intends to introduce in the very near future, and on which a White Paper was laid in this House sometime around October last year. In so far as those persons are concerned, they can easily fit into that scheme and get their loans whether it be under the Aided Self-help Scheme or otherwise.

With regard to the question as to whether an individual can purchase land out of this amount, I think that in so far as the workers in the lower bracket are concerned, we should more aim at providing these persons with houses similar to those which are now purchased and/or constructed by sugar workers. As you know Sir, where sugar workers are concerned, loans are advanced to them; and while it is true that we are not here to encourage the construction of wooden houses which deteriorate so rapidly, circumstances make it necessary for the Cantoneer and such people to construct houses out of wood. Therefore, it would not be a question of buying land, but they can get loans to construct houses similar to those which are being constructed by sugar workers and on similar conditions such as regards the renting of land.

As I said, sir, we cannot go outside of the limit of our financial resources. As soon as the Housing Loans Bill comes before the House, hon. members will be able to see the whole approach that we are making.

The question that the Bill be read a second time was put and agreed to without division.

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

Clause 1 of the Bill was called and opposed to.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I am very surprised that with all the expensive array of talent which we are supposed to have in the Administration of this colony, that anyone could ever imagine that a memorandum of agreement could ever be a legal organ. It is due to defects such as this one, that we are now trying to cure what the Civil Servants of this colony have been bereft of for the past two years—the benefits which would accrue to them under the provisions of the Act passed in 1952. When suggestions are made about correcting mistakes in a Bill which is before the House, those suggestions are always bitterly resented and looked upon as some kind of reflection not only of the Department of the Attorney General but also on the legal luminaries who now adorn the Government's benches. Time after time, amendments are either sent back from the Other Place, or after the Bill has been found unworkable in the form in which it has been bulldozed through this Chamber, we are asked to pass amendments which will make it a bit more workable.

If in this particular instance the Government has now discovered that (according to the Objects and Reasons) it is intended that a loan shall be secured by a legal mortgage of the land and buildings in respect of which the loan has been made, and that Section 7 of the Act requires such a charge to be made by way of "memorandum of agreement in the prescribed form," and Government had been advised that "memorandum of agreement" is not the proper description of an instrument intended to effect a legal mortgage as required by Section 6, I would like to know what has transpired in the interim period.

Has the Attorney General taken a refresher course, or was it that when he was on one of his visits out of the island some smaller light discovered that the person responsible for the drafting of Bills had made a cardinal error as regards the contract which must exist between Civil Servants and the Executive? I have no recollection of the Attorney General on a refresher course, and therefore it must have been pointed out by someone, outside the Government's benches and outside the Attorney General's Office, that something was wrong. I would advise the Government that this is a democratic country; and when suggestions are offered, no matter from which corner these suggestions may come, they should not be taken as reflections on anyone's ability but as suggestions which would save the Government a lot of headaches, and save the public a lot of waiting for things which should be done quickly, and would be done quickly if the Government accepted the advice offered on the floor of the House.

10.50 p.m.

I can recite thirty or forty different occasions on which something of this kind has occurred, and I do not want to say what I said on the last occasion. I am quite prepared to ask: by whom the Government has been advised at this time of the day, two years after the Bill has been passed, to take this stand. Have we got the Lord Chancellor or some plenipotentiary or some legal luminary other than those who are in the Government or in the Administration to advise us, or has the Colonial Office sent this back and pointed out something to them, as the Leader of the House often reminds us, what even an elementary school boy should have known in the first instance? The Government could have saved itself a lot of embarrassment if it would carefully check on all legislation that comes to this House and if Government would open its ears and listen to the views of those who are trying to suggest anything to them. I do not want to say, "I told you so", but ask the Hon. Minister of Social Services what I told him about the Separation and Maintenance Act. I am not prepared to tell the Hon. Premier anything because he is beyond redemption.

From the first instance, I pointed out that this Bill was wrong. I commented on Clauses 6 and 7. The Government has had to wait for two years until they feel that the official records have been burnt or obliterated, in order not to lose face by bringing it up again. Through their recalcitrance they have been holding up Civil Servants from obtaining Housing Loans all that time. Who has now advised this Government that a memorandum of agreement by Government is not a legal document? Why were the Civil Servants held up for two years? I am only raising this point to let certain people know that this is a democracy; and very often when Government is trying to suppress enlightened suggestion from the floor of this House, they are cutting their own throats and digging their own graves.

I do not want to say any more on this particular Clause; but tell me whether the interpretation of a memorandum of agreement has been changed by the Provincial Council since 1952, and whether now the interpretation of it by Maxwell, Craie, or Odgers which says that a memorandum of agreement is not a legal mortgage, is not right. I know that it is not a legal mortgage. You can say that it is so to the Hon. Minister for Communications, but not to me.

Hon. M. E. COX: In answer to the last point raised by the honourable senior member for St. George in which he said that he drew it to the attention of the Government, I will only say that all the legal luminaries of this House including the honourable member, spoke on this very Bill, and not one of them made any mention of it, not even the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. No legal member of this House or any other honourable member said one thing on it.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the Hon. Minister if I did not speak on Clause 6, and said that the whole thing would have to be re-drafted. I do not know whether the Queen's Solicitor got the O.B.E. for this.

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

Clauses 3 and 4 were called, and passed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

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

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: In view of the fact that I only just discovered that certain remarks were made about lawyers on the amendment which this Bill is now making, and because I happen to be one of the lawyers, I will just say that it is sheer nonsense to talk what the honourable senior member for St. George said; because apart from what the Hon. Minister for Communications said, the honourable senior member for St. George must know that if one lawyer says this is a legal mortgage and it should be done this way, and another one says it should be done by a memorandum of agreement and another says by something else, it does not mean that either one of the three is wrong. [A VOICE: The honourable member was sleeping!] Who would not sleep when some people are talking? It having been said that

this is some mistake, I only want to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that these are things which everybody knows. You go to borrow something from somebody; there are dozens of ways in which you can do it. It is the Queen's Solicitor who should say that you should have a memorandum of agreement. 11.00 p.m.

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

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, the Bill was passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed.

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

Social Security Report

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, before the adjournment is moved I would like to ask a question. I know that a Message came before this House from the Governor with respect to a Report on Social Security, but it seems that the members of the Government do not see fit to have a Committee appointed to deal with this matter. What I am really asking is this: what is the new procedure to be adopted in dealing with Reports which come to this Chamber? How do we debate them? Do we move the adjournment of the House for five minutes and then debate them? I do not see any reference being made to any Committee going into this Report. I would like to discuss this Report sometime, but I would like to know what procedure is to be adopted. I can easily move the adjournment of the House in order to deal with it, but you will hear a cry from the appropriate Minister that he was not informed of the matter before.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no change in the procedure in this House. If the Government cares to send down a Report, the Government will do so; but honourable members, as I have already said in this House, have it in their power to move the adjournment of the House in order to discuss any and every matter.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I now beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day week 1st February, 1955, at 3 o'clock p.m.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until this day week 1st February, 1955, at 3 o'clock p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

11.05 p.m.

100

100

100

100

100

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1954—55

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

1st February, 1955.

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. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M. (*Minister of Social Services*), His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS (*Deputy Speaker*), Hon. M. E. COX (*Minister of Communications, Works & Housing*), Mr. E. K. WALCOTT, Q.C., Mr. F. C. GODDARD (*Leader of the Opposition*), Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN, Hon. C. E. TALMA (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands & Fisheries*), Mrs. E. E. BOURNE, Mr. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc., and Mr. J. C. TUDOR, M.A.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meeting held on 18th January, 1955, have been printed and circulated, unless there be any objection these Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention that I have made a careful check both of the post and elsewhere, and up to the moment of my entering this Chamber, the Minutes of the meeting of 18th January, 1955, have not been circulated to all the members, and hon. members are in the unfortunate position of not being able to say whether these Minutes are correct. I consider that it is a very serious matter, with all the modern equipment for printing which is available, that such a situation should take place.

Mr. LEWIS: I too would like to say that I have not received my copy of the Minutes in the usual way. I have just had my copy handed to me.

Mr. SPEAKER: After listening to the statements made by both hon. members, my decision is to postpone the confirmation of those Minutes.

Typographical Error in Minutes of Meeting 4th Jan.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the fact that there is a printer's error

in the Minutes of the meeting held on 4th January, 1955. On Page 2, line 9, column 2, it reads: \$23,750, whereas, it should be \$23,752.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, by command of His Excellency the Governor, I am directed to lay the following: Memorandum on the Barbados Fishing Industry.

On behalf of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry & Labour, I am directed to lay the following:—

Agreement between the British Guiana Rice Marketing Board and the Government of Barbados in respect of the supply of rice for period 1st January 1955 to 31st December, 1956.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Resolution to place the sum of \$2,623 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1954—55, Part I, Current, as shown in Supplementary Estimate 1954—55 No. 40 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Resolution to place the sum of \$9,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1954—55, Part II, Capital, as shown in Supplementary Estimate 1954—55 No. 41 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. M. E. COX: Bill to make provision with respect to the Housing of persons of the working classes and other classes and for purposes connected therewith.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to consider the two Money Resolutions of which notice has just been given.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICE

Mr. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes later in the day to discuss conditions arising out of the Clinketts Housing Scheme.

QUESTIONS

Mr. J. A. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:—

To enquire of the Minister of Communications, Works & Housing at the next meeting of the House

1. Is it a fact that water is shut off from the standpipes at White Hill, Mount Hill and Dorants Hill, between the hours of 5.30 a.m. and 10 p.m. daily?

2. If the answer is yes, will the Minister investigate the reasons for this and so alleviate the discomforts caused to the residents of this district by this shortage of water?

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to make provisions with respect to the Housing of persons of the working classes and other classes and for purposes connected therewith, was read a first time.

3.25 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER'S RULING RE RESOLUTION FOR \$23,752

Mr. SPEAKER: At the sitting of this House of Assembly on Tuesday, January 18th ult., my ruling was sought by the honourable Leader of the House — The Minister of Social Services — as to whether or not an honourable member other than a member of the Government had the right to introduce and (as he afterwards assented to including) finalise a money Resolution.

The Resolution then introduced to the House and which was being proceeded upon in Committee of Supply was an omnibus Resolution for the sum of \$23,752. It appears after checking on the sequence of proceedings of the Committee of Supply on this Resolution that the Honourable Junior Member for St. Lucy moved that Head XL stand part and that there early existed some doubt as to the correctness of this motion when seconded by the Honourable Senior Member for the City as the voice of some Honourable member made reference to a 'sixth Minister.'

The question to which I must address myself is 'Can an honourable member other than a member of the Government be in order to move a 'Head' which is an item within a money Resolution?'

Now with reference to Sec. 4 of the Executive Committee Act 1891—22 it is laid down that:—

"The initiation of money votes by Bill, Resolution, or otherwise by individual members of the House of Assembly shall cease, and shall be made only on the responsibility of the Executive Committee in the manner provided in this Act;"

and later in the same section individual members of the House are restricted in the exercise of their powers as far as introducing any Bill, Resolution or other measure which does not create any charge upon the revenue of the colony.

Did the Honourable Junior Member for St. Lucy impose a charge for the Government since it could not be said that he initiated a money vote by Resolution?

The House has now by custom directed that in Committee of Supply an omnibus Money Resolution shall be proceeded upon Item after Item — Head after Head.

A Government Member initiates such a Resolution as is prescribed under the Law, is in charge of it on the Order Paper and separately moves that each Head stand part.

In doing so he invites the Committee to grant these supplies item after item as part of an omnibus

Money Resolution, by moving as many motions as are necessary in Committee of Supply which procedure is laid down in May's Usage of Parliamentary Procedure (18th Edition) of 1950 page 709 as follows:—

"Each Resolution for a grant forms a distinct motion, which can only be dealt with by being agreed to, reduced, negatived, superceded, or by leave, withdrawn."

Here as yet I am not concerned with the passing by the Committee of the particular Resolution as amended or the report of the passing of the Resolution. But I may state here that the Committee with reference to such a Resolution approves or disapproves or approves with an amendment the granting of such supplies and that the first or second reading of such Resolution is a mere formality as laid down in May's Parliamentary Procedure, since Money Resolutions are seldom debated in report (see May's Usages of Parliament page 750.)—

"Money Resolutions are seldom debated on report, since an adequate opportunity for debate has already been provided in Committee, and points of detail are more appropriately raised on the Clauses and Schedules of the related Bill."

Now the principle laid down in May's (page 709) *re* GRANTS PROPOSED by Ministers declares that the proposal for the grants of supply must be made by a Minister. Under section 4 of the Executive Committee Act to which I have already made reference it might be argued that the individual member who moved that this Head stand part did not initiate a Money Resolution and I would be a bold and venturesome man to say that he did so, but did he not initiate a Head of expenditure in this Resolution?

Again it may be argued that a Money Resolution is initiated when notice is given of it as provided under Rule 66 of the Rules — Orders & Forms of Procedure of this House, and introduced when a formal motion made by the Honourable Member in charge obtains the permission of the House to proceed with it at its next meeting or when immediate permission is granted to do so by the suspension of Rule 88 of the Rules, Orders & Forms of Procedure of this Chamber.

Acting upon this assumption it can be said that the Honourable Leader of the House initiated this Resolution.

But it is not clear when the prevailing practice of the Committee as directed by the House is to proceed separately upon the Heads of Expenditure in an omnibus Money Resolution, that the honourable junior member for St. Lucy did make a motion which was a proposal for the grant of supplies as contained in Head XL of the Schedule of this Money Resolution.

It is therefore my reasoned opinion that there has been committed a breach against the established customs of this House when in Committee of Supply and though I am not competent to pronounce unaided by expert and impartial legal advice (and despite the apparent persistent endeavours of highly responsible persons to suggest what my decision should be) what is a breach of the statute law of this island, I am inclined to consider the moving of a Head of expenditure or some other measure of legislation, against which individual members of this House are restricted from introducing as an action beyond the capabilities of an individual member of this Chamber.

Finally there is no doubt in my mind that according to the "Laws, Privileges, Proceedings & Usage of Parliament" as set out in May's Parliamentary

Treatise (Fifteenth Edition 1950) on page 790, and referring to GRANTS PROPOSED by Ministers, the motion is entirely out of order, and so I give my ruling.

TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN APPOINTED

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, before we enter upon the Orders of the Day, it has been intimated to me that the Chairman of Committees is indisposed and will not be present to-day. I therefore beg to move that the hon. junior member for St. John (Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN) be appointed as Chairman of Committees for to-day's meeting.

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

The motion was put and agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I leave the Chair, I should like to make this statement to the House:—

As touching an obvious irregularity which was pointed out by the Honourable Senior Member for St. George who rose on a point of order in Committee during the proceedings on this Resolution, I must point out to this House the motion made by the Honourable Minister for the passing of the Resolution as amended should have been passed before the one moved by the honourable member for the City who moved the report of the passing of the Resolution and this is to say the least an act of inadvertence not to mention S.O. No. 19 May Page 1025 which lays down the principle.

It will be noted, however, that the Honourable Senior member for the City made the same motion twice.

3.35 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

The question was put and agreed to without division.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I would like to say, at a few meetings ago the hon. junior member for the City intimated that if an hon. member desires to ask leave to take charge of a Money Resolution standing in the name of another hon. member, he should ask that leave while Your Honour is in the Chair. To be on the safe side, I am now asking leave to take charge of Order No. 1, which is a Resolution standing in the name of the Hon. Premier.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am not objecting to leave being granted. But for the information of the Hon. Minister, I will say that on the last occasion it was particularly stated (and the Minutes confirmed it) that the hon. member gave notice of a Resolution on behalf of another hon. member, and his name wrongly appeared on the Order Paper as being in charge of that Resolution. The two situations therefore are entirely different.

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

Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply Mr. VAUGHAN being in the Chair.

Supplementary Estimates No. 39

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is one to place the sum of \$42,930 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive to supplement the Estimates 1954-55, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1954-55, No. 39 which

form the Schedule of the Resolution. The Resolution is composed of individual heads; I now beg to move that Head XV stand part.

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

Head XV.—Police

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, speaking under Item 51—Motor Transport,—there is an explanation that is rather baffling. A sentence here says, that this Item was reduced by \$1,000 on the grounds that four new motor vehicles would be added to the strength of the Force; unfortunately the Note says, these vehicles did not arrive early as was expected, and up to this date only two have been received. Two of the old units which it was hoped to lay aside have had to be repaired, and have remained in service working uneconomically as they did. In addition other vehicles have had to do more than their share of work, resulting in an increase cost of upkeep.

Those remarks are somewhat baffling to me. What extra work did they have to do? The Government intended to have four new ones; only two arrived and they have used two of the old ones. What were they doing before? This explanation seems extraordinary to me. Perhaps that is not right information.

As regards Item 73,—Upkeep of Motor Launches,—the explanation is that it was necessary to give the launch 'Lynx' a general overhauling during the year at a cost of \$1,735. The cost of this overhauling is \$954,—greater than the repairs for last year. It seems to me that you will spend a \$1,000 more every year on overhauling. Not only will you spend money on overhauling a launch, but every year it will be \$1,000 more. That certainly would suggest that it is time to decide whether you should not replace this launch. What will happen next year? I do not know if the equipment is being handled fairly. This seems to me to be a great deal of money to spend in repairs. If the recurrent expenditure for repairs is going to increase every year like this, it is time that some report be made on the type of launch or the type of engine in the launch or wherever the repairs have become necessary.

The question that the Head stand part was put and agreed to without division.

Head XXI.—Science and Agriculture

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head XXI stand part.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I think this will be a very appropriate time for us to hear from the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, (whom I am glad to see in his place to-day) what is the position as regards the Mealy Bug Pest. I would like to get some up-to-date information as to how the campaign against the pest is progressing, what is the state of the pest, and anything else which would be important to us in this connection now that we are just at the beginning of the harvesting season. It would also be especially important to the Government, because it is necessary for them to know the implications of the pest with regard to budgeting which is just around the corner.

I would also like to hear what are the feelings of the Department of Science and Agriculture as to the methods being adopted, and how far inwards has the pest made into our main industry.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, before the Hon. Minister replies I think we should get some idea as to the cost. There have been two or three votes on this Head; I would also like to know what the planters themselves are contributing apart from just buying

this agroicide that the Government is selling to them. What is the planting community doing in their own interest as well as in the interest of the Island?
3.45 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA : Before you put the question sir, I beg to report that the statement is being prepared on the investigation which has been made by the two agricultural scientists of the Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture who have been investigating the Mealy Bug Pests. Every endeavour is being made not to mislead in any way, but to give proper information and advice to the planting community. The experts in question have recently visited here and the statement to which I have referred, will give hon. members a scientific knowledge as to the position of the Mealy Bug Pest. That statement will be issued in the very near future; possibly at the next meeting. In view of that, I do not think that it would be wise for me though I happened to have studied the Report of the two scientists, to make any statement at all to that effect. For the benefit of the hon. junior member for the City, I would inform the House that investigations are going on with all the various types of insecticidal mixtures at Blowers Plantation, St. James since the last reaping season, and it is with the object of conducting further investigations with all the various types of insecticides that these funds are required today.

The break-down of the figures which represent the total expenditure is made up as follows :—

(i) Two Fairbanks platform scales	\$ 840.00
(ii) Field Workers' wages during period 17th January — 31st March, 1955	2,000.00
(iii) Production bonus and holiday days with pay in respect of (ii)	840.00
	\$3,680.00

The sum of \$200 is also required to cover local travelling and incidental expenses of two further visits by Messrs. Fennah and Smith, of the Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture. Similar expenses of the first visit were, owing to short notice, met from Head XXI, Item 43—General Contingencies. The total provision required is thus \$3,880.00.

Mr. Chairman, I think the House should await the statement which I hope would be presented next week.

Mr. LEWIS : I am sorry that I should have to tell the hon. member this, but hon. members of the House deprecate the absence of information on these matters when they are being presented, and the promise of information by Statement. Let me say that information by way of a Statement is not good enough. The time for which these wages are needed is past already. This Resolution should have been in here in the month of December, if they are really doing what they are supposed to be doing in this Resolution. It appears to me that they have already spent the money out of the Treasury before it has been voted. This is the 1st February, and they needed this money for wages as from the 17th January last. I would like to know if the Government is standing the entire expenses for eradicating this pest. The planters want Government to do everything for them. Do you mean to say that they did not have two platform scales some part of the country to weigh these things? What is the Government going to do with these scales afterwards? Will Government sell these scales to them at half price afterwards? This is not a satisfactory state of affairs. You have a money Resolution being introduced in the House of Assembly on the 25th January, saying that you want money to pay wages as from the 17th January. Certainly that

is not the method for dealing with money Resolutions. This money is not supposed to be spent until it is voted; and it may be injurious to the whole system if these Resolutions are not introduced in time. Let me say again, that it is very unfair that we should get arguments on Resolutions, Bills and measures of that sort by way of Statements after the measures have been passed. I am asking the Hon. Minister if he would be satisfied with such state of affairs like this, if he were not a member of the Government. How can they decide to start off a scheme from the 17th January and only bring in the Resolution on the 25th January? Something is radically wrong since we cannot have some statement today to show how much we have spent already on this Mealy Bug Pest. We should be told that at least. Let us know if the people on the otherside (the planting fraternity) are pulling their weight. It is the considered opinion of the people both inside and outside of the planting fraternity, that the Government is being taken for a ride on this thing. They are saying that there are aspects of this matter which are wrong; and you are getting people who are interested in planting, ready to express that opinion. I am not saying that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is cognisant of that, but it is well that we should be given all the information on this matter. I certainly would like to know something more of it. Does the Department know nothing of what is being done? I see that no money is put down in the Estimates for 1954-55 for this matter. This financial year is coming to an end and nothing has been put in the Estimates for the eradication of the Mealy Bug Pest. If you look at the Resolution in front of you, you will see that. Is this a new outbreak of the Mealy Bug, or is it a little idea of somebody that we should get some more experts to look into this matter, and because of that they have asked for this \$4,000. This is not satisfactory at all. It is a fact that so long as it is anything to do with the planting of sugar cane and you say something will ruin it, unless you do something about it this House will pass the money to carry out the measure. It is a fact that you can get a lot of slackness in between the necessity for these things and the control of them. I am not satisfied that we are getting all we should out of this business.

Mr. MILLER : I have decided not to worry the Hon. Minister of Agriculture since he was out of the House for the past few weeks. I know that there is a branch of the Department of Science known as the Cane Breeding Branch, which operates some of these Fairbanks Platform Scales and so on, and I see nothing wrong in adding these two scales. The Botanist will probably be carrying out a test as explained in this emergency programme. What I would like to be made clear on is the Hon. Minister's use of the term "statement" because we are looking for a report. Is this Statement something in the form of a Report made by the Director of Agriculture, or is it the Report of the agricultural scientists? I see that money is being requested for a return visit of these two scientists. I appreciate the cost that has been set out in the Resolution as regards the two Fairbanks Platform Scales and so on, but as regards the use of Agroicide which was advised by the Department, I am wondering whether the Hon. Minister would have in his possession any report about the tests which have been made by the use of this insecticide. I am wondering if we are now using more or less something new in this emergency programme. I am eagerly looking forward to the report of the two scientists; I do not want to be too strong on the matter, because the Hon. Minister would require sometime in order to catch up with his back logs, but I am wondering if this

is a Statement made to tell the community what position we are now in as a result of the Mealy Bug Pest or whether it is the report of the two scientists.

Mr. HAYNES: On the last occasion when we were dealing with the Resolution in connection with this matter, I said that I would like to know whether it is the Hon. Minister's intention to organise a united front in the eradication of this pest; that is to say, it is of no use dealing with one or two estates and leaving the small-holders without any adequate safeguard. If that is so, the Mealy Bug Pest will increase and come back again. To my mind, unless some united front is taken in districts, I do not see that you will get any real benefits from this campaign. My feeling is, that there should be an all embracing campaign in whatever district it is being carried out. I was hoping to have heard something about the matter now that the Hon. Minister has come back for more money, but nothing has been told us about this matter; and I should like to get some information as to what policy is being carried out in this connection.

Mr. LEWIS: I am asking the Hon. Minister of Agriculture to let us know now whether this scheme as set out in Note 5 has been put into operation. As regards the payment of people, did that start on the 17th January, 1955? If it has started, there is an admission that they have been paying money out of the Treasury without having the right to do so.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I will answer the hon. junior member for St. George first. The position is that the experts did make investigations and they will probably go twice this year, and because it will take three or four years to cover the entire programme a preliminary report has been submitted. The Director of Science and Agriculture is very tardy about publishing a report which might cause confusion, and which is really with the object of doing the greatest good to the greatest number of people, fearing that wrong impressions might be given. The result is that a Statement is being prepared by the experts who actually conducted the investigations, and who are still conducting further investigations in order to get to the bottom of this programme. It is therefore hardly wise or discreet for me who is a non-expert, just a few days before the Statement is in my hands to elaborate on something which experts in Agriculture themselves are not willing to make a statement on. That is the position. I could add many points and probably explain a greater deal, but I do not care to do so at this stage; and I do not think it is expedient in the face of that Statement for me to be heard commenting on a report which experts are studying very closely and which will be published very soon under the guidance and supervision of the experts themselves. That goes to prove how much importance we attach to any report in connection with our staple industry. It is for that reason that this preliminary report is being studied and a Statement is being prepared to be laid in the House.

In so far as the hon. junior member for the City is concerned, these investigations of the pest and experiments with various insecticides were started soon after the reaping season last year. The money that is being now asked for is to continue these experiments and trials. It may be that the Resolution should have been here a week or so ago, but I was indisposed.

I believe I did not hear the hon. junior member for St. Andrew so well.

4.05 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. member wanted to know if the same attention is being paid to small-holders' canes.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: That question is also receiving very close examination. The question is whether Agroicide should be subsidised so that small-holders will be in a position to purchase it.

To make another point clear, I think I should say from what I have read and studied, the Agroicide has turned out to be not so successful as was anticipated; and it has been proved that opening the land and allowing it to lie fallow so that the elements of the sunshine can do its part, is equally as effective as the use of Agroicide.

Mr. MILLER: Just one final point. The Hon. Minister seems to misunderstand my question. I was not asking him to explain the details of the report. He was harping on a Statement to be presented, and I want to know if "statement" is a new word for a report. Although apparently the Hon. Minister was at pains to conceal everything in the report he let slip one important fact. Of course we all appreciate the position of the Hon. Minister, and none of us would want him to say anything which would jeopardise that position.

I wanted to know if this Statement was going to be the report that we have heard of. As I said just now, the Minister released an important bit of information, and that was the failure of Agroicide. The Committee will remember that when it was first used, I queried why the Department was not willing to try another insecticide since I myself from the reports of the people in the planting business, understood that it was a failure. I admit that it may not be so in all the districts. There seems to be justification for some anxiety from the very fact that the Minister is at pains to conceal things in the report.

If this Government applies to the United States Government under the Point Four Programme, they will probably get technicians to work in conjunction with these two famous scientists in Trinidad. The tests now taking place are just one phase, and may have to go on for years. If that is so, there can be no statement made as to what will be the outcome to the country as regards the Mealy Bug. I appreciate the position of the scientists who I know would hesitate to say anything except after several tests. I have implicit faith in the anxiety of the Minister to see this pest under control, and I want to assure him that this House will follow him doggedly to see that an end is brought to this state of affairs.

Mr. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, one thing is puzzling me. I notice here that the field workers' wages are for the period 17th January to 31st March, 1955. If Sir, they have already been sent to work on the reaping of these canes, it appears that they have been working for two weeks starting on the third. I wonder if the Minister can tell us if they did start as from that date and what funds were used to pay them.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to let the Minister know that I was not asking him for his personal opinion on anything. He knows that if you ask for information like this, it is something that will be communicated to him. I would say that he is not even as much a layman on matters of Agriculture as the Government spokesman in the Other Place; but when this Resolution gets up there, we may hear a good deal about it from the mouth of a layman.

What I am alarmed about is the two things that the Minister has just said. The first is that this is a continuation of a scheme. How could that be? A continuation from where or when? He says it started sometime after the last reaping season; but there is no money for it in the 1954-55 Estimates, neither

has there been any supplementary provision. So where did the money come from? With what is this being linked up. This is a brand new item coming in before the financial year is closed. As far as I know the reaping season ends in May, June or July and this has started with the reaping season of 1955. So what the Minister said is not correct.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The note suggests that such works have already been started.

Mr. LEWIS: But not since the last reaping season Mr. Chairman, because we voted no money for it.

The next thing that is alarming to me is to hear that a technical report has been made, and that another set of technicians are sitting on it to tell the Minister that he must issue a Statement. That is a full admission that the report of these people whom you are paying to come here, will never see the light of day as far as the general public and the planting community are concerned. That is not right. If we are paying for expert opinion what the expert says should be published. The Department of Science and Agriculture or the Executive Committee have no right to take reports of experts and decide that it is not right to publish them, and that they will make a statement on them.

4.15 p.m.

The report of the expert should be the truth of the matter; and it is only by knowing the truth of the matter, that we can make any headway. The planting fraternity should know the truth of that report as well as the people who read it. It is their taxes which are being paid to eradicate this pest.

How can you have an expert and yet send for other experts? Then you are withholding their report. You cannot withhold that report, Mr. Chairman; and I am sure you will agree that Government should publish that report. After that you can issue your own statement which can disagree with that report.

As far as the opening of the land and letting in the sunlight is concerned, that has been said from the first day; that was suggested so as to avoid the Mealy Bug Pest reaching alarming proportions. Planters have told me that it is because they have ratooned and ratooned, (sometimes as many as nine times without plowing the land) that this Mealy Bug has thrived. It is because they wanted a way to circumvent the increased cost in wages. It is a fact that they have built a house and left it for this Mealy Bug pest to live in. Where the land is loose you do not find Mealy Bug. You heard that eighteen months ago from the people who knew; and they do not have to be experts. They have said that we have had the Mealy Bug here since we were planting the Sugar Cane. Whatever planters have saved in wages by keeping the old cane stumps in the ground rather than planting new canes, you are now paying for it by taking money out of the Treasury to fight this pest. What about the wages the planters have saved?

I want to say that these Statements which we get after Items have been passed are very unsatisfactory. The Hon. Minister has not answered the question whether this scheme has been carried out as from the 17th January or whether it will be starting as from today. He should know that. Because one Minister is indisposed, do you mean to say that the whole of his Ministry must come to a stand still? I am demanding that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture answer my question, (because it is something which is vital to the constitution of this colony) as to whether this work has been put in force already. That is something which is absolutely essential. I feel the Hon. Minister should make a statement as to whether this

scheme has been started, because it is not a continuation of anything. We are not supplementing anything; this is a brand new item.

We have \$200 for the visit of two experts; are they coming between February and March? If so this money will lapse. Sir, I feel that this House should join with me in finding out if this money which is being asked for today for the payment of wages, is being spent already. That is a simple question, and the answer should be forthcoming.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: For the benefit of the hon. member who has just sat, I would like to inform him that this scheme was intended to start as from the 17th January. It is not actually started. As a matter of fact, you cannot start it until the funds are available. As I have said before, this Resolution should have been introduced earlier, but owing to my indisposition it was not introduced. That part of the scheme has not been started.

As far as the next point which was raised by the hon. member, he would see that this is part of the emergency programme. As he knows, this Mealy Bug Pest has caused a great scare. If the Department had done nothing about it the hon. member who has been criticising us now, would have criticised us for doing nothing about it. The hon. member is asking about money to buy Agrocide. I cannot answer that off hand; I will have to investigate that. All I would say is that this is a continuation of that scheme. Let me inform the hon. member that this threat of the Mealy Bug was evident long before Ministerial system. You cannot expect me who have only taken up the portfolio of that Department from that time, to have everything at my fingertips on this question of the Mealy Bug.

Mr. LEWIS: I have not asked the hon. member any such thing. What I have asked him about he should be able to say. If he can only answer questions on something starting on the 1st February 1954, what use is he? Cannot he look up the files? He comes in here and says he does not know of what happened before on this matter. Has he a bad case, or is he making a bad case for himself? I did not tell him anything about when this scheme started; he said it was the continuation of that scheme, and I said that cannot be true.

Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to hear from the Hon. Minister of Agriculture that money has not been spent yet on this scheme, because it is in his particular Ministry that money has been spent long before schemes have been started. I am not talking of the spending of the money on the scheme at Six Cross Roads, St. Philip, so I hope this is not a continuation of that scheme.

The question that the Head stand part was put and agreed to without division.

4.25 p.m.

HEAD XXIII (3)—MENTAL HOSPITAL

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The next Head which is Head XXIII (3) deals with various items in connection with the Mental Hospital. The first item is Item 25: "Allowance in lieu of rations of staff when on leave or on night duty." The Note says this: "hitherto, allowances were paid only for night duty or duty leave." The notes are fairly full. As I have said, provision was only made for night duty or duty leave, but the amount which is requested here will make further provision under this Head. Item 37 is "Rent Allowance" and Item 37 (a) is a new item: allowance in lieu of quarters." Item 38 deals with provisions for patients and for an increase in the cost of meat. I should like to take this opportunity to let the Committee know, (it is a meed of praise to

you, Sir, since you raised the question about the diet of the Mental Hospital being unsatisfactory) that the matter was investigated and as a result of that investigation, more green vegetables and fruit are being given for ordinary patients which necessitates the increase in the cost of the provisions. The next item is Item 40 "Cleaning, water, and light" and Item 49 is "Maintenance of Lorry and pay of driver." The Note says, that provision is made to meet the cost of two tyres for the Bedford Pick-up. The two front tyres were considered to be dangerous, and this pick-up had to be equipped with two new tyres. The next item is a new item: "Repairs to boiler." I now beg to move that Head XXIII (3) stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. LEWIS: I cannot agree with the honourable member that these explanations are very full; because, some of them are merely given in one line, and a short line at that. The Note to the first item says this:

"Hitherto allowances were paid only for night duty or duty leave." You will have to augment a statement like that with some further explanation. Has this House laid down any new conditions of employment? Are we creating something new where no rate has been told to us? The next thing is this: from when is this payment going to start? Has all that information been set out here? I have heard that certain allowances that were given to the Nurses at the General Hospital were denied the attendants at the Mental Hospital. Well, I would like to know how that came to happen, and if you are now trying to do justice from what date are you going to do that justice? Is it from the 1st April, 1954, or from the time that the Resolution is passed or what? There is nothing here to guide the Auditor General and this House which is the sole authority for attaching the conditions of money which is coming out of the Treasury. What is the rate? Are you now paying these attendants the same thing as you paid the attendants at the General Hospital? Cannot some explanation be given as to why the people at the Mental Hospital have been denied this treatment? Is it a ruling of the Crown Law Officer, or what? It all means that an allowance should have been made and it was not made. Those are some of the things which I believe we should be told. Who is now seeing the light after all these months? It is an important piece of information to give this House as to when these allowances will start; because, other people have cited the time when these conditions will start. If this House says that it is paying an allowance from such and such a date, somebody writes a memorandum on the vote to say what should be done; some gentleman in the Civil Service arrogates to himself the prerogative of the House of Assembly of this colony. He is the senior legislator of the colony; he writes a memorandum, as to when money is to come out of the Treasury and who is to get it.

4.35 p.m.

The terms and conditions laid down from money coming out of the Treasury by the House of Assembly should be the only terms and conditions that should prevail. I would like to know from what date these allowances can be paid. How can you say as is said in the Note, that "hitherto allowance were paid only for night duty or duty leave." Who has been denying it? How do you know that is due now? Do you mean to tell me that you were not paying this money from the beginning of the financial year and even before, and now you are going to pay up these arrears? From when? The 1st April? That is something I think the

House should know, and so the honourable member is entirely wrong when he says that these Notes are full.

The only way the House should vote this money is to know the facts which I have mentioned, so that they can compare it with anything that may happen at another institution. Now that the Government is trying to do justice they may be doing another injustice.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: In the last Estimates, Head 23 (3), Item 25 there is the sum of \$8,000 to pay these allowances. That was incorrect. It was a mistake in the Estimates, and the sum should have been \$14,000. This mistake was brought to the attention of the Government and this \$6,000 is to restore it. The rate is the same as that on which allowances are paid to similar officers of the General Hospital.

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable member says that this \$6,000 dropped out of the Estimates; that it was an oversight. That is asking too much of a normal human being. The fact is that it was calculated correctly to the last cent, because they were not going to pay certain allowances to these people. Do you mean to say that they cannot even copy the Estimates right? If you had said that the "1" had dropped out, or the "4" had dropped out it might be more reasonable; but not \$6,000 out of \$14,000. That is not the correct explanation. Probably the honourable member wants to be a little modest. He must have discovered that injustice was being done and got it rectified. That modesty, while being very becoming, is very misleading. Let him tell the House that some person or persons deliberately calculated to rob these people. There is no such thing as any mistake being made. A very careful calculation was made to reduce this vote by \$6,000; and was made by someone who should know better. Those are the very people who want the Government to rent furniture for them, and to pay them all sorts of allowances.

From what date these allowances will be paid? From the 1st April, 1954? [Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Yes.] I would like to state that the Minister of Social Services has said that these allowances will be paid from the 1st April, 1954. I hope that the Auditor General and the Accountant General will hear that. If that is so, it should have been shown in these notes that are also for the guidance of those officers; if not, someone will discover something entirely new and reduce the vote by another \$6,000 somewhere along the line.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the Hon. Minister will further enlighten us. It seems to me that there is a very sudden jump in the cost of provisions. In 1951-52 it was as low as \$107,000 per annum. In the present financial year it is \$130,000, and now we are being asked to vote \$14,000 more to complete the financial year which has two months more to go.

I would like to hear whether this is due to any great increase in the number of patients within the past few months; because, the price of food stuffs have not had such a sudden jump during the year. What is more, the meat supply is by yearly contract, and therefore there cannot be any change in price.

I would also like to know how far the authorities have got in making this place self-sufficient. It has been suggested on numerous occasions that one of the means of healing some mental cases, is to give those who are strong enough manual work to do. The only land owner in that area who has not

attempted to grow fruits and vegetables etc., on their land is the Government.

4.45 p.m.

It does appear as if the area of land owned by the Government there is around 12 acres or more. That does not include buildings and residences. All one can see growing on that land is grass and bush. One thought that out of the Resolution which was passed by this Chamber some time ago to step up the farming there, that that land which runs to the sea coast would be cleared and that cocoanut trees along with other fruit trees would be planted so as to bring down the running cost of that Institution. We have at that place free labour given by some patients, and that labour could have been put to the cultivation of the land which is lying fallow there. It is very important because while it is necessary that such patients should be given greens and vegetables, one is given the feeling that it is a new inclusion or that there was a sudden increase in the running of that Institution, or that the prices of the commodities had suddenly risen during the past financial year. It cannot be so in the case of the supply of meat because that is obtained by contract. Besides that, this financial year has not yet come to an end.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I entirely agree with the honourable senior member for St. John when he draws to Your Honour's attention that the Government has a considerable amount of land adjacent to the Mental Hospital at Black Rock, which is now lying in a state of disuse to say the least. I would also like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and the Hon. Minister of Social Services, that a Farm Superintendent has recently been appointed. May I draw to your attention Mr. Chairman, that a farm is not a place where you can only raise chickens, but one where you can produce other commodities such as feeding stuffs for chickens (pulses, grains and so on for the poultry) which you are raising. I think the newly appointed Superintendent would not be acting beyond the call of his duty, if he recommended to the Government that all the uncultivated lands be put into use as soon as possible. Quite apart from the disuse and general untidiness which prevails on these lands, I would like to point out to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture that a considerable amount of Love Vine can be found growing on those lands; and there is an Act on the Statute Book of this island which makes it an offence for an occupier or an owner of land to have Love Vine growing on his premises. I think if the Governor-in-Executive Committee (which is the Government of this island) wanted to see the laws of the colony followed especially those which are in the interest of the preservation of the agricultural amenities of the island, it should set the example in the question of the eradication of the Love Vine; and Government should furthermore see to it that the Love Vine Eradication Act is more strictly enforced.

When I noticed the deplorable state of Government lands some time ago, I had a talk with the then Acting Director of Agriculture; he was a newcomer to the island, and of course one cannot be too stringent in one's observations on his lack of knowledge of this situation. Because he was a newcomer, however, one of the points which we discussed was that the present method of enforcement of the Love Vine Eradication Act was entirely inappropriate to the object which we want to achieve. As you know sir the onus is placed on the members of the Barbados Police Force to prosecute persons who have Love Vine growing on their premises I would like you to know that before that, I had had a talk with a manager of one of the sugar estates in Barbados and he could

not tell me what Love Vine looked like. I find it difficult to appreciate how constables of the Barbados Police Force will be fit and proper persons to enforce the Love Vine Eradication Act; and it seems to me, that there are many people in the island itself both within and outside the Department of Science and Agriculture, who themselves are completely ignorant of the appearance of Love Vine. It is a very serious problem, so serious a problem is it indeed that the Legislature saw fit to impose strict penalties on the occupiers and owners of land for allowing it to be grown on their premises.

What I would suggest to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is that the present law should be amended, and the authority to inspect, import and prosecute be vested in the Sanitary Inspectors of the various parishes. And for this reason: all the Sanitary Inspectors are under duty to visit every single property within their respective districts at least once per month, and if the Sanitary Inspectors were given a short instruction, (a course of training is not necessary) on the appearance of Love Vine and their duties under the Eradication of Love Vine Act, then I feel that we would have made some step towards achieving the aims of the Legislature and preventing the cultivation of this island from being over run by this insidious weed.

Of course, I think it should also be the duty of the Sanitary Inspectors to invite all the occupiers of property on which they find Love Vine to eradicate it forthwith, either by burning or whatever method may be thought proper from time to time; and I would also suggest to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture that in the first instance that Love Vine is found on any premises, that prosecution of the occupier should not be automatic, but that instruction and invitation should always precede prosecution under the Act. Those are the suggestions which I have to make.

Someone may say, Mr. Chairman, that agriculture does not come within the province of the Commissioners of Health of the several parishes; but members are fully aware that a lot of the powers which are exercised by Commissioners of Health do not strictly come within the definition of Health. The whole history of Local Government and administration, and the very history of the office of Justice of the Peace has been one of expediency and convenience rather than logic. It seems to me that the machinery which I have advocated, would be a much more effective one than the existing method of inspection and prosecution laid down under the Love Vine Eradication Act.

4.55 p.m.

This procedure should recommend itself all the more to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, in view of the fact that I see no reason why it should involve any increased expenditure on the part of the authorities or of the Government itself; because, the Inspectors have to visit property in any case, to see whether the property is being kept clean once a month. I believe that it is the practice to see that the Health Regulations are being complied with; and if that is the practice, then they would be no additional burden thrown on them to look around at the same time and see so conspicuous a phenomenon as Love Vine. I am therefore asking the Honourable Minister of Social Services to let the Government set an example by cleaning up the land which they have at the Mental Hospital, and any other lands which they have belonging to the Government on which this very, very harmful weed may happen to be in existence. Again I hope that some step will be taken

to implement these recommendations which have been made by the honourable senior member for St. John.

Mr. ALLDER: Several points have been raised before this Committee, and one was asking for a further explanation; and I think the Honourable Minister should be given the opportunity of further enlightening us on the points which create some difficulty.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Anyone who says that land at the Mental Hospital is not being used, certainly has not visited that Institution for the last year and a half at least. [Mr. BARROW: I passed there this morning.] The honourable member says that he passed there this morning; he passed the road, but if he had gone through the lands at the Mental Hospital he would have seen that in consequence of the increased number of livestock, a part of the land is used for growing fodder for the stock and a part of it is also being used for a kitchen garden. I should like to say that this House passed a sum of money in the Estimates for digging a well for irrigation purposes. The well has been dug, but unfortunately equipment has not yet arrived; it is on order but it has not yet arrived. As a result of the increased number of stock, the Hospital is almost self-supporting in milk; they are now buying on the average of 20 pints of milk per day, whereas the amount was in the vicinity of 300 pints a day. If the honourable member had read the Note he would have seen that there has been an increase in the amount of green vegetables and fruit under the Item "Provisions". I am pleased to say that within the last few months, the diet of ordinary patients has been improved. For many years, as near as they are to the sea, they were not getting any Flying Fish but now they are getting Flying Fish.

The honourable member also referred to the price of meat, which he believes is on contract; the supply of fresh beef is not on contract. None of the suppliers would contract to supply the Institution with fresh beef. I believe that there are certain goods which are contracted for. However I repeat, that the Institution is almost self supporting in milk and within another three months or so we hope that we will not be buying any milk at all; the institution will soon be fully supplied with milk and when the irrigation equipment arrives, the institution will be fully supplied with green vegetables.

Mr. LEWIS: In spite of the honourable member's statement that the institution is becoming self sufficient, you will find that the cost of provisions has gone up. [Interruption by the passing military rehearsal parade.]

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I feel that some protest should be made against a happening like what is taking place now. After all sir, that road is supposed to be blocked to traffic when the House is sitting. I sincerely hope that it is not the band of the Police or the Military for which this House pays money! This is gross disrespect. This road is supposed to be blocked off to traffic. Do you mean to say that the Army or Police can pass here at a time when the House is sitting and route their band along this road?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have been informed by the Marshal of the House that the Police removed the barriers for the Band to pass.

Mr. LEWIS: I will refer the matter to the Speaker. I was just mentioning sir to the honourable member, that he said there was an increase in the vote for provisions because more green vegetables and fruit have been introduced into the diet and more fish etc.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister said that the increase is due to an improvement in the quality of the provisions.

Mr. LEWIS: I think he said that there had been some innovation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member explained that patients are now getting items of diet which they were not getting previously.

Mr. LEWIS: That is correct. It is not that the quality has improved, but that new items are added. If that is so, have none of the other items been taken off? Were they getting absolutely nothing before? If there is a change in diet, if for instance you buy carrots instead of potatoes, I would expect that the only difference would be the difference in price between the potatoes and the carrots. It seems to me that the diet was not only insufficient in variety before, but in quantity. For some time they have been supplying themselves with milk, but the vote for provisions has gone up by a little over 10 per cent.

Mr. ALLDER: Like the honourable member who has just sat down, my opinion is that the explanations are not sufficiently satisfactory, for the simple reason that this place uses hundreds of pints of milk per day and if it has become partly self sufficient as regards the production of milk which is an important item of diet, instead of the Institution asking for \$4,000 more there should be a reduction.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is no compatibility between the two things.

Mr. ALLDER: What I want to suggest is, that inasmuch as milk is one of the primary diets and hundreds of pints which used to be taken from outside are now being supplied by the Institution, instead of asking for an increased grant for the balance of the year, there should be a reduction or the cost should be stabilised. If you reduce the amount of milk that you used to buy from outside, and you increase the amount of fresh food, what you save on milk should naturally have gone to pay for the increase of fresh food and vegetables which you are giving the patients now; you should not need to have \$4,000 in addition to what you have saved on the milk. This is something wrong.

The Hon. Minister of Social Services should certainly go into it if he does not have all the particulars now. As regards the explanation about part of the land being used for a dairy, a part for a kitchen garden and a part for growing grass for the animals, those things were being done for many years. What I was trying to observe is, that a certain part of the land is not being utilised. I know that part is being used for grass, part for vegetables etc. I have seen it myself. I also know that there is part where you keep cow-stalls, pig-stys etc; but a large part of the land below is still undeveloped. I was trying to suggest that it should be developed in the same way that other land owners in that area develop theirs and grow hundreds of coconut trees etc. Even bananas can be easily grown and different things which we now have to purchase from outside. Sufficient is not being done to produce more of the things consumed by the patients in the institutions.

5.15 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: It is rather unfortunate that the Minister of Social Services should have replied in the way that he did, because as the honourable senior member for St. John has pointed out, they always did have a kitchen garden at the Mental Hospital and a certain amount of the land was always under grass.

I would have liked the Hon. Minister to assure this House that considerable extension of those ser-

vices has now taken place, but he has not given us that assurance. To suggest that members get up and make observations which they do not know to be absolute facts is no only misleading Government employees such as the Farm Superintendent at the Mental Hospital, but is also giving them the feeling that nothing more is left to be done. No further exertion is necessary on his part. I would like the Hon. Minister of Social Services if he has the figures, to tell me how many acres of the land at the Mental Hospital are under grass, how many are under Love Vine and how many acres are under cultivation? The honourable senior member for St. John made mention of 12 acres under grass, but from my estimation it must be more than that; so to suggest that the whole of the Mental Hospital is divided into three parts is completely misleading and the Hon. Minister of Social Services must know it. I am really surprised, that he has fallen into this habit in replying to suggestions of honourable members by saying that they do not know what they are talking about. I would be the last person to make a statement which I would not be able to corroborate. I further enjoin him to make no statement which would give Civil Servants in Barbados the feeling that whatever they do is not enough.

The question that Head XXIII stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division

Head XXXII—Highways & Transport

Head XXXII — Highways and Transport was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Head XXXII stand part.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, this Head deals with parish roads and the note attached to this Head reads as follows:—

"On the 1st of September, 1954, the Department of Highways and Transport assumed control of the maintenance and repairs of the parish roads in St. Joseph. To finance this work an allocation of \$17,330 was made to the Department from the provision in the 1954—55 Estimates under Head XXVIII, Subsidies and Grants, Item 18, Commissioners of Highways.

This amount has now been expended and further provision of \$6,000 is required to continue the maintenance and repair of these roads for the remainder of the financial year."

What I would like to be made clear about, is under which Head are we voting this money? If you look under Head XXXII, Department of Highways and Transport, you will find that Item 41 deals with parish roads and the amount of \$59,000 was passed under that Item. The note to that Item says: "Maintenance of approximately 140 miles at an average of \$425 per mile. Increase due to the increased cost of casual labour and materials on increased mileage."

The Note to this Item also makes reference to Head 28, and if you turn to that Head in the Estimates, you will find that it deals with Subsidies and Grants. Item 18 deals with Commissioners of Highways, and the Note to the Items says: "The following allocations are authorised by law:

St. George \$2,400, St. Thomas, \$1,920; St. James \$1,920; St. Joseph \$1,920, Christ Church \$1,920, St. Peter \$1,200; St. Philip \$1,200; St. John \$900.

Here you see that the amount voted for St. Joseph was \$1,920.

What I want to ask the Hon. Minister in charge of this vote is, what is the basis in arriving at this allocation? I am not now dealing with the allocation under Head 28, I am dealing with that under Head XXXII for parish roads, \$59,000. The arithmetic to this money was based on 140 miles of road approximately to be repaired at a cost of \$425 per mile. Now, you will find that in St. Joseph, you have already used \$17,000 and you are asking for an additional sum of \$6,000 so that out of a total vote of \$65,000 you are to use \$23,000 on the roads in St. Joseph.

The question is: if you had not taken over the roads in St. Joseph, would you have allocated \$23,000 to that parish? What proportion would you devote to the roads in the other parishes? Sir, I want an answer to these questions this afternoon; I do not want it by way of a Statement. I object to a Statement on it.

How many miles of road are in St. Joseph and how many miles are you repairing with this amount? Bear in mind, you said that you were going to repair approximately 140 miles of road at an average cost of \$425 per mile. What you are going to repair in St. Joseph is going to cost one-third of the amount you asked for originally. I do not believe it would be fair that because the Government has taken over the roads in St. Joseph, that it should take upon itself to repair more roads in that parish than it normally would have done if the roads were still being repaired by the Commissioners of Highways of that parish. What is the position with those roads which are maintained by the Commissioners of Highways of the other parishes?

I really would like to hear from the Honourable Minister in charge what is the policy of the Government with respect to the laying off of cantonneers. Is it a fact that some cantonneers were laid off by overseers recently? Is it the policy of the Government that cantonneers who have been working with the Department of Highways and Transport for the last nine years or so, should work as regularly as possible and if there is any laying off to be done, that the last person employed in this manner should go off first? Is it the policy of the Government now, that these cantonneers be knocked off at will?

5.25 p.m.

I have evidence that people who have been employed in the service have been subjected to the whims and fancies of the Overseers, and I would like to know the aspect of the employment of these people. I have asked two questions and I would like to get two clear answers to them. I have asked about this \$6,000 which is being asked for increasing the amount of \$23,000 which represents more than one-third the amount of money which is allocated for parish roads, and I would like to know what is the basis of the allocation. What is the original amount allocated to St. Joseph? And was there any amount allocated to St. Joseph after the 1st September, 1954? What are the reasons why St. Joseph requires \$23,000 for repairing their roads with reference to the other roads throughout the island.

Hon. M. E. COX: I will begin by telling the honourable member that the basis of the allocation has not been changed since he relinquished the portfolio.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I have never allocated any roads in my life; I was never a Minister. Let the honourable member answer the question. Do not give the impression that I made any allocation. I repeat, I have never made any allocations in my life.

Hon. M. E. COX: The basis of allocation has never been changed; the honourable member has the wrong end of the stick. The parish of St. Joseph has been getting an annual allocation for all the years I have known. The St. Joseph parish receives a total allocation of \$24,202 and the parish also collected in revenue \$14,100 making a total of \$38,302.00. grant and revenue. \$17,000 was put in a suspense account in view of the fact that the Government was taking over these roads, and therefore assuming the responsibility of the repairs. Now that the Government has taken over these roads the \$14,000 should be paid in to the Treasury. Therefore in asking for this \$6,000, it is \$1,000 less than one-half of the amount which the Highways Commissioners would have been entitled to spend if they were repairing the roads. In other words, the Highways Commissioners collected \$14,000 for the year. The Government assumed responsibility from the 1st of September; therefore the Government would be entitled to \$7,000. We are now asking for \$6,000.

The honourable member knows that the parishes get a grant in accordance with the revenue which they collect. For example, Christ Church collects a very large revenue, (a revenue of \$76,523 all told) and the Government only contributes \$2,300 to them because of the large revenue which they collect. The Parish of St. Philip gets \$45,654.88 and the Government grant is \$19,749 and so on. It is in relation to the number of miles which the Highway Commissioners have to upkeep; therefore, in so far as the parish of St. Joseph is concerned, they are yet within what is rightfully theirs. As I have pointed out, they will be entitled to \$24,202 which is the Government's contribution and their revenue would be \$14,100 making a total of \$38,302. If you add the \$17,000 and the \$6,000 which we ask for you will see that it is far below what the Highways Commissioners would spend if they were still in charge of the roads and with less satisfaction or results. The honourable member will appreciate the fact that we have now assumed responsibility, and as to the question of laying off the cantonneers I would say that a worker might have completed a particular job, after which there may not be any work to be done. There are regular "Casuals" who qualify for similar treatment to permanent employees. Once they put in 250 days in a year they qualify for leave just as if they were permanent employees.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I should like to say that the question of conditions of service is a matter for the Government. The Establishment cannot lay down policy in so far as the conditions of employment are concerned; therefore I cannot accept the Honourable Minister's answer that the Government is not concerned with the conditions of employment of people who work for the Government.

5.35 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: I said that we as Ministers have never assumed responsibility for dealing with establishment matters; that is a matter for the Administration.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I asked a specific question as to what is the policy of the Government. Is the Government in favour that the first person who comes in should remain or the last. If a man has been working for a department for nine years and you are going to lay people off, what is the policy of the Government? This is nothing to do with establishment. The Government must be prepared to say first come first go, or last come last go. I can take it from the hon. member that the Government has no policy as far as that is concerned, and I accept that.

I asked the hon. member a simple question. I did not ask him to tell the House what was my portfolio. I do not know that I was ever a Minister with a portfolio. What I asked him was, what is the basis of the allocation of this \$59,000. He says that this money is based on an allocation contingent to the amount of money or revenue that these respective parishes are taking. I am asking, what was the position with the allocation at the 1st September, which was half of the financial year.

If that is the basis of the allocation the parish is still responsible for collecting highways taxes. I ask what is the position with the amount of money which will be allocated in that way? Has that been put in the Treasury? The Hon. Minister talked about a saving; there is no such thing. All this Resolution tells you is that in addition to the \$59,000 the Minister is now asking for an additional \$6,000 which will make the total \$65,000. It is no saving. When the hon. member talks about saving, he must explain how that saving is reflected in the Treasury. Bringing arithmetical deductions that do not make sense does not satisfy me. I do not want a hypothesis of what they would have done and how much they allocated out of highways taxes, and how much is used for highways purposes. If it cannot be used by law, and if you are required to spend more money in that parish than you would have done under the ordinary vote, what is the position?

You are asking for \$6,000 more; you are spending \$23,000 in St. Joseph; I am asking what is the incidence of taxation in St. Joseph and what caused you to give that parish \$23,000 out of \$59,000 as compared with what you give the other parishes? In the original estimate that the Minister brought before the House, the basis was 140 miles of road at an average cost of \$425 per month. That was not an estimate that I brought, it was an estimate brought by the Minister himself. Now the Minister is asking for \$6,000 more for St. Joseph, and I am asking him what is the allocation that he is working out in this connection. There is no point in his saying that prior to September, they did not know what allocation would have been made to the respective parishes. Is it or is it not the same allocation that you were making before? I am trying to get a simple statement of fact that the records of the House can carry it.

Today is the 1st February, a year since Ministerial status was inaugurated; (you could call it Constitution Day) you have two months to run before the 31st March, and the Hon. Minister should be in a position today to tell us at least what this allocation was. I am asking this because it is not for me to do the work of the Minister. I am only seeking knowledge. I want to know what money is being spent. I want to know if this allocation for St. Joseph is in harmony with the laid down policy of allocation. I asked a simple question and it brought out the inuendo from the Minister that I had this portfolio on one occasion, and that it is the same allocation.

I am asking for this information as a member of the House. I do not want to be told that this is a portfolio with which I had dealings. I would like the Minister to say if he can answer my questions, or if it is one that requires one of those fulsome statements that we have been subjected to from time to time.

Hon. M. E. COX: I do not know where the hon. member got this figure \$59,000. As far as I know the amounts voted for the parishes total \$142,000.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The Hon. Minister asked me where I got the figure from. I got it from the Resolution before us. Before he answers the questions he will get up with his rude remarks again.

Hon. M. E. COX: The Highways Commissioners of the various parishes received grants totalling to \$142,000. The allocations are as follows:—Christ Church, \$3,000; St. Philip, \$19,477; St. John \$6,800; St. Joseph \$24,202; St. Peter, \$8,835; St. James, 32,300; St. Thomas, \$26,000; St. George, \$23,260. Those are the allocations.
5.45 p.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The Minister has not replied yet. By inuendo he asked where I got this idea of \$59,000 from. I will ask what is the meaning of putting \$59,000 in this Resolution? In this Resolution under Head XXXII—Item 41, we see that the amount that was voted is \$59,000. They are asking us for an additional \$6,000, and the Minister is asking me from where I got \$59,000. Is not this a glaring and conspicuous indication that he either does not know what he is doing, or that he is paying no attention to what is being said? How can he ask me where I got this from, when he is asking us to vote for this Head and Item so as to increase the \$59,000 by \$6,000?

I have already read the other part dealing with that for Parish Roads under the Head, Subsidies and Grants. The Note to this item in this Resolution says: "On the 1st September, 1954, the Department of Highways and Transport assumed control of the maintenance and repairs of the parish roads in St. Joseph. To finance this work an allocation of \$17,330 was made to the Department from the provision in the 1954—55 Estimates under Head XXVIII, Subsidies and Grants, Item 18, Commissioners of Highways." It goes on to say: "This amount has now been expended and further provision of \$6,000 is required to continue the maintenance and repair of these roads for the remainder of the financial year."

They now come and say that further provision of \$6,000 is required to continue the maintenance and repair of these roads for the remainder of the financial year; therefore they have come under Head XXXII and have asked to increase that vote by \$6,000.

What I am asking the Hon. Minister is: how is the \$59,000 under Head XXXII allocated to parish roads? He has asked where I got this \$59,000 from. Such statements really irritate me. You ask a simple question; a question as simple as daylight, and then the Hon. Minister in reply is asking you where you get this \$59,000 from! This \$59,000 is what was earmarked to repair approximately 140 miles of parish roads at an average of \$425 per mile. If he says that these roads are repaired on an *ad hoc* basis, well then that is all right.

Hon. M. E. COX: The Hon. member seems to be very confused between the Head, Subsidies and Grants and this Head. This item has nothing to do with the allocations to the various parishes. He should know that the \$142,000 is being spent by the Highway Commissioners of the various parishes on roads throughout the island which come under their charge. The \$59,000 is for the maintenance of Parish Roads under the direct control of the Department of Highways and Transport. For years, the Department of Highways and Transport has been keeping these roads in repair and before that, they were repaired by the Central Road Board.

Mr. LEWIS: Sir, I think I would be able to put the Hon. Minister for Communications and the hon. junior member for St. Peter right, if they would allow me. The Hon. Minister is as confused as the hon. junior member for St. Peter. If they look at page 96 and at the Note read out, they will see that the hon. junior member for St. Peter only read out eight out of the eleven parishes. Mr. Chairman, why

has the Government not allocated any money to the other three parishes?

Hon. M. E. COX: When I was making reference to grants to the various parishes, I did not mention the other three parishes because the roads in those parishes are under Government control; they are the parishes of St. Michael, St. Lucy and St. Andrew. No Highway Commissioners exist in those parishes.

Mr. LEWIS: If the Hon. Minister would only keep quiet for a few minutes! He is still wrong. The \$59,000 is for parish roads that are taken over by the Government with the exception of the parish roads in St. Michael, St. Lucy and St. Andrew. That is the reason why they are so confused. The St. Joseph roads were not taken over until recently and that is the reason why they have put it in this way. Now if you turn to Head XXXII, Department of Highways and Transport, Item 41, you will see \$59,000 for parish roads. If you look at Item 40, you will see \$93,500 for Highways. Can the Hon. Minister say for what is the \$93,000? That is where the confusion crept in. The \$59,000 is for parish roads in the eight parishes mentioned and over which the Government has no control, and the \$93,500 is for the arterial roads throughout the island which are repaired by the Highways and Transport Department. You will therefore see from that, that the Hon. Minister has not got it very clear himself.

Sir, they must keep the roads under repair and they must have some programme to work by. There is a regular programme that is made out for the repair of these roads. If nothing happens like unforeseen circumstances to call for expenditure, (such as damage by a flood or landslide, where they would have to come for money to supplement what is put down under the Head) the parish roads are repaired out of that which is allocated.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am not in any way confused. The Note to the Item we are dealing with in this Resolution states clearly that the sum of \$17,330 was allocated to the Department of Highways and Transport from the provision under Head XXVIII to finance the repairs of the parish roads in St. Joseph. What is the Hon. Minister saying? The Government is spending money from a Head which it has no authority to spend from. That is what the Hon. Minister is suggesting. That is an indication of how the Administration spent money in St. Philip before the Legislature gave them approval to do so. The Chief Secretary in the Other Place had to say that it was an oversight. In the House we were told that we were the biggest fools in Christendom; we do not understand the Resolution; we are confused.

All I am asking the Hon. Minister is, how is the \$59,000 allocated? We want to know what roads in the various parishes comprise this 140 miles set down in the Estimates. How many miles are to be repaired in St. Peter and so on? They have taken money from another Head to repair these roads.
5.55 p.m.

The parish roads have a distinct meaning. The Hon. Minister would be well advised to read his file clearly, get his Resolution clearly, and stop making these inuendos and trying to insult hon. members. I am asking him to explain what authority the Government had for spending \$17,000 under this Head: I think the hon. member should get a legal opinion in this matter. I suppose we will have to be content with his making a Statement on the matter next week. From what the Hon. Minister has said, this \$17,000 should not have been spent under that Head, because he was talking about allocating money to the various Highway Commissioners. If there is anybody in this House who is confused over this matter, it is the Hon. Minister; because, he is telling

us that he has not used this \$17,000 from the \$59,000 but from under the Head "Subsidies and Grants". You do not subsidise yourself, therefore you are subsidising these people who are the statutory authority. What the Minister is really saying is, that what you have given them, you have now turned around and given yourself. If you are not a lawyer you cannot explain this matter because there are legal difficulties in it; the amount of money which they have turned over to themselves should have been turned over in a legal manner. Nobody is protesting that you should not have spent the money in St. Joseph; and probably they would have to get the Attorney General to say whether you can spend money on a Head when the law has not been changed. We only want to know how this \$59,000 has been allocated. This is what the Note says: "On the 1st September, 1954, the Department of Highways and Transport assumed control of the maintenance and repairs of the parish roads in St. Joseph. To finance this work an allocation of \$17,330 was made to the Department from the provision in the 1954-55 Estimates under Head XXVIII—Subsidies and Grants Item 19, Commissioners of Highways."

That means that the Department undertook to take money which was granted the Commissioners of Highways to repair the roads. The Hon. Minister must ask the Attorney General if that is right. That proves that some administrative officers can do what ever they like, and to make the very suggestion that something is wrong is something sacrilegious. I will have to be one of the sacrilegious ones. I am not accepting what the Hon. Minister has said; not even the veiled insults about one does not know what he is talking about and so on. I cannot accept that reply and I can bring clear proof to show that what I am saying is right. Probably if he had given the information without making those insinuations, it would have been better. He should deal with the matters as they should have been dealt with and do not take umbrage because people ask questions.

Mr. BARROW: An amount of approximately \$24,202 was allocated to the St. Joseph roads; that is patent to all but the blind. The figures are those which have been given to the House today, and there is no breakdown of the total vote of \$142,000 which is allocated to Commissioners of Highways under the Head "Subsidies and Grants" on page 96 of the Estimates for 1954-55. As we know, the Estimates are passed sometimes towards the end of March and the financial year begins in April. The roads in St. Joseph were taken over by the Department of Highways and Transport in September, and the total amount of the St. Joseph vote which the Department of Highways and Transport is controlling, is something like \$23,330. In other words, between the 5th April, 1954 and the 1st September, 1954 by simple arithmetic the Commissioners of Highways of St. Joseph only controlled \$872 out of a total allocation of 24,000 odd dollars.

6.05 p.m.

This is now the season when maintenance work is at its ebb; and now is the crop season; and for the past three and a half months the Highways and Transport Department can spend a sum of \$23,000 out of the total allocation. I would like to know whether this was due to wilful neglect or the refusal on the part of the Commissioners of the parish of St. Joseph to carry out repairs because the change over was anticipated, or whether the money was purposely withheld from the Commissioners of that parish by the Government Department.

Mr. Chairman, as a representative of a country constituency you will be well aware that the season of hardship in these communities occurs right after the crop, let us say around about the middle or be-

ginning of May. It is unfortunate that none of the representatives of that parish are in their places, because it would appear to me to be a deliberate policy of creating unemployment in St. Joseph pending the taking over of roads by the Government. That is the obvious inference.

From April to September \$800 on maintenance; the total allocation was \$24,202. That is the figure which the Minister gave just now—

Hon. M. E. COX: I thought the hon. member when he looked in the column "Fixed by law" would have seen that the Commissioners of St. Joseph got an advance of \$1,920.

Mr. E. W. BARROW: I thank the Hon. Minister for reminding me that there is \$1,920 fixed by the law. That does not detract from the observations and the strictures which I want to make on this point. Because if we add \$1,920 to \$872—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member's contention is that between April and September, out of a total allocation of \$142,000 only \$800 was spent.

Mr. E. W. BARROW: Yes sir; and if we add \$1,920 it would be \$2,792 for those five months, and now we have to vote \$23,000 for the Department to do maintenance for the remaining seven months which work should have been carried out during the hard time. It is the deliberate policy of Government—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What I am not clear about, is how the figure of \$2,792 is arrived at.

Mr. E. W. BARROW: By a process of simple arithmetic. To the \$872 which was spent, I have added the amount fixed by law (\$1,920) making the total of \$2,792; that is my arithmetic. I never claimed to be a mathematician; as far as my arithmetic goes, it makes \$2,792.

Now, sir, if this had happened in my constituency, I am sure that my office would have been invaded by the out of work employees of the Commissioners. How is it that the parish of St. Joseph for five months can spend \$2,792 and now since the Department has taken over, a big rush is being made to spend the money that was always there? Is it to impress the people of St. Joseph that it is only now that the Government has taken over, that the work is being done? The money was voted since April last year, and there should have been a progressing scheme of maintenance work carried out. I am not saying that there is anything immoral about it; but you are dealing with human beings, and when the crop is finished these people look forward to the maintenance work on the roads.

None of the members of St. Joseph are in their places to explain how this situation arose. I think it is a deplorable thing especially with the employment problem in this island, to make it appear (although there may be some validity in the contention that the local authorities are more inefficient than the Central Department) that the Government was setting out to create unemployment deliberately. If the local authorities are inefficient, the Government should still give them the money to carry out this work and let them show how inefficient they are; but the Government should not make it look as if there would have been no maintenance work, were it not for the Government. I would not like it to happen in my parish.

The Minister might not have known what was going on, but it was noised abroad long before April 1954 that the roads of St. Joseph would be taken over and as I have said, there should have been a systematic programme of maintenance work carried out.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. senior member for St. George knew the mentality of

the Highway Commissioners of St. Joseph, he would not have asked about whether money was spent or not. I can tell him that they work in an anti-clockwise direction; that is why the parish roads are in the mess they are in today.

I would like to get some information about the late Road Inspector Mr. Mapp. What is Government doing about him? Will they give him something to help him like a gratuity or a pension? It seems to me very hard that he should be left high and dry. I would like to ask the Minister that.

Hon. M. E. COX: In answer to the last point, I can say that legislation will be introduced very soon to deal with Mr. Mapp. As regards the point made by the hon. senior member for St. George about the allocation of these funds, or rather the non-allocation in the early months of the year, I think that every member knows that during the crop time very little work is done by the Highway Commissioners of the different parishes; and therefore, the hon. member can be certain that a greater number of people will be employed when the crop is over, because the Government always tries to carry out its capital programme during those lean months of the year.

I will also say that surely the hon. member will agree, that if it were Government's decision to take over these roads and put them in good repair, the Government would be acting wisely in withholding that allocation of \$17,000 having already given the Commissioners the difference between \$17,000 and \$24,202, approximately \$7,000.

I felt sir, that it was far better to withhold the allocation until the roads were taken over, and I did so. I think as the hon. junior member for St. Andrew said, and everyone who knows how the Commissioners of Highways for the parish of St. Joseph administered the funds authorised to be spent on the roads in St. Joseph will agree, that the Government was right.

Mr. BARROW: I am absolutely shocked by the last statement made by the Hon. Minister for Communications, Works and Housing. I hope the Government will not do that with any other parish. The Hon. Minister has just told this Committee what I explained already; that is, that most of the maintenance work is done in hard times.

Now, sir, what has happened to the people in St. Joseph in May, June, July and August while he was sitting down on the \$23,000?

Hon. M. E. COX: I rise on a point of explanation, Mr. Chairman. It was not \$23,000. I have already said that it was only \$17,000 which was withheld. The Highways Commissioners were already given \$7,000 which is the difference between \$24,000 and the \$17,000.

Mr. BARROW: What I was explaining was that \$17,000 and this \$6,000 make \$23,000. If he said there was this \$17,000 which they should have, and then there is another \$6,000, does that not make \$23,000? It is in fact \$23,220. The Hon. Minister had the effrontery to say to this Committee that he withheld that amount because everybody knows what the Highways Commissioners for St. Joseph are.

Hon. M. E. COX: I never said such a thing. I said it was withheld because of the decision of the Government to take over those roads.

Mr. BARROW: Why did you give them \$800? Probably it was because water must have been washing in at somebody. I am surprised that Government gave them anything. What I want to say is this: you are not spiting the Commissioners for the parish of St. Joseph; you are spiting the agricultural workers who are looking forward to doing this work. I

am surprised that one of the members of that St. Joseph Board did not raise that point.

When the Hon. Minister for Works, Communications and Housing was dealing with this Resolution on the last occasion and referred to page 96 of the last Annual Estimates, Head XXVIII—Subsidies and Grants, he did not inform the House then that he had no intention of allowing the Commissioners of Highways for St. Joseph to spend any money on the repairs of the roads until such time as the Government took over those roads. From the general availability of the public, this is an island-wide problem, this is not a St. Joseph problem alone. The Hon. Minister is in effect telling this Committee that he allowed the roads in St. Joseph to fall into a state of disrepair because (a) he did not like the Commissioners of Highways for St. Joseph, and (b) because the Government was going to take them over. I think that is a shocking statement to make. However, I am glad that hon. members have seen that I was not just making a statement for the purpose of being dramatic. The Hon. Minister has confirmed every suspicion which I had in mind. I do not think we can be too severe with that dog-in-the-held. The Highways Commissioners were already people and the way in which they earn their bread, just because you do not like two or three people. Is that a display of a sense of responsibility? I wonder if the Hon. Minister realises the import of the statement which he has just made. Perhaps, he will come into this House three or four weeks from now and say he did not say so. (*laughter*). This is no laughing matter. When I got up and represented the people in St. Joseph I never thought I would have seen the day, especially with the well organised Trade Union, or supposed to be so, and with two eminent persons in this Assembly connected with it, that it would become my lot to represent the unemployed especially those of the parish of St. Joseph and then to hear the Hon. Minister for Communications, Works and Housing say that he withheld that money which would have created employment for those people.

Hon. M. E. COX: I rise on a point of Order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member is trained in that school of thought. I am sure no living being in this House heard me say that. That is his interpretation. That is his way of putting those things.

Mr. BARROW: I wonder if the Hon. Minister would get up and say what he said then about the Commissioners of Highways for St. Joseph. I beg him to say what he said then. He said that the hon. junior member for St. Andrew and the general public would commend him, because he withheld it from the Highways Commissioners of St. Joseph. He is not withholding any money from them; he is withholding money from the agricultural workers. The Commissioners of Highways for St. Joseph and all the members of the St. Joseph Vestry will have more money than the Hon. Minister or I will ever have.

6.25 p.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The Hon. Minister seems to be very pleased about wrong doings. He is smiling; but at what is he smiling? He said that he withheld the \$17,000 in view of the fact, that the Government was going to take over the roads in St. Joseph to which subsequently authority from this Chamber was granted the Government to do. What I want to say is, that the Hon. Minister acted wrongly. The Government has no authority under the law to do that.

Head XXXII is now the Head to give this \$6,000, because the Government is now responsible for these roads as they are responsible for the roads

of St. Michael, St. Lucy and St. Andrew. I am going to move that the consideration of this Head of the Schedule be postponed because this House must give permission for the amount of money allocated to the Commissioners of Highways under Head XXVIII, Item 18 of the Estimates to be given over to the Government; and the Hon. Minister had no authority to take this money and use it for the purposes for which he is now using it. I want to say that no matter could be passed like the affair in St. Philip when money was used on the land up there, and then we heard that there was an oversight. What authority have you got to use in the Department of Highways and Transport money which was voted in the Estimates for the Highway Commissioners of St. Joseph? This matter of juggling with money which has been passed in the Estimates by this Chamber without coming back here for authority to do anything, is a very serious matter. I was one of those who worried over the idea of Heads of Departments spending money without the authority of this House; I will be as scrupulous as anybody else over the expenditure of public funds without legislative authority for doing so. I am not supporting any Government in spending public funds in the way in which this money has been spent, without legislative approval. Who authorised the Director of Highways and Transport or the Minister of Communications to spend this money in the Department without getting legislative approval? Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the further consideration of this Head be postponed because the Legislature should have given the authority for the expenditure of this money in the way it has been expended.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I beg to second that. I would like to know how the money which was passed by the Legislature and put into the Appropriation Act and became the Law of this country, (money which was granted to the Commissioners of Highways) apart from the immorality of withholding it from the Commissioners of Highways, could have been used by the Department of Highways and Transport. I would like to know what sort of Auditor General we have because this is not the first instance of the kind. There is the instance of the Spa Road in which it was proved that the Minister in question misread a minute and a note, and then admitted here that he had misread it, and in spite of that action, the Auditor General passed it. We know perfectly well that the Debates have been vetted, and as people in higher authority are trying to prejudice the Speaker in his ruling, I wonder if the same pressure is being used on Civil Servants to make them break the law. That is what it boils down to; and then they ask us to have confidence in the Ministers who sit and do these things. Just by chance, it comes up that one is able to use legerdemain and you can pass a vote from one Head to the other and tell us "you cannot find under which vote we are doing it," as the hon. junior member for St. Peter has said. No matter that you can initiate votes, the one thing they have never taken away from us is that if you vote money for a purpose you must spend it for that purpose. We have heard that roads in St. Joseph were bad but do they think that they could make the roads good if they withheld the money purposely? They have made up their minds since the vote was passed in April, and as regards the \$1,920 which is allocated by law, apparently they could not get past the Auditor General with that; but the \$17,000 which should have been given to the Commissioners to help them to employ the people in the hard times is withheld. That is a firstclass political step; there is no work and there is starvation. But what a step it is that with the control of the money under

Ministerial Status, you would not let them have the money to spend and you are able to hide it from the public, and it is only in a debate like this that we can see how these things are done. There used to be Auditor Generals who used to hold up Governors and I hope that we will have Auditor Generals who will hold up the Ministers. There can be no explanation in this matter; one does not grudge voting money and putting things in order; but what is the use of giving us Estimates and having Heads separating the Commissioners of Highways from the Department of Highways and Transport and when you come to examine the expenditure, you find that the money which has been allocated to the Commissioners has been withheld and you take money from one Head and use it under another and then ask for \$6,000 more? The one thing we do not want is a Ministerial Status which will hide behind things which cannot be discussed. Let us agree to a postponement of this Head, and let us hear whether or not it is true that this money was withheld.

Let us wait and get an explanation, and hear if it is really true that this money was withheld. The Hon. Minister said so. If he misread, as he admitted that he misread in answer to the hon. senior member for the City, he may be misreading his instructions from his Secretariat. It cannot be true that this money was withheld. If it is true it is a terrible thing to get up in the House and say so.

6.35 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of Order, Mr. Chairman. I hope that the hon. junior member for St. James is not calling the Minister of Communications a liar. I heard the Minister say that he withheld the money and now I hear the hon. member for St. James quite wrongly challenging the veracity of what the Minister said. [Laughter] I do not see the humour in it. I think it is the most unparliamentary thing, (although disguising it in clever language) to suggest that the Hon. Minister could tell anything like a lie! He said he withheld the money, and if we postpone this Resolution we are challenging what the Minister said.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I understood the hon. junior member for St. James to say that the Minister may have misinterpreted his own instructions.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: The Minister may need a little white-wash to white-wash the statement that he made. He may have been indiscreet in adopting a statement made by the hon. junior member for St. Andrew. Heaven knows, I should not be apologising for him; but he might have been indiscreet. If he withheld it I would like to know what authority he had, not merely for withholding it, but for getting it out of the vote. How did he get past the Auditor General? The Auditor General has hitherto been a very good protector in seeing that Ministers, Governors, and Colonial Secretaries (now Chief Secretaries) do not play legerdemain with these things.

I am sure that any indiscretion that he may have committed, he will be able, if he is given a week and the help of the Auditor General and that of his Secretariat, to be able to present it in a little better light. I do not believe it is possible for it to be as bad as he says to-day; if so, we are wasting our time. We may as well allow the five Ministers to come here and pass whatever they like. If they can juggle with our accounts after we have passed them, we are no longer the holders of the public purse; we would be bamboozled and fooled. Therefore, I say it cannot be as bad as that. The Minister should not have jumped at the statement made about how bad the Commissioners of St. Joseph are. He should have known that you should not jump at another man's statements. A man may have a reason

for making a statement, but that statement, may not be suitable for the man who picks up the cue and carries it along.

Imagine not giving the Director of Public Works money to repair the buildings of this island, and then getting rid of him. You could safely tell him, "Look at the state into which the Public Buildings have fallen during your tenure of office," but you would not say that you withheld \$200,000; and when, however, you got a new Director you can say that you withheld this money, because you knew the former Director was bad and that you are now putting in your new man. I am sure that there is some better excuse for what has happened in this case.

Hon. M. E. COX : I would not attempt to follow the hon. member who has just sat. He started off by using a term which is peculiar to himself — immorality. What is immoral in this case? The House voted a sum of money to continue certain works in a particular parish as it does every year; the roads of that parish are to be taken over by the Government, and it will become the responsibility of the Government to keep those roads in good repair. Part of the money that is voted was placed in a suspense account inasmuch as Government would be taking over the roads. [MEMBERS: Why?] You take over the roads and you continue to repair them with money from that fund.

The money that was voted by the House is not so much to be given to the Highway Commissioners, it was to be given for a specific purpose; that purpose being to continue to repair the roads of that parish. Now, money is voted for the Highways and Transport Department which is responsible for keeping roads throughout the island in proper order; they are employing people, and more people mark you, than were being employed hitherto. [A MEMBER: There is more money.] I have already pointed out that the amount of money that we are giving, was money plus the taxation the Highway Commissioners collect from vehicles. What is voted to the Highways and Transport Department to-day is \$59,000 and we are asking for an additional \$6,000 to the vote for the maintenance of parish roads including St. Joseph, the Government having taken over that responsibility.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Note says, that the Department of Highways & Transport took over from the 1st September. When was this voted?

Hon. M. E. COX : I think from the 1st April. It is not correct to say that the Commissioners did not do any work; because they were given no money to continue. Members know that it is a fact that the repairs to roads are not carried out until after the reaping season when the crop is finished and people are out of work. That is exactly what happened in this case.

I want to go further now. Hon. members have talked about the Highway Commissioners and have said that the Government is starving road-workers and preventing them from getting work; I am very glad today to know that the hon. junior member for St. James has completely changed, and that he has got a new heart in his body. I am glad to know that some doctor has taken out the heart that he had and has inserted a human heart and that he is now able to feel for the working class people and wants to see them get work. I hope that he will use his influence in St. James.

I go further and say that the sooner the Government takes over from all the Highway Commissioners, the better for the people of Barbados. The honourable senior member for St. George talked about the Government only doing these roads to lay emphasis on its own department. The honourable member said that, and was followed by the

honourable junior member for St. James. That honourable member should realise that the people of St. Joseph were the first sensible people in Barbados. We do not have to stoop to political chicanery as he would have to do—

6.45 p.m.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT : Mr. Chairman, is that—

Hon. M. E. COX : Very well Mr. Chairman, I withdraw that.

What I am trying to say is this : I had to go to St. James under this new setup. I know the arrangements which are made in this parish with regard to the Highway Commissioners. There is a gentleman living in St. James who does not support the hon. junior member for St. James, and the Highway Commissioners of that parish gave orders to pass that man's house in the repair of a road leading in to him. If you go there you will see that road is repaired at either end leaving out where that man lives. That is the behaviour of the Highway Commissioners of that parish. You say this has got some political bearing; but we are not now spending money at this late hour to get political kudos. Let me say that the people still appreciate the good work which the Labour Party has done. What political kudos are we seeking after? As I have said, Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I do not have all the files with me on this question; but I can tell you that when we were discussing the question of taking over these roads, we went into it very carefully. There are people who can tell you what was the position as regards these roads when they were in the hands of the Commissioners of Highways of St. Joseph. Those Commissioners claimed that they had no money to repair these roads, and besides that they owed away a lot of money. They wanted money to pay for old iron. If we had given them the \$17,000 it would have been absolved in paying debt which they owed people in Trinidad for old railway iron. Let me say it was not a question of putting people out of work; it is all well and good for one to make a lot of rash, wild statements. Mr. Chairman, I am saying there is absolutely nothing wrong with this matter. As you have heard, the Government had decided to take over all the liabilities of the Highway Commissioners of St. Joseph when it took over the roads. I have said so already and I say so again that that was done. I know the hon. senior member for St. George is just scorning those people; it is not because he pays so much attention to agricultural workers that he said so. The hon. member has taken objection to my saying that I withheld the allocation of money for those roads until the Government had taken them over. If and when his time comes to be in the same position as I am, I will never be annoyed if he says "I withheld something." He may be assured that if I am present in this Chamber and he becomes a member of the Government I would not be annoyed if he says that I did not allow this thing or that thing.

Mr. BARROW : If the Hon. Minister is thinking that I am being annoyed over the portfolio given to him, I would like to tell him that I am not interested in it.

Hon. M. E. COX : I know that the hon. member would not condescend to be Minister of Communications and Works, but surely he would not be unwilling to accept the Premiership. As I was saying our policy is that as soon as the crop is over work will then be started on these various schemes. I was well aware that the Bill to give this Government the authority to take over the St. Joseph parish roads, would have been passed before the end of this financial year. As you will remember, I said that the allocation of \$7,000 plus the \$14,000 they collected

given them was sufficient for what they had to do, and that was to mark time until the crop was over.

As to whether it is technically right or wrong in so far as the decision of the Auditor General to release these funds for this purpose, I am going to say here and now that if the pigmentation of the Auditor General was that of the hon. junior member for St. James, the hon. member would not have made that statement. He would have covered it up as a cat covers its mess.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT : Mr. Chairman, I challenge that statement.

Hon. M. E. COX : I withdraw.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT : The hon. member gets up in a debate and tries to make a point. He refers to the question of pigmentation. The hon. member cannot merely jump up for the second time and say "I withdraw it;" he should be made to apologise for it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for St. James objects to the unfounded allegation about pigmentation.

Hon. M. E. COX : Mr. Chairman, I have already said that I withdraw it.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT : There should not be a withdrawal unless the usual apology is made; for the obvious reason, that one would be able to speak unparliamentary language and use untrue and filthy statements about people, and just get up and say afterwards "I withdraw it." You should make an apology for the breach of the privileges of the House. If that were not so, we would all use them and just say "I withdraw."

Hon. M. E. COX : I never asked the hon. junior member for St. James to withdraw. May I remind the hon. member that I refrain from using the word immoral. I am sure that it was indiscretion on his part to say what he did about my giving one explanation before the thing was done and another after it was done. He went further than that, he talked of my getting a little white-wash to white-wash something.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT : I said that when he got a true explanation and further information on the subject, he would be able to give an explanation as to how it happened.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable junior member for St. James is asking for a withdrawal of that statement.

6.55 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX : I have already withdrawn it. Sir, I think the whole trend of the debate is wrong and it is unfortunate. These things were done in the best interest of the people; and I do not consider any mistake was made at all. Under the circumstances, as have been pointed out, I feel that any person who is charged with responsibility would have understood a little more about the matter and would have acted in similar fashion as I have done.

As I said Mr. Chairman, the money was voted by the Legislature not to be given to the Highway Commissioners for their own private use, but for the repairs of roads in St. Joseph. All we are asking for is to increase this vote for parish roads by \$6,000 on account of the fact that the Government has now taken over the roads in St. Joseph. Since we amended the Act and brought these roads in line with those of St. Michael, St. Lucy and St. Andrew, these roads have qualified for similar treatment. Therefore the question of spending money which should not be spent on these roads is misleading. I must say that I do not feel that the Auditor General or anybody else made any mistake. The Highway Commissioners had money to continue with the roads, and this money would have been spent in paying people

in Trinidad for old iron which they had credited from them. Nobody has suffered as a result of the change over. I go further and say that I have gone to that parish on a few occasions, and many more people are employed than formerly and they are much more contented now. They have expressed to me that they have never received in the past wages equivalent to what they are now receiving. Some of the Commissioners in the Vestry have said that they did not understand employing a man by the day, since if they were put in the hot sun, they would not be able to do one half as much as these men do. I am satisfied that there has not been any breach of faith, of law or anything else, and the action taken was a good one.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT : It is pitiable for anybody to be as dogmatic as the Hon. Minister about a matter which is patently an error. He does not even make an excuse and say that the intention was good, although we have in some manner broken the law.

Mr. CHAIRMAN : I understood the Hon. Minister to say that the money was withheld because it might have been mis-spent.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT : I am not dealing with that part of the matter at all. I have gone further than the hon. member; I have pronounced my views about Vestries in the whole of this island. I did not wait until the Vestry offended me.

Hon. M. E. COX : No member of any Vestry has offended me. I have not got any malice against anybody. This is a question of policy.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT : You are not yourself, if you have not got malice! (*laughter*). I am not going into the question of the St. James Commissioners or the East Coast business. The hon. member has admitted that the \$17,000 which he used in St. Joseph has nothing to do with this particular vote on parish roads because, as he said, it came from the Head in the Estimates, "Subsidies and Grants", Item 18, "Commissioners of Highways" and we have the very note which he has put before us. I will read the Note for his benefit again, the Note says this:—

"On the 1st September, 1954, the Department of Highways and Transport assumed control of the maintenance and repairs of the parish roads in St. Joseph. To finance this work an allocation of \$17,330 was made to the Department from the provision in the 1954—55 Estimates under Head XXVIII Subsidies and Grants; Item 18 Commissioners of Highways."

Now let us see what the Note in the Estimates says. It shows the allocations which are authorised by law and it goes on to say this :

"Further expenditure from this Item will be subject to approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee on submission by Highway Commissioners of detailed programmes for the year 1954—55. Expenditure on the parish highways of St. Andrew, St. Lucy and St. Michael is made from Head XXXII."

The Executive Committee has the authority under the Act to increase a vote or whatever the case might be. I am not accusing the Hon. Minister of withholding any money. The Note says that expenditure on the parish highways of St. Andrew, St. Lucy and St. Michael is made from Head XXXII, under which Head the Hon. Minister is asking us to increase the vote. The Legislature has passed an Act saying that there are no more Commissioners of Highways in St. Joseph, which gave the Government the authority to take over those roads. The Hon. Minister is not asking us to increase the vote under Head XXVIII, Subsidies and Grants, Item 18, "Commissioners of Highways;" he is asking us to increase the vote under Head XXXII, Highways and Transport, Item 41, "Parish Roads." I repeat

that an Act was passed giving the Government authority to take over the roads in St. Joseph, but the Hon. Minister did not get the approval of the House to take this \$17,000 which was given to the Highway Commissioners and give it to the Department of Highways and Transport. The Hon. Minister did not have the authority to pass that money over to this Department, because under the Appropriation Act, this money was voted for the Highway Commissioners of the various parishes. The Department of Highways and Transport assumed control of the roads, which means that this control will be in respect of these roads in respect of which they are now asking for this vote. I can lend the Hon. Minister a book on Administration by Major Attlee [Hon. M. E. Cox: I thank you].

7.05 p.m.

What I am pointing out to the Hon. Minister is, that he could have spent the \$17,000 from under the same Head under which he is now asking to spend \$6,000. The Hon. Minister seems to have the idea that when you point out an error you are pinpricking someone. The Hon. Minister uses the word "trust". This is a legislature. You only talk about trusting when you are dealing with a peddling shop! Government financing is not done on that basis, it is on a higher level.

You pass an Appropriation Act which allocates money for specific purposes. If you did not have the Appropriation Act, you could buy a table instead of buying a chair. That Act is to protect public funds. I hear the Hon. Minister talking about begging the question; I am not begging the question. I am making a positive motion that this be postponed. The Hon. Minister should know that you cannot take money from one Head and use it under another Head unless you get legislative approval. The Governor-in-Executive Committee does not have the authority to use money that way.

If this was being considered in the Other Place there would be a lot of explanation. We are elected to this Chamber, but we are treated with no courtesy. If something goes wrong in the Other Place explanation is given to members who are nominated there by the Governor; to us who represent the people no explanation is given.

I am not concerned with the immorality or morality of the case. When I say that, I mean that I am not concerned with whether the Government is doing a road that needs to be done. What I want to be meticulous about is how public funds are used; because the Minister is saying that there was nothing wrong in using the money in the way in which he used it; he is saying that, despite the fact that under the Act he could not use it in that way.

If he had not been doing wrong, would he not have come back and asked for this increase of \$6,000 under Head XXVIII? What the Minister fails to admit is that he did not use this money on the road until he had taken over control of the roads; it was not a road for which the Commissioners were responsible when he spent the money on it. Coming and asking for this \$6,000 under another Head, proves that the Minister knows he was wrong. Why did he not go back to Head XXVIII? [Hon. M. E. Cox: Because the roads were taken over.] What is logical in that? When were the roads taken over? The Minister did not spend the money until the roads were taken over. We are not saying that you should not have used money on the road; but the fact is that under the Appropriation Act you did not have any authority to use that \$17,000 on doing a parish road.

The Minister talked about a suspense account; there can be no suspense account in this context. He

would have been on sound ground if he had used the \$17,000 from the same Head under which he is now asking for \$6,000. That would have been the right and proper way. If the Resolution is held up in the Other Place on this account, the Hon. Minister will then see the point. I am submitting that the way in which the Minister acted is illegal; and I support the motion for postponement on those grounds.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I think that I should be permitted to deal with one or two points raised by the hon. senior member for St. Michael. He talked about my heart being changed. The argument that the hon. member was using was to distract attention from what we were arguing about.

The Minister also made some comparison about St. James. The idea behind that was, that what he was doing in St. Joseph was not so wrong, because look at St. James. Now I represent St. James. The Minister should remember that a member of his Party is the senior representative of St. James, and what is more he is a member of the Vestry. I do not belong to the Vestry, nor is there any road you can go through in St. James to get to my land because I do not own a square inch of land in that parish. The land that I own is in the parish of St. Michael; although it is some distance away from the Bay Land. If they do tenancies in St. Michael and they do one near to my residence, it does not benefit me.

When the Minister was giving the allocations he said he hoped that the hon. junior member for St. James was listening. He meant to imply that in St. James the Commissioners are such good boys and they do such good work, that the Government allocates them \$32,000. I thought he would have said "We are doing it because a colleague of mine is on the Vestry and he can help spend it and spend it carefully."

7.15 p.m.

I was not casting any reflection on any Auditor General. What I said was: how did they get on to the Auditor General? Did they use pressure on the Auditor General? You wanted to know how it was done. I then made the apology to him and he is forgetting it. When I say apology I mean that he must have had a better reason than he has given us to-day and I would like to hear him. One feels hard to believe that they should have done it as crudely as the Hon. Minister is suggesting. There must be some other way than how he suggested they had done it. The honourable junior member for St. Peter said that there was only one way they could properly do it; that is, by letting the vote lapse and then asking for the amount under another Head. The explanation which the Honourable Minister gave us is obviously in some way incorrect and I only wanted to know, like the honourable junior member for St. Peter, how it was done.

Mr. LEWIS: I do not know but probably it can be argued that in their taking over of the roads, they took over all the money. What I find in the figures that were put before us, is that there is still about \$6,000 there. The total allocation according to law is \$24,000; the Hon. Minister told us that himself. He said that \$17,000 was used, therefore there must be \$6,000 or more to come from that vote. Even if you say that they must have some plan, according to law, there must be nearly \$6,000 still to come from that vote. What I would like to know is what is going to happen to that money? Is that money going to lapse? That is an admission on the part of the Hon. Minister of Communications and the Government that they did something wrong. It can clearly be seen that if they want \$6,000 for this job, they do not need to vote \$6,000 under this Head be-

cause the \$24,000 has not been spent. They have only \$17,000, or they have misused it.

I would like to know: has the Government taken a legal opinion on what it has done, and discovered that although there is a couple thousand dollars there, it will have to do this? What has happened to the rest of the \$24,000 allocated to St. Joseph? Is that still in the Suspense Account? That has to be explained.

There is another \$15,000 taken from another Head. The Hon. Minister of Communications told us that on the last occasion. He said that was taken out of the Capital Expenditure. I do not think he can use it for that purpose. It appears to me that after taking over the roads in St. Joseph, his Ministry was looking around for money to spend in that parish. I am not one who is going to say, that the \$24,000 to be spent on the roads of the parish should not be spent in that way, because they took over the responsibility. Let me say that although the Government has already spent \$17,000 they will still have to pay for the old iron; because, they must have taken over the liabilities. Therefore, the Hon. Minister has not saved any money when he talks about this old iron. He must bear in mind that that is a legitimate debt.

Please tell me, will the remainder of the \$24,000 which has not been spent be put into the suspense account? I think that a legal opinion is necessary. We have heard a legal luminary say that this is wrong. I have expressed the opinion, that if the money has been allocated to the Commissioners of St. Joseph you may say that the Highways Department is entitled to it, because since that department has taken over the responsibility of the roads of that parish it must take over the liabilities.

Mr. Chairman, I know that I should not question certain things now, but I would like to ask a question about this \$15,000 being paid out of Capital Expenditure on parish roads.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are not questioning it now.

Mr. LEWIS: I can bring it into question now because it was voted for the St. Joseph roads.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am telling the honourable member he cannot question that now.

Mr. LEWIS: We are dealing with the parish roads of St. Joseph. If I lose the opportunity to speak on it now I may never get the opportunity to speak on it again. That \$15,000 was spent on those roads.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are questioning an amount spent from Capital Expenditure. I do not think I can allow you to discuss that now.

Mr. LEWIS: The Hon. Minister for Communications said that \$15,000 out of the \$80,000 under Capital Expenditure was spent on those roads.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of Order. I have never said that. I said that the whole road running from Melvins Hill down to the border of St. Andrew would cost \$15,000, but for the time being only \$3,000 would be spent; in other words to the end of the financial year.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think it is out of order that Capital Expenditure should be discussed in this Resolution. I am not going to allow it.

Mr. LEWIS: This Resolution has brought out the principle as to money being taken out of the Treasury wrongly. I am saying that we should be able to discuss that. Money which has been voted for the building of schools or for housing has been used in the purchasing of property; the sum of \$140,000 has been taken out of the Treasury illegally, so I am saying—
7.25 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot discuss that under the heading of this Resolution.

Mr. LEWIS: I am speaking on the question of the postponement, and it is a matter of knowing whether the money has been paid out. There is a habit of taking money out of the Treasury whether it has been voted or not. I would like to know what is going to become of the balance of the \$24,000 which has been allocated to St. Joseph. Are you spending this money in addition to this \$6,000? If you are spending any of this money, have you got any legal opinion to the effect that you cannot interfere with the balance? That is something which would shed light on the whole debate here tonight. What is happening with the \$24,000?

Hon. M. E. COX: We held over \$17,000 and the remainder was given to St. Joseph.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The Hon. Minister has said that no amount of money was allocated to St. Joseph or any other parish, but they held this \$17,000.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: As far as I remember, the Hon. Minister made reference to \$1,920.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: That was voted by law. When I mentioned the allocation, the Hon. Minister said that there was no allocation made to "A", "B" or "C", but that the Government had money which it could use. The hon. member said that this money was withheld; his argument was that they did not allocate any money. Instead of doing that, they held back the money and gave that vote to St. Joseph; and I asked: how can you do that? Before the change-over came into operation, did you assume that the Legislature would assent. In other words they are not adding anything more to St. Joseph tonight. We are now for the first time making a vote for St. Joseph and we are getting the approval of the Legislature to do it. What I am pointing out, is that these are administrative mistakes for which the Hon. Minister is responsible. In the growth of things you will not pin down a Minister for an administrative mistake and make him resign, but the Hon. Minister cannot even explain that the Act which was passed, gave the Government authority to take over the roads in St. Joseph and that is the Act which was cited. If the hon. member is prepared to say that that Act gave them authority to take over everything irrespective of whether any thing was allocated or not, then no question arises; but the Hon. Minister cannot say these things. I am asking him to say what is the legal authority for doing what has been done? Everybody knows that you cannot take money from one Head and use it under another.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Most of the information on which I have based my argument has been given to me by the Hon. Minister of Communications. [A MEMBER: That is wrong!] It was wrong until it was confirmed by hon. members. For any body of intelligent people to sit down for two hours discussing whether there is anything wrong in saying that a sum of money which was voted for a specific purpose cannot be spent by a body which this Assembly has put in the place of an original body, is just sheer, undiluted nonsense. For years we have been voting money to the Education Board to do this, that, and the other; from time to time the Education Board employed contractors or private people to do these things, to widen schools, build walls, repair windows and what-not; they would employ Messrs Clarke and Tucker who are good friends of the hon. junior member for St. James to undertake the repairs of schools and the building of places like Combermere School with its subsequent cracks and subsidence. Directions have been given to the Public Works Department to undertake these repairs, and do you tell me Mr. Chairman, that we have got to come to this House and say

"you have under the Head Education a vote for repairs of Schools and you want to repair Harrison College but the Public Works Department cannot do it because the money was not voted under their particular Head to undertake the repairs of Harrison College?" Sheer nonsense! It is useful to get things off your chest especially when you are in the Opposition; but it does not help the Government.

I must pay tribute to the hon. junior member for the City who sees the point quite well that when this Assembly says that the roads in St. Joseph are to be taken over by the Highways Department, we put the Highways and Transport Department in the shoes of the Commissioners of Highways of St. Joseph. To spend two hours in saying whether that is right or wrong is a useful example as to the way in which we do things in the tropics; but it is hardly sensible from a logical point of view. It was suggested that pressure had been put on the Auditor General; but as long as this Government remains in power which will be a very long time (*laughter and cheers*) no pressure will be brought upon any Civil Servant. 7.35 p.m.

That is to say, if by pressure you mean that he did something that you wanted done when he did not agree with it. You may have to do as I have occasionally had to do; (I am not blowing my own trumpet, but there is an instance just outside there by the Central Foundry site). Naturally it was I who suggested to let traffic coming up know that traffic coming down has the right of way. That is not pressure. But I do think that the hon. junior member for St. James meant that this Government would tell the Auditor General to do something that he should not otherwise have done. It used to be said when the hon. member was Attorney General, (I am not one of those people who believed it, because I knew that he always had a very keen sense of duty) that Mr. Jemmott was in the hon. member's pocket. I do not believe it; because, it would be unparliamentary to believe it. I have no views on it. To say or to suggest that any member of this Government, and particularly the Ministers, would try to force their views on the Auditor General or anyone else in a similar position, is just not true.

Now actually this is blowing the trumpet of this Government: I sometimes feel that we are too meticulously careful in steering clear of the Public Service Commission. I say that because sometimes we have to stand up here and be fired at about something of which we know nothing, because it is purely within the jurisdiction of the Public Service Commission.

My contribution to this debate is that you have a Bill authorising a sum of money to be spent on a specific object; hon. members talked about shifting from one Head to another; that is nonsense. If you shift from one object to another you are wrong. If you vote money to repair the Public Buildings and you use the money to repair the Town Hall you are doing wrong. If you say originally that the Public Works Department is to repair the Public Buildings and then you pass a Bill saying that the functions of that department are to be taken over by another department, how are you shifting from one object to another? Only children would answer like that. To spend two hours arguing that point is an act of children or of members of the Opposition, who merely want to say, "Let us hit at the Government."

I got up merely to make that point. You passed a Bill last year putting St. Joseph in the schedule along with the other parishes whose roads have been taken over by the Government. As soon as you do that you say that "B" is to spend the money that "A" used to spend. Imagine the hon.

junior member for St. James after 20 or 40 years or however long it was that he was Attorney General, coming here today and talking about a lapse. A sum of money lapses in the Treasury when you have not been able to spend it on the object for which it was put there; not when someone else is told to spend it.

I am appealing to members of the Opposition. Because they are in the Opposition it does not mean, that they have to leave their commonsense in the backyard at home on Tuesdays. Let them come here and use their commonsense. Do not let them abandon their commonsense and try to make out that something is wrong, which if they were on this side of the House they would defend with every drop of their blood. Let us deal with the point made by the hon. junior member for the City; there may be something in that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: As far as as the Premier's reference to me is concerned he may as well stop referring to me; in fact he may as well refer to the wall. I will live on in spite of what he says. There is one thing that he can never get up in the House and say, and that is that I am dishonest. The hon. member came in here late; he did not hear all that was said. All he can do is insinuate that someone belongs to the Opposition. I can say that I belong to God; I do not think the hon. member can say that for himself.

It is a true indication that as soon as you are beginning to get out of touch with the people, the first thing that you can do is to make sarcastic remarks about their education. The hon. member is always ready to talk about people's education. Today he is saying that you live in the tropics and all that. It is the same people who live in the tropics that has given him an opportunity to ridicule them; and he will go about the island asking the same people to support him. He sneers at people about not being able to read and write.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: When have I ever done that?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: On several occasions. Remember the speech that the hon. member made at Erdiston. There are a lot of people who had no education and who did quite a lot to help the hon. member. If the point that the Premier made about this vote is correct, why did the Minister have to come under this Head for this \$6,000? The Premier said that they could have used money from under any Head.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I never said anything of the sort. I said you passed a Bill transferring what "A" had to do to "B".

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: What the Premier is now saying is that you can take money from one Head of the Estimates and spend it under another, as long as you are carrying out the object for which the money was passed.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I say that if the House passes a Bill transferring a duty from "A" to "B", it is not the same thing as spending money on a different object. 7.45 p.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The point is that the \$17,000 was not allocated to them yet when it was used. It was not allocated to St. Joseph, St. Peter or anyone.

What did happen was that out of the vote of \$128,000 they used \$17,000 to repair the roads in St. Joseph. Our point was, if you use this money which should be given to the Commissioners of Highways of that parish, and you say that you have taken over their duties why did you not use all the money from

that Head? Why did you come back here and go to the parish road vote for some more money? The Hon. Minister has tried to explain to the House the difference between the parish road vote, under Head 28 and the vote that is under Head 32. Why should you want to use money from two different Heads? The Hon. Minister said that it is the parish road which he is doing. He has used the \$55,000 under that Head and he requires this \$6,000 to be added to it. If that is the appropriate Head, the one under which he has come for this money, why has he chosen two different Heads to get money to repair those roads? Why did they not come back to the House and use all the money under the original Head? What is being given to them now is additional money. The Hon. Minister said that this money is not enough; he has not come back here to add to the vote, he is talking nonsense. In these things I pay much attention, probably more than he. I have a record in this island for work; not for laziness. I ask again, why did they not come back and ask for \$6,000 from under this Head? Why is it that they move from this Head and go to the Head for Highways & Transport? It is clear that they have taken money from under two Heads to build one road, and the position has not yet been regularised. If the Hon. Minister is willing to agree to that all well and good; but it is these innuendoes accusing you. As soon as you are doubtful over anything and ask a question on it, the Government is saying that you are ignorant and in the Opposition; this is the sort of thing that worries me. Any honest man will always win out; righteousness will always prevail.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I think that hon. member is going to change my disposition; I have often restrained myself in this House from making people look ultra-small. The hon. junior member for St. James has been the Attorney General of this island; one would have thought that he would have taken the trouble before hand to see what is the position of the Department of Highways and Transport, and what is the position of the Highways Commissioners. The law as passed before the Bashe Experiment, is that when a road is taken over from a parish and given to the Highways Department, the Highways Commissioners of the respective parish pays all its funds into the Public Treasury and submit all its accounts, and all that it proposes to be done in the parish. The smallest law student ought to know, that before he can give opinion, he should know what the law is. I am not going to be provoked Tuesday night after Tuesday night; I am going to stop my tolerance and sufferance. I am going to reply to everything as I think I should reply. I am surprised that an Ex-Attorney General and an Ex-Leader of this House should seriously ask this House to say that these things are done wrong with the law as it is. I am not touching on the point made by the hon. junior member for St. Peter; I do not know that point. The hon. member says he is one honest man. As soon as a man tells you of honest men grab hold of your trousers pocket; the hon member is trying to make out that he belongs to God but that I cannot say so. The Good Book says, "He came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance."

Mr. Chairman, I am only making the points that nothing wrong has been done. I do not know, but the Hon. Minister may be wrong and the honourable junior member for the City may be right. All I am saying is that if we voted money under Subsidies & Grants for St. Joseph, (I did not say that this was done) if that were done, and we took over their roads we also had to take over their liabilities; therefore they will have to pass that money over to

the Public Treasury. If that were not done, does it not follow simple logic that the money kept in the Treasury for that purpose can be taken out by the Department of Highways and Transport and spent for the purpose? It is as simple as two and two make four.

Before I sit, I am going to say that from now on I will be as provocative as possible. The honourable junior member for St. Lucy is making an aside, I have not caught what he said. I will reserve what I have to say about him for another time.
7.55 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: And I shall be ready, Mr. Chairman, to deal with him.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the day the honourable member presumes to attack me, I will say all I know of the honourable member; and all will not be pleasant. I am sick and tired of these stupid accusations against the Government which have no foundations in fact; that is why I seem to be somewhat wrong. It has been used against me that I said that the Opposition should be strong.

Only yesterday and again this morning, I have been in conversation about another new election. My fear is that we may get too many seats; and it is bad for anybody to have complete power. I am not afraid of the Opposition; it is too mild and paltry. I would like to see them come here with an alternative policy and argue it out, commonsense will tell us what is right. We may make a mistake, but when you say that we have made a mistake, get your facts right. To get up and say something which has no foundation in fact, will only make us despise you. Why do they persist in saying that something is wrong when the law says this is what you must do? That is, that the Department of Highways and Transport has to take all these things in their possession and so on. You have to hand over lock, stock and barrel and let the Department run your show. I say again, that I do not know one single thing either about this \$17,000 or about this \$6,000; I have not heard the arguments about them. I should like to say that no human being could ever say that he has ever heard me sneer at anybody. Just as I sat down in an elementary school and made my way through, I will say that everybody in this island should be given a chance to do the same thing. [Mr. CRAWFORD: With age grouping and superannuation?] There are some people who, no matter how much you teach them, they will never learn, and the Interrupter is one of those people. I am not going to reply to any charges made by "Commies" and Fellow travellers.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of Order. The honourable member is a master of slander and defamation—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I object to that. The honourable member is accusing me of a criminal offence.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the honourable member to withdraw that statement. The honourable member has used two words which are unparliamentary.

Mr. BARROW: I withdraw those words. The honourable member is in the habit of making slanderous remarks; the moment he comes into this Chamber the tenor of the debate goes down. I am asking him to withdraw the remarks about "Commies" and fellow travellers—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable senior member for St. George is asking the Hon. Premier to withdraw the remarks about "Commies and fellow travellers".

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Those remarks were not made in respect of the honourable member.

Mr. BARROW: The honourable member has already denied using certain remarks in this Chamber. He is unfit to hold public office in this island.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am asking the honourable member to withdraw that statement.

Mr. BARROW: The honourable member was obviously ignorant of the debate. He saw me checking up on the Order—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think that both honourable members are out of Order.

Mr. BARROW: I have asked him to make statements outside, but I have not interfered with the honourable member. I am asking him to withdraw the remarks which he has made.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: He said that he made no reference to you.

Mr. BARROW: Will the honourable member say about whom that statement was made? If he says that he did not make those remarks about me, in respect of which honourable member did he make the statement? I would like to refer you to the Rule about one member making offensive remarks about another member.

8.05 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: According to Rule 130 if a member makes an offensive reference to another member that member may ask that the words be taken down—

Mr. BARROW: I consider, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Two members cannot speak at the same time

Mr. BARROW: If the honourable member is saying that it was not me to whom he referred, let him say to whom he referred.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The honourable member is out of Order.

Mr. BARROW: I demand that you rule that it be taken down. I am making that demand because I know that he is a physical and moral coward.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Premier says that he did not refer to you.

Mr. BARROW: Then I am asking the honourable member to say to which member of the House he referred.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not know that I have the authority to ask him that. I think I will have to call Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BARROW: I will ask each member of the House in turn to get up and object to the remarks.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I repeat that the Rule says that if offensive remarks are made about an honourable member he may immediately before any other member speaks, ask that they be taken down.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of Order. Is the Premier telling you what to rule? I consider that the remark was directed against me, and you will be totally lacking in your duty as Chairman if you do not rule as I have asked. If the honourable member is not a coward, let him tell the Committee who was the member that he was referring to. If he does not, he stands damned as a coward, both morally and physically. He should be brave enough to say to whom he was referring. He is trying to shelter behind his offensive action.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am waiting until the honourable member is finished speaking.

Mr. BARROW: I consider that the honourable member was making reference to me in the context in which the remarks were made.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: My duty is to call the Speaker.

Mr. BARROW: Your duty is to ask the Clerk to take down the words.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of Order. I think that this idea of calling the Speaker can be overdone.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am being asked to rule on something on which I do not have the authority to rule.

Mr. LEWIS: You cannot shirk your duties by saying that you do not have the ability to rule. I am merely saying, on a point of Order, that you owe it to yourself to do what is right. You are the sole judge of what has taken place.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Premier denies having made the reference to the honourable senior member for St. George.

Mr. LEWIS: I am saying that calling the Speaker has nothing to do with it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I ask the Clerk to take down the words. Rule 131 says: "In committee of the whole House the Chairman if it appears to be the pleasure of the committee will direct the words objected to, to be taken down in order that the same may be reported to the House." In that case I will have to put the motion to the vote.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: On a point of Order, sir. I am asking Your Honour (as far as I am concerned I do not care what happens to me) to refer to when objection can be made. In the first place it must be made by the particular member to whom the words were spoken. I did not mean the honourable senior member for St. George. It is immaterial to me if he is a Communist or not. Perhaps he does not have enough commonsense to be a Communist.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The Rule does not say that the offensive remarks must have been made against a particular member.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Which rule is that?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Rule 130. It says: "When any member objects to words used in debate and desires that they be taken down, Mr. Speaker, if it appears to be the pleasure of the House may ask that they be taken down by the Clerk accordingly." Then Rule 131 follows. I am objecting to the words used by the honourable member. Less than six months ago—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The honourable member cannot object if some other member has spoken after the words were used. Two or three members have spoken after the alleged objection was raised.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am now citing Rule 129 which says: "No member may use offensive or unbecoming words in reference to any member of the House." I consider the words used as offensive to any member of the House. Less than six months ago the honourable senior member for St. Joseph said in here that he had told the Colonial Office—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are not dealing with six months ago.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am referring to six months ago, because that is the basis of my objection to what he said just now. He said he had told the Colonial Office that there was not a single Communist in Barbados.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Premier says he was not referring to the honourable member.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Apparently Your Honour does not know what is going on. If he did not mean the honourable member he means all the other members present. When you picture conditions today as regards Communism and anti-Communism, you will realise that it is a serious charge for an honourable member to come here and accuse another member who has sworn allegiance and loyalty to the Throne and what-not, of Communist tendencies.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But the honourable member denies it. The only thing I can do—I am not going to be bullied by any member of the House into mak-

ing a ruling. I will call Mr. Speaker, and that is what I have asked the Marshal to do.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It is not a question of bullying. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said that he did not use those words in reference to the honourable senior member for St. George. Does that mean that they are not offensive to other members of the House?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: They may be.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am saying that they are offensive. I say it is a serious charge to call any member of this House today a Communist. The Chief Minister of Jamaica, (I think he has been elected Chief Minister now) recently charged the former Minister of Housing for calling him a Communist.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I agree that it is a serious allegation. But if the honourable member denies having made reference to the honourable senior member for St. George, what can I say?

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable member said he would not reply to them in the House. He cannot reply to anyone outside of the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot ask the honourable member to withdraw something that he denies having said. Will the honourable member withdraw the words?

8.15 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I will withdraw nothing. I know that there is a Communist cell in Barbados and that one member of this House is actively engaged in helping them.

I will do nothing that is not consistent with the Rules of this House. I say most categorically that I am not referring to the honourable senior member for St. George. He therefore ought to accept that from me. No member other than the honourable senior member for St. George having objected to those words, it is impossible under the Rules for anybody to object now; because, a rule says that objection must be made before any other member speaks. Obviously, if a member does not know that, he can go to the Library and borrow May's and read it. Any offensive words used to A, B, C, D, or E, that member must get up and object before another member speaks; he must object and ask for the words to be taken down before another person carries on the debate. That is the rule.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of Order. I suggest that you vacate the Chair, because, I have been constrained to have a "no-confidence" in the Chair. I am no worshipper of Stalin or of his regime as the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. The only two persons who are such worshippers are, the honourable member to whom I have just referred and you; therefore, he is referring to you if he is not referring to himself. If he is referring to you I am asking that the words be taken down. I think it is a very serious reflection on this House; therefore, I want the honourable member named.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am informing honourable members that if those remarks refer to me, I can laugh at them.

Mr. BARROW: The honourable junior member for St. Peter and I have spoken; it is in the records; you can see it in the Debates on the Better Security Act, 1950. I am going to sit because it is not my duty to tell you what the words are; but I am asking all honourable members to object to the behaviour of the Hon. Premier.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have asked that the words be taken down.

Mr. BARROW: The Hon. Premier referred you to May's.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not know what the duties of the House are on this particular matter. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph did use some remarks of fellow travellers and "Commies".

Mr. BARROW: It is shocking to me to see members of the Opposition sitting and smiling, while they hear slander on the House as a whole. It is actually casting reflection on one of them.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Sir, I understand you to say that you are sending for the Speaker. Not only were the words "fellow traveller" and "Commies" used, but there was also the accusation that a Communist cell was in this island and one of the members of this House was encouraging it, or words to that effect. It has to be one of the twenty-four members; and such a remark is supposed to be a slander on one of the members of this House. If this is not dealt with in the House, a finger can be pointed to either one of us when we go out that we allowed the accusation in the House to go unchallenged.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member may sit, I have asked the Hon. Premier to withdraw those words. I have also intimated that I shall send for Mr. Speaker. However, some hon. members seem to object to my sending for Mr. Speaker.

A VOICE: They cannot object to that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I rise merely to state what should be carried out before you send for the Speaker. The Rule says: "If it appears to be the pleasure of the Committee that certain words should be taken down, the Chairman will direct that they be taken down in order that the same may be reported to the House."

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have asked the Clerk to take down the words. As I have said, I heard two words "fellow traveller" and "Commies", but I cannot reconstruct the whole sentence as the Hon. Premier said it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, in a few moments I can name the debate in which the hon. senior member for St. Joseph said less than six months ago, that there is not a single Communist in the whole of Barbados. In view of what he said just now, I would like to ask—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is not necessary to ask anything now. Will the hon. member sit? I have asked the Clerk to take down the words.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Am I in order to speak, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member may speak.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, you have said that this whole argument hinges around an expression of opinion by the Hon. Premier. Before the words are taken down, I would like to know if you mean that the first or last words should be taken down. The only reason why I rose to my feet is to say that the Hon. Premier is a very responsible and influential man in West Indian politics, and more especially, as the representative of Barbados to Colonial Office. Personally, I have no fear of the words which were spoken being used in reference to me, and I believe you do not either. What strikes me is this: I have heard the Hon. Premier say that all the speeches made in this Chamber are read at the Colonial Office; what is going to be the position? I am not referring to the first words because you see very often in the *Beacon* something written of "Commies" and that sort of thing. I want to know what is going to be the position if we sit here and allow a member of the House to say—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already asked that the words be taken down. I want to send for Mr. Speaker.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY I know that; but I want to explain.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: All the explanation the hon. member wants to make he may reserve it for the Speaker.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: If that is your ruling I will bow; but I am only trying to explain—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: All the information the hon. member may want to give can be given before Mr. Speaker. I therefore rule that you sit at this stage.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: If you so rule I am going to sit; but I want to assure you that I am going very far in this debate before it ends.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is what I foresee.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have told you that I feel myself incompetent to rule on the matter, and I am sending for Mr. Speaker.

8.25 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: You do not have to ask for a ruling, because the Rule says what is to be done. You are opening yourself to a serious charge. I am going to tell you what I have told you already. They did not ask for a ruling, because the Rule says what is to be done.

I am saying that if you have—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member sit?

Mr. LEWIS: It is not out of place on an occasion like this for another hon. member to make an appeal to the offending member or the alleged offending member; and I am appealing to the hon. senior member of St. Joseph to withdraw those words because it is quite obvious that they are slanderous.

Mr. Chairman, I am like you; I do not care what they say about me it cannot make out what they say to be true. The hon. member objected to his being called a master of slander and defamation, and he used slanderous remarks about some members of this House; I am appealing to the hon. member to see that that is so. It does not matter what he said subsequently; it either mitigates or aggravates the position. I am attempting to use my common-sense now; I am appealing to the hon. member to see that he has referred to some member of this House and this is not the place for him to prosecute the case which he has in mind. He should not leave what is regarded as a stain on any member of this House. I know that he is not willing to say to whom he is referring and have the matter out; the position is regarded as slanderous, and I am asking him as a favour to withdraw the remarks. He should see himself big enough to withdraw a remark when he knows that it is something which he should not have said in this debate. I know the trend which this debate must take; it will be that we will not get through any business, and as far as the Committee is concerned they may have to make a motion to the effect that the words be taken down and reported to Mr. Speaker. The only doubt I have in my mind is that the Rule only says: "If it appears." It might not be so, and therefore I am making an appeal for assistance.

Mr. BARROW: I have got the physical courage and that is more than what the hon. Premier has got. For all his life he has been a coward. I am making a motion that the words used by the Premier both at the time when I got up and his subsequent words be taken down and reported to Mr. Speaker; because, I am a great stickler for constitutional rights and constitutional law. I do not think that we should have any "mamby pamby!"——I am not calling you that Mr. Chairman, but that is your attitude?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: As you know sir, owing to the conduct of some hon. members our Rules have

had to be amended and added to and so on, for the purpose of orderly debate. We have copied the Rules of the Irish Brigade! And they are the Rules of this House which we must obey. I absolutely, deliberately and coldly made the statement which I have made. If some day I did not open the eyes of this Community to what is happening in it, I will be pilloried and hanged for not warning against the danger. I have the best possible reason for saying what I said a moment ago. I have absolutely no intention of withdrawing those words. If I have it absolutely in my own possession, if with mathematical certainty evidence is brought before my eyes and before the administration of which in this particular instance I form a part, that this and that is happening, I would be betraying the people of Barbados if I did not say what is happening.

To come to this specific point now: I want to say that these Rules exist for the purpose of orderly debate, and they say what you must not do. You must not use the Sovereign's or Governor's name irreverently in debate; you cannot reflect on any vote of the House and so on—

Mr. BARROW: On a point of Order. I am moving a procedural motion and I move a vote of "no confidence" in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You may do that when I am finished listening to the honourable member.

9.35 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Rule 128 says: "No member may refer to any other member by name."

As far as Rule 129 is concerned, if honourable members will remember what they have read, or if those who have not read it will do so now, they will see that that rule does not refer to any specific member. It says: "No member may use offensive or unbecoming words in reference to any member of the House." Then you have Rule 130 which says: "When any member objects to words used in debate and desires them to be taken down, Mr. Speaker, if it appear to be the pleasure of the House will direct them to be taken down by the Clerk accordingly." The next rule applies to Committee. All those rules must be read with reference to the fact that the offending member must have said something about the honourable member for St. Andrew, or St. James or St. Peter as the case may be, and the member objects. If it happens in Committee and the Committee feels that it is trivial, the Chairman will do nothing. If on the other hand the Chairman sees by vote or by the expressions of disapproval of members of the Committee that they want the words taken down, then he will ask the Clerk to take them down; and Rule 132 says that "every such objection is to be taken at the time when such words are used and not after any other member has spoken."

I give my strong and solemn assurance that I did not in the least mean the honourable senior member for St. George, any more than the honourable junior member for St. James. He is the only person who objected and he cannot object because I did not refer to him.

Mr. BARROW: I objected because the honourable member is not speaking the truth. He is only trying to wriggle out of a difficult situation.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The honourable member thinks that because he goes into Court and bullies a magistrate or a judge—

Mr. BARROW: I object to those words.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If he objects I withdraw nothing that I said before. I am maintaining that the member to whom I referred has not so far raised an objection.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is—

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: As soon as I attempt to speak you want to put the question. You have allowed three other members to speak. Is this a party House?

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to second the motion made by the honourable senior member for St. George.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the words objected to be taken down by the Clerk.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: When you stopped me I was about to make what might appear to be an appeal. It is not an appeal. The Premier has given the assurance that he did not mean the honourable senior member for St. George. In that case the words that he used might have been in reference to any member of the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I agree with the honourable member.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: This is a matter for Rules; this is a matter of decency. I am now appealing to the non-professional members of the House. The Premier has assured the honourable senior member for St. George who is his brother professionally that he did not mean him. It is left to the laymen of this House to defend themselves.

The Premier in his second remarks said it has been brought to their notice that there is a Communist cell in Barbados, and that a member of this House is actively participating in it. I might feel the same way; but if I had said so in this House, I would have been asked to withdraw it. [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Why?]

When the honourable member says in public and in this House, that the utterances made in this Chamber are read by the Colonial Office, how can we the members of the Opposition, Government backbenchers and even Government members themselves be satisfied when the Premier said what he did, and then give only one member the assurance that he did not mean him. I think that the honourable senior member for St. George is gallant enough not to back down even though the Premier has said that he did not mean him.

Speaking for myself, I would not have asked the honourable member to withdraw anything. I would have told him a few home truths. I look around this House and find myself an old and active politician—

HON. G. H. ADAMS: If the honourable member will give way, I will withdraw the remarks.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: There may be some members here whose views might be extreme; but I do not think there is any justification for a responsible member of this community, a responsible member of the British West Indies, a man of great influence in the British West Indies making such remarks on the floor of this House. If he exonerates the honourable senior member for St. George then he leaves every other honourable member wondering, "Is it I?"

As I have said, I would not have asked him to withdraw anything. Similar remarks have been made about the Premier in this country before. During the war it was popular to make reference to the Communist Party. I have heard reference made to the fact that the Red Song was sung in the Barbados Workers' Union, and also that the emblem of the hammer and sickle could be found there. I have heard the Premier say that Joe Stalin was the greatest man in the world.

This is my last appeal. If the Premier can get up and exonerate a brother barrister, let him get up and exonerate the other 22 members of the House. He must withdraw what he said. All this talk about

going back to the country and having an election does not frighten me.
8.45 p.m.

I say this for the benefit of the Honourable Premier: moral decency compels him to withdraw that remark. He said, that he has not accused anybody of not having education; how is it that he can exonerate the honourable senior member for St. George. Moral decency compels him to withdraw that remark and he is big enough in statue to do that. I think that he has made a gross mistake when he rose on the second occasion to say that he knew about his Communist cell. I know things, and I have heard things. I have heard on one occasion an avowed Communist speaking on a platform in this country, and the honourable Chairman also spoke at that meeting; but because you spoke at that meeting, I do not consider that you are a Communist. The former junior member for St. Lucy was branded in this country as a Communist, and it gave him a lot of trouble. Even if you say I am a Communist I can laugh at that, because it can hardly send me back lower in life than whence I came; therefore, I have no worry about that.

Mr. Chairman, I again say the Honourable Premier should withdraw those remarks. Just one more thing before I sit. Within the last five or six weeks every newspaper in this colony has been front-paging articles about the dignity and behaviour of this House. It may be argued that some of us have not education like others, but because you do not have education like others, it does not mean that you do not have a certain amount of culture. Because you have education it does not mean that you have culture; I have seen the most cultured people who can hardly read or write. With respect to objection to parliamentary discourtesy and the like, it is a fact that we get remarks coming from the Government's bench which are not worthy of emulation. I will say that example is much better than precept; and it is for persons like the Honourable Premier to set the example. It is his moral duty to withdraw the last remarks of his. This is an occasion on which I would say really and truly that it is members of his own party whom he has actually accused. I am going to sit and see how they are going to vote. I am going to vote with the honourable senior member for St. George.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I want to say clearly that there is nothing which will make me do anything against an intimation from the Chair; let alone a ruling. Your Honour has asked me to withdraw those remarks, and for that reason I withdraw them; but I maintain that I have done nothing wrong in giving an early warning. I have heard of pressure being brought against Communists coming into this island; but I have said if Stalin came to this Island I would have shaken his hand. I have stated that over and over again. I believe in tolerance. Let every shade of political feeling flourish; but it must be borne in mind that with the position I am in to-night, I have a duty as Premier of this island to see that no trouble takes place in this island. I would hate to do anything against the Chair, and for that reason and because of your intimation I cheerfully, utterly and completely withdraw those remarks.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Premier has withdrawn those remarks.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: What did he mean by the withdrawal? Does he mean to say that no member of this Chamber is a Communist?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I take it that way.

Mr. LEWIS: Since the honourable member for St. Joseph has been so persistent, I would just like to tell him that the printed explanation

of the vote as to the effect of financing this work does not say that this balance of the money was due to St. Joseph. The Hon. Minister was saying all the time that it is a statutory amount that was given. You can say statutory because it is fixed by law. He has not made it clear at any time that they had the other \$7,000 and that this \$17,330 was a balance. He now says that is so; and therefore, that argument does not stand.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry that this debate has kept you so long in the Chair; but I must say that I make no apology for what I have said. I want to repeat that despite all this time which we have spent on this matter, up to now so far as this Head is concerned, it has not been stated to this Committee that the amount of money that has been used under the Head is in accordance with the Act. I do not agree with what has been stated by the honourable junior member for the City about it.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I am not saying it is so, sir. I said, after hearing the lawyers that it appears to me if they took over the roads, they also took over the liabilities. I hope the honourable member understands the way in which I said it. 8.55 p.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The Minister was quite in order to bring the Act and read it. As you are aware he digressed on many other things. I dealt with this matter on the basis of looking at the Resolution, and how it appeared to me as not being in order. I did not accuse any person of any improper motives. What I objected to, and objected to vehemently (and I say now whether it is the Premier, a Minister or anybody else, on the next occasion I raise a matter in here and the Premier gets up and uses any vulgar remarks I will be as vulgar as he or anybody else) is that when you raise any point in here, you will hear that you belong to the Opposition and you leave your commonsense at the back door. What do you want to reduce Parliament to? Are we to be placed in a position where we cannot ask any questions in this Chamber? As soon as you ask a question in this Chamber you are accused of improper motives. Money was asked for under one Head and they have come back for money under a different Head to complete the work. I am submitting that if what the Premier and the Hon. Minister of Communications want to say was in order, they would not have come back under another Head to use this money; they would have used the money under the original Head if the right thing had been done. My submission is that the money should have been used under the Head dealing with parish roads, and if it lapsed in the Treasury, it would have had to be put under a new Head.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: The point was raised by the Premier about my being an ex-Attorney General; he is always using abuse to deal with an argument; he is surprised at anybody who has ever done this or that; he is a young lawyer and I would not like to injure him—all of which has nothing to do with the debate. Then he talks as if he is God Almighty; [Laughter] I will do this and I will do that; I will not hold back this and I will not hold back that; I have been so kind to everybody; but do not look on him as any kind of benefactor. If he could only hear himself he would believe that he does not belong to in here at all; he belongs to Black Rock. [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Funny!] It is funny. When a man of ability has to resort to abuse in dealing with an argument, there is something wrong. He has not yet explained how he could take funds from one Head and put them to another. They do not see that where a law has been

passed to give something to the Commissioners of Highways and the money has not been paid out but is retained, that they cannot take that money and pay it over to somebody who is not the Commissioners of Highways. That was the only question which was raised. There is the other camouflage of trying to tell you that they are the same people by another name; therefore, how can you object if we take money which is given to somebody when we have taken the place of that body. We are not saying that the money should not be voted; but we hear how this money was put in a vote for parish roads and when you look it up, it was dealt with under a different Head and we have asked for an explanation as to how it was done, and the explanation is such as we have got.

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said that the money has been handed over but he did not say under what Act it was handed over. I would like him to tell me from what Act he was quoting [Hon. M. E. COX: The 1954 Act] That Act only has about three or four words in it [Laughter] I would like to know whether the 1945 Act says that these items can be taken over.

Mr. BARROW: I have asked for information and it has not been given me. I saw the Hon. Premier put a book on top of those Laws of Barbados and I would like to know what book it was from which he was reading. He says immediately the Department takes over, these things must be handed over. I only want to know where all that came from; what Section and what Act?

Mr. ADAMS: Even a barrister let alone a lawyer, ought to know where to find the law. The honourable member is a barrister; he was called to the Bar. For the benefit of the honourable junior member for the City who has asked me for this information, (and not for the benefit of the honourable senior member for St. George who ought to know that the Act is the 1945 Act) as the Hon. Minister has already said, the information is at page 79 at the top of the page. That is what I quoted. The honourable member attempted to suggest that I have misquoted him, but what the honourable member says means absolutely nothing to me. It might mean something to some people in St. George, but it means absolutely nothing to me. The 1954 Act refers to the 1945 Act; so that anybody who is reading the 1954 Act—Of course the honourable member is trying to be characteristic! One of these days out of the House I will give him the necessary synonyms to the word "characteristic" 9.05 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: I would like to know which part of section 27 gives the Hon. Minister of Communications or any other person the right to withhold for five months money passed for the House for the Commissioners of Highways, and as a result to keep people of St. Joseph out of work, and which part of the Act gives them the power, having done that, to appropriate the money? I am not saying, that if they had handed the money to the Commissioners the Commissioners would not be legally bound to show it in their books. That is all I want to know. And I want to assure the Premier that I too know where I can find my law.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Head XXXII be postponed. Honourable members in favour will please say "aye" and those against will please say "no". I think the "noes" have it.

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

AYES: Mr. Barrow, Mr. F. L. Walcott, Mr. E. D. Mottley, Mr. Tudor, Mr. E. K. Walcott and Mr. Haynes—(6).

NOES: Hon. G. H. Adams, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. Cummins, Hon. M. E. Cox, Hon. C. E. Talma, Mrs. Bourne, Mr. Bryan, Mr. Lewis and Mr. Brancher —(8).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I now declare the "noes" have it.

The question that Head XXXII stand part was put and agreed to without division.

Hon. Dr. Cummins moved seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox that the Resolution for \$42,930 do now pass.

The question was put and agreed to without division.

Hon. Dr. Cummins moved seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox that the Chairman report the passing of one Resolution in Committee.

The question was put and agreed to without division and Mr. Deputy Speaker took the Chair and reported accordingly.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chairman of Committees has reported to me the passing of one Resolution in Committee and that the Committee has asked for leave to sit again.

Mr. BARROW: It is only my duty to inform you, sir, that the Committee never asked for leave to sit again. I have no recollection of that motion having been made.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is what was reported to me.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am afraid that I have not been listening. [Mr. BARROW: Then sit down!] This ill-mannered member of the House must realise —

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Whatever Your Honour says let us accept. That is all that I got up to say. The honourable member must realise that he is not a child in this House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it the wish of the House to adjourn at this stage?

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am going to ask that the House adjourn for three quarters of an hour.

Interruption by Army Band

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before the honourable member makes his motion, there is something that I want to raise. I do not think the honourable member was in his place then, but this evening when the House was in Committee a military band passed along the street above this Chamber, and I understand that some policeman undertook to remove the "Road Closed" sign, and allowed the band to pass, to the great discomfort and disrespect of this House. It was my intention on the motion for adjournment to call the matter to Mr. Speaker's attention. I think that some protest should be made. I am asking the House to confirm in some measure that I do report this matter to Mr. Speaker.
9.15 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I agree, sir. After all, it may be that if the House does not stand on its dignity at all times, people would take liberties with it. It is a point which should not be overlooked; it should be drawn to the attention of the Commissioner of Police or the Colonel of the Barbados Regiment; but you cannot do like the House of Commons and order him to come to the Bar of the House and put him in prison. However, we can express our displeasure otherwise.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The meetings of this House are official, and are given notice of in an

official way. These people whom we are dealing with are officials; they are not the ordinary outsiders. I think they should know when this House is sitting. They should have known then that it is very disrespectful, because, the playing of the band as noise or a greater degree than ordinary traffic passing. The debate which was going on had to be closed entirely.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Anything which prevents the House from hearing, to put it in simple language is a breach of the privileges of the House and it is within the jurisdiction of the Speaker of the House to deal with this matter; it is not necessary for the House to pass anything to give the Speaker the right to make a protest in this matter with the persons concerned. The Speaker in his own right can deal with whoever is responsible, if he is the Colonel of the Regiment or the Commissioner of Police.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take it then that I can put this matter to Mr. Speaker.

The question that the House do now adjourn for three-quarters of an hour was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. Deputy Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.

On resumption.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes in order to discuss a matter of public importance.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that the Government has concluded its business. I have another matter to announce to the House. I told the honourable member that as soon as Government business is completed he would be given permission to move the adjournment of the House and he still has my assurance.

Mr. TUDOR: I am wondering, sir, if the matter should not be put to the vote.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do not let the honourable member be influenced by any other member. The Government has not yet concluded its business and I am giving the Government a chance to do so.

Mr. TUDOR: I beg to move the adjournment of the House —

Mr. SPEAKER: I will not allow that motion, I have already told the honourable member that as soon as the Government has concluded its business he will be given permission to make that motion. The honourable member accepted that from me and I am sure he does not want to break faith with me.

Mr. TUDOR: While it is true that it was at 3 o'clock or thereabout that I did agree with that, it is now 10 o'clock and I think the length of time which has elapsed weakens the force of that agreement. I am not trying to break faith with you.

Mr. SPEAKER: My agreements are not broken so easily.

TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION BILL RETURNED

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

*The Legislative Council
To
The Honourable The House Of Assembly*

The Legislative Council have the honour to return to the Honourable the House of Assembly the Bill intituled "An Act to implement certain terms of the Agreement for Technical Co-operation Assistance entered into between the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of the United

States of America" which has been passed with the amendment shewn on the Bill.

2. The Council trust that the Honourable House will see their way to accept the amendment, the object of which is to correct an error which appeared in the printed copies of the Bill considered by the Honourable the House of Assembly.

J. D. CHANDLER,
President.

Legislative Council Chamber,
1st February, 1955.

Mr. LEWIS: Do I understand that the Other Place has written a letter to this House saying that there was an error in a printed copy of a Bill which was circulated and considered by this House?

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the honourable member has understood correctly.

Mr. LEWIS: Do you think that any such thing has ever happened in the history of this colony before? Is the Honourable Council in a position to write this House and say that something was an error in the copy of the Bill which was considered by this House? Or is it for the Honourable Council to consider a Bill sent from this House?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know if the honourable member wants to consider it a matter of impertinence of the Other Place; I do not know whether the honourable member wants to regard it in that light. I think that it should be dealt with as an amendment; I am not prepared to take it as a matter of impertinence.

Mr. LEWIS: The Other Place should consider a Bill as sent up from this House; it has no right to know what was in the printed Bill. I think that the House should be asked to waive its right, not for the Other Place to point out that this House made a mistake and sent the Bill up to them. I am asking for your judgment on this point; when a Money Bill is sent back by the Other Place they respectfully ask that the House should not stick to its right; it is not for them to tell us that we deliberately sent up a mistake to them.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member can initiate a motion if he likes.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: You have a Government which has an Executive Committee, and the Premier in this House and the Chief Secretary in the Upper House put forward measures on behalf of the Government from time to time. I accept full responsibility for what has happened. I was not reading from a printed copy of the Bill, I was reading from the file dealing with the matter; and in the file the Bill is typed "1954" because it was intended to apply to anybody whom the United Nations had sent to us under the United Nations Technical Co-operation Assistance. It could apply to Dr. Buie and the Housing Experts. When the honourable junior member for the City asked me about the date on the Bill and whether it had been put in relative to income tax and so on, I replied "Yes." I was reading the year "1954" and immediately after the Bill was passed, I realised the mistake. I was about to suggest to the Clerk to change "1954" as a typographical error; but not having made the point in the House, I did not ask him to change it. I made the point in Executive Committee, but not having told the House that the year "1955" was a mistake, I suggested that the correction should be made in the Upper House and the usual procedure should be followed. The Upper House is perfectly entitled to amend a Money Bill and they can send a respectable

Message to the Lower House asking us to waive our privilege.

10.20 p.m.

If the Lower House says that you have no right to touch it, that is the end of the matter. If on the other hand the Lower House chooses to waive its privileges it will do so, because the Government tells them that the amendment will provide for what they wanted. We passed this Bill so as to give Customs Duty exemptions to U.N. technical experts coming here. On more than one occasion since I have been a member of the House it has happened that a respectful message has been sent from the Other Place. Anyone who reads May's will discover that that is the normal practice.

In this particular case, it was my mistake not to see that my file said 1955 and the printed copy of the Bill said 1954. That is what happened. I therefore invite the House to reply in the usual way to the effect that on this occasion it waives its right to object to the Upper House making an amendment which has the effect of creating a charge on the Treasury, but it re-affirms its right to be the sole giver of supplies to the Crown.

Mr. LEWIS: I agree with all that the honourable member has said up to a point. But I am saying that the Other Place has no right to send back and tell us that we passed the Bill with one date and that they passed it with another. They had a right to consider the Bill that was sent up to them and leave it to the honourable member to see after the amendment. They are saying that we have been terribly careless and they had to point it out. They are wrong in that respect. They had no right to tell us that one Bill was introduced and we considered another. We are at liberty to tear the belly out of any Bill and they must accept it. The Speaker does not sign a Bill introduced in the House, but after the date of its first, second and third reading and the date of its passing. That is the Bill that the Other Place must consider. They had no right to see the Bill that was introduced in here. They have no right to the documents of the House. It is not only impertinence, it is a gross insult to the House. Mr. Speaker, it is really a very serious matter, and the House should take cognisance of it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will some honourable member make a motion in respect of this amendment?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that this amendment be considered forthwith. In doing so I will say again, (because the honourable junior member for the City apparently did not hear me) that the Government has a mouthpiece in this House and in the Other Place. [Mr. LEWIS: He is not a Minister; he is Chief Secretary.] [Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: You want to make Parliament a joke.] Let me put it this way: Government Business is done by five members of this House and by one in the Other Place. [Mr. LEWIS: He has to introduce Bills as they leave this Chamber.] The Government in introducing a Bill tells the Principal Minister or a particular member of the Executive, what the Bill is to provide for; the Government introduces that Bill and it is passed in one form or another, and if necessary amendments are put in by the House.

When that Bill is passed and the Government intends that it is to be introduced into the Other Place in the form in which it was passed in this House, the Government will instruct the person in control of Government Business in the Other Place to introduce it in that form. If on the other hand, after the Bill passes this House and the Government wants an amendment—[Mr. LEWIS: There is a subtle difference]. Job never had my task; he would

have cursed God long before he was told to do so! If the Government wants the Other Place to amend a Bill which has passed this House, there is nothing to stop the Government from telling its mouthpiece in the Other Place to move an amendment. If when the Bill is returned here and the House does not accept the amendment, the Government has lost on that point.

10.30 p.m.

There is nothing wrong from a ministerial point of view or constitutionally, in the Government itself changing its mind. It is a breach of privilege to move an amendment to a money Bill to create a charge on the Treasury. I do not believe in the Upper House having a concurrent jurisdiction with the Lower House. I believe the Upper House is a useful place to advise you in the carrying out of the policy of the Lower House. I do not think the honourable member should be so strong in attacking the Other Place because the Other Place said that it was a typographical error. I can draw swords with him. I am entitled, and it is my duty, to point out to the Government's Spokesman in the Other Place any error or mistake. I was reading it from the file which had clearly '54' while honourable members had the printed document. I do not know whose fault it was. I do not for a moment suggest that it was the Clerk's. All I say is, that the file says '54'. Every member of the Governor-in-Executive Committee knows that the file says '54'; and that is what I had in my hand while I was dealing with the Bill. Having made the explanation to the Chief Secretary who is the Government's Spokesman in the Other Place, he pointed out that it was a typographical error.

Everybody knows that the honourable junior member for the City is a stickler for precision and efficiency, but this is no attempt to infringe the privileges of this House. In this case, a breach of privilege has been acknowledged by the Other Place in the usual way with the request that the House should waive it. According to the Rule, I am asking that the amendment of the Other Place be considered forthwith.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the motion, I am reiterating the point which I made that when a Bill is introduced into this House and then considered, it is nothing that is in a file. Would you say that when a Bill is read a first time that that is a Bill? No member sees it and if it had 1950, 1954, or 1955, or anything like that, no member sees it until you give permission for it to be printed and circulated. As soon as that is done, that is the Bill which is to be considered. After it has been considered and passed by this House, that Bill is signed by Your Honour and goes to the Other Place; therefore, there is no such thing as something in a file.

I am only asking the Hon. Premier to use his commonsense. Do not try to cover up something because some of his friends may have done it. A Bill which is signed by Your Honour is one which has been read a first, second and third time and passed by this House. The Other Place has to accept that as the Bill; they have no right to know what was introduced in this House. Even if they knew, they should not use it against us. They should have only asked you to accept that amendment because it carries out the intention of the Government and leave it at that. They should have left it to the member who is being asked to explain all the mistakes; but they cannot say in that Message that something was introduced in this House and another thing was considered. The person who was dealing with it in the Other Place had no right to say that a corresponding Bill which he has in the file contained 54; except he had done so privately and with no purpose to humiliate this House. They

had no right to do that and on reflection, I am sure the members of the Other Place would say that they were wrong.

I would like to know who asked them to consider a matter that was in a file. Sir, that same private information about something in a file, has been used in the Other Place to humiliate this House; and that is what I am objecting to, and I think it is time to let the Other Place know where they get off. I would like to move that this amendment be considered this day six months.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Speaking on the first motion Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I think that the views expressed by my colleague are very correct; because the second paragraph of the Message from the Other Place reads as follows:

"The Council trust that the Honourable House will see their way to accept the amendment, the object of which is to correct an error which appeared in the printed copies of the Bill considered by the Honourable the House of Assembly."

The object of that is to correct an error. Is that really a reflection on this House of Assembly or the Clerk? It strikes me, as my colleague rightly said, that it is a printed error which appeared in the copy of the Bill. What appeared here is what was actually passed. It strikes me even with the apology which the Premier made, that the wording of this Message from the Other Place to this Chamber should certainly have been different. Under the circumstances, while I do not agree with the motions for the postponement or consideration of these amendments for six months, I think the Hon. Premier should take a different approach to this matter. I do not think because there is a Ministerial Government, and because there is a mouthpiece for the Government both in here and in the Other Place, that this is the procedure which they should have adopted. What would have been the position if this were a minor amendment? I do not agree with postponing the consideration of this amendment for six months; but I do feel that this suggestion of an error appearing in the printed copy suggests that one thing should have been passed, but another thing was passed.

10.40 p.m.

What the Premier has said might be correct, but it has often happened in recent months that the public had to depend upon the Other Place for information as to what is happening; because, you get such little information in this Chamber when matters are brought forward. When you press for information here, very little is given and then you find the Chief Secretary in the Other Place explaining matters so lucidly. As a result of that, you have to say that if you had been given the explanation in the House you might have voted differently. It might be a case as to the way in which business is conducted in this House, the Ministers not knowing what they are talking about. I am not a stickler for these things, but my colleague is correct. To say that there was an error in the printed copy of the Bill and we passed something in one way and the Clerk sent it up in another way, what would the position be if there had been a different amendment involving a question of policy? As long as the Hon. Premier and his Ministers agree with something.—In truth and in fact no error appeared in the Bill which was passed by this House; the Premier admitted that he discovered that there was an error when the Bill passed the House, but it was not said in the Message that an error appeared after the Bill had been passed. I associate myself with the criticisms which have been offered by my colleague relative to the Other Place; and in future we should see that we carry out the usual practice. In the circumstances Your Honour should defin-

itely say, guarding the privileges of this House, that it is not a fact that this House passed one thing when it should have passed something else and an error appeared. My colleague actually drew this matter to the attention of the Hon. Premier and the Hon. Premier has admitted that he saw the error afterwards. I think that we should say that this statement in paragraph 2 of this Message is not a statement of fact; the Other Place must make themselves clear as to what has happened. If the Hon. Premier makes an excuse then you cannot say that we passed something which was incorrect.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have no knowledge whatever of what appears to have been an error. This Message was handed to me rather hastily and I did not peruse it carefully enough, even to realise that there was a breach of privilege. This Message is not couched in the respectable terms in which it might have been couched, and the Other Place has really committed a breach of privilege. I must point out that honourable members might waive their privilege or not, but I must say that ordinarily I did not expect this language to be used by the Other Place in respect to this House.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: This is an absurd motion. The United Nations have given us the assistance of two experts, and we must give exemptions from Customs Duty to these people who come to our colony. We cannot do anything which would be the equivalent of throwing out this Bill. The United Nations have sent us Dr. Buie and the I.L.O. has sent us Mr. Matthews, and we have been sent experts who will be here for about two years to help us with our housing. Do we then sit down and do something which will have the effect of saying that we are not carrying out our portion of the International Agreement? Absolute nonsense! Should we pass something which is the equivalent of saying, that although we are getting your services free and we are bound by International Agreement, we are not doing this? Absolute nonsense!

10.50 p.m.

The honourable member should withdraw his motion completely. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: It is a mark of protest.] Protest against what? I was at pains to point out that the Upper House should use the phrase that it customarily uses. I have not looked at the Message to see whether they have departed from the normal wording. I will not look at it, because I will not question the Speaker's ruling as to if it is not couched in proper terms. I have already said that there was a difference in the date in my file and the date in the printed copy of the Bill; there was an error. After a Bill is brought in here it is published. Why cannot the members of the Other Place discuss such a Bill?

All that I am saying is that a motion of this sort (that this amendment be considered this day week, or this day six months etc.) is tantamount to throwing it out. I often wish I were on the Opposition Bench so that I could put its case properly. I will not tell them tonight, but there is a proper way of doing what they want done. [Mr. LEWIS: How do you know that we do not want to throw it out?] If the honourable member wants to throw it out he is perfectly in order to do it this way. But I am appealing to other members not to join with him in throwing it out, on the ground of, how would we get this technical assistance from the U.N. experts if after the U.N. has paid their passages to come here and help us, we cannot offer them these concessions in return. If we do something which is tantamount to throwing this out, I repeat that we are just acting silly.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is the intention of the House to throw out this

Bill. It has already passed this House with our blessings. But we still have to protest against the way in which it has been sent back to us. The motion made by the Hon. Premier is that we deal with this amendment forthwith. If we vote against that motion it is not a vote to throw out the Bill. We will consider it next week. I will ask the members of the House to vote against the motion that we deal with it forthwith. I move that this amendment be dealt with at the next meeting of the House.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that. In doing so I would like to point out that according to Rule 262 of the House, we are not in the habit of voting on such amendments forthwith. It is the exception rather than the rule.

The Rule says: "Council's amendments to public Bills are to be appointed to be considered on a future day, unless the House shall order them to be considered forthwith." This is plain. No one wants to throw out this Bill. Everyone will want these experts to bring in their things duty free. I advocated that three years ago.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If the hon. member will give way, I will withdraw my motion. I was trying to see that the indirect motion of the hon. senior member for the City did not prevail. If hon. members feel that we should postpone this until the next meeting as a mark of protest against the language used by the Other Place, I have no objection.

I would, however, like to make this point: although the Rule says at a future day, it is the practice of the House to deal with these amendments forthwith.

The question that the amendment be considered at the next meeting of the House was put and agreed to without division.

MONEY RESOLUTION PASSED

On motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. Cummins seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox in each case, the Money Resolution passed in Committee of Supply was read a first and second time and agreed to.

11.00 p.m.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, Order No. 5 deals with those two Resolutions on which you gave your Ruling. Would it be in order after asking for leave, to move that Your Honour do not leave the Chair and this House go into Committee of Supply to deal with those two Resolutions?

Mr. SPEAKER: I would request that you do not proceed with those Orders now.

FIRE BRIGADE BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: second reading of a Bill to amend the Fire Brigade Act, 1908.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple matter.

Under the Police Act, 1908, grants are made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee from the Police Reward Fund towards the cost of the annual sports, in which both firemen and policemen participate; but there is no authority under the Fire Brigade Act, 1908, for similar contributions to be made from the Fire Brigade Reward Fund.

This Bill seeks, therefore, to amend section 45 of the Fire Brigade Act, 1908, so as to authorise the Governor-in-Executive Committee to apply the Reward Fund for this purpose.

It is very simple and I think it is as clear as possible. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS 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 motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, the House went into Committee on the Bill Mr. VAUGHAN being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. Chairman, reported the passing of the Bill in Committee, and Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair, and reported accordingly.

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

REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier; second reading of a Bill to amend the Registration (Births, Baptisms, Marriages and Burials) Act, 1891.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that I gave notice earlier in the day—

Mr. SPEAKER: Two hon. members are on their feet and the Hon. Premier was the member supposing to address the Chair. I have already given the hon. junior member for St. Lucy the assurance that as soon as Government business is completed, he will have the opportunity of moving the adjournment of the House for special reasons. The Government is still continuing with its business. As soon as the Government is finished the hon. member can proceed.

A VOICE: I have not heard that yet.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order in this Chamber!

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Although some members on the Other side of this Table seem to think that Government is deliberately withholding them from proceeding with their business, I want to say that I am not prepared to do anything more than the old business on the Order Paper. Government is not asking for more time than is necessary.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to amend the Registration (Births, Baptisms, Marriages, and Burials) Act, 1891. Some hon. members may remember that my colleague, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph whom I regret to say is absent to-day, pointed out that people have to walk from all the way down St. Andrew to Bissex Hill Station St. Joseph, to register the birth of a child, and it was suggested that such registration could take place at a Police Sub-station. As a result of that, this Bill was introduced to amend the Act and to make such provision for the whole island. This amendment would therefore allow persons to go to the nearest Police Station or Sub Station and register Deaths and Births. Instead of persons having to walk from Below Rock, Christ Church to Boarded Hall, they would be able to register at the Oistins Police Sub-station.

The people in St. Philip and St. John have to go to District "C" to register these things. The object of this Bill is to allow them to go and register at the nearest Police Sub-station. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

11.10 p.m.

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

Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS: I am taking this early opportunity to point out something, because when we come to consider the particular Clause it will not be thought that a surprise has been sprung on

anybody. I will ask the Hon. Premier if there is some new importee in this island calling the "Official Gazette," the "Gazette" or something like that. I do not know what the position is coming to now, and I have no doubt that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph can defend it. The object of this Bill is a very good one; I have never been inconvenienced, because I have always had to register my children at a nearby place and so I have never suffered this inconvenience which is suffered by people in these districts as to the registration of these things. It is therefore something of importance to these people who have to make this long journey up hill and down ditch so as to register a birth or a death. I sincerely hope that the wording and the dates are correct.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I will write it in red ink, that for once the honourable member was right.

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. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill Mr. VAUGHAN being in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 1 stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS: On a previous occasion I have pointed out that this is an entirely new Graftsmanship, and I suppose that every legal draftsman would have a certain difference; but it does strike me that this method adopted in Clause 1 is rather strange, if it is right. There are many Acts in this island which can be referred to and which do not have the wording set out in this way. I do not think that this wording does anybody any credit. The principle laid down by the present Attorney General is that he puts the principal Act and right after the Act he says "hereinafter referred to as the principal Act." I must say that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph is perfectly right in saying that he can understand what this is. The honourable member agreed with me on a previous occasion; I claim that some explanation should be given for putting the wording in this way. Nobody knows what the principal Act is in this form; all the Acts amending the principal Act has got the wording that this Act is to be read as one with the principal Act. In these amendments everything is put together and it is called the principal Act.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: When you say that this amendment shall be read together with the principal Act and shall be referred to as the principal Act, you might amend an Act ten times and the tenth amendment is the principal Act. When you say that the original Act is amended, you mean the original Act with the last amendment. I think that there is much to be said for putting it in either way. Of course I am not prepared to argue with the honourable member.

The question that Clause 1 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: In moving that Clause 2 stand part, I am asking leave to insert the word "Official" before the word "Gazette" in paragraph two of Section 2.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause as amended stand part.

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

The motion was put and agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 6 inclusive were called and passed. Clause 7 was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 7 stand part.

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

11.20 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I am using this Clause, (and I hope you will permit me) to bring to the notice of the honourable member something that has been told to me this evening; I hope I have got the gist of it correctly. I understand that certain people are asking for Birth Certificates as against Baptism Certificates. People going to the U.S.A. or England are asked for both. What I have heard is, that a Birth Certificate need not have the name of a child, and it has been suggested to me that while we are doing this amendment we might give the Registrar permission to put in the name of the child afterwards. I must say that my information was given to me very hurriedly, and I personally know nothing about it.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: You cannot always tell what some authorities will call for. You may go to a secondary school and be asked for a Baptism Certificate, and you may go to a University and be asked for your Birth Certificate etc. I would like to see all these stupid laws that have come down from medieval or early christian times about illegitimacy abolished. You do not write in the name of an illegitimate child's father because the child is supposed to have no father according to the strict interpretation of the Common Law and perhaps the christian religion. That is why some people ask for a Baptism Certificate; because, by then the child has been given names. Ordinarily you only register the birth of a male or a female child; you cannot regulate what the various authorities will call for. I agree with the honourable member that it is a nuisance. Sometimes you have to get people to swear to an affidavit that they knew the child's parents were married, that they had a child, and that this child was born at such a time and was given such and such a name, otherwise you just do not get through.

The question that Clause 7 as amended stand part was put and agreed to without division.

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS the Chairman reported the passing of a Bill in Committee with amendments, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

BILL TO AMEND REGISTRATION OF DEATHS ACT

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the next Order of the Day is Order No. 4. It is a Bill to amend the Registration of Deaths Act, 1924.

This Bill is consequential to the one just passed. Honourable members will see from the Objects and Reasons that this Bill is to allow people to go to the nearest Police Station to register Deaths, instead of having to go to Bissex Hill Station and all the other various stations.

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

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

Mr. BARROW: I would draw it to the attention of the Government that this Bill contains two Clauses numbered five, and it has the same error about Gazette.

The question that the Bill be now read a second time was put and agreed to, without division.

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

Clause 1 was called and agreed to.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part. In doing so, I am asking leave to insert the word "Official" before the word "Gazette".

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

11.30 p.m.
There being no objection, leave was granted the honourable member to insert the word "Official" before the word "Gazette."

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

Clause 3 was called and agreed to.

Clause 3 was called and passed.

Clause 4 was called and passed.

Clause 5 was called and passed.

Clause 6 was called.

Mr. BARROW: This Clause is numbered as five; there are two fives. It reads as follows:—

"This Act shall come into operation on such day as the Governor may appoint by Proclamation published in the Gazette."

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the word "Official" appear before the word "Gazette." I take this opportunity of thanking the honourable senior member for St. George for seeing that two fives did not appear.

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

The question that Clause 6 stand part was put and agreed to.

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of a Bill in Committee with amendments.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. G. H. ADAMS seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS in each case, the Bill as amended was read three times and passed.

CLINKETTS HOUSING SCHEME

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for five minutes, to enable me to discuss and bring before it a matter of public importance.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as you are aware, the first Aided Self Help Housing Scheme of this island was started in the parish of St. Lucy; and it must have been common knowledge that the houses, of which there are fifteen, have been handed over to the beneficiaries, and that of the fifteen handed over, only four have been taken possession of. The other eleven owners have not been able as yet to take possession of their houses for various reasons. But, sir, in order to explain as fully as possible this matter, I shall have to unveil the tale in strict chronological sequence. On or about 29th August, 1954, a campaign was started in the parish of St. Lucy for the return of a member to the House of Assembly in the place of the former junior member for that parish. The Hon. Premier and the Hon. Minister of Communications being both of them leaders of the Government Party, busied themselves in that campaign, and from early in the campaign they had conversations with the prospective tenant-owners of the Clinketts

Housing Scheme. They talked over various measures connected with the scheme with these prospective tenant-owners. Among other things, those prospective owners, or some of them, put to the two Ministers a request that water should be turned into their houses; and I may say in passing, that this request was granted. According to what my colleague and I have been told by some of these residents whose names we have, the Premier in the course of his remarks said that the Aided Self Help Housing Scheme was an important one; and that the St. Lucy Scheme being the first of its kind, it should be as attractive as possible so that if any visitors came to the island who might wish to see how far we have progressed in that particular form of housing policy, they will be provided with a good show. He also mentioned to them that he would like to think that if the visitors had asked to be shown over the Housing Scheme in its entirety, there would be no difficulty in having the doors of the houses opened so that visitors could come in and admire everything. In the course of that particular conversation, the question of the supply of furniture to those who might have need came up; and according to the residents whose names I have that took part in the conversation with the Hon. Premier and the Hon. Minister of Housing, both these Ministers allowed it to be known that they personally saw no reason why the Government should be against granting a loan to them for the purpose of buying furniture.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of Order. If the honourable member is making an accusation, he must give me the name of the informer. I am not saying that people may not have told him something; but if he is making an accusation, he must give us the name of the person who told him of it.

Mr. TUDOR: If the Hon. Premier wishes the names of those persons, he could have them privately.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Give the House.

Mr. TUDOR: If he wishes the names he could have them privately, because I have no guarantee that they would not be penalised if I gave them publicly. I am not inclined to mention the names of those persons across the floor of the House.

As I was saying, sir, there were six people who told me of this thing. If I may continue further, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the 2nd September, 1954, on the advice of the Hon. Premier, those residents addressed a Petition to the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing. I say on the advice of the Hon. Premier, because that is what they told us, (my colleague and myself) and he advised that a Petition be signed by a large number of the residents, be respectfully worded, and so on, and sent to the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing. That was done on the 30th September, 1954; and meanwhile I may say, that the campaign was running then in its full vigour.

On the 30th September they received a letter from the Hon. Minister of Housing, a copy of which I am prepared to read.

11.40 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is the honourable member reading from?

Mr. TUDOR: This is the copy of a letter addressed to the Petitioners of the Clinketts Housing Scheme in answer to one which was sent by them to the Hon. Minister of Housing. It reads as follows:—

Minister of Communications, Works and Housing.
30th September, 1954.

Sir,

I am directed by the Minister to acknowledge the receipt of the letter from yourself and other members of the Clinketts Self Help Housing Scheme dated 2nd September, 1954 and to inform you that your request for the grant of a loan to assist you in purchasing furniture is under consideration.

I am,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

That letter was signed by the Permanent Secretary. As I said, that reply was dated 30th September. From the 30th September until the end of the bye-election campaign, a strong impression was held by the prospective residents of the Clinketts Housing Scheme that the two Ministers who had made promises to them would have held their promises. I am saying in passing, that if it be thought that I am ploughing my own furrow, I wish to say this: (not as a reflection on the people whose interest I am representing here this afternoon) that they are not so far as I know, even thinking that their asking me to champion this cause is anything to do with their having supported me in the recent election campaign. I do know I do them justice in saying, that the residents of the Clinketts Housing Scheme did not give me that measure of support I could wish, owing to the strength of the promises handed out to them. The campaign came to its end with the same impression being held by these people, who were most agitated about this matter. When the campaign was over, six of the residents on the 17th December, 1954 sought an interview with the Minister of Housing. This is where the matter enters scene 2. On their way to his office, they overheard the Hon. Minister to say that he is nothing to do with the St. Lucy people.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of Order. Is that what the honourable member says, or what somebody told him?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister can reply to the honourable member on the strength of what he says and how he says it. I cannot ask for that information.

Mr. TUDOR: I have said that the six people of whom I have been talking all along, sought an interview on the 17th December and before they entered the *sanctum sanctorum* they heard him say that he had nothing to do with St. Lucy people. They went to the Minister on the strength of the reply dated 11th September, to the effect that the matter was under consideration, and asked him about it; because they had even been informed that the Attorney General was prepared to go to St. Lucy towards the end of December, to see about the signing up of the documents for the handing over of the houses. At least, they had, two weeks before that, taken possession of the houses. At that interview the Hon. Minister was asked why he said that he would have nothing to do with St. Lucy people; and according to these people, he said that he would not canvass in St. Lucy again. [LAUGHTER], a Resolution which, if he keeps may lengthen his absence. Just as these people left the Hon. Minister of Housing they saw the Hon. Premier. Again they tackled them about the matter as to whether the Government would lend them money to buy furniture. The Hon. Premier is alleged to have said that he saw no objection to it, and he did not see that any member of the Government should be against it. He is said to have advised them the second time to send in a petition or a letter to the Minister of Housing.

There is something which is also very peculiar; the residents claim that in a conversation between themselves and the Premier sometime during the campaign, he also let out information which led them to believe that they would be supplied with furniture from the Social Welfare Department; so they also visited Miss Arne on the 17th December and she said that she knew nothing about the furniture scheme.
11.50 p.m.

We are not finished yet. Sometime towards the end of December, the Attorney General went down there; there was a little ceremony, not really much. Documents were signed; and I may say in passing, that a further complaint of the residents is, that the Attorney General took away from them copies of the documents and promised to return them by post. He has not yet done so; that is by the way.

The four families moved in towards the end of the month and the beginning of this year. The eleven could not do so because of the embarrassment they suffered, through not having furniture. On the 15th January they received another communication from the Minister of Housing. I cannot now remember whether they received it in answer to a letter which they sent, or as a result of the interview which they had on 17th December, 1954. I have a copy of the second letter dated 15th January which you may peruse and which I will read to the House. The letter said: "I am directed to refer to the letter dated 2nd September, 1954, from yourself and other members of the Clinkett's Housing Scheme, and to inform you that the Minister regrets that your request for a grant of a loan to assist in the purchase of furniture cannot be granted as no such provision has been included in the Scheme."

It was not in December, but on 15th January that it was decided that a loan could not be granted because no provision was made in the scheme. This is not a matter of defending a few constituents, although that is important, and should always be done; much more is involved; it is a question of defending political liberty. I am willing to grant that all people in an election do have the tendency to make extravagant promises; but are two Ministers of the Government to be precisely categorised as all people? Will not any number of citizens of this island be forgiven if they are led to believe certain things by two Ministers? Will they not be forgiven if they continue under the strong impression that after the campaign had been concluded, no matter how it has been concluded, win, lose or draw, that the Ministers' promises will be kept?

There is something I cannot understand about the Premier. Everything he says is something different, because we imagine it to be different. The fact is, that he made promises to the people; the people are not liars; they are prepared to say so in the presence of the Ministers.

The question is whether the two Ministers who were still Ministers while the campaign was going on, can seriously tell any number of citizens of this island that the Government is prepared to do this and that, and then at the end of the campaign, especially if it has not gone their way, find that the promises they made two months before cannot be fulfilled, and having raised the hopes of the people, to dash them to the ground. [ASIDES].

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am prepared to allow as full and as free a debate as possible consistent with the Rules of this House and Parliamentary Procedure. Therefore, if any member wishes to reply to what the honourable member is saying he can easily wait until the junior member for St. Lucy is through.

Mr. TUDOR: The most important point is this: if you are saying on 15th January that no funds are there and therefore you cannot consider the request for the grant of the loan, you are probably not saying anything that is wrong; but if you say that on 15th January, but could not or did not say it on 30th September, it means that either when you sent the first reply you were not fully aware of the provisions of the scheme to which you are administering, or that you deliberately had it in mind to make promises which you hoped you might fulfil with a good reason for fulfilling them, or that you might not fulfil if you had a good reason for not so doing.

I think that my colleague can substantiate what I am saying—that a strong impression was left among those people in that Housing Scheme that definite promises had been made by the Premier and the Minister of Housing. Of course, it is possible to argue that since there is no provision in the scheme for the grant of a loan for furniture, the Government on maturer consideration decided to drop the whole matter, because Government did not want to create a precedent since there are other similar schemes in other parts of the island. No one quarrels with that; but you still have not satisfied the hopes that you have raised in St. Lucy. As long as the people feel that you left the impression with them, that you made them the promise because you were interested in getting them to espouse the cause you were championing, you stand committed to that one way or another. It is not good enough to say now that everything is over, that no funds are there, when you obviously knew it to be a wrong impression being given to the people at the time.

12.00 p.m.

Of course, there are other elections to come; and that is a fact which honourable members on both sides of this House should take note of, especially those on the other side; they should make an effort to profit by their mistakes.

If Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is going to be argued by those two Ministers that they never made any promise, or that they could not have left such an impression on the people, it is the duty of my colleague and myself to let the people who complained to us know that the two Ministers entirely refute having made any such promise; and I daresay that those people would be sensible enough to confront them and pin them down to what they actually said and with the evidence which they can summon. However, that part of the case does not worry me; what worries me, is if a principle has been established that you can make a promise during an election campaign which you know that you cannot or do not wish to keep, then you should not repudiate it without the courtesy of giving a reason.

Sir, those promises were not made by ordinary members of the Labour Party; they were made by the Hon. Premier and the Hon. Minister for Communications, Works and Housing in St. Lucy during the Bye-Election campaign; and anything which the Hon. Premier says should carry a lot of weight. I cannot pretend that what he said during that campaign launched him very far, or reached the consequences he desired; but people listened to him and whenever he spoke, no matter what he was speaking of, the people felt that the Head of the Government was speaking. He did not have to remind them that the Government was speaking, they knew it. Everything that he spoke was spoken with a certain amount of seriousness, except the attacks which he made on his opponents. I am not making political capital of it in the sense of wanting to score over political opponents; but I wish to have cleared up, first of all, whether any promise was given; and

secondly, if the promise were given, why was it repudiated in the fashion. The people who made that promise were Ministers of the Government, and the people who listened to that promise believed it as Abraham believed of God—that whatever He promised, He was also able to perform. Therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, both of those Ministers must say in the public interest, we made no such promise; and let it be known. Let the residents of the Clinketts Housing Scheme hear you say publicly that you made no such promise; that is all that should be established, and that is all that needs to be established.

While I am on this issue, I wish to say that the request for the granting of a loan is a serious thing; and it says much for the way things are going on in this island in any housing scheme, which only admits that of fifteen families only four have been able to take advantage of it. Sir, eleven out of those fifteen families cannot yet move out of the hovels in which they live; and it is merely because they do not have enough chairs, (or any chairs at all) perhaps a proper bed, or anything at all to carry in the new house which was built with their own labour. If you provide a housing scheme for so small a number of families and you find that only four of fifteen can take advantage of it, that is enough for you to take heed; and the reason why those eleven families cannot take advantage of that scheme is because they have nothing to take into their new homes.

Sir, of these eleven families, some are prepared to say in a way, that they have been promised by those two Ministers that the Government was in favour of advancing sums to them by way of a loan to purchase furniture. They are prepared to swear to it and to say, that from the impression given them, they are not satisfied with the shabby way in which they are treated by those members of the Government, and would like an opportunity at any time to confront the two Ministers and hear those two Ministers say that they made no such promise.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to second the motion of my colleague—that this House be now adjourned for five minutes to ventilate this matter. Needless to say, Sir, I have authenticated the information which my colleague has put before this House tonight. In fact, together, we had the privilege of meeting the persons whom he has referred to and of hearing the concise evidence in connection with the matter. I would therefore say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that from my experience of hearing evidence from people in this island for about two decades, that the residents of the Clinketts Housing Scheme made out an overwhelmingly *prima facie* case as to the promises which were made to them for the granting of a loan for the purchase of furniture. It would not be good enough, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for Ministers (or for that matter any reasonable person) to couch their remarks or their promises in such language that it could be easily understood to be one thing, whereas it was not intended to mean that. Whatever was said by those two Ministers, it can be said that the honourable senior member for St. Michael led those people of the Clinketts Housing Scheme to feel beyond any shadow of reasonable doubt, that there was a very strong promise held out to them. The Hon. Minister referred to, told them that once this petition was sent in to the proper quarters, it would be dealt with favourably and sympathetically and to their advantage.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is remarkable that so long a period should elapse between the letter of the 2nd September, 1954, and that of the 15th January, 1955. Should it have taken the Ministry con-

cerned so long to decide and announce that the request would be granted and for the reason which that letter contained? I take it that the scheme is not so complicated nor difficult, nor incomprehensible, that it could not have been decided in just a few hours.

12.10 a.m.

I take it that the Scheme is not so complicated or difficult or incomprehensible that within a few hours, with his agile brain, the Hon. Minister of Communications could not have run through it and say at once that no such provision was made in the Scheme as had been requested; but for such a letter to come after three months—the time limit is incomprehensible. One does not know whether to blame the Post Office or perhaps an indolent Secretary or Typist or Messenger in the Hon. Minister's office for sending out this letter stating that no such provision was made in the Scheme. We have been reminded of something which I read as a quotation from Professor Dicey, that the Legislature can do anything except turn a man into a woman; well, if that can be done, surely there is no difficulty in making provision in the Scheme for a grant for the purpose of purchasing furniture. It has been suggested by the members of the Housing Board and the Hon. Minister of Housing, that this is a model Scheme; and if it is desirable to take visitors to this island to see these houses, it is but natural that the occupants of those houses would like to feel that the furniture is worthy of the edifice which is housing it. It would seem to be carrying the Scheme to its logical conclusion to provide assistance to these people in getting furniture, and include that in a comprehensive bill for the whole outfit. As anyone who takes a drive out to that part of the North West coast can see, it is not only my colleague was left with a strong impression; it was an ineradicable impression that provision would be made in the Scheme; and as so long a period of time elapsed before these people received the last communication that no such provision was made in the Scheme, it was expected that the Scheme was being worked out, and it was just a matter of waiting on it and that the Government was considering the Scheme being brought to this House.

It would be a sad commentary on our lives, if the impression were to go out that campaigners promised things which they knew would not be carried out. The provision of furniture would only cost a mere bagatelle, and such would not be on all-fours with the provision of a hot meal for the elementary school children or on all-fours with the provision of free secondary education to the limit of the Treasury (*laughter*). I would suggest that it is not too late for this matter to be reconsidered. Let the Legislature be invited to make the provision which I have no doubt at all, the Legislature would be willing and happy, and in fact, over-joyed to make, so that this Scheme would be a model scheme and one which would be a credit to the island. How miserable it would be to picture these new and neat little houses having been erected, and as soon as you open the door you see no furniture at all or some dilapidated provision quite entirely unworthy of the surroundings which encompass it.

I was present with my colleague, and I was informed that the hon. senior member for St. Michael did say that he would have nothing to do with the people of St. Lucy. It is merely a matter of evidence which we heard and I would say that if I were sitting as a Magistrate, (I hope never to be reduced to that status) on the evidence which I heard, I would consider that a *prima facie* case had been made out for trial at the Assizes. As I see it this particular scheme should have nothing at all to do with a campaign or anything of that sort. I think things should be

done from a broad stand point, and if it is agreed that these people need such loans as they have requested, and if without such loans they cannot adequately furnish the houses then there is no justification for not rendering that assistance. The persons of whom we spoke are persons with whom I have had a long association and there is not one of them who, from my previous experience of many years' standing, I would ever have any reason to doubt. They have always been persons whom I have heard on many occasions discussing matters and whom I have always found to be level-headed, intelligent and truthful. It would take a lot to convince me that they were not giving an accurate report of what was said in their hearing. I can only conclude that if anything was said which they misunderstood, it was said with such subtlety and with such an emphasis on the wrong word, that they so to speak fell into a trap.

I do not think I need labour the point anymore. I am wondering if I would be hoping too much to believe that the Minister or the Secretary with the indecipherable signature attached to that letter of 15th January, would use his great influence to have this matter reconsidered. Ministers and Governments have been known to have matters reconsidered.

12.20 a.m.

Mr. TUDOR : There was an indecipherable signature; but as far as I know it was attached to the letter of 2nd September.

Mr. BRANCKER : Yes Mr. Deputy Speaker, the letter of 15th January, was signed by Mr. Cozier, who was capable of writing his signature so that it could be read. Anyhow sir, I am saying that it is not too late for the Minister to undergo a change of heart and to back down with grace from that very positive refusal of the 15th January in which he regretted that the request could not be granted. That word "cannot" is a very strong word; it requires a lot of explanation. If it is claimed that it would be creating a precedent, what objection could there be in creating a good precedent?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I think the letter explains why.

Mr. BRANCKER : The letter says there is no such provision made in the scheme. That would lead me to say that because no such provision was made, is there any reason why such a provision cannot be made? I must commend the last word of the hon. member, that there is no justification for continuing to refuse to make such a provision; and I trust I shall hear of one being made in the near future. Let not the hon. member for St. Michael feel that if he changes his attitude now, he will be losing face. What matters is, that the people would be getting the benefit to which they are entitled in the Socialist Welfare State which we should create in this colony.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS : Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no hope of granting this request for financial reasons, just as there is no hope of building a secondary school in every parish. We just do not have the money, unless hon. members are willing to pay more income tax, and to pay more tax on rum and tobacco etc. We made the Five Year Plan and made no provision for a Deep Water Harbour. Professor Richardson has come and said that we can spend \$400,000. Let me say plainly that we are in a very awkward position financially at the moment, even though we have had some rain which has pulled us from what would have been a crop of 120,000 tons up to one which will probably be 160,000 tons.

As far as this particular case is concerned, I have never discussed furniture for the Clinketts Housing Scheme with any human being in St. Lucy during the St. Lucy campaign; what may have happened with the Minister of Housing is another mat-

ter. The question of pipes was raised, and we said that we would speak with Mr. Lashley and get the matter in; and we did do that.

What has happened is, that a conversation which took place outside my car after the election, has been transposed to before the election. A number of people (some of whom I am sure are staunch supporters of the Labour Party) came up to my car and said they had spoken to the Minister of Housing as regards furniture. They also suggested that the houses should not be occupied until the middle of January.

I said that as long as the money was there, I saw no reason why we should not help them with furniture; and I still feel that way. If we find oil, I still say give them furniture. (*Laughter*). They laugh because they are not facing reality! If we do not find oil there are a lot of things that we cannot do. I say that regardless of how the hyenas may howl! [Mr. CRAWFORD: Cut down the Ministers' salaries.] And the salaries of the other members of the House! I am prepared to cut down all salaries.

I repeat, sir, these people came to me outside my car and told me they had spoken to the Minister of Housing about furniture, and that he had told them that the matter was being considered. I said that I agreed in principle that furniture should be supplied. I have seen it done in Puerto Rico on the hire purchase system. One should remember that there is not only one Housing Scheme, and the money may not stretch to furniture. I said we would consider it, and that it had not yet gone before the Executive which was the simple truth.

Now that we are considering the Estimates, there are many things which department after department is putting up — things which may be admirable. I do not mind disclosing now what is a budget secret, and that is, that we are hundreds of dollars out with our expenditure. I wonder if hon. members will support me if I say increase income tax, increase customs duty etc. I repeat that unless we find oil, there are a lot of things that we cannot do. That is my answer.

The hon. junior member for St. Lucy skirted all around trying to suggest — At one time he was childish enough to suggest that at election time the most honest politician would not promise to try to give help.

12.30 a.m.

There is not a man, woman or child over the last ten years who can say that I ever told them anything, without saying "if possible." I say that because if I have to meet you at half past nine tomorrow morning, I may not be able to manage it; and therefore I say "If I can manage it." Before you leave home, somebody may stop you: and rather than make a promise and break it, I say "if possible." I have been held up very often in such a manner; up to this morning. This morning I was supposed to have an appointment with the Estimates Committee at 9.30 o'clock and when I got to the Public Buildings Yard to go up the stairs to my office, people stopped me and I could not be brusque. Similarly you get politicians saying (if something is put to them which they have a reasonable chance of doing) "if possible." If a man came to you and said: "Would you vote for what Uriah Butler preaches about taxation," you would be dishonest if you did not say emphatically "No" to that. If there is anything to be considered, a person is perfectly entitled to say that the matter is under consideration; therefore, if the Hon. Minister for Communications, Works and Housing says that the matter is under consideration, there is nothing wrong about that. Of course, I can say now that it is not under consideration because I know that we cannot find the money. It will be under consideration when

we can find the money. If anybody were to ask me if we are going to put forward 178 housing schemes, I would be bound to say emphatically "No" to that; because, I know that we cannot find the money to do all that. We are going to try to put a scheme or two in every parish. That does not mean that I am opposed to putting forward 178 housing schemes. I have been to Puerto Rico where I have seen refrigerators supplied to the persons in housing schemes by the housing authorities; I am not opposed to that. If you find the money you can put in television sets; but if you have not the money, you cannot do it. We have no money under this scheme to help you with furniture, that is all we are saying.

Sir, I deny that I have made any promise, but I do not deny that I saw that group of people. There were ten or twelve of them and when I finished speaking to them, I said "Go and see Mr. Cox." One of them said "We saw him already today" or something to that effect.

What I think has happened to the hon. junior member for St. Lucy is that his chickens are coming home to roost. One woman in his beloved Half Moon Fort District has told me something already. If the hon. member likes, he can call that district mine too because for twenty odd years, I have been going to that district often. She related to me what the unfortunate gullible people in St. Lucy were saying. She said to me: "Mr. Adams, is it true that if Mr. Tudor gets in, he will be Premier and you will cease to be Premier." That sort of thing is happening in that parish. The hon. junior member for St. Lucy has not been able to fulfil the promises which he made to the people of St. Lucy, that as soon as he gets in everything will be changed. He has said that this Socialist Government would be wiped out, and whatever they want will be done. He has told them that he is now supported by his more wily and most wise colleague. The hon. member has got to make a speech so that he can say to the people of St. Lucy, "I did my best to force the Government but they would not give in." I repeat, nobody will be so silly as to believe that we would refuse to help those people with furniture if we had the money. Nobody would be so silly as to believe that we would refuse to pay Civil Servants more than they are getting now, if we had the money. Nobody would be so silly as to believe that we would not build a Harrison College in every parish if we had the money. [A VOICE: Do not promise that]. I can only promise that, if we strike oil; I do not know where the money would come from otherwise. I do agree that we should not raise anybody's hopes by saying that we are likely to get these things. For many years I was in the Opposition, and I used to hit my head against a brick wall when I got up to argue; the Government of those days just would look at us and smile. I think the hon. junior member for St. Lucy will have to wait for twenty years to get on this side of the table. If the hon. member cannot wait so long, he has his remedy; he need not stand for election. If the hon. member is looking at the results of the bye-election in St. Lucy, I will only tell him that politics is politics. You cannot always win; you cannot always get the most persuasive argument accepted. Sir Winston Churchill was turned out of the House of Commons, apparently, not because of his policy, but because he was a pussy-foot; he was a prohibitioner. That was the apparent reason why Sir Winston lost his seat in 1921; and for two sessions Sir Winston did not get in. So there should be no feeling of depression on the part of the Labour Government that it has not retained that seat in St. Lucy. All that is politics.

I do assure the hon. junior member for St. Lucy who has raised this question that I understand his difficulty. When you take into consideration anybody who says, that is the man who can push back the waves of the Labour Party politics, that is the man who can get rid of the Premier and the other Ministers, and that said man goes into the House to do that, but cannot do it, his superiors must say he has not done anything for us. I appreciate the position in which the hon. junior member for St. Lucy finds himself. He is in an awkward position. The Germans never attempted to attack the Maginot Line; they went around it. There are some people who you do not try to attack. Sir, I think I have spoken fairly long. I say in one simple phrase that the Labour Party has nothing against granting money by way of a loan to those people to buy furniture, but there are so many other things to be done that there is no money for it.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was hoping that some other hon. member would have spoken on this question, but apparently due to the fact that we have turned into another day, members are more ready and willing to go home. Sir, I must deny the allegations put by those two hon. members for St. Lucy, when they said that I had given the people in the Clinketts Housing Scheme the assurance that they would get a loan for the purchase of furniture to put into their houses there. 12.40 a.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not know if I am correct in correcting the hon. member, but I do not think it was a direct accusation made by hon. members; did they not say that they were so informed by these people? I was under the impression that these things were told to the hon. member.

Hon. M. E. COX: At one time they said that they heard it from the residents of the area, but I think that they did go a little further to make it appear as if what they were saying were statements of fact. The manner in which they spoke, reminds me of those professional persons whom we call village lawyers, who hang around the Courts and who know absolutely nothing about a particular matter which might be heard before the Judge; but are always ready to give evidence in Court. Somebody comes along and tells these village lawyers that such and such a thing has happened and then they go into the Court and elect to give evidence as if they were present when the matter occurred. Everybody will agree with me that that is a fair description of the manner in which the statements were made. Never have I at any time, told these persons at the Clinketts Housing Scheme that they would be granted a loan to purchase furniture to be placed in these houses. I want to say here now, that one of the reasons why I have always succeeded in election campaigns, is because I have always given people facts; I have always told them the Gospel truth. I have absolutely no fear; I have never promised these people that they would be granted loans to purchase furniture. A lie has been told. I have in my hands two letters written on letter heads of the House of Assembly by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy—

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of explanation. The replies addressed to my constituents are here; but I have made copies, signed in each case by the subordinates of the Hon. Minister. I made copies of them so that they could be passed on to him if he wanted to see them or in case he did not know anything about them.

Hon. M. E. COX: I do not know if what is written here is word for word with the replies which were sent to these people.

Mr. TUDOR: I object to that. He is now questioning my good faith in copying a letter which

comes from his office; I have made copies of the original, and Your Honour can examine them for yourself. I left out the signature of one letter because it was undecipherable, but I have since ascertained that it is the signature of Mr. Fields; but everything else is an accurate transcript.

Hon. M. E. COX: What is the position? The people connected with this scheme at Clinketts wrote, (I do not remember the date, I have not got the file with me because I did not know that this matter would have been dealt with tonight) asking for a loan of £50 to be advanced to them in order that they might be able to purchase furniture to put in these houses. Here I should pause to say this: if I had promised these people as those hon. members are trying to make out, there would not be any question of their writing an original letter asking to be granted the loan of this £50; they would have written reminding me that I have promised to help them with this loan of £50, and they would have asked me that that promise be honoured; but they wrote an original letter asking for a loan of £50 to be advanced to them for purchasing furniture to put in these houses. 12.50 a.m.

In official language a reply was sent that the matter would be considered. The question as to how long a decision was reached does not arise in this case. As the hon. Premier has pointed out, it is a question of finance. As you know sir, under these Aided Self Help Schemes the Government advances material for the construction of the houses; the people who are going to occupy these houses have not got to advance one single cent. All material for the construction is advanced by the Government and technical supervision is also given by the Housing Board. The people construct the houses with the assistance of artisans of the Housing Board, and when the houses are finished the people occupy them and pay approximately \$4 a month on the hire purchase system for a period of say fifteen years, and then they become the owners of the houses.

Rather than refusing to help these people, I want to say here and now that when these Schemes were first started, I did everything I possibly could in the parish of St. Lucy to encourage these people to join these schemes; because I knew it was in their own interest and that they would benefit considerably. The hon. senior member for St. Lucy whose aid I was unsuccessful in getting—

Mr. BRANCKER: The hon. member has left it quite vague when he says he was unsuccessful in getting my aid. I certainly am categorically denying the statement that he has made.

Hon. M. E. COX: Whenever we were prepared to hold a meeting and the hon. member was asked to assist in explaining to the people and to help bolster up the scheme, knowing the influence which he wields in that particular parish—I remember even in the Half Moon Fort area when the last meeting was held, acting on the advice of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy I prolonged the meeting waiting for him to arrive, but he never turned up. I am sure I am correct in saying that we never had his assistance publicly on any platform in getting the scheme going.

Mr. BRANCKER: If I may say this further in explanation, they did not remember that I was a member of the Party at all until at a very late stage in the proceedings. I remember that the meeting clashed with a previous engagement—a meeting at the Empire Club. When I did attend meetings I got no publicity.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: How can I relate what I am hearing now to the question that is before us?

Hon. M. E. COX: I gave all the assistance that I could, even though the hon. senior member for St

Lucy could not see his way at the time to give similar assistance. That being so, I want it to be clearly understood that there can be no question of making false promises to those people. Hon. members have said that some of those people told them that I said that I was finished with St. Lucy; that is not a correct statement, and I want to deny it. What I did say I will say here now; I said, I would never canvass in St. Lucy again, because there was no house to which you went where, after putting your facts, people did not push their hands at you for something. That is the only reason why I said that I would never canvass in St. Lucy again; but I never said that I was finished with St. Lucy.

I want to assure the representatives of that parish that in so far as my Ministry is concerned, they need not worry or be afraid that whatever is for St. Lucy they will not get. I go further and say this: if we were to withhold their rightful due, we would be doing exactly what we have preached against for all these years. When rich people face elections and lose, they try to bring all sorts of pressure on poor people. If we adopt that attitude we would be wrong. A man should be able to vote according to his free will and without any hindrance; no pressure should be brought to bear on any individual because he did not vote for Mr. A. or Mr. B. That is the old time system, and we shall not do anything of that sort. I have heard people say that the Government will not give St. Lucy this and that, because they did not vote for us. I want to emphasise again that I never promised those people any loan of £50 or any other sum. They asked for a loan of £50 to buy furniture along with other things. The matter was considered and it was found that we could not afford to do it. Members will know that under our Housing Programme we have proposed to build 680 Self Help Houses.

If you are going to build 600 Aided Self-Help houses, it will mean that every individual would be entitled to similar treatment. Whatever you do for anyone of them, each of the 600 families would ask for a similar request. You just cannot do it; and the reply was sent to them telling them that we regret that we were unable to do it. Before sitting, I would say that I am in sympathy with the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. He probably feels that the statements given him by some people were promises, perhaps realising that what promises he himself did make, were promises which he knew he cannot fulfil. I am sure that from my end, no promise was made to lend those people any money to purchase furniture.

1.00 a.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, should concern the House for a moment, is that there are some people in the island who are so poor that they cannot take advantage even of the offer of free houses. What we should concern ourselves with is, what is likely to become of those eleven houses which up to now are not tenanted. If up to now only four families have moved into those homes and eleven are still unoccupied, when are the other families going to move in, and are they really going to move in? Are they really so poor that they cannot buy some furniture to carry into those houses with them. That is what is worrying my mind all the time.

There is no doubt in my mind that those people were being played fast and loose with during the election campaign; because, in September they were told that their request was under consideration and four months afterwards, it was suddenly realised that there was no such provision included in the scheme. Why did the Government not tell them so from the beginning? The obvious answer is because

the election was on. It is not that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has realised subsequently that there is no money. Do you think that it would take four months to realise that? He must have known it before.

There is one more point which I want to make. The suggestion has been made that the day you give one member of the housing scheme this concession, you will have to supply all of the 678 people if there were 678 that were aided; that is, you will have to supply all with this concession in so far as the entire island-wide scheme is concerned. But we are told that only eleven out of the fifteen have asked for this loan.

Hon. M. E. COX: All fifteen of those people have asked for it. The petition was signed by all fifteen members. Each has asked for a loan of £50 each.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. junior member for St. Lucy said that eleven people requested it and I am quoting him. The Hon. Minister has no files to back up his statement; it is just like last week when he said that it was an oversight over the Six Cross Roads affair. Let me say that there are fifteen people in the Clinketts Housing Scheme and eleven have asked for a certain amount by way of a loan to purchase furniture; all may not get a similar request; they are asking that they be considered on their own merits.

I am quite willing to say that the Government could not very well be expected to take up money indiscriminately out of the Public Treasury and lend people to buy furniture. That would be sheer nonsense; but in cases of extreme merit they might be willing as Governments in other parts of the world which advance amounts of money to purchase furniture to people who are taking advantage of similar projects—

Hon. M. E. COX: That is not true. Not one cent is given for that purpose in Jamaica.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Has somebody accused the Hon. Minister of misleading the House, when a previous speaker said that people were given loans for furniture in similar schemes?

Hon. M. E. COX: Not under Aided Self-Help Housing.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What is it, if it were given for Aided Self-Help Housing or under another type of housing scheme where the Government built the houses, and you paid something annually for it. As a matter of fact, there is a far greater point in lending a man money to buy furniture who owns part of a house, than to a man for whom the Government builds a house; because, that house is going to cost twice as much as if he had built it himself. The houses that people have built under the Aided Self-Help Housing Scheme only cost \$1,100, but similar houses that were built by the Government cost over \$2,000. It is far better to lend money to the man who owes you less.

Speaking generally, we cannot afford to lend money on scheme of this sort, not even a smaller amount of, say, £25, but we can find \$2,000,000 to do other nonsense. You cannot think of earmarking \$1,100 for a loan to purchase furniture for those people, but you can pay out for the passages to Officers and their wives. As I have said, it is not good enough to say: it is impossible unless we find oil; because you can find money for cases in which no hardships are entailed. Nobody would expect that the Government would pick up money irresponsibly and lend people to buy furniture, but at the same time that is far from saying that we have no money for that purpose unless we find oil.

1.10 a.m.

I believe, sir, that the cases require consideration on their merits so as to make it possible to give some sort of assistance without committing yourself generally to the principle of giving people money for purchasing furniture or without saying that every occupier of a Government house is entitled to money as of right before he or she moves in a house. The parish of St. Lucy is one of the poorest parishes in the island, and the cases of extreme poverty found there are not found in any other parish in the island. The crops there are of shorter duration, agricultural yields are low because of poor rainfall and poor soil, and what-not; and I personally do not feel that if the Government gave assistance of this sort to those people, therefore people elsewhere would also feel themselves of necessity entitled to it. It is sheer, criminal indifference and hard-heartedness on the part of the Government, merely to say that we have not got the money to lend these people unless we find oil; and therefore we cannot consider an application like that at all. They could see their way to be so wise only when at least a year and a half, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has had before him all the details of the colony's financial position in connection with the Deep Water Harbour and what-not, and he should have been in a position to tell the people from September that he could not do it; but not to raise their hopes in September and then four or five months after the election you say you cannot do it, because no provision has been made for loans under the scheme. These people have been waiting for help from the Government, otherwise they would have resorted to some means of getting the money to go into these houses. Do you expect that these people would fight for houses when they could not move into them?

Mr. TUDOR: With respect to the remarks of the Premier, just let me say that he seems to have been in a very whimsical mood this afternoon particularly in respect of this matter; I do not know whether the position of 11 families is a subject big enough for a joke. What the Premier does not seem to realise is this: in a scheme which the Government has established, 11 out of 15 families cannot partake, and the chief reasons which they have given is that they have nothing to put into these houses. Does the Premier seriously suggest that it is beyond the ability of this island even to find a token sum of money to assist them? That is the implication and if it were decided even to give these families \$50 each although I think a little more than that would be needed to meet the case, is it being said now that 11 x 50 is too much a sum for this Government to find? Are you really telling people that you cannot find it possible to give these people a bed or something to sit on unless you find oil? And is the oil to drop from the Premier's tongue? Can you not assist these people in a matter of this sort? The hon. senior member for St. John has just reminded me of something which I had almost forgotten; it is the question of the provision of a carpet at Government House which, instead of being repaired a new one had to be furnished. The whole establishment was collapsing because they did not think that that carpet was suited, and the furniture was said to be so badly needed, that Lady Blood was obliged to use packing cases. Even the packing cases would suffice in this case. Let the hon. member get annoyed if he wishes to do so, but he cannot seriously tell us that they are not in a position to extend a little help to people who say that they have not got tables or pots and pans; and unless you strike oil you cannot consider granting this help.

With respect to the Minister of Communications, the most of what I have to say has already been addressed in criticisms of the Premier's remarks; and I must ask him why is it, that he has come to the conclusion about St. Lucy's people on such flimsy evidence? If the people of St. Lucy held out both their hands to him they must have heard that the Ministers' salaries were so great, that the holding out of the hands could not meet with any disappointment. Secondly I shall stress on him what I have already stressed and what my colleague has more than emphasised. The two of them have left an indelible impression on the minds of the people of St. Lucy, an impression that, somehow or other the Government in the person of two Ministers, had promised to see to it that these people got assistance. I have to stress that point in order to show, that when these people made applications to him, these people were claiming that it was alright with the Premier and they only had to put the matter in writing.

One last word. I am appealing to them to think very carefully before they brush this matter off as one more attempt on the part of a member to please his constituents, because they expect it of him. If my chickens are coming home to roost, there are 751 above what was needed even for the roost! I want to say this: in St. Lucy all the remarks I have ever heard about the Premier, had reference to the people being asked about him and they answered that in St. Lucy both the Premier and his title were unknown. Before I sit down, I wish to appeal to them to consider very carefully that if they cannot face these unfortunate people with one quarter or even one eighth of the way, give them something because as the position is now they are in need of furniture; do not let us bandy words about who said this or who said what. What we are asking them to do is to find some method of relieving the situation so that these people can occupy the houses which they have helped to build.

They are going to pay taxes on them whether they occupy them or not. It must therefore be a matter of great concern to them to occupy these houses as quickly as possible; and they cannot do that unless they have something comfortable to move in with.

1.20 a.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The correct procedure is to ask the views of the House to withdraw your motion, the purpose for which it was made having been served.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I now ask leave to withdraw my motion.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker left the Chair, and Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday next at 3 o'clock p.m.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am going to appeal to hon. members. They know that hon. members will have to attend a special function here next Wednesday. Let us consider what has happened today because the same thing might happen next Tuesday, and we will be here until one or two o'clock next Wednesday morning. I beg to move an amendment, that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday the 15th instant at three o'clock p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, it is well known to all of us that next week is a busy week. I understand that Wednesday next is to be a Bank Holiday. There will be three days given over to festivities which will really mean a dislocation of business. I am seconding the motion for adjournment until the 15th instant.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday 15th instant at three o'clock p.m. Hon. members in favour will please say "Aye" and those against will please say "No." I think the "Ayes" have it.

On a division being called for, the question was put and resolved in a tie, the House dividing as follows:—

"Ayes"—Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BRANCKER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. VAUGHAN and Mr. GODDARD.—5.

"Noes"—Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. Cox, Mr. TUDOR and Mr. ALLDER.—5.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been resolved in a tie; I now vote with the "Noes."

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday next at three o'clock was put and agreed to without division, and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.

1.30 a.m.