

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1954—55

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

(Tuesday, 7th June, 1955).

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

Present :

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*); Hon. H. G. H. 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 and Housing*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Chairman of Committees*); Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, Mr. T. O. BRYAN, Mr. F. C. GODDARD, (*Leader of the Opposition*); Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and 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 meetings held on the 17th March, and 22nd March respectively, have been printed and circulated amongst honourable members and unless there is any objection these Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed.

There being no objection those Minutes were now taken as read and confirmed.

Mr. VAUGHAN and Mr. CRAWFORD entered the House and took their seat.

TEMPORARY DEPUTY CLERK

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a letter from the Acting Deputy Clerk, Mr. D. A. Banfield applying for leave of absence for the day owing to illness; and that Mr. H. O. Cumberbatch, Solicitor, be allowed to act.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I am asking that leave be granted to Mr. D. A. Banfield, and that Mr. H. O. Cumberbatch be asked to act in his place.

Leave was granted to Mr. Banfield.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS seconded by Hon. M. E. COX the question that Mr. H. O. CUMBERBATCH be appointed to act as Deputy Clerk for today's meeting was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay by command of His Excellency the Governor the following:—

Message No. 15/1955 from His Excellency the Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly regarding the approval by the Secretary of State of a grant from Colonial Development and Welfare Funds towards the hospital scheme as proposed in the Hospital Planning Committee Report.

MESSAGE NO. 15/1955.

*His Excellency The Governor
To*

The Honourable The House of Assembly

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to refer to his Message No. 31/1954 dated 11th December, 1954, in connection with the financial arrangements to implement the proposals in the Report of the Hospital Planning Committee, and to inform the Honourable House of Assembly that the Secretary of State has approved a grant from the Colonial Development and Welfare funds of \$80,000 to meet the capital cost of the additional improvements to the hospital scheme, which were recommended by the Medical Adviser to the Comptroller, Development and Welfare Organisation. The Secretary of State has also approved a further grant of \$73,000 towards the original scheme. This brings the amount of Colonial Development and Welfare grant for the hospital development schemes to \$924,000, leaving \$311,000 to be found from local funds to meet the total cost of the improvements estimated at \$1,235,000.

R. D. H. ARUNDELL,
Governor.

Government House,
Barbados,
5th June, 1955.

Hon. M. E. COX: Statement of Post Office Advances for payment of Money Orders, to the 31st March, 1955.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: (For Premier): Reply to Question No. 17 asked by Mr. J. E. T. Brancker regarding free hot meals for school children and free education in secondary schools.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Reply to Question No. 24 asked by Mr. E. W. Barrow regarding a Branch Library for St. George.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows: Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: (For Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour) :— Bill to provide for the establishment of Employment Exchanges and for purposes connected therewith.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Resolution to place the sum of \$11,214 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955-56, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1955-56, No. 7, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. Cummins seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, the Bill to provide for the establishment of Employments Exchanges and for purposes connected therewith, was read a first time.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, in connection with the Resolution just introduced by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, I should have given notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to deal with that Resolution. I now beg to give that notice.

STATEMENT ON PIG SUBSIDY SCHEME

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I ask leave to lay a statement in connection with the proposed employment of Sanitary Inspectors relative to the Pig Subsidy Scheme.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The Statement is as follows:—

"In the interest of justice I wish to make a statement relative to the debate on Thursday, 26th May, 1955, during which an attack was made on the Director of Agriculture.

The misunderstanding arose out of a statement of mine that the Director of Agriculture had reported that only one reply had been received from Vestries relative to the use of Sanitary Inspectors for the Pig Subsidy Scheme. It appears from my investigations that there was a misunderstanding of a report made to me verbally by the Director of Agriculture on the 25th March, 1955. In fact, several vestries had by then replied. The Director did not report further after that date, because I then reached the conclusion that the proposal that Sanitary Inspectors should undertake inspections under the pig breeders' subsidy scheme would in any case lead to administrative difficulties.

I am quite satisfied that neither the Director nor anyone else had any conscious intention of misleading me.

In the end, nine Vestries replied to the Director's letter, eight affirmatively and one in the negative. Two Vestries did not reply."

HOUSING DEVELOPMENT BILL C'TD

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day is to resume debate on the second reading of the Bill to make provision with respect to the housing of persons of the working class and other classes and for purposes connected therewith.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Bill before us is to make provision with respect to the Housing

of persons of the working classes and other classes; and I think sir, that the basic test, indeed the acid test of the Government's *bona fides* in this matter of improving the housing of the working classes is best reflected in its attitude towards the question of land for housing. If we are to embark on an ambitious and comprehensive housing scheme, obviously the prime consideration is the question of what land is there available for the purpose. It is true that in the Bill before us the proposed Housing Authority will have the power to acquire land from time to time, but under the actual operations of the Bill what is important, is the avowed policy of the Government. Therefore, it is relevant for us to refer to the pronouncement of the Minister on the introduction of the Bill with regard to the Government's policy on this vital question of land.

Now, this is what was said: he referred to the fact that certain housing schemes had been started in some parishes, but so far none had been started in St. Andrew, St. Peter or St. Joseph because of the unavailability of land; and he said that as soon as areas become available in those parishes the Government would negotiate to acquire these areas. Then, he went on to express the view that his own feeling was that plantation owners should with the necessary safe-guard, on a long term policy lease either to Government or persons employed on their plantation, lands suitable for the housing of workers under the supervision of the Housing Authority to be set up by the Bill. The reason for that view was that the price of land was so high in Barbados that if there was some arrangement whereby land can be acquired without the taking out of money from the Treasury, the Government could do much more by way of producing housing facilities.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member quoting from a speech recently made during this session? The honourable member cannot do that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am endeavouring to refer to the relevant portion of the speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member may not do that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: In other words, the Government according to the Minister, intends to wait until land becomes available in St. Joseph or St. Andrew or St. Peter; and his personal opinion is that the estate owners should lease land to workers for this purpose. Well now, I want to ask if anybody in Barbados really thinks that we will acquire sufficient land for a bold comprehensive housing scheme in this colony? The Government does propose in this Bill that there shall be erected every year, 600 Aided Self Help Houses; that is nothing to do with the apartment houses and nothing to do with the borrowers who want to get loans either to repair or erect new houses. Where is the land to come from? Are we to sit down and wait until areas become available or await the public spiritedness of plantation owners to lease land on which to build houses? One would expect that in a Bill of this sort which we are told aims at improving the housing conditions of the working classes, there would have been some proper statement from the appropriate Minister with regard to the Government's policy for the acquisition of land.

3.35 p.m.

Land does not become available in Barbados overnight; and with sugar bringing a fairly good price it is most unlikely that any plantation owner is going to be willing to lease land of any appreciable amount for this purpose, or to sell land unless compelled to do so. I am of the opinion that on the question of land, either for housing or land settle-

ment purposes, the Government will have to embark on a bold policy to make more land available to the population. To begin with, long before now, the Government should have had a ceiling figure on the amount of land which private individuals or corporations should be allowed to own; and I personally would state that that ceiling should be placed at 500 acres. You cannot possibly expect to acquire the land you want in suitable proportions either for housing or other purposes, unless and until you fix the amount of land which private individuals or corporations should be allowed to own. The Government is going to find that within a short time after the coming into operation of this Bill, that the Housing proposals will be bogged down because of the unavailability of land to carry through the proposals of the Bill. You do not want a better illustration of this than the announcement of the Minister, when he said that Government will start housing schemes in those particular parishes when the land becomes available. Perhaps he means when that land drops from the skies, or by some miraculous achievement, some land appears off the coast of those parishes. That is to what it amounts. This is not the time, in my opinion, for any corny clichés as regards the basic means of the working class on housing, or for any of the platitudinous remarks indulged by the Minister when he introduced the Bill. I am of the opinion that the presence in this Chamber of people like ourselves in such preponderant numbers, in itself signifies that the largest number of the land needed section of the community is convinced that we appreciate their housing needs; so that merely reiterating that will get us no where; what we want is action. I for one am prognosticated at the lack of action or lack of policy envisaged by the Government in this Bill before us and in the statement of the Minister in order to get on in a bold manner with their housing proposals.

Now, the Minister says that the Government plans 600 Aided Self Help Houses a year at a cost of \$900, and ten Government-owned houses each at the cost of \$1,000; that is one million dollars. The Bill itself says that the total expenditure by the Housing Authority in any year should be a million dollars. As a matter of fact, the Bill itself says that it is anticipated that with a total expenditure by the Housing Authority of \$1,000,000 a year, the total capital of \$2,500,000 would be required by the Authority over a period of approximately 10 to 15 years, depending upon the type of houses and the amount of assistance given. I tried to emphasise last week that if Self Help Aided houses and the Government-owned houses cost a million dollars which is the ceiling price now, I do not see what will be left for loans to people who want to repair or erect their own homes. I also tried to point out in my humble opinion that you are not going to get 600 Aided Self Help houses erected every year. When I said so, there was the *sotto voce* remark "what about Puerto Rico?" The thought struck me at the time that it was really remarkable how willing Government appeared to follow Puerto Rico when it suits them, and in other instances to decry what is going on there. I should like to say that if they were to follow Puerto Rico more carefully than what they are doing as regards Housing, they will find in actual practice that their ambition of 600 Aided Self Help houses a year is bound to founder in reality when it comes to trying to get them erected in Barbados. Since none of us knows where the land is going to come from on which to put these houses, and the Government itself apparently has not the intentions to get that land, we need not bother our

selves unduly over whether or not this target is practicable. The only thing I want to point out before I pass on, is that if the Government is not definitely going to take steps to acquire land in a comprehensive manner, then the whole housing scheme is doomed to failure. And the talk of leasing land is even more stupid; because if we started off in 1955 erecting wooden houses on rented land or leased land at the rate of which the Government proposes to improve the houses of the working classes, it will take another 40 or 50 years before the major portion of the population is rehoused. Long before that time elapses, the houses constructed or repaired by the Housing Authority in its first years would be in need of either rebuilding or major alterations. In other words, if we want to ensure that the best results are obtained from the Housing Scheme, we should be building on land with secure tenure in order that houses may be constructed of stone.

The Minister of Housing probably is not yet aware that some of the sugar workers' houses constructed and repaired under the recently started Labour Welfare Scheme, are in need of repairs because of the quality of the building materials which we get in this island at the present time. The quality of the lumber which we get is such that in five years both the sidings and the flooring will have deteriorated while the shingles and galvanise are not lasting as well as have been accustomed.

3.45 p.m.

It is highly important for the Government to bear in mind from the time it starts off, that if this new housing scheme is to be a success Government will have to think first and foremost in terms of land; and there need not be the necessity for the passing of money as the Minister of Communications envisages in order to secure this land. He claims that the cost of land is exceedingly high; and this high cost is militating against his intentions; therefore, he recommends the leasing of plantation land in order that land may be acquired without the passing of money; which presumably, his Government has not got. I see no reason why if land is to be acquired the money need not be passed now. Nobody is going to suggest that rich cultivable land should be utilised for housing; but almost every plantation in this country of any appreciable size has a certain amount of non-arable land or uncultivable land which can be acquired for housing on economic lines for the benefit of the community; and I think that under a comprehensive scheme it can be acquired and paid for by the Government, not only by acquisition, but on some other basis. One method which possibly appears practicable to me, is that the Government might acquire the land and remit taxes to be paid on the remainder annually until such time as the purchase price of the acquired land has been paid completely. In other words, if you acquire ten acres of land from any given property for housing, leaving perhaps another 300 or 400 to the same owner, there is no reason why there should not be a remission of taxes on the remainder of the estate to cover the cost of the land acquired. You would have provided land on the one hand with no cost to the Government, while the owner ought to be satisfied with this arrangement since his purchase money will be amortised annually in such a manner as to relieve him of the payment of taxation which in any case he is bound to pay.

I suggested just now that at the rate at which this Bill proposes to build houses or rather to improve housing conditions, it will take us nearly 40 to 50 years to rehouse the major portion of the workers in Barbados. The total annual expenditure envisaged in this Bill as aforementioned is a million dollars a year. That million dollars a year includes

the \$600,000 we are now spending on the rehousing of agricultural workers; and that is where the proposal of the Government almost becomes farcical. We are now spending, (not from our own money but from money believed to be provided from the British Government in relation to the sugar price (\$600,000 a year on the rehousing of sugar workers. Last week I quoted the figure on sugar workers to be something like \$33,000; and with this expenditure of \$600,000 a year we are only attending to about 1,500 or 1,600 sugar workers, that is all. In other words, at the rate at which we are going with the Labour Welfare Fund (not with Government Funds, or special funds) it will take 20 years to rehouse the sugar workers alone; and as I said long ago long before that time many of the houses first attended to will need major repair or reconstruction, because of having constructed these houses in wood. Well, now, if \$600,000 will only meet the requirements of 500 workers a year in the Sugar Industry, a simple arithmetic calculation will disclose what is needed to meet the housing needs of the 55,000 workers in the colony, even at the small rate at which we are attending now to sugar workers. In other words, If we are to attend to the same 5% of the other workers annually as we attend to in the case of the sugar workers we will need over a million dollars.

Whenever it is borne in mind that this million dollars includes the \$600,000 we are now spending on sugar workers, you will see what we are doing: we are merely scraping the surface; just toying with the problem. We will only have \$400,000 a year left to attend to almost double the amount of workers in the sugar industry.

3.55 p.m.

In other words out of the colony's 55,000 general workers hardly more than 6,000 can be attended to under the financial provisions of this Bill. I need not bother to tell the House how long it will take at that rate to make any appreciable and visible improvement in the housing of these 55,000 workers. The Government is really almost getting away with murder on this question of Housing; what they are really doing is sheltering behind the Labour Welfare Fund and making it appear as if they are really doing something about Housing, when in truth and in fact there are almost doing nothing. We know that whether or not this so-call housing scheme is put into operation, whether or not we have this Housing Bill before us enacted, we are going to spend \$600,000 a year on Housing from the Labour Welfare Funds; but they themselves have been brazen enough as to admit that all they are actually spending or proposing to spend every year from the general revenue on Housing is the sum of \$150,000, and still they carry on with these high sounding and bombastic pronouncements about the needs for housing and the value of housing and what appeals to the morals and economic conditions of the workers to be properly housed. We all know that; we expect the Government knows it and we do not want to hear it repeated; what we want to see is that their fundamental apprehensions of the problem is followed up by some practical action to improve it. If you were to refer to what the Minister had to say about the plight of the working classes you could come to no other conclusion than that the Government proposes to spend about 6 million or 7 million dollars a year on Housing; but stripped of all its platitudes, you will find that the Government is merely paying lip service to the question, and in actual fact it is doing far less than what any Government would dare to do in this matter in this year 1955. What we should be doing, is not to use the Labour Welfare Funds to

cover our deficiencies in Housing or to bolster up our paltry proposals on Housing expenditure; what we should do is to take advantage of the unexpected availability of this appreciable sum from sugar funds for Housing, and at the same time make the maximum amount available for Housing from general revenue so that with the two combined and put into operation, a really ambitious and comprehensive housing programme will be put into effect.

We are apt to laugh at everything that Trinidad does. Well a similar Bill was introduced in the Trinidad Legislature some weeks ago, and it is significant that the Trinidad Government has refused to put any ceiling whatsoever on the funds which shall be available to the Housing Authority. There has been some talk about \$13 million; but the Government does appreciate the magnitude of the problem. Government has practical experience from the Public Servants' Housing Scheme in operation as to what its commitments are likely to be when the general Housing Scheme begins to operate; and therefore Government should refuse to delude itself that any paltry sum will do, or that it can fix any low ceiling and really expect that there will be as a result, any proper headway made in the housing of those who should be assisted with houses. By Comparison, the niggardly action of the Barbados Government lays bare its pretensions of any deep interest in the social conditions of the people of this country. I cannot for the life of me, understand how they expect to fool the public that they are really tackling courageously the question of Housing. We should be spending annually no less than \$3 million on these priorities, and even then we would not be attending to the needs of more than 3,500 people every year. When one bears in mind that we are spending money on Housing, thereby improving the durable assets of the country and increasing the national wealth, there is no reason why we should be parsimonious or reactionary or shortsighted in embarking on a large Housing programme.

4.05 p.m.

This is not a question of road building or building bridges or investing money in some enterprise in which the return will be doubtful, and from which there can be no improvement in the national credit of our economy. We are building houses, extending and improving them for the people of this country. The people want them and they will pay for them because they must have somewhere to live; they cannot live in trees. If they do not own houses they will have to rent them and it is only a question of your providing them with these houses on liberal terms and in the process of time regaining your credit from them. Of course, nobody expects the present Government to think in these terms, because it is still fresh in the public's mind that on two recent occasions this Government actually enacted legislation which entitled them to pick up our surplus funds and invest them outside of the colony. As a matter of fact, even when we first started to collect the funds accruing to the country from the sugar funds including the Labour Welfare Fund which they are now using for Housing, the only thing which they could think of was to bring down a Bill to give them the power to pick up surplus from these funds and send it outside of the colony for investments. Despite the views of the Opposition on the floor of the House, this legislation was enacted. For all we know, even now there may be surplus funds from the Labour Welfare Fund invested abroad. Of course, one can take it as a foregone conclusion that with regard to one of the other funds (the Sugar Industry Rehabilitation

Funds) that the sugar interest involved is not going to let the hay grow on that money, because as soon as they are entitled to it they draw it.

With regard to the other two funds controlled by the Government (the Labour Welfare Fund and the Price Stabilization Fund) it may well be that appreciable portions of either, or both of these funds, are invested outside of this colony. The Price Stabilization Fund now stands at over \$6,000,000. Perhaps one of the Ministers might regard it as a moral obligation to enlighten this House during this debate as to where and how this \$6,000,000 is now invested.

Mr. SPEAKER: It would not be relevant.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The Bill before us proposes that the Housing Authority should have a capital of \$2½ million, and it also tells us how we are going to raise this \$2½ million. I am suggesting how this should be expended; I deem it that I am entitled to suggest how it should be expended and where the money should come from. I am submitting quite diffidently of course, that in my humble opinion instead of taking up this \$6 million from the Price Stabilization Fund and investing it abroad as they are entitled to do, they might call it in and invest it in Housing in Barbados. I do not think we should be investing our money in Bloemfontein when we can invest it in Housing in Barbados. I am told that they have given the local banks some of the same money to play with. If that is not true let them deny it. I am told that three commercial banks in this island get money from the Price Stabilization Fund to play with and pay them two per cent for it, and then the same banks invest that money.

Mr. SPEAKER: That matter is also irrelevant.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Let us put it this way Mr. Speaker, I personally am dissatisfied with the proposal to spend \$1 million annually and with the proposal for a Capital of \$2½ million for Housing. Now the Government has money loans on which it gets two per cent; It gets the same two per cent from the local banks on what ever portion of the Price Stabilization Fund which they put in the hands of those banks. You are now taking money set aside for the improvement of the people and allowing private banks to speculate on it, when we can well utilise that money to improve the housing of people of this colony. What I am suggesting, sir, is that in the case of money invested outside, it is even worse than in the case of the local investments, since they are not getting more than what we get from our housing debtors, that is, 2% per annum. As you will see, it is to the advantage of this country to utilise this money which is being loaned out for the purpose I am suggesting.

If I am wrong or if there is anything unorthodox or uneconomic in my suggestion, I am willing to stand at anytime—
4.15 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: However the Government manages or mismanages its finances is not really a matter for definite concern now that we are debating the second reading of this Bill. This is more a matter for the Housing Committee. For all I know the hon. member may be offering good advice but the hon. member should stick to the principle of the Bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The basic principle of the Bill in my interpretation is how the Housing Authority is to be financed, since the more finances the Authority has the better it can operate.

Mr. SPEAKER: If I may attempt to refresh the hon. member's memory he would realise that he is debating issues dealing with finance such as Price

Stabilization and so on; that does not really concern the member at the moment.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I expect that if the Government proposes an expenditure of a million dollars and it is not enough I would be immediately asked by somebody where would you be getting more money from. Even allowing for the fact that this particular Government is omniscient, it may well be that certain avenues for the securing of finance could have escaped its attention. It is well that somebody in the House should point out now that you cannot get very far with this million dollar a year on Housing. If the funds are available, why should it not be mentioned at this point. I even go further: I personally feel that the \$600,000 accruing to the Housing Authority from the Labour Welfare Fund should not be included in our considerations today at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has certainly said that more than once; he has made that point crystal clear.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am really setting out now to say this: let us say that the Government proposes today to set up a Housing Authority to spend \$400,000 a year on Housing, (that is what they are doing) out of which they provide from general revenue merely \$150,000; what sir, should have been very welcome is this: today we are increasing our annual expenditure on Housing from the Labour Welfare Funds alone, and then of course bringing proportions to bear, with another \$200,000 on workers then we would have been getting somewhere.

Now with regard to the provision for loans of the Bill, the Housing Authority has power to make advances for acquiring houses, or houses and land, or constructing houses for workers under specified conditions.

This will entail the operation of mortgages and other legal binding instruments; and I want to suggest to the Housing Authority that when it comes to the actual operations of the Bill, they will discover that in the arrangement of mortgages on property and what-not, the legal expenses are going to account for a sizable proportion of a loan. Security or mortgage against property in this country entails a fairly appreciable expenditure. In the old days when the Peasants Loan Bank first started to operate advances, the Bank was as you know was authorised to hold a first lien against the security put up by the borrowers; and it was found in many cases that owners did not have proper titles to the land, and to perfect those titles would involve in the majority of cases, almost nearly the entire amount of money to which the borrower would have been entitled to on his land. As the House is aware, you were allowed to borrow so much money; so that the Directors of the Bank had to concern themselves with devising some legal means by which money could be advanced under proper securities, without involving abnormally high expenditure. Hon. members of this House must appreciate that legal expenses being what they are in this country (I do not know how they compare with legal expenses outside, I know they are high here; the cost of selling or transferring or mortgaging property if anybody thinks it is cheap let him try it;) some poor worker who wants to borrow £100 or £300 on a property to repair it or a piece of land to build a house on, even if they have perfect title deeds, may well find that the cost of obtaining the mortgage and what-not will be as much as to make it completely disadvantageous to them to proceed with it. I want to suggest to the Govern-

ment that they are going to have to investigate the possibility of making these loans available, and properly secured of course, without recourse to the normal channels for the Barbadian today.
4.25 p.m.

In the same way that the Peasants Loan Bank's directorate had to devise a method of relieving potential borrowers of the normal high-cost of effecting a mortgage, similarly this new Housing Authority must immediately concern itself with the same problem. I cannot for the life of me, see any member of the working classes who would be entitled to a loan under this Bill, being able to sustain the normal cost involved.

Now, sir, with regard to the other sections of the Bill, there are one or two points which appear to me as being somewhat impracticable, but I imagine that we may more appropriately deal with them when we reach the Committee stage. However I do seriously hope that on more mature reflections, the Government will realise that on this question of Housing more is expected of it with justification; and that it can, without any harm to the economy of the country or without any prejudice to any of its other financial commitments, allocate greater sums for this purpose and really endeavour in a more effective manner to tackle what it admits is a very grave, social and economic problem.

Messrs. Bryan, Brancher, and E. D. Mottley entered the House and took their seats.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for Christ Church, who obtained leave to speak again on the last occasion is entitled to speak now.

Mr. GODDARD: I will give way to the honourable junior member for St. John.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker, there is scarcely a debate which has taken place in this House on Housing that I have not entered. I have done so mostly as a critic; I am still a critic today, although not on the same lines. Formerly, I was disturbed at the cost of the housing units in this colony; but I have since had to revise my opinion on examining Government houses, and I must confess that the quality of houses has been worth the price. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Who told you so?] I am satisfied with that. As regards the Aided Self Help Housing and the housing at the Bay Estate and so on, I am satisfied that the quality of the houses is worth the money. I have listened to the Minister's introduction of this Bill very carefully and I recognised the explicit, political doctrines expressed therein. I was glad indeed that he has recognised the seriousness of Housing as a social means of some sort of progress of the working classes; not only has he recognised that bad housing is contributive to social diseases, but he appears to have recognised that the very social status of society is influenced by the standard of the housing obtaining in the community. The working class families coming from tumbled down shacks are apt to feel that their own persons can look tumbled down and shackled too; but coming from decent houses, they have a tendency to dress better on the average.

I have the fundamental criticism to make today on another line from that I made previously. I must agree with the last honourable member who has just sat down, that at the rate at which our Housing programme is going it will be generations before the working class families can have adequate housing for living purposes. Sir, I welcome this Bill to set up a central authority, but the meaning of that central authority should also mean a revolution in the present rate of housing for those who need it in this

country. If it has not got that meaning, then let us stop this Bill now; it is the only sensible meaning for the setting up of a Central Housing Authority. It should accelerate the development from the Labour Welfare Housing Scheme.

Although much praise has been showered on that matter, I am satisfied that as much as could have been done has been done. The rate of acquisition of funds from the Labour Welfare Housing Scheme should afford them to proceed at a much faster pace in rehousing the labour population in the housing districts than they are actually doing. I do hope that the new Housing Authority which we are setting up now will make that a thing of the past. There are labourers who have applied for over a year, and if their houses have been examined, that is as far as they have got. With the funds at their disposal from the Labour Welfare Housing Fund, that state of affairs is not good enough. I will quote from a document (and, Mr. Speaker you can have the documents from which I quote if you want it) as regards similar development in British Guiana. This document is the report of the Caribbean Commission for the year 1953.

4.35 p.m.

This is what it says:—

"Sugar workers of the territory (British Guiana) built a total of 931 houses during 1952, according to the annual report of the Commissioner of Local Government, which was recently released. The workers were assisted in the building of the houses by the Sugar Industry Labour Welfare Fund Committee which made available for this purpose loans totalling nearly \$950,000."

As you can see from that, 931 houses were built during 1952. As I have said, the funds are available. There is another item which I want to quote in reference to the same sugar workers housing establishment; it is this:—

"The British Guiana Sugar Producers Association has agreed to divert \$2½ million from the Sugar Industry Price Stabilisation Fund to be used in the re-housing of sugar workers. The major portion of the Sugar Industry Labour Welfare Fund, which is normally used for such purposes has already been spent and Sir Alfred Savage, Governor of the territory, (British Guiana) asked the Sugar Producers' Association to consider making a loan to the Government from the Price Stabilisation fund. The re-housing programme to be conducted under this scheme will be carried out by an *ad hoc* housing sub-committee of the Labour Welfare Fund Committee consisting of a Government Officer, a representative of the Sugar Producers' Association and a person nominated by the Trade Unions concerned with the Welfare of workers in the sugar industry."

From this you will see that the suggestion by the last honourable member who sat down was not far fetched. I want to point out that this particular assistance from the new Housing Authority should cause a considerable acceleration in your housing. You should use your Housing funds for this purpose, but in my opinion the fund is not used for that purpose or as readily as it could be used. I think that is due to the delays in fulfilling the applications; I think those delays are quite unnecessary. I do not know if that is due to a lack in the administrative set-up; I do not know if the Department is not big enough, but the funds are there.

Well sir, the specific purpose which this new set-up in the person of central Housing Authority must achieve is an overall progress in the rate of building houses. These are the statistics which I am

going to quote since the establishment of the Housing Board in this colony, and I invite the Hon. Minister of Housing to tell me where I go wrong in my statistics and to correct me. Since the establishment of the Housing Board in 1940, we built 66 houses at Deacons Road, 150 at the Pine Estate, 104 at the Bay Estate and completed 15 Aided Self Help Houses at Clinketts, St. Lucy, to give you a total of 345 houses built in 15 years. I will quote from the Monthly Information Bulletin of the Caribbean Commission on the article called "Housing Week" which was published in October of 1954. It deals with the colony of Jamaica and it gives an example of the acceleration of Housing in that colony. It so happened that there was a visit of delegates from other islands of the Caribbean during that period, and the local Minister of Housing who was there on that occasion addressed a gathering of delegates at a dinner given for them and in doing so he expressed his admiration at what Jamaica had accomplished as regards Housing. The excerpt from that article reads as follows:—

"Since 1951, the Ministry of Health and Housing through its main agency, the Hurricane Housing Authority—has established 24 housing estates and set up approximately 10,000 housing units. These have been added to existing schemes by the Central Housing Authority, while other agencies, such as the Lands Department and the Sugar Industry Labour Welfare Board, have co-operated by putting up their own schemes."

Let me just pause to say that so much is Housing associated with Public Health, that in most colonies you will find that the Minister of Public Health is also Minister of Housing. Well, Sir, from 1951 to 1955 is a matter of five years inclusive, and that figure of 10,000 will give you the average annual total of 2,000 housing units established in that country in those years. The article also states:—

"Most of these were visited by the delegates, who saw the neat, concrete-nog houses of one or two rooms, for which the occupiers pay in some cases as low as 6/- per month towards ultimate ownership of the holding; and the economic, low-rental housing units in some of which tenement accommodation is to be had for as little as 6/- per month."

The Housing Week reached its climax on Sunday, September 12, (according to the report) with the official opening of the Maverley Estate, which was termed as the showpiece of the island's Housing programme. The article went on to state:

"Here 800 houses have been built, each standing on lots of one-fifth acre and having a floor space of 171 feet. The population is 4,000 persons, who are provided with parks, playfields, community centres, schools, shops, mail service, electric lighting and telephone service."

"All the delegates attended, and enthusiastic speeches were made by Messrs Cummins and Cox (the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing) who again raised Jamaica and the Ministry of Health and Housing on what it had achieved in this sphere of social and economic development."

Well, Sir, our Housing as I referred to formerly, after reading these reports, appears to be somewhat superior to those in some of the other colonies and I do not think we have any with the floor space as low as 171 square feet. The average floor space of our Aided Self-Help houses is 360 square feet. However, I will continue with my quotations in order to bring home to the Hon. Minister of Housing and to the prospective new Housing Authority what other places are doing so far as acceleration of Housing is concerned.

Again, from the same Monthly Bulletin of the Caribbean Commission, in the issue of January, 1955, you will see this report:

"Work on the Housing Schemes at La Penitence and Ruinvelt is progressing satisfactorily, and it is planned to have accommodation available for 400 working class families by the end of the year."

You also get this reported in the December issue of 1954 with respect to Housing in Surinam:—

"According to Mr. William Sniphout, Housing Adviser and Supervisor, attached to the Social Welfare Department in Surinam, this territory will launch a housing programme next year with a production target of 700 new buildings per year."

The Hon. Minister of Housing says he is aiming at a target of 600 aided self-help houses per annum in this country. That is a proper and quite necessary target to aim at; but I have a profound doubt that we in any year will be able to build 600 Aided Self-Help Houses. Our present method of building them will prove to him that it is impossible. However, it is a very impressive target to aim at, but I do think it is far too optimistic by our present method. Sir, I have made those quotations to show you when it comes to the leading colonies, that our rate of housing is negligible.

4.45 p.m.

We cannot possibly set up the Housing Authority which we propose unless we are going to abolish this almost snail-like rate at which we are attempting the rehousing of the people. I want to emphasise that. As I said before, I make no criticism of the price; the price satisfies me; but I am far from satisfied with the rate of housing. Their way of handling the matter is in no way compatible with the problem.

Housing is a social service. It is one of the important social services. We cannot look upon it as an economic investment; it is an annual charge upon the state; it is one of the major schemes of social service; it is the most important social service. When you remember that good housing will lessen the prevalence of diseases, the prevalence of undesirable moral standards and the prevalence of slack social conditions such as I have mentioned earlier, you will see that good housing inspires people to live and even to dress better than they used to. I will now mention something about the rents.

I will repeat what I said before: that housing is a social service. I am going to make to Government what I regard as a constructive suggestion; that is: that where a case of unemployment among the families can become established, the weekly rent during that period of unemployment should be reduced at least by 75 per cent. I know of a case now of one who is accustomed to working on the road; he is an employee of the Highways and Transport. He is not on the established staff and he does no other work. He has been unemployed now for ten weeks. I think his rent is two dollars a week, and that is an accumulation of twenty dollars for those ten weeks. He has his wife and four children to support and his average weekly wage is four dollars. You can see that when he gets work again that he is going to find it difficult to support his family. Therefore, I repeat that where a case of unemployment can be established by the occupants in those housing estates, the rents for that period of unemployment should be reduced by at least 75 per cent.

I do not look with pessimism, (as the former speaker did) on the idea of leasing land; I do not; but it is strange that the Minister only mentioned three parishes -- St. Peter, St. Andrew and St.

Joseph in which they cannot envisage housing schemes being started; and I, like the last speaker cannot see at all the progress of housing without the acquisition of land. I welcomed the Minister's remarks in the introduction of this Bill when he talked about loans to persons whose income is under thirty dollars per week for the building of houses etc. It may be some clarification, but I also welcome even more his reference to the acquisition of land and the moving of houses where security of tenure is not as it should be now. One of the remedies which a proper housing administration should cause to be effected is the remedy of this evil surrounding agricultural tenants. A serious disadvantage is at present taken of several tenants on estates, because they object to some injustice which may arise in their rate of pay or conditions of work; and some owners are indiscreet enough to demand the spot on which these tenants have been living for over twenty years. With the proper set-up of a Housing Authority that kind of insecurity of agricultural tenure and living conditions should not obtain; that kind of thing should be abolished; and with a proper Housing Authority set-up it could be abolished. That is or should be one of the great results of this Housing Authority: the greater security of tenure and better living conditions for agricultural tenants.

Well, sir, I have one more suggestion to make. Let this stare the Housing Authority clear in the face: they have got to build more houses on their own if the problem is to be lessened within our generation; and one of the greatest means for lessening unemployment is a comprehensive housing scheme. That is recognised in all countries; and especially in the case of areas where after-crop unemployment can be almost chronic for several thousands. Instead of that, it has been reported to me that even in the present Housing Scheme at the Pine, instead of employing more people, they have sent off some. That appears to me to be playing with the problem.

The Housing Authorities, during the past fifteen years, have had enough experience, in my opinion, that when they are converted into a Central Authority, they should be able to handle the job of housing with much imagination and with much greater benefit to the thousands of families who need good housing. And I am looking forward according to the terms of this Bill, for them to abolish slum areas within a reasonable time both in town and country. I mentioned the country, because what a lot of people forget is that there are slum areas in the country as well as in the town. There are villages in the country in which it is a disgrace to see the type of housing that obtains.

4.55 p.m.

There is one warning or suggestion which I would like to throw out. In the selection of the sites, they should be so placed that they will not require any great road construction cost, because that eats into the cost of housing. The road construction that took place at the Bay Estate is substantial in cost; too much money might have been spent; but on account of what was to be done it had to be spent. In selecting sites they should avoid those sites where great road development will have to be included in the housing cost, because that will increase the cost of housing considerably and prevent houses from being erected as fast as they should be erected. With those criticisms, I welcome this Bill; and I appreciate the comprehensive introduction and the relevant facts which the Minister appeared to have in connection with this matter.

Mr. MILLER: I too would like to make a contribution to this debate; and I should like to start, by saying that this is a nice comprehensive Bill. What I have in mind to refer to, is the powers and the constitution that will be given to his Board. One would expect that a Housing Authority of this type would be regarded and treated as a Department of Government. I am thinking of the Waterworks Department, the Department of Highways and Transport and other Departments under the control of the various Ministers. When it was decided that this Department should be set aside as a body separate and distinct from Government Departments, I was persuaded to believe that aback of the Government's policy was that the Board would be granted such powers as to borrow money; a sort of corporation which would be free to purchase land as it thinks fit. As to the idea of creating those Board and giving it capital, you will find that you will have to wait for repayments of loans, interest and rent which may handicap the possibility of the various developments where housing is concerned. And since it is likely that this Housing Authority will have to wait for funds with the hope that it would take care of the expansion of the housing scheme, then failure must inevitably ensue. What I am unhappy about is the question of the Board. When I say that this Bill is a fine bit of draftsmanship, I am persuaded to believe that the Government took extra pains to see that this Authority would come under its control. I am in agreement with the Government swamping all the Boards; and I believe and you are well aware that the actual thing which is likely to happen and has happened, is that authority is given to these Boards with all the evils which could stop and mar democracy in its progress.

I am hoping that the Minister in his reply, will be in a position to shed enough light as to have me understand why the Government was prepared to create and appoint such a Board; the authority to appoint their servants must come under the Government. Another serious point is that there is such a thing as a Town and Country Planning Bill which would have an authority of its own. I am wondering whether the usefulness of this Bill will have the desired effect. There are several important things in this Bill; there is the planning of the country and the districts of which the Authority will not have ultimate control. I feel however, that sooner or later we will have the Town and Country Planning Bill which will supply the necessary authority.

Another question is that of the Public Health Act; and I am wondering if this Housing Authority will have to depend upon the Minister of Social Services to satisfy the Regulations which must come up from this Board from time to time. We have such a thing as the Public Health Act and detailed instructions and other things, and if this Authority will be pinned to another Authority which is making it subordinate to an Authority which is not strong enough, I am wondering whether it will serve or carry out the ambitions of the Minister. This Authority has no right to make Regulations; it cannot decide that a house is not suitable for any area. This Board should take on re-development in the real power and sense of the word and create the type of houses you want. I am wondering if the Minister is cognisant of this matter; you are apt to make this Housing Authority in itself useless, if it is not given the strength to say anything in support of the Government. I am wondering why the Government did not elect to create a Department rather than give authority to a Board whereby nothing can be done without the approval of the Government.

I am anxious to see this Bill come into effect; we have the Labour Welfare Fund operated by the Organisation, which is rather unsatisfactory. This is not a criticism of the Bill; we want to bring satisfaction to the people whom the Government intends it to help. It is not so much a question of administration; the office of the Labour Welfare Department is busy and overtaxed, and the staff is working to the peak of capacity; nevertheless it is failing to carry out exactly what the Government wanted to carry out when this particular office was brought into play and being. An individual qualifies for a loan and applies to this Board; after a year or so he or she is asked to come to this Board, then there is another length of time, and on this application is written in red ink: "To be inspected." This inspection takes a period of a year, and then you will find that some of the applicants have to remain for as long as a year before they can be called for the release of the money. I do not know if it is a rumour, but it is believed as regards the moneys released to this particular department, as regards the allocations made by the Government from time to time, this Department is expected to rely on repayments plus allocation of its own, if it is to answer to the minimum requirements of the Department. I say it is unfortunate; and I think that this Department is failing in its purpose. We are spending millions of dollars from this particular fund, but in truth and in fact it is just a matter of subsidising the termites and wood ants, a sorry thing in our community.

5.05 p.m.

It is unfortunate, but to be perfectly honest we are just simply rehabilitating termites and the other type of destructive little creatures that ruin these houses which are built or repaired with wood.

Another point is this: the money has been released, and I believe it is to some extent specific because the Bill makes it reasonably clear that this money is for repairs. Again, no particular education is given to those people about the importance of painting their houses. It is well known that paint has long ceased to be a means of decoration; one or two coats of paint would add to the life of those wooden huts. It is my ardent belief that it would not be denied that it was unfortunate that the Government failed to secure the advice which Mr. Brannam gave on the Brick Industry, but again, it is fortunate that some private company has seen fit to spend money to bring this industry into being. [A VOICE: The House passed that Bill for the establishment of the Clay Industry, but it was thrown out by the Other Place.] I happened to be in the House when it was passed and I know it was thrown out by the Other Place. That is why I said that it was fortunate that some private company has seen fit to spend money to bring this industry into being. I do not know if the Government would lose by this industry being now taken over by this private concern.

However, the composition of the Housing Authority is set out in this Bill. It does leave me shaky, although I am aware that I am a member of the present Housing Board. As I have said on a previous occasion, that Board should have been long abolished because it is nothing more than a Tenement Committee. It is a Board that produces nothing and you would like to expend your energy on something that is worthwhile; something to which you can make a contribution. With respect to the question of erecting 600 Aided Self Help houses annually that is just a question of your satisfying the community that such can be done; to my mind I regard it as over ambitious.

I am very anxious to hear some word from the Hon. Minister as regards the question as to whether or not from the time that this Bill comes into effect and this Housing Authority begins to function, this Authority will be eventually taken over and treated as a Department of Government.

Another point on which I would like the Hon. Minister to say a few words is whether or not it is hoped to bring down to this House a Town and Country Planning Bill with an Authority separate and distinct from this Housing Authority, and whether or not that Authority is to work in conjunction with this Housing Authority. Why I say that is because I am wondering if the standard and type of these Aided Self Help houses would be controlled, because from my scrutiny of the Bill there is nothing about that.

Mr. Speaker, at this stage I would like to move the adjournment of the House for half an hour. I therefore move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

Mr. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

On reassembling:

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment the hon. junior member for St. George was addressing the Chair.

Mr. MILLER: The scope of the present Bill gives the Authority power to remedy, and remedy at the public's expense. For instance, "Part IV General Powers and Duties of the Authority" etc., the words "to prevent and to remedy" I take to mean that the right of this Authority to have sufficient power to be able to erect buildings, covered and otherwise, has been granted.

It is done to some extent; but should be much wider and it should not be restricted to an area. I want to be quite clear on that point. The scope of the Bill does not give this power. It only has the power for instance to buy or lease land, or to buy any buildings which it wants to demolish etc. but the important part is that you should have the right or authority to erect or develop; but the authority to say whether this area should be developed or whether or not as regards to what type of building should be erected is not shown in the Bill. I say this because there is an Authority functioning through your local Vestry system; and under this Authority you are free for instance, to allow a pig which you may be keeping to occupy a cellar in the present house; and if there is a heavy rainfall you are free to take the pig into the house.

I still feel, (and honourable members will agree with me after a critical examination of the matter) that it will be difficult to assess the usefulness of this Authority when we have a Town and Country Planning Act; and this Authority set up under the Town and Country Planning Act should rest exclusively with the Ministry. You have a Government Authority and recommendations will be asked for; and resolutions from time to time can be made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee asking that legislation be enacted accordingly. But as I said before, there is nothing specific in this Bill. Nevertheless, it is a majestic document, a tremendous bit of legislation; and for this reason I am hoping that the members of both branches of the Legislature will be interested and anxious to see how quickly they can get it on the Statute Book.

The first attempt of the House with the Town and Country Planning Bill died when that Session of the House ended; and I think that the second attempt.

which undoubtedly had been a gruelling passage, also died in Select Committee. I have a vague recollection of some comments upon it by Sir John Maude when he was working on his review of the system of local government in Barbados. He thought that it would be a difficult piece of machinery to be handled by a local organisation. I believe that the Minister concerned paid special attention to the question as to how best they should centralise, and to how local authorities should be able to handle certain aspects of this particular Housing Authority mentioned in the Bill now before us. But here again, the matter is not quite clear to me from the information contained in the Bill; and I am hoping that a lot more explanation will be made in the course of the debate on this Bill.

I remember introducing an Address on land tenure some years ago, and it had a rather easy passage although it was exposed to tremendous debate. I remember when it was proposed to the Governor, he expressed the thought that it was a big bit of legislation. I want to stress this, because it is very important in the sense that it has the word "Housing" as its main-spring. The Government is being told by land owners that you cannot have this land at your price; but if the Government intends to use its acquisition powers, I do not know if it is good enough for the Minister to say that the price of land is too high. You have the tools and you have a majority in this Chamber. The basic fundamental is 'Housing'; and with that knowledge of its importance to the Community, I cannot see why the Government is not particularly anxious to secure land. A lot of land now used in back tenancies could be reabsorbed by the land owners of this island.

The Housing Authority also has the right, not necessarily to advise the Government, but the power of authority itself to decide where, when, (rather than be exposed to the hot rebuffs of the land owners) and what are the given reasons why land should not be acquired.

Think of a country village; does it entail a bit of road? You can obviously see that you would be spending most of the money on tenancies.

I finally ask if the authority (in so far as the type of house is concerned) would have to come from the Director of Medical Services; or if, on the other hand, it would have to be a question for the Town and Country Planning Bill. I am very anxious to find out what the position would be.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, up to three quarters of an hour ago, I had it settled in my mind what comments I wanted to make on this Bill now before us; but, having listened to the honourable junior member for St. George, I must confess that I am more interested to know what was going on in his mind than in my own. I find that his argument has grown so far inclined away from this Bill, that it becomes almost impossible for anybody who has followed him to do justice to the Bill as justice should be done. Mr. Speaker, there are several aspects of this question of Housing which have to be, not only understood, but understood in a way in which the Government and the House generally, will know what will become of housing in this island.
5.55 p.m.

Like other members of the House, I have listened to the Hon. Minister very carefully when he made his introductory speech for the debate on the second reading of this Bill; and though I could not follow carefully the course of his speech, both from my own listening and the report of the speech which I have read, I have gathered that the Government is concerned about Housing. What I wonder is this: whether the concern is as deep as they would like us to think it is; and in saying that, I want to

pay them the compliment of believing that they are serious in all they say about Housing; but still they ask that room be given to doubt that they are serious, when you listen to what they have said and when you see what their policy is likely to be. First of all, putting on one side the question of land which is so necessary to any housing scheme, (whether you are extending one or bringing one into operation for the first time), this is what I feel that this House ought to be told: if according to the Minister this Housing Bill is so vast and so extensive that it requires an entirely new approach to the question of Housing in this island, I should have thought that the Minister's first duty would be to provide the House with some plan showing where the Government proposes to erect these new Housing Estates. Because if you take their own announcement that their aim is to set up six hundred Aided Self-Help houses every year, that is not enough; and we need not question at this stage whether they can do that or not. If you take that figure it means that over all this island dotted here and there in every parish there will be an Aided Self-Help Housing Scheme. Presumably in addition to that they are going to erect other houses of a different type all over the island; if they are going to do that, they must have some clear idea of what their overall Housing policy is, the sites, the locations and everything else connected. I do not think that they could have intended to erect over 600 houses or any number of houses without letting us know in some way or other what provision is made for water, roads, light and the other utilities. It is common knowledge, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot set up Housing Estates or extend Housing Schemes unless at the same time the amenities which go with housing are provided. Therefore I am saying that the very first thing I should have expected to hear the Minister say is this: "Here is a Plan of the island; dotted or marked with this coloured pencil or ink shows where our population is densest. Here in another colour, you will see what we propose to do to spread out this population and house it properly; and here there are going to be houses or housing estates in this and that part of this and that parish; here we are bringing water, roads and light if they are not already there." More important of all, they should be able to indicate to us that Plan that they have acquired or are about to acquire all the land necessary for the extension of these housing estates. I take it, and I think the House is entitled to believe it, that the Government must have realised that for the sort of Housing Scheme which they have in mind is not a vast scheme because they are only tinkering with the problem really, but for the sort of scheme they have, they have to show where in the island these things are to be done. If you do not tell us what land you think you will have or where you will put these new houses or encourage the building of them, then I do not think you should ask us to believe quite seriously that a Housing Authority will be able to get ahead with these plans and schemes without at the same time, this House having prior knowledge about them and being in a position to give prior approval. Not having shown us any Plan, another doubt arises in my mind and this is perhaps where one gets the impression that this Housing Bill is so very inadequate to deal with the problem of Housing in the Island.

When the hon. junior member for St. John was speaking, I was very much impressed when he drew to the attention of the House the fact that if you take all the Government's Housing Scheme and Policies in the last 15 years, (of course it was not this Government, I mean the Government as such), it appears that only 335 houses have been erected during that time. That is what frightens me: sup-

pose you say that the increase in population has been something like 2,500 a year, (probably it is more than that,) but suppose you say you have 2,500 new souls to house every year; after 15 years you might still find that you have something like over 30,000 or 35,000. Of course some of them will die, but if you are only able to erect 335 new houses in 15 years, on an average it means that you have only built one house to house 112 persons. These figures are rough and you need not read remarks into them that they are not actually meant to convey, but they do show that the houses you are building have not kept pace with the rise in population, even if you bring that rise to the lowest figure possible.

If you therefore want to go into the matter more carefully, you will discover that to keep pace with the rise in population you will have to build something like 1,000, 1,200 or 1,500 houses a year; so that even if you can manage to build or get people to build 600 Aided Self Help houses per year, you will not be able to build enough to take care of your normal rise in population. This is not a proper Housing Scheme. You have to remember that you have to take into account certain chances such as hurricane or a disastrous fire or two, by which a couple thousand houses could be wiped out overnight; therefore, if you build 1,000 new houses per year and you lose several hundred of them through any natural disaster or an act of God, in the space of 24 hours, what you would have succeeded in building a year would have been wiped out. How much more stark that reality becomes when you are building less than you normally should build. Your building programme does not meet the contingent rise in population.

There is also this aspect. No matter how small this island is, I am not disposed to believe that any Housing Authority as set up under the terms of this Act can really improve the Government's diverse policy to put Housing on its proper footing. I am admitting that this Bill does make some concessions, owing to the fact that we would have soon some form of Local Government; and local bodies must co-operate; yet I am wondering whether it would not be more in keeping with reality that Local Government should bear quite a lot of responsibility in housing in rural areas, and whether it would not be the best thing to give them more power. If you do that, it would not shorten the powers of the Central Housing Authority; but I think there should be more flexibility in your policy. Local Government Authorities have more to do with Housing than the Central Housing Authority. Much as I or any member of this House love to support any kind of housing policy and any means of getting more housing for the people, it is a fact that some of us are still a little disturbed at this feature of the housing policy in this island, one which I do not think is the best. I know that the question of cost and other economic reasons make it necessary for Government to build houses which are the cheapest to build, and which do not give too much trouble to construct, but I will still here make a plea for beauty of architecture. I shall hate to see the process continued where houses along a road half mile in length are exactly alike. I think there should be room for diversity of design in this matter so that the landscape of the particular housing estate would not look as if those houses were turned out of a factory. I think that the people themselves would not like to live in a housing estate where the houses look exactly alike. Any such people are

liable to enter the wrong door and even the wrong bedroom. Of course, I do know that each individual house cannot be built differently; but I am asking that where it is proposed to establish large housing estates, there should be variety in designs and diversity. It would mean a lot to the people, and members of the Government themselves must realise that when you live in a place where everybody comes out of doors looking the same way, it tends to cramp personality; and it is that, even more than poverty, which produces a slum. I am asking for diversity of design; and in asking for diversity, obviously I am asking for particulars, and that is the whole point of this Housing Bill.

In this Bill, sir, a determined attempt is being made to re-house that part of this population which needs housing, but anything which is done even now in this Bill is bound to be undone, and that is where I draw swords with members of the Government as violently as anybody else. It does no good to fool one's self that you can establish your expenditure in any sort of Housing Scheme without taking into account your population so far as number is concerned, and also the rise and fall.

6.15 p.m.

And your housing policy should not only be designed to deal with the increase in population, but it should be designed also to see to it that as your population increases, you should be rehousing it in the best and most advantageous circumstances. I have to emphasise that all the houses, no matter who builds them or who owns them, should be erected on agricultural land.

In a community like ours with so little land at our disposal, (and even if we had agricultural land which ran as far as the Sahara desert,) a plan would still have to be drawn up for getting house spots. That is why I feel so unhappy about this Aided Self-help Housing Scheme. There should be a limit to the number of houses which you are putting on rab land. The reason is this, Mr. Speaker: if (in the country areas it might not matter so much) you put people to live where it is impossible for them to plant a pepper or a couple of banana trees or even to get a bed of lettuce or beans, you are working a hardship on them; because their whole economy and their way of living depends on being able to get something out of the soil which surrounds their house. They do not need a whole acre, or a half acre; but just enough to enable them to lay out their good kitchen gardens. That is all they need; and if you do that, you might have some justification for building these type of houses. But to go to the extreme of saying that any rock will do to set a house on, is to me, a policy not of helping the people, but of impoverishing them since you are asking them to live in houses, either by purchasing or by renting them from you; it is therefore not right to place them without some economic advantages around their houses.

I do reject the falacious argument that because a man says: "I do not like rab land," he is at the same time saying that he wants houses built on agricultural land. In establishing these housing estates, I would have asked for just enough land for the people to make at least three or four garden beds beside or around their houses.

Now, Mr. Speaker, from what has been said already in this debate, especially by the honourable senior member for St. Philip, it appears that some people feel a little disquieted about the financial provisions of this Bill. As far as I know, only the Minister himself feels happy and comfortable that

\$150,000 a year is being put into Housing; and while I am on this point, I should say that I entirely agree with the hon. member for St. Philip in the protest which he makes against the use or involvement of the Labour Welfare Housing Fund in this Housing scheme generally. He dealt with it very thoroughly; but there was one other aspect which I feel strongly dissatisfied about. I do not think that any Government is entitled to make too much of the Labour Welfare Housing Scheme with respect to its housing policy; and apart from the fact that it is not a Government scheme. This fund has also to be considered, as money that agricultural labourers borrow for the building or repairing of their houses, which strictly speaking, has been withheld from their own wages; that is what it is strictly speaking, and therefore, they are providing, not only their own welfare money, but their own housing scheme. It does not speak well for a Government to sandwich Labour Welfare loans between its Government policy to blow it up. I think what is said of housing should not even by the merest reference or remotest inference include anything about Labour Welfare Housing Loans.

I was very much surprised, when I was not a Member of the House, to see that so much was made of the Labour Welfare Fund as being part of the Five Year Plan. So I think that even when you take away that (as you are in duty bound to do) from the Government's scheme, generally you can see that the Government's performance is not far from the poorest on record. This Housing programme therefore, has got to be very realistic; and we should never congratulate Government on doing something which is really below standard.

According to the Five Year Plan, (I have not got it with me here) Government does not envisage building more than 129 houses per year; that is 600 houses in five years; I speak under correction here.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if that is so, and they are now building say, 600 Aided Self Help Houses a year, at any rate, you can say this for them: they are now beginning where the number of houses they want to build is concerned, but they are still far below what is actually needed. And with respect to Aided Self-help Housing they have still got to convince the public and the Legislature that that is an economic way of building houses; and they will not be able to build 600 houses of that type in a year. I have just as much experience as the Minister of Communications of the Clinketts Housing Scheme. The St. Lucy campaign was a long one. The Clinketts Housing Scheme which was somewhere about that time, had been started some months ago. It was not really completed until December; and in order to complete it they had to bring in carpenters and masons, I think, from the Housing Board or from the Public Works Department—skilled artisans to assist the Clinketts people in finishing it. [A VOICE: What? For the bye-election.] Mr. Speaker, they succeeded in time for the bye-election. Mr. Speaker, from that experience, any unit of 15 people can start building; and according to the terms of Aided Self Help Housing they do not have to be skilled workmen; if they have carpenters they must pay for them; but I say that if they are not lucky enough to have people to advise them they will take possibly, from 5 months to 15 months to set up the houses.

How much delay there will be when the Minister embarks on the 600 houses? Of course he will get 600 started, but he will not get 600 finished because if he has to remove the skilled carpenters and masons which the Government employs to

help, and if the skilled workers still have to do their own work on the Government's building programme, he will not be able at any time to have sufficient of them to erect these 600 houses. If he wants 600 houses of that type built he will have to stop the Ministerial Buildings and other Government works which are being done; he will have to stop building the two houses for the doctors at "Enmore" and the Parliament Buildings and put every single person to work on the Aided Self Help houses. I have no doubt that the Hon. Minister will explain to the House whether another 15 houses of that size can be erected in a shorter time, and whether the Scheme just completed is the one by which we can go. If it takes 9 months for 15 people to erect 15 houses, I do not know what will happen with this Scheme. I do not like the Scheme personally; but I am not opposing it because I do not like it. It cannot rehouse the population fast enough. If you set out on an ambitious programme of 600 houses a year, you will have to divert all the skilled artisans to finish these houses. I will tell you how any such unit will be successful. If you were to ask 12 masons from the Public Works Department to deal with this Scheme, they would get through with it because they would know how to apportion their time to it; and perhaps in two or three months' time you will get the houses finished because the particular unit consists of skilled workers. There is nothing which says that Aided Self Help houses must be done by skilled masons or carpenters, but by anybody.

If therefore the Minister finds it necessary to ask the masons and carpenters who are otherwise engaged on Government projects to leave them off and finish the Aided Self Help houses, then it ceases to be self help. Is that something to be done? I think that these are questions which should be answered. We must know whether in a unit of 15 houses, these houses can be completed in such and such a time; we must know whether the time taken to complete the houses at Clinketts is the ordinary time. If it takes nine months to complete these houses, the Minister cannot get 600 houses finished in a year.

I would like to look away from this mirage of Aided Self-Help Houses and ask the Government to make housing a part of their building programme as they are doing with the Ministerial Buildings. Let the people from the Public Works Department assist in this matter. The Ministers may not even be there after the next election! [Laughter] And if it requires no skill to build a thousand houses a year, this is a most serious aspect of the matter. From the start, can we get the requisite number of houses which are necessary to take care of the normal increase of the population? I do not mean that every three babies born need a house, but I mean that the Housing Programme must bear some relation to the increase in population, and you must also take into account that you may have some epidemic or something which might destroy the Housing Programme.

On the question of the acquisition of land and the agreements which the Housing Authority is empowered to enforce on these matters, I do not intend to speak, because I cannot remember whether the Minister dwelt very long on the legal aspects of this Bill; but I would just say that this Housing Authority if it is to do any good at all, must have greater power than that which this Bill envisages, and more power of the right sort. This power must be shared by this Legislature. I got the impression that this House will not have very much control

over these statutory bodies which we are setting up; and that is something for us to labour. I feel the Government should have taken into account the new change in the Local Government which is to come about, and make a little more adequate provision for bestowing these powers on the Housing Authority. I would remind the Government once more that they have no right to disclose their housing policy to us without at the same time, giving us a clear indication by a Plan as to where their houses estates will be, and just where in each parish they propose to spread out this Housing. 6.35 p.m.

If they had done this and had given us a Plan showing us in some detail what they were going to do, we might be able to follow them; and I would have been more sympathetic. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the Hon. Minister that the extension of the Housing Scheme or Schemes requires also an extension of public utilities or amenities generally. Certainly it would not be the best thing if we erected new houses somewhere, and then found out that we have not made provision for the things which go with them, such as roads, water and light. I therefore would like to see a dove-tailing of housing and the utilities and amenities which go with it.

Lastly, I would like to repeat my two cautions. The first is that it is dangerous to inflate our housing policy by bringing in the irrelevant matter of what the Labour Welfare Fund is doing. I think that should be kept by itself; it has nothing to do with the Government and its income if added to what is proposed to spend on houses, gives a whole disproportionate idea of our total expenditure on Housing. The second caution is, that Government should think twice before embarking on such a delaying scheme as Aided Self Help houses because that scheme would not house the population, it would only cause confusion and frustration. The Government should confine its housing policy to a definite attempt on its part to employ its own artisans and workmen for the people. If these houses are not built very rapidly, what the Minister fears will become a reality. When it becomes a reality, it will not do to lament it or to say if you had known you could have done better. You are out to house the working classes; and by working classes, I take it to mean the overwhelming part of this population which needs to enjoy housing. This Government is much too complacent, and we ought not to encourage it in this complacency. There is nothing in this Bill, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate yourself on; because if you take the figures alongside of each other and with what the Bill proposes to do, you will see that both are woefully inadequate to meet the situation which is before this House.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on the last occasion, when that stupendous document, the Town and Country Planning Bill, came before this Chamber, some members who are now members of the Government unscrupulously abandoned the letter of honesty and went about the country on a political campaign accusing me of attempting to block legislation which would be a means for the better housing of the people just because I took the stand to point out that the Bill was not workable for Barbados. Even with the memories of that staring me in the face, it would not prevent me from doing my duty in criticising this Bill. Sir, I have taken a very keen interest in the people ever since my debut in public life; and as a result of that, I have read this Bill thoroughly and side by side with the many statutes which affect public housing.

I am going to say at the outset that I am at a loss to understand what this Government is doing

as regards housing; and for the reason that in another few days or months you will be bringing into effect your Local Government Act. You will be changing your entire Vestry system to bring in your Local Government Act. Of course in effect, what the Government will be doing is to change the Vestries in Barbados by calling them by a different name. I want the Ministers to enlighten me; I plead guilty; I do not pretend to be like some of them, some of whom are men of letters and others who pretend to be men of letters. I do not pretend to have anything else but a little commonsense. What I want to say is this: You are going to bring into effect your Local Government Act shortly, and as I understand it, in Jamaica, Trinidad, British Guiana and England (I would not mention the United States because if I were to mention the name of that country members of the Government would sneer and laugh; but I would be following a pattern which the Premier used to adopt at one time) all those countries when they brought into effect Local Government, the Local Authority was the authority to deal with housing. I am awfully sorry that the Hon. Premier is not in his place at the present moment, because I believe he is the only competent Minister to reply to me.

What am I to understand by this Bill? Yesterday you landed somebody here who is to tell you how you should work on your Local Government. You can peruse that Local Government Act and you will see what is left for the Local Government to do; and listening as we did to what the Hon. Minister for Housing said last week on the introduction of this Bill, you must wonder why it is necessary to establish this separate authority for housing, where the Local Government Act could take care of that. 6.45 p.m.

What I am worried about, or what I am at a loss to understand, is that you are going to establish this Housing Authority and you are looking therefore to this Authority to be an Authority on housing, and then you are establishing your local Government. I should like to be enlightened on why they have got this hybrid in here.

I will repeat what I said on the floor of this House when the Town and Country Planning Bill was being debated, a Bill which a certain man said was too big for this country. When Sir John Maude came here he confirmed what I had already said but that Bill has since gone, not the way of all flesh, but the way of all stupid things that are sprung in here.

The Bill now before the House with its title: "To make provision for the housing of the working classes etc.," is a title merely to fool people. All this is meant to do is to extend the powers of the Bridgetown Housing Board in order that Government might be able to work in the country; and if that is so, you need not have made all this fuss to impress people. You do things for political reasons; I suppose you have to do it.

The Bridgetown Housing Act under which the Bridgetown Housing Board works should be amended. But what I am arguing is that you need not have brought in this Bill with this big title to fool the people.

Now Sir, you have your Bridgetown Housing Board and you are merely amending the Housing Act under which the Housing Board is working now; and what you are doing is actually fixing funds with which it can play. You are giving it powers to work all over the island which it does not have now, and in fact it is allowed to plan its finances, (of course subject to the approval of the

Governor-in-Executive Committee) and most important, to give it power to clear slums, again with the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee; and it incorporates into the Bill the right to pay compensation.

If you will remember, Mr. Speaker, in the old Town and Country Planning Bill there was a little dictatorial Communistic spark therein because the Government was then influenced by one who thought that he could come to this colony and influence all of us. Now, on the other hand, this Bill itself besides amending the Bridgetown Housing Act and giving the Board this authority, instead of being called a Board, it will be called an Authority comprised similarly of seven members. This Bill brings together not only the work of the Housing Board, it also brings together the work of the Aided Self Help Housing Scheme; and there is the other Scheme which I am worrying about which at an election time or as soon as an election is near, you will hear a great deal of. There are funds for houses, and there are carpenters to build the houses for people. There is the Labour Welfare Fund, and then there is the Civil Servants Loan Fund for which this House gave the right to sanction since Adam was a boy, and I cannot hear anything about it. All of these various Boards and Authorities you are amending, but I cannot understand why the Government is approaching it in this way.

6.55 p.m.

I cannot understand why the Government has brought down this matter in this way and not in a more comprehensive way: but it is for the Government to say. Whatever is their idea, it is their duty to govern. While it is not our duty to oppose and make it intolerable for them to govern, it is still our duty to show them when they are making mistakes. What I am worried about is this: you are setting up this Authority and you will have to create housing schemes in a circle; and you come in here and say: "This is a new Bill; it is a Bill which will usher in something for the working-classes". You create the impression that nothing was ever done for the working-classes. I think I hear those honourable gentlemen going to the public and saying that they brought in something for the housing of the working classes. But ever since 1936 the first Bill in connection with Housing was brought in by the Conservative Party; the first Housing Scheme was brought in by that Party. This Government will say that they brought in something for people earning \$120 per month, but if in 1936 the then Government provided for people who got \$60 a month, how do you regard that when a Socialist Government, when the cost of living has skyrocketed to 50%, say that they have brought down a Bill to provide for people who are earning \$120 a month in 1955? I do not want to go into this matter now, but are they saying that a man who earned \$60 a month in 1936 is in the same position as one who gets \$120 a month today? I am saying that unless he is getting \$200 a month now he was better off in 1936. Under the Bridgetown Housing Act if you were earning \$60 a month, you could get a house; and that was what the "Conservatives" said in 1936. The Hon. Minister says that that was unchristian; but they are bringing in a Bill to amend the law and abolish the Housing Board, but where are their Socialist feelings? Are their ears not down to the ground?

I am entirely in agreement that an amendment should be brought forward giving the Housing Board all the power to deal with slum clearance; but I must make this point quite clear: why does the

Government approach the matter in this way? If you have to face various Authorities for lending money in this way, why are you going to say, with all the taxes coming from one source, that you will set up this Housing Authority and create this monstrosity, as I call it? I will say this: rumour had it around here that there were certain people selected for this job, not local people. [Mr. SPEAKER: Which job?] It is sufficient to say that the Ministers know; it is not everything I say on the floor of this House that you Sir, will be acquainted with: but when I say it, the Ministers will know. [Mr. ALLDER: We should know too.] Well, you should go around and learn.

I quite agree that we should have a Bill giving greater powers to the Authority which is dealing with the housing of people, slum clearance and the like; but, as the honourable junior member for St. George has said (I seldom agree with him, but I agree with him on this occasion) when you really peruse this Bill and really go through it thoroughly, you will find that the purpose which honourable members of this Chamber would like it to serve, will not be served. If you are bringing in this hybrid, you could have gone to the Town and Country Planning Bill and decide on the zoning, decide whether an area should be used for housing or for theatres and so on. As the law stands at present, if any hard-working person in any humble district opens anything next door to you and a steel band is hammered all night, nothing can be done about it. If you are amending the Act, then do something real; you go right through the Bill and you will find (I am not dealing with the funds at the disposal of this Authority because the honourable senior member for St. Philip has already dealt with that) the stress which the Minister is laying on housing. As regards Aided Self-Help Housing, I do not think you should flog a dead horse. I heard that those 600 houses being built per annum.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of explanation. I have no reason to believe that the honourable member would deliberately misquote me; but I never said that the proposal to erect 600 houses per year was over ambitious. I said that it was an ambitious scheme viewing it from the construction work at the moment. I do pray that the honourable member would forgive me if I did not make myself clear on it.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that the honourable member did say that it was an over ambitious scheme.

The Honourable Minister has said that his target is 600 Aided Self Help houses to be built in a year, and it is also stated in the Bill. I have heard members of the Government say that I am opposed to the Aided Self-Help Housing Scheme; but that can only come from the minds of those in the gutter, therefore I pass those members by. This means that these 600 houses will be built in every parish and if that is so, it means that Government is going to acquire land for this purpose in all the parishes. I do not think that this is over ambitious, neither do I think that Ministers should make statements just to bolster up the passing of some legislation or just for the public benefit, when they know that from the facts which they have in front of them, what they say cannot work.

Sir, when this Act is amended, and you have the right to build houses in the eleven parishes of the island, it should be borne in mind that you will only be able to build in what is known as the hard time; you will not be able to build these houses in the crop time. Experience should teach you that the endurance of human beings is limited, and that during the crop time it is difficult, if not impossible, for people to put in time in building Aided Self Help houses; therefore their time for building such houses can only

be during the hard time. It is over ambitious to say that you can finish 600 houses by Aided Self Help in a year, because your materials for the building of those houses are not like that obtained in the United States of America for prefabricated houses. You must bear in mind that you are building houses for labourers and unskilled people, and these people must have skilled workmen to do the plumbing and laying out of those houses. The most that the unskilled people would be able to do is to mix the mortar and after the skilled workmen have done the plumbing to pack the blocks. You are bound to carry skilled workmen to give assistance to those people in the building of their houses.

Of course, I can see that it is not impossible to build 600 houses per year if you are going to include the houses which you are going to build by artisans employed by you, to rent to people afterwards. I would not say that that is over ambitious, but it is not only over ambitious, it is impossible to build 600 Aided Self Help houses per annum.

In this Bill it is stated that they will have schemes presented to Government, and I am at a loss to understand why that should be so; I want some explanation on it. When the Ministerial form of Government was ushered in, which was over a year ago, the Hon. Premier told us that Ministers would be responsible for the running of their departments. What I want to know is this: how is it, if you have a ministerial system where the Minister is responsible for his portfolio, that however I go through this Bill I see everything reflected back to the Executive Committee? I would have thought in their drafting of this Bill from the English Statute, that they would have put in something making the Minister to be responsible for policy. Nowhere in this Bill does it give you the impression that anything is done under Ministerial Government. It strikes me that the very strong statements which were made on the floor of the House about Ministerial authority are merely a farce, if this Bill is passed in the way in which it is drafted today.

I should like to question the Hon. Minister for Housing on a point. I think backbenchers, conservatives and all, would agree that there is the necessity for housing the lower income groups. I am not saying anything about working classes; I am speaking about the lower income groups in this colony. If you take your statistics since the 1914 War, you are going to find that the great difficulty has been that unlike any other West Indian colony, including Puerto Rico and Cuba, this colony is the only one of these colonies where you have such a high percentage of the people owning their own houses. There is no other colony in these parts where the people own or have the strong desire to own their own houses.

7.15 p.m.

If you went to British Guiana, Trinidad or Jamaica you will find that the greater percentage of the working classes are persons who rent houses; but you will find in Barbados that 77% of the working classes are owners and that is why you account for so many of the little chattel houses about. That is why on the other hand you find that feeling of security. You know this as well as I do; the first thing a man does in this country, the first thing he wants to have, is a place into which he can go at any time of the night and have no one to ask him about what time he comes in. In the United States it is peculiar. The Hon. Minister will tell you this: the average West Indian in the United States will go on and on renting and renting, but the Barbadian as soon as he puts his hands on money he wants to be an owner. Therefore what do you find with

Aided Self Help Housing? The system of Aided Self Help Housing is that some people will get together and they will build together a house. The Government is going to supply the material. They are going to give each other help; (this is nothing new; this is something that has happened in Barbados for years) but what do you find with this Aided Self Help Housing? The Government will own the land, the Government will forward the money to buy the material and the people will get together and build a number of houses with the help of skilled workers of the Government, after which they will own the houses having been given a 99 year lease. I feel this; and I hope the Hon. Minister will pay his due regard to it. This is a type of Scheme which, operating in the United Kingdom, United States of America and Puerto Rico where you have people accustomed to lease-hold property, will work well; but if Aided Self Help Houses is to work well in Barbados, you have got to put two schemes into operation. You have the type of Barbadian who wants to know that he has his own plot. I see nothing wrong in a man disposing of his property to leave this country. The fear has also been expressed by these people, of a man selling his property and leaving his family; but my experience is that it is a very rare thing in Barbados for a man to pick up himself and go off from them like that. I think their fears about that are rather negligible. I think that another Scheme of Aided Self-Help Housing should be in operation. I fear that unless another scheme is put into operation, there will not be that sense of security in this country. People feel that in a lease-hold property they have actually to put all their labour into it; but if the time comes as happens right now, that a man's daughter has to leave the country and he has to raise a loan with a lease-hold property it may be impossible for him to get it. If the Government buys the land and sells it out cheaply, they can make it possible for people to own their own homes freehold instead of lease-hold. There is a difference between the two.

There is something in this Bill which I dislike very much. I am sure the Minister will be able to tell us why for instance, when you passed the Local Government Bill you enacted legislation in such a way that the employees of the particular department became pensionable. Take the Vestry for instance in which the responsibility from the liability of the Department would be absorbed or taken over into the new Department; in other words, when you took over from the various Highway Departments and made it into one authority, you enacted legislation through your Bill allowing the employers to become pensionable and that their rights be taken into consideration. In this Bill now before us, when this Authority comes into being and abolishes, let us say the Housing Board, the entire staff in that department who have been working since 1936 their rights will only come into operation after. That is bound to be an oversight; and the Minister will, I presume, explain why that has to be so. If you by statute abolish a Board or any Authority and you bring in a new Authority, I think it is but fair in enacting that legislation that you see to it that it is done as has been done in the Local Government Bill. I feel that there are many anomalies in this Bill which have to be explained. Principally, I should like to have explained (and the Minister ought to know) why is it that with a system of municipal Government in introducing a Bill to create an Authority for housing, when a reference is made to the Government the reference is the Governor-in-Executive Committee. I am counselling hon. members and those of you who have not had time to read your Bills carefully, that this Cham-

ber cannot in one breath argue (as the Hon. Premier has argued) that this is a municipal Government therefore this Housing should rest with the Minister.

You cannot in one breath argue that this is a Ministerial Government and then the power does not rest with the Ministers; this is a question of housing and the power should rest with the Ministers. There is a system of Ministerial Government, but everything in this Bill is to be done by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. If we pass this Bill and it becomes law, you will find that, although we will make it law and say what this Authority can do and what it cannot do, the Executive Committee will be the only person to say something else. You will find collected in a little secret Section that the Governor-in-Executive Committee can say, with authority, what a working class person should be. If you are going to give away the right which is yours as a Legislature, well do it; the Premier will say that this is a Ministerial system and the policy is that of the Ministers, but all through this Bill you will find that the Governor-in-Executive Committee will do this or that. You are amending an Act which says that before the Bridgetown Housing Board can do anything, the Scheme must come before the Legislature, and as soon as the Legislature approves the Scheme, the authority is given to act. If we are working under a Ministerial system, we are bound to say that the policy is that of the Ministers. Here a Minister is responsible for housing, but in this Bill you have the Governor-in-Executive Committee as the authority to do this, that and the other.

I would like these points explained to me, I cannot imagine that any honourable member who has a sense of responsibility to his constituents, would sit down and pass this Bill without referring it to a Select Committee. This is an elected Chamber, and the Other Place can send such a Bill to a Select Committee, and it is only then that the people of this colony can understand what the position is. I say that no Bill of this magnitude should be passed without every honourable member understanding what he is voting for. I can talk as good as anybody else and better than most of them. Honourable members should not merely want to draw \$160 a month; the Chief Secretary will make a speech on this Bill in the Other Place and they will refer it to a Select Committee. They are not elected by anybody, they are just placed there by the Governor; but with a sense of duty they will refer this Bill to a Select Committee. And a Bill of this sort cannot be destroyed by referring it to a Select Committee; When we considered the Town and Country Planning Bill, it went to a Select Committee, when it went before the Other Place it was shelved, but there is no idea of shelving this Bill.

Your existing Housing Authority is the Housing Board, and here you propose to have a Housing Authority which will have seven members, but I cannot understand if you have a Ministerial Government, why you have to refer so much to the Governor-in-Executive Committee. You are making provision for the expending of money by this Board; this Board can be sued and so on. You are giving this Board power to work all over the island and it can plan its finances; and I counsel honourable members that if they are going to say that this Authority can plan its finances and that it is ultimately responsible to the Minister, let that go through; but if this Authority is responsible only to the Governor-in-Executive Committee, then I say that the plans given them should be dealt with by this House.

I did not want to make any reference to the Clauses of this Bill, but you will find in Part IV or

Part V of the Bill that reference is made to the Legislature. I counsel honourable members to go carefully into this matter; if there is a Ministerial system of government and they are referring to the Governor-in-Executive Committee in this Bill, then let us insist that we get before us the Schemes and the plans for financing this Authority.

7.35 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I contend and I believe that every member will agree with me when I say that you should go into Committee on this Bill or rather that it should be sent to a Select Committee so as to let members contribute from their experience what is best workable for Barbados. For instance, I warned hon. members on the last occasion when we were dealing with the Town and Country Planning Bill that it had two vicious sections. Every Barbadian is proud of the fact that he is entitled to justice, but you have sections in this Bill which take away their rights. The method of compensation is quite alright because it is the same as that under the 1948 Act. However, anybody who is jealous of his rights should go very carefully into this Bill; and we should get the Hon. Minister to explain every section fully to us. Although I am voting to support the passing of this Bill with certain amendments, I am bound to say that I cannot understand why the Government has made this approach when in truth and in fact they have just amended the Local Government laws of the island to establish a local Authority. Barbados will be unique in not placing its Scheme for Housing under the Local Authorities. I hope the Hon. Minister will be able to explain fully why it is that with your Civil Servants' Schemes and your other schemes for Housing, you have actually approached this matter in this way.

Last but not least, will the Hon. Minister tell us why in 1936 when there was a Conservative Government in power, members of the working classes getting \$60 per week could qualify for any housing scheme, and today with a Labour Government that a man getting more than \$30 per week cannot qualify. I do want the Hon. Minister to explain that fully. The whole trouble about this measure, as it appears to me, is that the Hon. Minister will not be able to explain it; therefore, may be the legal luminaries of this House should expound a theory under which they think it should work. I would also like the Honourable Minister to say whether they have considered a scheme of Aided Self-help housing not only under leasehold but also freehold where Government could help people who have their own land.

Sir, I feel that this amendment giving the Housing Board greater authority, while it might be necessary, it is being done the wrong way. I feel you are going to create an unnecessary administrative burden upon the people of this colony, inasmuch as that with your new Local Government, you are going to have a similar set-up. As a matter of fact, you are going to have various set-ups to deal with this type of housing: your Civil Servants' Housing Loans Schemes and your other schemes. As the honourable senior member for St. George has said, you could have come in here with a more comprehensive Bill taking some sections from your Town and Country Planning Bill, though you need have not as large a Bill as that one, but one which would give the Housing Authority such powers as to zone and to say where in these areas you can have theatres and such things.

One last point and it is this: while you are making amendments to give this Authority more power, there are also amendments you have made to the Public Health Act. I do not think that the Hon. Minister and the Government have given suf-

ficient study to this. When you pass this Bill it is going to clash with your Public Health Bill. In other words, if you are dealing with Housing Authority you should have certain sections of your Public Health Act which you recently passed omitted, so as to make this Bill workable.
7.45 p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to reiterate what has been said this afternoon by members on this side of the Table on this Bill which we all desire to see on the Statute Book as soon as possible. I have refrained from speaking earlier, giving way to the last honourable member who spoke because I consider him to be an authority on housing. He has been a member of the Housing Board for many years, and he knows the great needs that exist in this colony for housing among the working population. I am not saying that other members are not conscious of that, but we prefer to allow those who are experts on certain matters to speak for our Party.

It has been said that the present Government has not paid sufficient attention to Housing, they have spent large sums and they have made certain progress in Housing; but it is considered that with the money available today sufficient attention has not been paid in that direction. Apart from what has been done at the Pine, it is considered that Government has not even taken into consideration the increase in population. Nothing has been done except in that flood disaster some years ago, when people had to be removed from flooded areas. We do not wish to delay this Bill because it is necessary to bring these forces into play; and with this Bill, it will call for an extension of the present Housing Authority.

The present manager of the Housing Scheme is a hard worker, a good and very conscientious worker; but I have been told by an expert, and an expert from abroad, that he needs assistance. It is impossible for him alone and singlehandedly to cope with the Housing problems of Barbados. He needs both technical and clerical assistance. It is a part of our programme that the Housing Scheme should go forward and go forward on sound lines. There are many things in this Bill that generally meet with disfavour; it should be sent to a Select Committee. It seems to me that some members are weary of sending Bills to a Select Committee because some Bills are delayed at Select Committee; but I do not think that members dealing with this Bill in Select Committee would delay it, especially knowing that the General Election is around the corner. We would like to see something done; not only for St. Michael, but we would like to do justice to the several parishes that we represent.

A Housing Scheme has been started in Christ Church and it is doing well; but quite a lot more could be done there. In Bridgetown one has been started, but there is no one Scheme that would meet the approval of our Party, because housing is a matter of experimentation: different types of houses, different sizes and different classes; and for that reason if the Bill went to a Select Committee we felt that more justice could be done to it.

I knew there are other honourable members who would like to continue speaking after dinner. The last speaker has spoken very fully on behalf of our Party and I am going to leave the matter at that.

At this stage, Mr. Speaker, I am going to take the opportunity to move the adjournment of the House for three quarters of an hour.

Mr. LEWIS: I beg to second that.

The question that this House do now adjourn for three quarters of an hour was put and resolved

in the affirmative without division, and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.
7.55 p.m.

On re-assembling,

STATEMENT WITHDRAWN

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the Statement made by the Minister of Agriculture earlier today, it would seem as if there was some misunderstanding last week relative to the Director of Agriculture misleading the Minister by design. From the Statement made by the Minister today, it is clear that there was no attempt by the Director of Agriculture to mislead the Minister, but that through some error the House was misled. I therefore crave Your Honour's permission to say that any statement I made that the Director misled the Minister by design I unqualifiedly withdraw, and I hope that no occurrence of this kind will take place again and that the facts will be given more clearly to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment the House was debating the motion for the second reading of the Housing Bill. The question is that this Bill be now read—

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I should like to reserve my remarks on this Bill until later.

Mr. BARROW, Mr. Speaker, when I listened to the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing introducing this Bill, the only conclusion to which I could come, without in any way wanting to appear to be intellectually snobbish or anything of that kind, was that his ability to read had improved considerably during the last 12 years and he was able to regurgitate bits of information collected from various sources without managing in one of his statements, to make one single original remark or give one prospect of amelioration for the majority of people who live in overcrowded conditions in this island. I have before me the Five Year Plan for Development and Taxation. I hope that those who are reporting this debate can spell the word "rationale", but at the time when this Five Year Plan was put before the public the whole rationale of the propounding of the Plan and the institution of a Five Year Plan for development and taxation was that the Government wanted to know exactly where it stood; and it has been stated subsequently in answer to hon. members who have asked questions and made proposals about the amelioration of conditions in this island particularly with regard to housing and unemployment, that every last penny had been taken care of in the Five Year Plan and there was no further money left for the Government to spend on Schemes, much as they would like to do so. I do not like to quote without illustration. The hon. Junior member for St. Lucy, the senior member for St. Lucy and the hon. senior member for St. John can all give illustrations of what I have just set forth. One illustration is the Clinketts Housing Scheme in St. Lucy, when at the time of the recent bye-election, it would appear justifiable when an allegation was made that certain Ministers had promised furniture to the members of the Clinketts Housing Scheme. One has only got to go back to the debates since the Five Year Plan and find the Minister of Finance and other Ministers saying that the Five Year Plan has restricted us in our expenditure, and we have already taken care of nearly all the possible contingencies that our limited income would afford us. Not only have these statements been

made on the floor of the House, but they have appeared in the Press.

Hon. members will remember that during the debate on the Five Year Plan, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries with whom I am glad to associate myself, (the only one perhaps) said that it is remarkable that in an island in which there was so much overcrowding, that in a Plan for development and taxation the Government could only think of providing one house a month for the next five years, sixty houses in five years. I would like to refer hon. members to the debate on that occasion in which the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries and I pointed out that to anticipate spending \$750,000 on Ministerial Buildings and Parliament Buildings, and to anticipate spending a restricted sum to the extent of one house per month for the next five years on such a vital matter as Housing, was showing a complete lack of proportion and understanding of the sufferings of the people of this island, or words to that effect. It is rather remarkable now when an election is anticipated that the member for St. Michael who holds this portfolio for Housing, can multiply tenfold what the Government in its wisdom at the time of the Five Year Plan felt their financial capabilities allowed them to do. As a matter of fact, in one year they proposed to extend not tenfold but fiftyfold what the Government anticipated at that time. It was the honourable junior member for the City who at the time of the Five Year Plan, pointed out in common with the honourable junior member for St. Peter, who I am sure, was voicing Your Honour's sentiments, that the three and a half million dollars from the Labour Welfare Fund should not in any way be confused with the general funds for the development of this island, because those funds were external to this island in their source, and had been the subject of imperial strictures as to how they should be spent. It was false to introduce a revolving fund when the idea was neither development nor taxation, and you were importing into the Five Year Plan something which was of a revolving nature completely outside the ambit and scope of taxation and development.

For reference I would like to draw the attention of honourable members to the Five Year Plan for Development and Taxation, and they will see on pages 16, 17 and thereafter appendix "B" various Schemes which the Government envisaged at the time. But what is perfectly clear is that in the Five Year Plan there was only an anticipated number of sixty houses to be built and that will be found on page 20 of the Five Year Plan. It says this:—

"The Estimates put forward by the Housing Board contemplated expenditure totalling \$1,835,183, including an amount of \$104,543 in the Capital Estimates, 1952-53, Head 11 and \$36,000 in Supplementary Estimates, 1952-53, No. 24.

The Board suggested, (this is the same Board from which this new plan now emanates,) "that 60 new houses be built in the city and urban areas and 28 in the rural areas each year.

The Government does not consider that the housing problem can be solved in this manner with the means at its disposal, and the Housing Board is examining methods of providing cheaper houses. Capital expenditure of \$530,000 is included in the programme, and there is the Self Help housing scheme under the heading "Loan Funds". There is also the Organisation for housing from Labour Welfare Funds, which it is expected will expend about \$3,500,000 on housing during the period.

An amount of \$25,000 is included to cover the cost of land which it may be desirable to acquire."

At this stage, with all due deference to the Hon. Minister of Housing, I would like to say that it is slightly ambiguous; but I am going to give him the benefit of the doubt. It would appear that what he is saying is that 60 new houses will be built in the City and 28 in the rural areas each year, but that is capable of two interpretations. One is that you are going to build 60 houses in the City and 28 in the rural areas each year and the other is that you are going to build 60 houses in five years in the City and 28 houses in the rural areas each year, that is 12 houses in the City each year and 28 houses in the rural areas a year, or alternatively 60 houses in the City in five years and 28 houses in the rural areas each year. It is a fact that in the way in which this paragraph is worded it is capable of two interpretations; but I as I said before, I am prepared to give the Hon. Minister of Housing the benefit of the doubt. I believe it was repeated on several occasions that it was 60 houses for five years; and in reference to the figures, they would show you that is the correct interpretation; and for that reason I base my calculation on one house a month for five years. But whichever way it may be, whether it be 300 houses in five years or 60 houses in five years, my observations are no less stringent than before. It is rather remarkable that the Plan which was supposed to be the blue print of Government's expenditure over the next five years should be so drastically modified within the short period on the eve of the elections by an expansion, either to ten-fold or fifty-fold. That, Mr. Speaker, is the financial background against which we must discuss this Bill which is before the House.

Now, the first observation which I would like to make is this: let us accept that the Government has now decided to build 600 Aided Self Help houses a year; these houses, from what I was given to understand by the introduction to the Bill given by the honourable senior member for St. Michael, will be of the Aided Self Help type. I hope I am correct or incorrect, but that is what I have been made to understand. Now, in the Five Year Plan of Development and Taxation the annual figure of 60 houses which were to be built were over the Five Year period and they were not to be Aided Self Help houses; they were to be houses independent of the Aided Self Help Housing Scheme, so it would appear to me that the Bill now before the House entails a drop in the level of employment in Housing, for the simple reason that Aided Self Help houses are built with labour which is not paid for; the labour is labour of the collective efforts of the persons who are going to live in these housing units. I have already said that the prime consideration in any expenditure of a Government should be expansion of employment in the numbers of working population and to see that they are gainfully employed. It would have been a good sign and the best thing for this community, if 600 new housing units were going to be erected every year in this island from local materials and by employing local labour; but when you are going to build 600 houses with cement or largely out of cement which is imported from Trinidad or from other sources and the labour involved in the erection of those houses is going to be free labour, one can easily see that it will have no effect on the employment situation other than a deleterious effect.

I would like to draw the attention of my colleague to the facts concerning the experiment carried out in the parish of St. Lucy in the Aided Self Help Housing Scheme. That Scheme took about four times as long to complete as the Housing Au-

thority said that it would have taken at its inception; and it only reached fruition, as the Hon. Minister admitted on a previous occasion, when they took hired labour from the Housing Board and from Bridgetown and transported that hired labour to St. Lucy to complete the Scheme for some festive occasion; since the Governor or some other plenipotentiary was to go down there and see the scheme; quite apart from the political considerations of their having a bye-election in that parish. I would not say a waging bye-election but it was waging in the parish during the relevant period. Sir, they did not anticipate spending one cent of hired labour on those houses, but yet they are going to tell you (when it took them in St. Lucy over a period of well over a year, if not two, to build fifteen Aided Self Help housing units) that in each and every year in the next ten years the Hon. Minister of Communications, if he is in the position, will wave his magic wand and will induce and imbue the parishioners with a sense of cooperation and good-will so as to get them to finish 600 houses within each year. I do not think any such consideration should deter a Government from being ambitious. Of course, my assumption would not be 600 but probably would be in the vicinity of 6,000 and it would be on a comprehensive scale, not only to build houses but to inject and to infuse in the community that necessary impetus which is so sadly needed at the moment, and which would shower a general atmosphere of prosperity throughout the island.

9.05 p.m.

I feel that building constructions, in contradistinction to other forms such as the building of elaborate offices, is a form of investment, investment, not only in the purely economic sense that you are putting purchasing power in the pockets of masons and carpenters, but investment in the social sense of the term. On the other hand, when you spend the elaborate sum of \$450,000 on elaborate offices, it is a social disinvestment; because you are encouraging people to exist in an atmosphere which will cut them off from the real wants and aspirations of the people whom they are supposed to represent. I say then, that unlike my colleague, I do not regard this Scheme as ambitious in its principle; but it is ambitious only in the manner in which it has been engineered. It is not ambitious in the number of houses; but in the manner or type of houses that is anticipated and almost in the manner in which the building of these houses will be financed. In that way, the scheme will be inhibited by the Bill as itself especially by the personnel who are going to manage the scheme; and in the final analysis by the Minister of Communication and Housing. In other words, it is too big a scheme for a little man! It is too big for the present Manager of the Housing Board; but it is not too big a scheme for the people of Barbados. As I said before, we thought that a more comprehensive Housing Scheme would have been more or less launched upon for the next four or five years.

The Scheme is inhibited by the persons responsible for the drafting of it of a Scheme which they had in British Guiana and a scheme which has transplanted itself by some miracle of mechanism which we mortals cannot quite appreciate or understand. It has sort of transported itself into the mind of the Executives of this island; but the British Guiana Bill of 1946 was to a large extent of a very poor sort of synthesis of the 1945 Town and Country Planning legislation in the United Kingdom at that time. The existing legislation to the best of my recollection in the United Kingdom in 1945 proved to be unworkable and was the subject of too much debate and was such as to be, in the words

of my recollection in the United Kingdom in 1945 proved to be unworkable and was the subject of too much debate and was such as to be, in the words of the Lord Chief Justice:— 'Legislation of the new despotism'; and this new legislation of the Minister is one which no well thinking member of this community would want to exist under. Perhaps the only wise thing that has been done is that it has been vested in the Minister himself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the first thing that one would have thought of a Government which was serious and was not just rushing through ill considered legislation which had been suggested to it or foisted upon it by some person from abroad, was that we would have had a census of houses; and having had that census of houses, that the statistics would have been tabulated; and in accordance with that, the Minister of Communications would have been able to tell the public of Barbados that the position is this: our population is so much; it is increasing at the rate of so much per year; the number of housing units which we have in Barbados is so many; from the private investment sector, we have discovered that the average rate of building houses for a certain income group is so many per annum; and we find that in the lower income brackets in the working classes, (because if I may dilate for a moment), the same sort of interest for housing does not exist between owners, but as between income groups; and there are many people of the so called middle classes who are not in a position to afford anything other than what they call working class houses. But I will return to that at a later stage.

Before you start making any charge on the Treasury for a Scheme such as this, one would have thought that with a Housing Authority in existence with all the financial geniuses which, like the Bill itself, they have imported from the neighbouring colony of British Guiana, they would have been able to tabulate how many houses, (and they could have got it from the Vestries or any of the parochial authorities in the island or they could have got it from the Police for as much as I know; any how, the information was available;) and they would have been able to say that the distribution of the Housing unit was 3.6 or 5.9 as the case may be, or that we consider that it is four houses per unit or so many cubit feet per dimension. Having done that, there was left a residuum without taking it into consideration any prospective growth in the population at this particular stage now; and we are deficient in this income group ("A") which is up to \$120 a month on 15,000 houses; and in income group ("B") which has the salary scale between \$120 and \$200 a month; and in income group ("C") (Civil Servants) we are deficient on 3,500 houses, just for illustration. Having done that, Mr. Speaker, they would have been able to let the people know where they stand; and without taking into consideration any further population growth, say we know that the housing population is such. Then the Minister could have brought into this Chamber a plan of all the urban districts, and on that plan he would have eliminated all the areas which could have been designated as slum areas, and he could then have added another group of areas delineated as urban areas such as Cave Hill, Upton, Wildeys, Rendezvous Hill and all the surrounding areas which are at present undeveloped.

9.15 p.m.

And after all, Mr. Speaker, Barbados itself is not growing: you know where your houses are and you know where your uncultivated land is and where the areas for development can be. These facts are

already available for those who would like to seek them out. We always proceed from the known to the unknown quantity; but in this Bill we are proceeding from the unknown quantities into oblivion or eternity, which of them I do not know. Having done that, the Minister could say that the sector of the economy which would not be taken care of by private investment in housing and to meet the present needs of the population of Barbados, we need 15,000 houses in order to accommodate the inhabitants of this island under conditions which approximate to Civil Service standards. That is what the Minister should have done; he cannot do things like this with a Board to-day; having told us what the present position is as regards housing, he could go on and say that with the population growth of 1.9 per cent or 2 per cent, with an overall picture of 4,000 new persons to be looked after every year at five persons per house, we now have to provide 600 new houses overall with the increase population. Out of 3,000 to 4,000 persons per annum at least 1,000 will be going into homes capable of holding two or three more persons, and we would be left with a residual deficiency of 400 units to be provided. With this problem we are going to give this Housing Authority the power of raising money to provide houses for the residual population growth.

Mr. Speaker, this is what I want to say; from my analysis of these things which should be done or which the Minister is incapable of doing or his advisers cannot advise him how to do, one salient point must be outstanding. It is that Housing is not a problem of people who work for \$36 a week or less; Housing is a problem common to over 95% of the population of this colony; and you cannot divide the colony into any \$30 or \$36 a week element and those who work for more than that. Very often the persons who work for less than \$30 a week own their own homes, although they may not be comfortable houses; and you will probably find that the majority of persons who earn over \$30 a week and under £500 a year will never own a house of their own. What is going to be done about them? If the Minister had come into this Chamber with figures showing us the disparity as between one income group and another income group in housing conditions, this House would be in a better position to judge between the classes in contradistinction to the masses. The impression which the Minister wants the general public to get is that this is class legislation; this is something being done for the underprivileged and the working man, but in truth and in fact, if it is examined closely, Mr. Speaker, you will see that if the type of housing which is going to be encouraged is of the Aided Self Help pattern for the widows and orphans and the women who are married and have five or six children and the domestic servants, indeed even factory workers will be excluded for physical and other reasons in the areas in which they live from the benefits of the Scheme.

Let us take for example Bulkeley as a factory. What the Minister is telling us is that there is an engineer working at this factory for over \$1,500 a year who may be renting a house or having to live in a house with his relatives perhaps, and he will not be able to benefit under the scheme, because his average earning will be over \$30 a week. There must be a lot of people living under conditions of overcrowding; if these persons are disqualified from the Scheme it does not mean that you have solved your Housing problem or that people are not in need of houses because there is a shortage of housing already. If people are overcrowded and you say that because

one is working for so much and so much he is not included in the Scheme, well, in the near future a proper Socialist Government will get in power. [Cheers] In the next 15 years do you not anticipate that any member of the working class will get \$30 a week for a 44 hour week in Barbados with all these Conferences going on in Geneva? Government is spreading the gospel of despondency and in the next 15 years do they not anticipate that any worker will be able to get more than \$30 a week! What kind of outlook have you got for the working classes?

9.25 p.m.

In the island of Bermuda at the present day, you have domestic servants who are getting \$360 per month which is \$12 per day; and in the neighbouring island of New Providence in the Bahamas it is difficult to find any worker getting less than \$30 for a 40-hour week. I say that from first-hand experience. You have here that a working class man is one who is getting \$30 a week and less. In other words, a foreman mechanic in a garage is not a working class man; therefore, he does not need housing and the Civil Servant is a working class man although his father may be working for an income of £500 per annum and you are building a house for him; but the engineer although he may be sharing a house with eight or nine of his relatives is not a working class man; he is *ipso facto* disqualified. That is some of the failures in the Bill now before us.

Mr. Speaker, I want to draw your attention to some of the salient absurdities in this Bill and also to bring them out for the edification of members of the Government. In a Bill of this nature, if you can jump the Five Year Plan tenfold you can go the whole way and jump it one hundred fold. If you did not have money then and you have it now, there should be no limit to your capacity. I would like to see somewhere in this Bill that the Housing Authority will be under obligation to build these houses with water and electricity placed in them. No matter what part of this island these houses would be built, the utility services should be laid down in each and every house; and because we are building housing units not because we may want to show visitors next year, but because these houses should be durable and should be built to last for the next fifty years. Sir, what kind of houses are we building in this year of grace 1955? We are building houses which do not have the ordinary comforts of water and electricity. In the neighbouring colony of Trinidad water runs through the back-yard of every house in the City of Port-of-Spain. I have seen old motor-car bodies on the eastern main road at a place called Shanty Town where water is installed; and the Port-of-Spain Town Council is passing legislation to prevent the Electricity Corporation from supplying electricity to those people because they are encouraging bad housing conditions. In Barbados, we have elaborate houses in Speightstown and even in St. George that have been wired up for electricity for the past five or six years, and up to now the current has not been turned on. That has been under the beneficence of the existing Labour Government.

The Government can now set a standard in Housing. It is only after I trenchantly criticised the honourable senior member for St. Michael that he condescended to let a standpipe come within fifty feet of the Clinketts Housing Scheme. If the Government is embarking on a Housing Scheme, don't you think that the Government should include into that Scheme that no house should be built unless there is water and electricity installed on the premises? There should be no excuse or saving clause,

because the Government has no right to build houses unless it can ensure that the ordinary domestic comforts are available to the prospective owners of those houses. What is the use of the Government going down into Drax Hall Woods or at the back of Superlative to put up a Housing Scheme, when it can buy the land on the public road where every house would be able to put in water and electricity. Sir, nothing like that is envisaged in this Bill for the working classes which this Government is supposed to be thinking of. This is not a scheme for the working classes; this is one to fool the people that they are doing something for them when in truth and in fact they are not doing as much as the British Guiana Government did for the East Indian squatters living on the Essequibo in 1946.

We who claim to have the best constitution in the world and who are more advanced than all other people who inhabit this earth, are now in 1955 introducing all the discarded legislation from the United Kingdom and all the out of date legislation from the benighted colony of British Guiana, which lays no claim to having the best constitution. This is what the Hon. Minister is foisting on the unsuspecting public of this colony; I do not know if through ignorance or design, because he certainly has not read the Town and Country Planning Act of England. The Hon. Minister of Finance went to British Guiana about four times and he knows that this legislation is out of date there, and they now have improved on it.

There is one other aspect of the Bill on which I would like to touch. I come now to certain drafting errors in the Bill. Perhaps hon. members will remember that some months ago on the floor of this House I mentioned that there was a move on foot to offer the present Manager of the Housing Board the job of competent authority (a job which had been first offered to the present Director of Public Works who is a qualified architect of experience and ability) to a man whose only title to fame and whose only qualification is that he was engaged in some clerical duties in Broad Street before he was appointed to the same job as Manager-Secretary of the Housing Board. It is true to say that the salary now offered to the Manager-Secretary of the Housing Board is small in remuneration and of little reward for the share which he took in this inconsiderate piece of legislation.

9.35 p.m.

And I suggest that if you are going to set up a competent authority for Housing, that you get a qualified man who would be able to stand up to the machinations of the Minister, a man who is able to look the world in the face, a man who has qualifications and can tell the Minister or the Officer administering the Government plainly that he is wrong.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has just made a statement referring to the machinations of the Minister. That is a question which calls for some defence, because if the hon. member's remarks are directed to include two persons both are involved. I think the hon. member had better go more carefully.

Mr. BARROW: I am only saying that those are situations which are likely to arise. I am saying that in considering a competent authority we have to be sure that we get the type of man who has the qualifications and the ability to do a job of this kind, rather than to appoint a person who may owe his presence to the machinations of the Minister now administering this phase of the Govern-

ment, while the Minister might not then be in charge of the position which he now holds.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are one or two matters to which I should like to draw to the attention of the House, it is a matter of certain drafting errors in the Bill. I know that hon. members on the other side are not going to pay any attention to this, but the Bill is going to come back down from the Legislative Council with the amendments exactly as I am going to point them out to the House.

In their definition of dwelling, the Bill says that "dwelling" or "dwelling-house" or "house" means any premises (including a flat) used as a separate dwelling, and any part of a building which is occupied or intended to be occupied as a separate building or being, of a type suitable for such use."

Mr. Speaker, I know that you have seen it right away. You cannot have any part of a dwelling as a separate building. That is the first thing which is wrong. I do not have to stake my legal reputation on that because I know it is going to come back down from the Legislative Council with the amendments just as I have said.

The definition of Housing Association has been taken from a definition of England. It reads as follows:—

"Housing Association" means an association, society, body of trustees or company established for the purpose of, or amongst whose objects or powers are included those of, constructing, improving or managing or facilitating or encouraging the construction or improvement of, houses for persons of the working classes or for members of the association, which the Governor-in-Executive Committee may for the purposes of this Act deem and certify to be a Housing Association;"

Now this is what I want to say about that: if you are going to abolish the Civil Service Housing Board, where are the Civil Servants going to come in? Because after careful scrutiny of the Act it would appear that Civil Servants will only benefit where a Civil Service can benefit, but I understand that there were too many bodies; so in your definition of Housing Association you must retain some kind of statutory Board in order to retain the Civil Servants.

I should like to draw to the attention of the Minister of Housing that this should not be the definition of "Judge" It reads as follows: "Judge" means the Chief Justice or a Puisne Judge sitting in Chambers and in the case of any matter within the jurisdiction of the Assistant Court of Appeal includes a judge of that Court;"

There is no such word as "Chief Justice." The officer referred to is the Chief Judge. A Justice is a Justice of the Peace; and the term "Chief Justice" is a sort of colloquial term. To call him a Chief Justice is almost a relegation to an inferior order.

Then I object to this definition which reads as follows: "person of the working classes" means a person whose income does not exceed in average of \$50 a week or such other sums as the Governor-in-Executive Committee may from time to time prescribe—"

By what mode of scientific experiment or *ad hoc* empiricism have they arrived at that definition of "working classes"? I should like to say that in other parts of this Bill where they are making provision for working classes (and I am warning hon. members now that Government is pretending to make provision for working classes, and they have given

money to factory owners to build workshops and to other people to build churches and things of that sort) that this is an ill considered piece of legislation taken out of the Town and Country Planning Act dealing with places in England around Crawley and towns like that where whole townships are built; but surely if this is a working class Housing Bill, how can you give the Board power to build factories for all kinds of persons including costermongers? What kind of housing can be involved in that? I suggest that this Bill be called a Bill with respect to the housing of persons of lower income group. Are you going to create a precedence in Barbados by saying that a working class man is a man that gets \$30 a week? Are you going to tell professional men that their interests are not in common?

You are supposed to be making provision for persons in the lower income groups; not that you are making provision for the working class itself when under the Bill we make provision for the Authority to erect houses for factory owners.

I should like to draw the attention of hon. members to Clause 20 of Part IV "General Powers and Duties of the Authority." This clause says: "Subject as in this Section hereinafter provided and to the other provisions of this Act, the Authority may —

(a) erect, construct, maintain, repair, or improve or cause to be erected, constructed, maintained, repaired or improved (whether by or on behalf of the Authority, or persons other than the Authority)"

This means that you can do anything; you can either build, maintain, or improve whether by the Authority or by persons other than the Authority that is something any being can understand—"houses, gardens and factories" I suppose that means places like the Soap Factories.... "workshops places of worship, places of recreation, and other works and buildings for, and for the convenience of persons of the working classes—"

We agree down to there. But listen to this "and other persons" But if this is a Bill for the working class people, why do they have to put in places and things like recreation grounds? I think recreation grounds should come into something else. Do not tell me that this is to be a working class Housing Bill and that you are giving money to build factories and workshops for persons other than working class persons.

9.45 p.m.

If this Bill has been carefully considered, it is the most dishonest piece of drafting I have ever seen. I do not believe it has been considered carefully at all, because here is a Clause which is taken straight from England in respect of those towns where it is supposed to relieve congestion: Manchester, Sheffield and places of that kind; and you have it in this Bill, that this Board can repair factories for people. When you say that you are not only going to build factories and workshops but you are doing that for persons other than the working classes, you are giving the Board authority to expend all the funds at its disposal on the erection of a shirt factory and a factory for canning flying fish; is that housing? Is the Hon. Minister serious? I suggest to the Minister that he should show his *bona fides* and cut that provision out of the Bill in Committee. When you impose upon us a voluminous Bill, Clauses of this kind must escape the attention of members of the Government themselves. I am very perturbed that that provision should appear in this Bill at all. In the "Objects and Reasons"

of the Bill they do not mention it, but when you refer to Clause 20 you will see that they anticipate building factories for persons. If it is not so, then let us take that provision out of the Bill. When you come to the other subsections of Clause 20 where the Housing Authority can guarantee the repayment of interest on money borrowed, I have already said on several occasions that when you are lending money to build a house you are not really helping people unless you are prepared to lend them the money with which to buy the land on which to place the houses. There were proposals made by the Civil Servants themselves, and there were proposals made by myself and other honourable members on the floor of this House, but up to now the Government has not made it clear that they are prepared to lend people money to purchase the land on which the houses are to be built.

There is one other matter in the interpretation Clause to which I would like to draw the attention of the Hon. Minister, not because I think it will do him any good, but because I like to say "I told you so" when the Other Place sends back the Bill with an amendment. In the definition of "Local Body" it says that this Body "means the Lord Mayor and City Council of Bridgetown or the District Council of the Northern or Southern District" whereas it should read "the district Council of the Northern or of the Southern District." As it stands here, it makes sense to nobody beside the Minister of Housing. We have the unsavoury experience of advising the Government on these matters and they ignore our advice; and then the members of the Other Place consider the 24 members of this House as a whole bunch of semi-illiterates because in elementary things like this when the Government is advised that the draftsman has made a mistake, they get up and say that the Attorney General is drawing so much and so much money and this is what he meant otherwise he would not have put it down. Anyhow, my conscience is clear; I hope that in the very near future if this Government is not prepared to do it, some other Government will be in a position to bring down legislation to assist the unfortunate people of this island in extricating themselves from the dilemma in which they now find themselves.

9.55 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, while I am not prepared to spend much time on the criticisms made by honourable members, there are just a few points to which I think some reply should be made. Of course I am well aware of the fact that some honourable members have come to the conclusion that they will speak after I have replied; that is the practice nowadays. Sir, to deal with the honourable senior member for St. Philip; in the first place the honourable member started off by saying that the Government was only spending \$150,000 on this housing project.

He also said that he was opposed to the Labour Welfare Fund being added or included in the administration of this new organisation. Then he went on to say that this scheme was over ambitious.

(Mr. Speaker left the Chair and Mr. Deputy Speaker took the Chair).

He went on to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the 600 Aided Self Help houses was a programme which Government knew to be too ambitious and that Government should come down out of the clouds and lend the people money to repair their houses. During the course of that speech the honourable member made personal attacks and made reference to my

character. I only want to say in reply that abuse and slander is no substitute for argument. [MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!] I think it is an old adage which tells us that whenever you point one finger at an individual three are also pointed back to yourself. That is all I have to say where he is concerned.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have listened very carefully to all the remarks which he made. The hon. member included in the \$1,000,000, the funds which concern the Civil Servants' organisation, or in other words, the fund which includes loans to be made for Civil Servants. He then said that we were spending \$60,000 from Labour Welfare and in that case nothing will be left to advance loans to people for repairing their houses. He also quoted part of the White Paper which I laid down on the table of this House some time last year, but he failed to quote the part which dealt with loans. As I pointed out then, and it is in paragraph 12 of that Memorandum, you will see that in addition to the programme referred to in paragraph 10, it is anticipated that the amount of money available for the repair of houses under the Labour Welfare (Housing Loans) Organization would be much the same as at present; and also that the finance for the Civil Servants Housing would continue to be a separate Government's responsibility and at the same level as proposed at present, so that no funds made available to improve the housing conditions of those members of the community whose need is most urgent, would not be diverted to the housing of Civil Servants or other purposes. That was set out as clear as crystal in the White Paper; and although he had that White Paper from which he quoted the paragraph with respect to Aided Self Help houses and the 10 four-unit houses at \$100,000 each, and although I was careful to point out when I was making my speech on this Bill that that amount only dealt with new houses and it had absolutely nothing to do with anything else, the honourable member still said what he did.

Now, some honourable members in their discussion expressed the view that Government would be taking Labour Welfare money to lend to other people, and that they consider this to be wrong. I am sure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you look at sections 17 and 18 of this Bill, you will see that stipulations are made there for keeping this Labour Welfare Fund separate and distinct from any funds which Government will advance to this organisation for the purpose of Housing. For those who qualify for loans under the General Loan Scheme which was set out in the Five Year Plan, a sum of \$750,000 is set down and it goes further; because when you turn to the schedule of this Act, you will see that all the regulations governing the Labour Welfare (Housing Loans) Organisation are inserted in the back of this Bill. The second schedule of the Bill sets out that under section 17 (3) the rules conform to that organisation which deals with persons engaged in the Sugar Industry. Those are the same regulations which govern the Labour Welfare Funds (Housing Loans) Organisation. However, it pleased the hon. member to make it appear as if the Government was contributing nothing towards this scheme. I was careful to point out that \$150,000 was the amount which is now spent in administering those funds from the two departments which have to do with Housing; that is, the Housing Board and the Labour Welfare Organisation. I was also careful to point out that the \$150,000 was for the purpose of servicing the loan; and in addition to the Government advancing the \$150,000 for the interest and sinking fund on the loan, the Government will make advances yearly to

the organisation for the purpose of constructing those houses. In the Objects and Reasons of this Bill you will also find it set out there. You will also see there, that in addition to building these houses (and I pointed it out at the time) that the Housing Authority is given power not only to advance loans for the repair of houses and for the construction of new houses, but in addition to that, to call on persons whose houses might be in a bad state of disrepair and to repair such houses if those persons are unable to repair them. That is all set down in Section 23 and any blind person can see it. That Clause confers on the Housing Authority power in respect of dwellings which are unfit for human habitation, to require the owner to remedy the building, and if the owner does not do so, the Authority may carry out the necessary work and recover the expenses from the owner. After all of that is stated in the Bill, you get the honourable member getting up and saying, that you are only spending \$1,000,000 on Housing, and there will be nothing for Civil Servants and nothing for repairing houses of people of the labouring class let alone other persons. Of course, the honourable member is capable of twisting anything; but I am sure that other honourable members know better than that.

Now, the honourable member also dealt with the question of utilising the Price Stabilization Fund which is now in the bank. I am sure that he is not correct in saying that the Government controls that fund, because if I remember correctly, the 1947 Act gave the Government the power to administer the Labour Welfare Fund only.

10.05 p.m.

The honourable member talks about lending money to the workers rather than putting it into the bank to get a 2 percent while the bank is lending it out at 6 per cent etc.; and why should we not use that money.

I am sure I know very little, if any about banking; but I am sure there is something which is called a giltedge security—a phase of banking whereby the equivalent can be kept in possession and can easily be converted into cash. As we have already pointed out, that money is to be kept in reserve so that you can resort to it in cases of drought or any other emergency. If you take that money and tie it up in long term loans, I should be glad whether any honourable member would tell me how to get that money when we may suddenly need it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable member rising on a point of Order or explanation?

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot rise on a point of Order.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of explanation, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I had purposely to refrain from interrupting the last speaker, but I do not know if he wanted me to say that the \$6 million should be utilised for housing loans. As a matter of fact, I said that we should be spending at least \$3 million a year on housing.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the honourable member thinks he is making a speech.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think that is sufficient explanation.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It depends to whom you are speaking.

Hon. M. E. COX: And in the next point he made, he quoted an instance of a poor person trying to borrow money. The person he said would have to pay so much in legal technicalities that in the end he would not be able to worry with the loan.

Loans have been advanced under the Labour Welfare Fund and nobody can complain that it has cost them any fabulous amounts; I do not think it cost more than \$3 or \$4. Recently these stipulations have been modified and we have a form which the individual fills out and that is the end of that; therefore I cannot see where (to use his words) all these legal financial burdens will arise.

The honourable junior member for St. John made a remark about the slow pace at which loans are being advanced. I agree with the honourable member, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that loans have not been advanced as quickly or as readily as many of us would have liked; but when I first went over to that Department in 1954, I tried to find out from the manager what was the reason for the delay in the advancement of these loans; and I was told that it was not a question of shortage of staff but that it was a question of certain routine where every application had to be passed by him before the people could get the money. It is true that while there was a bit of acceleration, these loans are not discharged as quickly as perhaps could have been. However, I should like to say this now: in so far as new houses are concerned, I felt that it would be far better to encourage people to construct permanent structures than to continue the building of wooden houses which are only guaranteed for approximately 12 to 15 years. As you know, in our Aided Self Help programme we are constructing wall houses rather than wooden houses. We do that because we are sure that the maintenance costs will be far less with the wall structure than will be with the wooden.

The honourable junior member for St. John also made some reference to housing in Jamaica and quoted some figures. He answered himself, at least in some respects, when he mentioned Jamaica, because the housing situation in Jamaica is still very desperate. Houses there are very small and people are still living in old motor cars covered with tarpaulins, etc., but in order to improve the conditions as quickly as possible the Jamaica Government is supplying small unit houses for the people from time to time.
10.15 p.m.

As he points out while their units are 171 square feet ours are 360 square feet.

The honourable junior member for St. George made a point about the Housing Authority having the power to appoint people with the approval of the Governor. He also suggested that the Government should set up a Department rather than have this Authority. Well, it was felt that in order to expedite matters in so far as the purchase of land is concerned, since we would have to bring down legislation to the House and it might take some time before we could get money, therefore for the smooth running of this matter it would be much better if an Authority were established.

Now sir, I understand that the honourable senior member for St. George is leaving the House; and I am not prepared to say much, because he has spoken for a very long time but he has said very little. I think he will agree that what he said amounts to almost nothing. There is one thing I would like him to carry along with him, and it is this: it appears to me that he is more or less suffering from a weird spell of a malignant, dissatisfied mind.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of Order. I would like to ask since when the member for St. Michael has been capable of making a clinical or any other

kind of diagnosis of people? I would like him to withdraw that remark.

Hon. M. E. COX: This is not the time for making fun.

Mr. BARROW: It is not a question of making fun; I am asking the honourable member to withdraw that remark if he knows the meaning of those words. I invited the honourable member, through one of the other members, if he had anything to say about my speech, to say it before I left. Is this all that he has to say? I take exception to the honourable member's remarks. I always take exception to him, of course.

Hon. M. E. COX: The honourable member has to learn to take his blows.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, are you making any ruling on that? I want you, sir, to inform the honourable member that I am taking exception to those remarks made by him; I want the Hon. Minister to explain how the erection of factories or the repair of factories got in this Housing Bill. I did not ask him to explain what I am suffering from.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member has not yet finished his reply.

Mr. BARROW: I am asking the honourable member to withdraw his remarks and I want that to go down in print. I never say anything which I cannot back up. I have asked the Hon. Minister how provision for factories got in this Bill and he made some reference to my suffering from a malignant mind. That is for the benefit of his satellites of the Press and for his paid henchmen.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable member calling attention to strangers in the gallery?

Mr. BARROW: The stranger is absent.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. George is taking exception to the remarks of the honourable senior member for St. Michael.

Hon. M. E. COX: If the honourable member objects, I will withdraw the remarks. [VOICES.]

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like honourable members to remain silent and let the Hon. Minister continue with his reply.

Hon. M. E. COX: The honourable member started off by attacking me. However, that is something which he has inherited; he cannot help that.

Mr. BARROW: I would like to ask the honourable member what he knows about my ancestors. I do not want to be unkind to him; I am proud of my ancestry and I do not think he can be proud of his.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think one honourable member has offended just as much as the other honourable member.

Hon. M. E. COX: I can leave the honourable member alone because he has not said anything. The honourable senior member for the City began by accusing us of doing something political and he said that this is politics—

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The honourable member is blindly misleading the House. If I were outside, I would say that he is lying. [Laughter.] I have never said any such thing; everything we do in here we do politically.
10.25 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Since the honourable member says that he has not said that, it is as good as if he said it.

Sir, in view of the fact that he said he did not say so, I will not say anything more on that.

In answer to the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, he said that we should have come in here with a plan showing the number of houses, the various districts

and villages, the land on which those houses are to be erected and so on. I am sure that the hon. member was not thinking at the time as perhaps he thinks occasionally, if not he would have realised that this is a Bill to establish a Housing Authority, and in establishing the Housing Authority that Authority is given power under the Bill which does not exist today. We have today the Bridgetown Housing Board; and those activities administered by that Board outside of Bridgetown are done by that Board as an agent for the Government. The Board has no authority to carry out activities outside of Bridgetown. What I am trying to tell the hon. junior member for St. Lucy is that before there can be any plan as to what and where those houses are to be constructed, the Housing Authority has to be established; otherwise you will be putting the cart before the horse. The Housing Authority must first be established and when that Authority is established and given the power to act as is provided in this Bill, the Authority will then be able to go through the length and breadth of this Island to erect houses. If you read the Bill carefully, you will see that provision is made for the Housing Authority to submit plans to the Executive Committee in which case those plans could be easily passed on to this House. How are you going to get plans at this stage for work which is to be carried out by an Authority which has not yet been established.

Apparently, honourable members are satisfied at this stage that the most that can be said of the criticism made against the Bill is that it was useless; it is the kind of criticism which we call wasting the time of the House; nothing constructive whatsoever in it. In that case, I am appealing to hon. members not to send this Bill to Select Committee because we want to get it on the Statute Book as quickly as possible. We laid down in the manifesto of the Labour Party and in the Five-Year plan what we intended doing. This Bill seeks to fulfil even to a greater extent what we decided on a few years ago.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, I certainly did not intend to join in this debate because various points have been raised by hon. members other than those of the Government on this issue, and I feel that they were very extensive and instructive; but the Hon. Minister for Housing has ended his speech with a criticism which has caused me to spring to my feet. Mr. Speaker, it is highly discourteous for the Government Bench to bring a Bill of this magnitude for our consideration with the hope that our views would be put at their disposal either directly or indirectly, and then for them to be so ungrateful as to say that our criticisms and suggestions were only made for the purpose of wasting the time of this House.

I should also like to make a few observations which I was trying to hold back until the House goes into Committee on the Bill. I will begin by saying that everybody appreciates seeing a Housing Bill of this sort presented to the Legislature. There is no hon. member whom I feel could be so indiscreet as not to give this Bill his blessing; but because of the desire for this Scheme to bring as much benefit as possible and in the shortest time possible to those who desire it, I should like to suggest to the Government that it does not matter if the Government proposes to spend £10 million on Housing. It will matter if Government does not start the Scheme in a proper manner, because if it is not started in a proper manner it will not have the beneficial effects which are expected.

I think it was the hon. junior member for St. Lucy who raised the point with regard to the acquirement of land for this purpose. If I were in the Government's place, I would before embarking on such a Scheme bring in legislation to put a ceiling price on land in this colony.

10.35 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I am saying that I would put a ceiling price on land irrespective of who it affected; even if it is the honourable senior member for the City. I would also refuse to introduce a Housing Scheme of this magnitude unless I intended to enforce the compulsory Land Acquisition Act. I know it is on the Statute Book, but I would not initiate a Scheme unless I intended to enforce it; and the Government refused in the past to enforce it when they should have. Unless that intention is there, your Housing Scheme is not going to have the beneficial effect which it is desired that it should have. The Hon. Minister of Housing knows that this Scheme is not going to work because the land owners are not desirous of giving up their land, and will not do so unless they are forced to do it. Perhaps they would do so only in cases where the land is situated in such a difficult terrain that the owners would care to dump it on the Government; otherwise they are not willing. We have reached the stage where people should be removed from behind the canes; and if that is not the intention of Government then there is going to be trouble; for there will be the necessity to use the compulsory Land Acquisition Act which I believe the present Government is afraid to use.

Now it seems as if this whole Scheme is mostly centred on the Aided Self Help system. While it is good for say, 15 persons to come together and put up these houses in a given area, you have to consider this: you are going to put up 600 Aided Self Help houses a year; you are going to the eleven parishes to do it; but in every parish in which you are going to use this Aided Self Help Scheme you ought to have as many artisans. When you take into consideration the number of artisans in a parish who already own houses and who may not be willing to enter into such a Scheme for the erection of houses by a group of such unskilled individuals, the Scheme might not go forward so quickly. To have to depend upon unskilled labour alone is not enough to make your Scheme a success; therefore, I would suggest as an alternative that in every group technical or skilled labour should be introduced to manage the technical side of the work while the individuals who are to benefit under the particular Scheme should give their assistance. That is to say, if you have a group of 15 people to build 15 houses none of them may be skilled artisans; but the Department should employ say, half a dozen carpenters or half a dozen masons, where you can get that guarantee then the Scheme would work as smoothly as possible. The Hon. Minister has already had the experience of the lack of technical assistance given with that Clinketts Scheme. After difficulty was experienced, they carried some work from the Bay Land to complete the work down there. men from the Bay Estate to complete the work down there. If they had not done this perhaps the Clinketts scheme might not have been completed up to now; therefore I would suggest to the Government to employ technical workmen who should be put at the disposal of every group.

I still prefer the system in which if you feel it necessary to help people with housing, to grant them loans and put them on their own. In this way the rehousing of the population would be more success-

ful. Suppose for argument's sake I wanted a loan; I put up the necessary guarantee and you advance the loan to me at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. or 3 per cent. on my guarantee; I would then go and employ whatever labour I could employ. There are many many people who are not interested in the Aided Self Help Scheme as envisaged by the Government; moreover they are some women who are the only bread winners of the family. They have to provide houses for their dependants because the men folk are either dead or absent; and we know that women cannot be easily included in such a group. That is where loans would assist such persons more so than an Aided Self Help Scheme.

I see that the Labour Welfare Loans is working very beneficially from the point of view of the Government and the people. That is because the individual has only to apply to the Department. He is on his own and he employs skilled labour which ensures an early finish to his job. On the other hand you get a long drawn scheme in Aided Self Help housing which may take over 12 months or (as was the case of the Clinketts Scheme) uncertainty as to whether it would be completed.

I think it was the hon. junior member for St. Lucy who suggested that Government should have been able to intimate to him as regards where they had expected to start work. It does not appear so to me; I believe that there is a definite possibility for Government to acquire land in St. John and the Government is not [A VOICE: Will not!] I am not willing to say that I will say "will not". But the Government has failed for the past few months to complete the negotiations; and a delay has caused many to feel (and I should like the honourable member to know that this is not my own view alone); they are trying to punish the public because of the misdemeanours of a certain individual. It is an opinion which is gaining grounds; because it is a fact that the Attorney of the particular plantation has given word that he would sell; but since then he has heard nothing from the Government, and therefore the fault lies with Government. The opinion is that because of certain political actions the Government is not keen on coming to the aid of that particular section of the public.

10.45 p.m.

That is a bad impression for any Government to allow to develop. I would still at this moment counsel the Minister of Housing not to allow that impression to gain further ground. Victimisation of an individual might be nothing, but victimisation of a crowd of people is very bad; it borders on tyranny. However, Mr. Speaker, the points have been very effectively put by previous speakers and I think I can hear the voice of the Chairman of Committees who tries to surpass you in upholding the dignity of this hon. Chamber. I hope that the Government by my special appeal now, will do something in respect of the area of land which they can get without having to put up any struggle. Several authorities have visited the area and they have all expressed the opinion that they have not been able to acquire a site such as that in St. John and therefore it is the duty of those who have it within their power, to do what is really justice and what is right.

Mr. LEWIS: I would just like to add a word to this debate as a representative of the City, and it is well known that it is in the cities that you get slum dwellings. I sincerely hope that this Housing Authority is going to tackle the problem of slum clearance in a way in which we have not seen it done in Barbados; because in spite of all the Housing Schemes and the land acquisition and the devel-

opment of housing, I think the Hon. Minister will have to agree with me that it is not making any impression in so far as the clearance of the slums of Bridgetown is concerned. I do not know what is the best method of doing that; taking people out of the City may not be the right way of dealing with this matter, because it is in the slums that you get some of the best sites. I do feel that if this Housing Authority were to take a bold step in so far as the City of Bridgetown is concerned, it would build a series of two-storied houses and improve the housing condition of the City, and also have the people nearer to their work. The matter needs a bold step being taken; it will take something more than policy. Could you not get a housing area, pay a reasonable amount for the land and clear the slums? There is the question of land acquisition. The hon. junior member for St. John has said something about fixing the price of land and something will have to be done in that respect. This Authority has to acquire land and it has to do that under the Land Acquisition Act. Fabulous prices are put on land because of the method of appraisal; the Government itself knows that that is a doubtful method of having land for the rehousing of the people. You have to call in people who have land in the area and you will have a high price asked for it. If you have an area which is deemed a good area for housing, the land can be acquired at a reasonable amount and the place should not be allowed to get in such a condition where it degenerates into slums.

I am asking questions and I hope that I will get answers to them. I would like to know exactly what are conditions of employment of the people who are working under this Housing Authority? I have not read the Bill so carefully as to know whether these people are pensionable or not. I sincerely hope that an effort will be made to clear the slums of Bridgetown and that concentration will be placed on this matter. As is well known, people drift from the country to the City; [A VOICE: They are moving out of the City now]. I am glad to hear that and I do hope that it is for a good reason and in the interest of the people that they are moving out of the City. As the population grows, it is the cities which will get congested and eventually lead to slums.

This Bill is creating a Housing Authority which is to take over the functions of the other Authorities in the island, and I do hope that it will not get into such a mess as to end in confusion.

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

Clause 1, was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that Clause 1 stand part of the Bill.

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

10.55 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Before you do that I am going to suggest—

Mr. LEWIS: Unless this motion is seconded, I do not know if anybody can speak on it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The motion is seconded.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Before you deal with any Clause, sir, I should like to say that while I am aware you are only going to call the Clauses instead of reading them, they are certain clauses which I think should be read.

Hon. M. E. COX: I agree, Mr. Chairman, with the hon. member's suggestion.

The question that Clause 1—stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:—

In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires "the Authority" means the Housing Authority established under Section three of this Act;

"Building" includes house, hut, tent, caravan or other temporary or movable form of shelter which is used for human habitation and has been in the same enclosure for a period of two years next before action is taken under this Act;

"dwelling", "dwelling house" or "house" means any premises (including a flat) used as a separate dwelling, and any part of a building which is occupied or intended to be occupied as a separate building or being of a type suitable for such use;

"flat" means a separate and self-contained set of premises constructed for use for the purpose of a dwelling and forming part of a building from some other part of which it is divided;

"Housing Association" means an association, society, body of trustees or company established for the purpose of, or amongst whose objects or powers are included those of, constructing, improving or managing or facilitating or encouraging the construction or improvement of, houses for persons of the working classes or for members of the Association, which the Governor-in-Executive Committee may, for the purposes of this Act, deem and certify to be a Housing Association;

"the Housing Board" means the Board established under Section three of the Bridgetown Housing Act, 1936.

"Judge" means the Chief Justice or a puisne Judge sitting in Chambers and in the case of any matters within the jurisdiction of the Assistant Court of Appeal includes a judge of that court;

"the Labour Welfare Housing Loans Fund" means the Fund established under Regulation three of the Labour Welfare Fund (Housing Loans) Regulations, 1950;

"Local Body" means the Lord Mayor and City Council of Bridgetown or the District Council of the Northern or of Southern District;

"Manager" means the manager appointed pursuant to Section eight of this Act;

"road" means any road whether public or private and includes any street square, court, alley, land bridge, footway, bridle path, passage or highway, whether a thoroughfare or not;

"scheme" means a slum clearance scheme, a re-development scheme and a scheme varying or revoking any such scheme;

"slum clearance area" means an area defined and declared as such in the manner provided in this Act, to be acquired or re-developed for the purposes and in accordance with the provisions of this Act;

"person of the working classes" means a person whose income does not exceed an average of thirty dollars a week or such sum as the Governor-in-Executive Committee may from time to time prescribe and who are either—

- (a) clerks, mechanics, artisans, labourers or other persons working for wages, or
- (b) hawkers, hucksters or costermongers, or
- (c) persons not working for wages but at some trade or handicraft without employing persons other than members of their own family and domestic servants.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to delete the word "justice" in the definition "Judge" and insert the word "judge." At the same time I am also asking leave that the word "building" which appears in the last line of the definition of "dwelling" be deleted and the word "dwelling" be inserted in its place. I am also asking leave to delete the word "of" which appears after the word "Northern" in the last line of the definition "Local Body."

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am not so sure that the word "building" should be changed. The honourable senior member for St. George more than once has given vent to bits of law which is law in his own mind. If honourable members look carefully at the word "building" it includes house and dwelling. It means any premises used as a separate dwelling. Therefore, I would suggest that we should not delete the word "building." There is nothing wrong with the word "Chief Justice" in the definition "judge," but the Act itself uses the word "judge," therefore, the word "judge" can be inserted in its place.

11.05 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I myself felt that there was something wrong with this definition: "A separate dwelling and any part of a building which is occupied or intended to be occupied as a separate building." It would seem to indicate a separate dwelling which is going to be used as any part of a building. I feel a part of a building is a separate building.

Mr. Chairman, there may be something in what the honourable senior member for St. George pointed out here in the definition of local body. The Local Government Act does say: "The City of Bridgetown" is a "municipal City." Section 3 (1) of the Act reads as follows:—"The City of Bridgetown is hereby declared to be a municipal City and the inhabitants thereof a body corporate bearing the corporate name of "The Mayor, Aldermen and citizens of the City of Bridgetown, and by such name shall have perpetual succession." [A VOICE: It can be either one].

Does the Hon. Minister accept the definition of "City?"

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What are you speaking of now?

Mr. LEWIS: It is clause 2 definition of "local body" of the Bill before us that I am speaking on. But Section 3 (2) of the Local Government Act, 1953 states that "The City of Bridgetown is hereby declared to be a municipal City and the inhabitants thereof a corporate body bearing the corporate name of "The Mayor, Aldermen and citizens of the City of Bridgetown" and by such name shall have perpetual succession." And what I want to know is: does the honourable member accept the definition of "City"? [A VOICE: There is no Lord Mayor in a City Corporation].

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, what my colleague is getting at is that in the Local Government Act there is no such thing as "The City of Bridgetown." The Hon. Premier could put in an interpretation clause stating what you want it to mean; but in strict accordance with the Act there will be no "City of Bridgetown." As my colleague has said, the inhabitants will be known as the inhabitants of Bridgetown; but "The City of Bridgetown" will not be. You cannot call it the "City of Bridgetown" because there is no such thing in the Act.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the term "City" is used in section after section in the Maude

Bill. Even when lawyers get up and make offhand statements like that you have got to be on your guard. Section 8 of the Act has it, and he gets up and says there is no such thing.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I am asking the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to look at this: "the Labour Welfare Housing Loans Fund means the funds established under Regulation 3 of the Labour Welfare Fund (Housing Loans) Regulations, 1950."

Has there not been some amendment to those Regulations? I think that the fund was given a wider definition. I am only asking whether you think that it covers the fund as you will be checking it over and using it here.

Hon. M. E. COX: I should like to ask leave to delete the word "of" in the last line in the definition of "Local Body."

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has asked leave to delete the word "of" and unless there is any objection leave is granted.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 as amended stand part.

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

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am dealing with "road." "Road" it says here means "any road whether public or private." I do not quite understand this one about private. Should you not have that one about private defined better? Because, as it applies to Barbados, if you go through the Act closely and you note the duties and powers of the Board, I cannot see the wisdom of leaving it so in the definition, as we know private roads in Barbados. Does this word "private" cover roads in general? I want this made clear. This might be taken to mean a private road leading into a private residence; I quite appreciate this; but I am wondering if this only means a road over which a— [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Anything not of public road.] You mean that anything not of public roads is a private road or anything of the sort. Where a private road is concerned, I cannot see where the definition of "road" can cover that.

Mr. Chairman as I see it, it means a road where people have a right to pass.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: A right of way is not a public road. It is a right of way over which certain people have a right to pass. Anything that is not a public highway is a private road.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: This Act is being operated by a separate and distinct Authority. What I am asking is this: where there is a road in common, where the properties of several persons are butting on the road. (I am not bandying with the Hon. Premier.) But there are other informed sources of opinion which might say that that is not a private road. Where "A" conveys a road say to 50 or 60 people and reserves the right in a place convenient for the public to pass, that is not a public road; this might be defined to my mind as "private" in a restricted sense. Take Bank Hall [A VOICE: Strathclyde.] I do not think the Hon. Minister of Health should come into this; let me get on with the Hon. Premier.

The hon. member said that everybody knows what is a private road; but the hon. member is not saying that where "A" develops a Housing Scheme (because that is what it comes to in this Bill) and that portion of the land is conveyed with reserve etc., that that part of the road is not a private road any longer. In other words as the Hon. Minister of

Health has said *sotto voce* Strathclyde is a private road; but I am saying that it is not a private road. 11.15 p.m.

Forty people live in Strathclyde and the people who live there have the right to pass. If Mr. "A" owns a house in Strathclyde and the other people who live there try to stop the road by putting up a bar, Mr. "A" can pull down the bar and allow anybody to pass there. It is not a private road.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If the hon. member will give way to me, I do not think he will repeat what he says. The 40 people who own the road in Strathclyde can allow people to pass that road; every single human being who owns a right of way can join together and prevent people from passing that road. The hon. member should remember this: a public road means a road over which every human being can pass. Anything other than that is a private road.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: That is not what I am driving at. Where you develop an area and lay out roads under the Act, you have so many square feet of road and you do not convey it to either of the parties on either side of the road; there is the question of a private road. What I am fearful of is the question of the entrances to private property controlled by this Authority. There are several instances of what may be construed to be private roads; there is also the question of local associations with which the Authority may deal in the development of land and so on. Does this mean a private entrance to a residence? I do not consider the road at Strathclyde as a private road at all.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Every human being who owns the land on the two sides of a road owns the road too, but he cannot stop anybody from walking along that road. As the hon. member says, private persons can allow their friends to go over their cart paths; a public road is a road over which the whole community can pass without being stopped by anybody. Anything else is a private road; a bridge, footpath or anything else is private. 11.25 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, further in this Bill you will see something about roads. It means private roads, private entrances. If it means that I am not agreeing with it. If a private road means a road running through a developed tenantry or an area set up by a Housing Authority as set out in this Bill, I can agree with that; but if "private" means that you are coming in under this Bill to take over an entrance into some man's entrance then I say "no." This word "private" can be construed to mean an entrance into a private residence and because of that I say "no."

Mr. TUDOR: With respect to the opinion which the Hon. Premier gave on whether it should be the word "building" or the word "dwelling" in the definition "dwelling", I am wondering whether he would not consider to use the word "dwelling" in view of what happens afterward. I do not think when the hon. senior member for St. George drew the attention of the House to this matter he was speaking as a lawyer. He was speaking from the point of view of the sense of the words written down there—both those words which came before the word "building," and those which came after it. I am wondering if the Hon. Premier would agree to accept the interpretation as this: "and any part of a building which is occupied or intended to be occupied as a separate dwelling or being of a type suitable for such use."

I feel sure that we can accept that interpretation without doing violence to the particular interpretation. It does not seem to me likely that

"separate building" would carry the same course as "separate dwelling." Again, Mr. Chairman, it does not seem to me that it requires legal interpretation; but to my mind it requires merely an interpretation according to the sense of the sentence with respect to the words which come before and after the disputed word. In view of that the word "dwelling" seems to me more sensible.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I am going to suggest that there seems to be some confusion amongst hon. members about this interpretation Clause. I am therefore moving that Clause 2 be postponed.

Mr. BRYAN: I beg to second that.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question just look lower down in the Bill at Clause 31 sub-section 2. That sub-section gives you the Authority the right to carry out such scheme including roads as soon as you say that you include private roads. Sub-section 2, of Section 31, reads as follows:—

"The Authority may in like manner and for the purposes of such scheme lay out, pave, sewer and complete all such roads upon the land acquired by it; and all roads so laid out and completed shall thenceforth be public roads repairable by a Local Body or the Director of Highways and Transport, as the case may be."

As soon as you pave, sewer and complete all such roads upon the land acquired by it, those roads although they were on private land become private roads. The Authority has the right to lay out those roads and then those roads become public roads.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I cannot see that point.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, the explanation given by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph seems to be correct. A few seconds before he raised that point I observed the same thing and hinted it to one of my colleagues, therefore, I should like to say that they seem to be confused as we were, otherwise the Hon. Premier would have found it out before.

The question that Clause 2, be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Cause 3 — was called, and passed.

Cause 4—was called. It reads as follows:

"The Authority shall consist of not more than seven persons to be appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of whom one shall be appointed Chairman, and such persons shall hold office for such period as the Governor-in-Executive Committee may determine."

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that Clause 4 stand part.

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

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Does this mean that the Chairman or is it that the Board will appoint him? Is it clear to hon. members that according to this section the Governor has the right to appoint the Chairman or is it that the Board will appoint him?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The Governor-in-Executive Committee means the Ministers.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I know I am a novice to this, but this section does not make it clear whether the Chairman would be appointed by the Governor-in-Executive or by the Board. Under the old Housing Board it was stated that the first meeting of the Board the Chairman shall be appointed.

It is always set out. There are certain Statutory Boards where the Act specifically says that the Governor-in-Executive Committee shall appoint the Chairman. This merely says that the Governor-in-

Executive Committee shall appoint seven persons one of whom shall be the Chairman. You are establishing a new Housing Authority, and the time will come when that Authority is established that it will want to know whose duty it is to appoint the Chairman.

Mr. TUDOR: With respect to Clause four, Mr. Chairman, I support the criticism which has just been made by the hon. senior member for the City. I go further than that. What has surprised me on reading this Clause is that I see evidence of the fact that the Legislature in general, and this Honourable House in particular, are left out of a very vital concern to this Government and to the public. I really think that on all these Statutory Boards this House should be represented directly.

Mr. Chairman, you will remember when we were dealing with the Technical Institute I did say that it would be better for the information of this House if one of its members should be put on these Boards. 11.35 p.m.

There is not much more to say with respect to an Authority which is now being set up under statute. I think that seven people is an adequate number. You do not want to have these things too big. But at the same time there is a strong feeling that the Legislature should be represented on this Authority. I myself have been inclined to see the number increased to nine with at least two of the members of the Authority being members of this Assembly; or if not of this Assembly, of either branch of the Legislature; one from each if both do not come from this House. It is very important and I do not stress this in any controversial manner; but what I have found in my experience is that seldom can you get an opinion on anything we know. For instance: during the Estimates when Housing was being discussed or anything to do with the Control Board, we got through much quicker and saw our way very much more clearly merely because there were hon. members of this House who were on the Housing or the Control Board; and other honourable members of this House were also members of the various Governing Bodies of secondary schools and were able to contribute to that debate and much time and bitterness was saved. What we have to do more than anything else is to call a halt to this process which has been creeping on, where the Legislature has been progressively denied of its authority. I think it is a bad thing that can happen; and the only way in which it can be prevented, is that not only on this Housing Authority should legislators be appointed, but they should be appointed on such statutory Boards that are to be set up in future. You will agree, Mr. Chairman, that it is better to be linked with than to receive information from the Hon. Ministers. I say that not meaning that such information would, in any way, be restrained, but it ought to be possible on all occasions for a member of the Legislature and of this House in particular, to be able to inform the House on all matters within these portfolios without the House having to wait for it at the convenience of the Ministers. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I recommend that this House should consider whether first of all it can afford to be left out of an important body like this, and whether the dignity and importance of the Legislature is not better conserved by being directly linked to these public bodies.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Although the Committee does not believe it, I think the hon. member who has just sat down has far more intelligence than what he has shown. Imagine at this time of day wanting to have another legislative member on this Board. The

Attorney General, the Bishop and those were on the Education Board. Who appoints the Rector of St. Michael? A Roman Catholic! That is the position in having these statutory Boards. The Rector of St. Michael's Anglican Church is appointed by a Roman Catholic and a Fundamental Baptist; that is the law; and the law says that in appointing a Rector the two hon. members for St. Michael—[VOICES: Who says so?]

The Dean of St. Michael is appointed by the honourable junior member for St. Michael who belongs to the mother church and the honourable senior member who belongs to the infant church. The honourable junior member for St. Lucy should see that a legislator should be on no Board if he is not a Government member; let him be prepared to watch and criticise.

Mr. LEWIS: I know the views of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph on this point. Do you mean to tell me that legislators can not legislate for Housing? You mean you are to be cut away for everything, and it is only your daily vocation that you are to know about? A legislator is supposed to know something about everything. I cannot see for the love of the Almighty why you cannot have this Board so constituted that a member of the Government's Party could be put upon it to see that the Government's policy is carried out. 11.45 p.m.

Earlier today we had a statement made to the effect that there was a misunderstanding between a Minister and the Head of a Department and we cannot allow that state of affairs to go on happening. I feel that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has only adopted this attitude because, as Premier, he knows something of everything that is going on. Let us take this Clause 4 and see what is in it. Do you mean to say that the Legislature cannot enact a Bill and say how many years you can appoint somebody for? What is here is that if you like a man you can appoint him for a year and if you do not like him you can appoint him for a day. Here people are to remain on the Board for such time as the Governor-in-Executive Committee may say; do you mean to say that you are taking away the right from the Legislature to say how long a man should be there? This is absolute absurdity: I do not see the sense of having to legislate at all. All the other places in the Caribbean which are supposed to be Crown Colony Governments have said that the Mayor of the City is to be on the Housing Authority so that the Governor could not do as he likes. In Barbados you have to search about for people who have to be put on the Board. Combermere School is falling down and everybody knows about it except the Legislature. The School will fall down and kill the children and then the Legislature will have to pay compensation, but the Legislature is not to know anything about the existing state of affairs! Why has the Bridgetown Housing Board been in existence after every other administrative Board has been dead or killed by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph? Do you not see the selfishness of it?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: On a point of Order. Those remarks are not only untrue but they are definitely offensive; how can you begin to talk about a Ministerial system and keep this ancient provision which was excellent for the time it existed? If the Ministerial system means anything, the word "Governor-in-Executive Committee" should come out and the word "Minister" should be there; however, some things do not go to the Executive Committee; a Minister sees after them and reports. In time a

Minister will do everything, but could anybody be more stupid, I use the word advisedly, as to suggest that I want to do everything! [Mr. LEWIS: You know that is true; you got rid of the Hospital Board]. Anybody with the honourable member's mentality can think anything. If he has reached the stage of saying that I am destroying Boards for selfish reasons, what have I got to gain by that? I wish I could shelve one-half of my work now.

Mr. LEWIS: Why does he not give up some of the Committees on which he is serving?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: What Committee have I tried to get on except the Committee falls within my portfolio or except the Executive Committee?

Mr. LEWIS: The hon. member has said: "Let the Executive Committee do this and do that" because he is on the Executive Committee. The only Board of which he is Chairman he has not abolished yet, but he is abolishing it now. His Excellency the Governor never said anything about the matter and it was not until long after the 1st February 1954, that we heard that Ministers were to give up membership of these Boards. Why could they not have said that at the time? I am dealing with the constitution of this Board and the Authority which is taking over; this Authority is taking over the Board which the honourable member has just left. The Housing Board employed people and did everything else and it is only because the honourable member was Chairman of this Board and it could be used for political purposes, that it remained. The honourable member wanted the Housing Board to continue because he was a member of it; it remained a political Board for his reasons and he did not even get off the Board after Ministerial Status came into being. They had to be told from England that they had to get off the Boards; do not let us talk about Party or anything of the sort. 11.55 p.m.

You are on the Debates Committee where they employ the servants of the House; why don't you give that up and do some of your Ministerial work? If there is anybody to be appointed to go away, you attend the meetings; go and look up the attendance on Committees and you will see that. They have even gone a step further now and have said let us even keep the length of time on a Board to ourselves. You cannot be appointed for any length of time because they have to hold some whip hand over you. You really are carrying this thing too far.

I am not going to tell you whom you should appoint. I am going to move an amendment to the Clause. I feel as regards the appointment of the Chairman, it can be inferred that the Governor is going to appoint him too. The only way you can have a Chairman other than that is to elect him. I certainly feel that on Boards of this sort, the members should hold office for a period which should be the period of the Legislative session. It may not always coincide. I feel that a period of five years is something which they should accept. I am therefore, going to move that the last part of Clause 4 should read as follows:—

"And such persons shall hold office for a period of five years."

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I rise to second that. Mr. Chairman. Honourable members can remember that in my speech I said that I was somewhat confused over the fact that they have Ministerial Status and still are saying in this Bill "The Governor-in-Executive Committee." I appreciate the point made by the last hon. member. This Bill amends the powers of the Housing Board so to speak, and I am

wondering whether just as you have in some Bills, the island could be divided into three districts, that is: the City and the Northern and the Southern districts. It should be stated in this Bill that at least three of the representatives to be appointed to this Authority should come one each from these districts.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: That is not a matter of principle. Obviously, the Governor-in-Executive Committee would appoint the Board for three or five years. You must assume that a Body like the Governor-in-Executive Committee will act reasonably, but that is not a matter of principle. We are getting away from naming the specific persons, although we have done it already. As a matter of commonsense, inasmuch as you are dealing with the country districts, you must expect that at least one of the seven people to be appointed to that Board would come from a country district; maybe more than one. The suggestion of three members is reasonable, but it is unscientific. You must assume that if it is something say, dealing with the Church, that the Governor-in-Executive Committee will appoint a clergyman.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that. The motion was put and agreed to.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I do not suggest any change in the Order Paper. I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until next Tuesday, 14th June, 1955 at three o'clock p.m.

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

B.W.I.A. SUBSIDY

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the fact that on our Order Paper, we have no Item so far as I gather, for discussion on the Agreement with the B.W.I.A. Limited relative to the granting of a subsidy. I understand that the Agreement has been circulated amongst honourable members and that it would have to be adopted before any of the money voted in the Estimates for a subsidy to that company can be paid out. [A VOICE: We can only debate it when we have heard from that company. We have not heard from them yet.] Sir, what I want to stress is that the subject of that debate can be kept as an Item here. The Agreement has been circulated; it has not even been printed.

I would also like to call attention to the fact that Item No. 5 on the Order Paper is not laid out properly; it should not be left as it is; it should be "To resume Committee of Supply." It will only cause confusion when you go to deal with it if you allow it to stand as it is.

12.05 a.m.

REPORTING OF DEBATES

There is another matter that I should like to mention, and it is the reporting of the debates of this House. The Hansard of this House is becoming something that in order to retain your sanity, you have to desist from reading it. It is shocking. I am sure that there are other hon. members of the House who will agree with me. You sir, are virtually the Head

of this Department; you make no speeches, your interruptions are salutary and therefore should be taken down. When you give a ruling it can be written so that it needs no shorthand taking, therefore it is difficult for you to have the same interest as another member in what is printed; but I am asking you to do something about it. There is no ordinary remark that is reported in here with the accuracy of anything that is said.

The person whom you have appointed to deal with the debates is not editing for a newspaper, he is editing for accuracy; and so far as that is concerned he cannot hear one word of any debate. He should sit in the House and hear the debate, or else he would be in the same position as any person in Timbuctu. Therefore I am asking you, Mr. Speaker, to have something done about it. I have on more than one occasion come to this House and pointed out obvious mistakes. There is never a correction in any of these debates. I have pointed out to the Secretary of this House that a whole question has been left out of the debate; a question has been asked and addressed to another hon. member altogether. It is putting the archives for people of other generations to come and read. There is something radically wrong about it. I know that there are hon. members of this House who intend to bring this matter to your attention.

The last debate that has been printed has caused me to speak tonight. On that occasion I was trying to draw the attention of the House to the fact that some years ago the late Mr. Walter Bayley drew attention to the fact that you can test the lights or the wattage or the candlepower of the electric company to see if the bulbs had substitutes and none had substitutes. All those words have been used and what I have said has come down to this: that the electrical engineer was to go around and see that the cables were put in place. I am asking that you appoint a committee to go into this matter.

I recommend to you that the Secretary should sit in this House while debates are going on and do not edit the debates while the House is sitting. While this House is sitting he is diving down in a debate editing it for accuracy and hears nothing of the debate while it is going on. He can be of great assistance because he has a liking for journalism or something like that. No there is nothing absolutely wrong in that.

I am going to adopt the method of coming in here after every meeting and pointing out errors on the floor of this House and see if we can get it straight. The Minutes and the debates generally should correspond. Nothing is done correctly and I think that this is an injustice to hon. members.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I should like to inform members that I propose to ask leave to take Order No. 21 very early at the next meeting of the House. It deals with taking over the Electric Company and I have just given hon. members notice because I do not want them to think that anything is being done speedily. As hon. members know, there are time limits affecting both of these Bills — the Electric Company and the Gas Company; and I have asked the persons responsible at the *Advocate* to speed up with the printing and circulation of these Bills. The Bill relating to the Electric Company has not yet been circulated and it is a fairly long bill.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Premier said in giving his notice that the Bill relating to the Electric Company has not yet been circulated. I

think that he should give us more time, because it would give us an opportunity to come here and do justice to our work.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If I may be allowed to speak again, the Clerk will get in touch with the *Advocate* very early in the morning to try to get this Bill out to members.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this House be now adjourned until Tuesday next at 3 o'clock p.m.

The question that this House be now adjourned was put and resolved in the affirmative and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.
12.17 a.m.