

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT).

SESSION 1947—48

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 25th November, 1947.

Pursuant to adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 o'clock noon to-day.

Present:

His Honour Mr. G. B. EVELYN (*Speaker*), His Honour Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, (*Deputy Speaker*), Mr. J. T. C. RAMSAY, (*Chairman of Committees*), Messrs. L. E. SMITH, M. E. COX, D. A. FOSTER, R. G. MAPP, F. L. WALCOTT, C. E. TALMA, G. H. ADAMS, B.A., H. D. BLACKMAN, J. A. HAYNES, B.A., H. A. DOWDING, V. C. GALE, and Dr. H. G. CUMMINS.

Prayers are read.

Messrs. S. A. WALCOTT, and SYMMONDS enter the House and take their seats.

MINUTES.

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 11th November, 1947, having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

DOCUMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Colonial Treasurer's Financial Report for the month of October, 1947.

Mr. WILKINSON enters the House and takes his seat.

PAPERS LAID

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker.—I have the honour to lay on the table of the House the following Papers:—

Report on the Excise Branch of the Customs Department for the year 1946.

Memorandum on employment of labour from outside the United Kingdom.

Statement showing gross Customs and Excise receipts to the 31st July, 1947.

Mr. MOTTLEY enters the House and takes his seat.

NOTICES

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Mr. BLACKMAN: Resolution for £27 11. 11. as a refund to Messrs. Robert Thom, Ltd., of the

Customs Import duty and package tax paid on one case containing an Opperman 4-wheel drive assembly which was subsequently shipped to Trinidad.

Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution to place the sum of £210 4. 2. at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee (to be subsequently refunded as a free grant under the provisions of the Colonial Development and Welfare Act on the terms and conditions stated in the Message from the House of Assembly to His Excellency the Governor, dated the 14th December, 1943) for the purpose of paying an additional grant to Barbados Welfare Limited.

Mr. TALMA: Resolution to grant the sum of £332 to the Peasants' Loan Bank to pay a cost of living allowance to the staff of the Bank with effect from the 1st April, 1946, to the 31st March, 1948.

Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution to place the sum of £431 at the disposal of the Hospital Board to enable the Board to engage the services of a whole-time Resident Surgical Specialist at the rate of £1,000 a year, to pay him a cost of living allowance at the current rates, and to provide him with a house allowance at the rate of £150 a year.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of £2,230 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the service of the Colony as set out in the Schedule hereto.

Mr. TALMA: Bill to provide for the payment of a gratuity and reduced pension from the Public Treasury to Lisle Aubrey Chase, formerly Superintendent of the Government Industrial Schools in this Island.

MR. ADAMS: Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to consider the money Resolutions of which notice has just been given.

Other Notices are as follows:—

Mr. MOTTLEY: Of the following Address:

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency the Governor

1. The House of Assembly are of the opinion that, in view of the difficulty being experienced by Members of the Civil Establishment and other government employees in this Island in the matter of acquiring homes for themselves and their families, the government should establish a Fund from which to make

loans to such members of the Civil Establishment and other government employees as may need such assistance to enable them to acquire homes as is at present being done by the government of the neighbouring colony of Trinidad and Tobago.

2. The House respectfully request Your Excellency to send down the necessary legislation to give effect to this proposal.

Mr. GARNER enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. SYMMONDS: Of the following Address:

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency the Governor

1. The House of Assembly are of the opinion that the setting up of Canneries locally for the processing and preservation of Tomatoes, Ochras, Etc. is desirable.

2. The House respectfully request Your Excellency to consider the advisability of setting up a Committee to investigate the possibilities of erecting and operating such Canneries with or without Government assistance.

3. The House respectfully request Your Excellency to take the necessary steps to implement this proposal.

Mr. MAPP: A Bill to amend the Corrupt Practices Prevention Act, 1885—2.

Mr. SYMMONDS: Of the following Addresses:

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency the Governor

1. The House of Assembly are of the opinion that greater efforts should be made and increased financial Assistance given by Government in order to ensure a substantial expansion of the Tourist Trade in this Colony, thereby providing this Island with a supply of Dollars and creating employment for taxi-drivers, hotel-workers, market-gardeners, and those persons engaged in the making of various handicrafts and the home-industries sponsored by Barbados Welfare Limited.

2. The House respectfully request Your Excellency to take the necessary steps to implement this proposal.

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency the Governor

1. The House of Assembly are of the opinion that in order to assist in promoting the Industrial Development of the Colony and providing employment, the erection of cement and/or glass factories is desirable.

2. The House respectfully request Your Excellency to consider the advisability of setting up a Committee to investigate the possibilities of erecting such factories with or without the help of the Government.

3. The House respectfully request Your Excellency to take the necessary steps to implement this proposal.

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency the Governor

1. The House of Assembly are of the opinion that with the development of deep Oil Wells, the

economic resources of this colony will be increased and opportunities for work thereby created.

2. The House are also of the opinion that the capacity of the Island's natural gas supply in relation to

(a) Domestic consumption

(b) Providing power for productive industrial undertakings as suggested by Sir Frank Stockdale should be ascertained as soon as possible.

3. The House respectfully request Your Excellency to take the necessary steps to implement these proposals.

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency the Governor

1. The House of Assembly are of the opinion that immediate steps should be taken to extend the "Pig-rearing Industry" in this Colony.

2. The House are further convinced that a plentiful supply of breadfruit would be of great assistance in the development of this Industry and, with this end in view, respectfully request that steps be taken to make breadfruit trees available to every householder in this Island who may desire them.

3. The House respectfully request Your Excellency to take the necessary steps to implement this proposal.

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency the Governor

1. The House of Assembly are of the opinion that immediate steps should be taken to set up a branch of the Public Library in the parish of Saint George.

2. The House respectfully request Your Excellency to send down the necessary legislation for implementing this proposal.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: A Bill to fix a minimum price for Peasant Canes for the year 1948.

QUESTIONS

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Senior Member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of this House:—

Is it a fact that a kerb-wall extending from the North Eastern part of Bank Hall main Road along Bank Hall cross Road, parish of St. Michael, was recently constructed by the Department of Highways and Transport?

(2) If the answer to query 1 (above) is "yes," will Government inform this House of the following:—

(a) Whether wall in question was done under supervision of an Overseer of the Department; and if so, by whom?

(b) Total cost of this kerb-wall?

(c) How long did it take to construct same?

(d) Present condition of the said wall?

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Senior Member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of this House?

Is it a fact that lorry drivers and lorry labourers, employed by the Department of Highways and Transport are not paid for time expended by them in the service of this Department after regular working hours?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. TALMA, seconded by Mr. ADAMS, a Bill to provide for the payment of a gratuity and reduced pension from the Public Treasury to

Lisle Aubrey Chase, formerly Superintendent of the Government Industrial Schools in this Island, is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. MAPP, seconded by Mr. Cox, a Bill to amend the Corrupt Practices Act 1885-2 is read a first time.

Mr. WARD enters the House and takes his seat.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph.—To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the colony.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee of Supply, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

EX GRATIA GRANT TO EDITH BARROW

Mr. TALMA: The first Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is for the sum of £58. 10. 5½. as an *ex gratia* grant to Edith Barrow, formerly employed at the Codrington Experimental Station of the Department of Science and Agriculture in consideration of her 21 years' service in that Department. Edith Barrow was employed from 1925 as a labourer at the Codrington Experimental Station. She is at present suffering from cardiac failure and is unable to work any longer. The object of this Resolution is to provide the means whereby some sort of sustenance will be given to this unfortunate woman who has served for 21 years and is now physically unfit. We all know the hardships which labourers endure during the period in which they are able to work. Edith Barrow is not eligible for a pension but the government proposes to give her this gratuity which is computed on the basis of one month's pay for each completed year of service. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I suppose it is necessary to compliment those responsible for sending down this Resolution but what I am worried about is the basis on which matters of this sort are worked. It is my experience—having been as a Poor Law Guardian of the parish of St. Michael and I am sure it is the experience of the senior member for St. Thomas too—that several of these labourers who have worked for the Government for 15, 16 and in some cases 20 years have had to fall back on the parish of St. Michael and other parishes for some sustenance, and I am hoping that this policy will be pursued by the Government when labourers have put in not only 21 years' service but a reasonable period of time and are no longer able to work. I have had to call the Government's attention to instances in which people who worked for it for 18 years are given nothing after they have been no longer able to work and I am hoping that some interest will be taken in this type of worker when they reach the stage at which they are no longer able to work.

Mr. GARNER: Mr. Chairman,—I do not share the views of the honourable member who has just spoken. I am not going to compliment the Government because if the Government can see fit to make those employees in the higher brackets eligible for pensions, it should also see to it that those in the lower brackets are also eligible for pensions and not have to depend on the good graces of those in power to give them gratuities when they

are no longer able to work. There must be some set policy. You give the ones in the higher brackets pensions, give the ones in the lower brackets pensions also and let them know that they will be eligible for pensions. An employee who receives £600 a year knows that he is going to get a pension when he is no longer able to work but a poor labourer does not know what is going to happen to him when he is no longer able to work. The fellow at the top is assured of his pension but the fellow at the bottom has to go hat in hand begging when he retires. That system is ridiculous; it is a system by which you make fish of the one and fowl of the other.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: It is ungracious for any honourable member to claim that this Government is doing something for the rich and not for the poor. The remarks of the honourable member who has just sat down would lead anyone to believe that this is an act of the Government and not the law of the land. This is a case in which this woman, so far as the law relating to pensions is concerned, could be ignored but the Government has not done so; it has taken her years of service into consideration and is giving her a gratuity as a result of those years of service. How then can anyone blame the Government? If the honourable member wants to do anything, let him ask that an amendment to the Pension Act be sent down to meet cases of this nature but he cannot take this instance as a spring-board for accusing the Government of not doing something that is right.

Mr. GARNER: On a point of order. I never accused the Government of anything.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The honourable member said that those who work for £600 a year are assured of something but the poor labourers are not assured of anything. That is not so. If that were so, this Resolution would not be before us to-day. Mr. Chairman, we who have given this matter some thought cannot appreciate the remarks of the junior member for St. Philip because it is ungracious in the extreme for any honourable member, merely to make a statement for effect, to say that this Government is doing something wrong in sending down a Resolution of this sort. On many an occasion prior to this, people like this woman have passed out of the Service without having received anything but the present Government which includes persons with socialist points of view realizes that people are human beings and should be treated as such.

Mr. TALMA: I do not intend to delay this matter any further but matters of this sort come before this House at almost every meeting and I should have thought that the junior member for St. Philip would be fully acquainted with them. This is an *ex gratia* grant and that means that this woman is not entitled to a pension but to a gratuity in respect of her service to the Government. The honourable member has been a member of this House long enough to know that this is computed on the basis of one month's pay for each completed year of service. That has been the principle which has been observed in the past. It is the principle which was adopted by the Conservative Government and it is the principle which has been adopted by the Labour Government up to now.

Mr. WARD: This is nothing new as far as I know. I have been in this House a good many years and every now and then Resolutions of this kind come down to give gratuities to individuals who have put in a certain number of years' regular service. It would be impracticable to bring all casual labourers under the Pension Act because some

people may be employed for only a few weeks in the course of a year. What I feel about this matter is that it would be more judicious on the part of the Government to allow this woman a certain amount per week, so that she would not be able to draw this money and some of her friends squander it but would be in a position to carry on as long as she lives.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Before you put the question, Sir, I should like to repeat what I said in my earlier remarks, that is, that I hope that this will be a set policy on the part of the Government. I have not said that former Governments have not done a similar thing and I hope that honourable members have not misunderstood me. But I have known instances in which people have put in 15, 16, 17 and even 21 years' service and I have been told on investigation that they do not come within the scope of persons who should be given *ex gratia* grants. These latter persons were not up to the retiring age but in the opinion of medical men they could no longer work owing to the state of their health. They were told that in the circumstances they could not be given anything and I am expressing the hope that that state of affairs will no longer exist. I feel that when people who have given 15 or 16 years' service in a Government Department are no longer able to carry on, their years of service should be taken into consideration and they should be given something. I can appreciate the remark that all casual labourers cannot be brought under the Pension Act but if the authorities are humane they can take into consideration the service of people who can no longer work, although they have not reached the retiring age.

Mr. CRAWFORD enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. COX: Mr. Chairman,—It is difficult to understand some honourable members at times, more especially the junior member for St. Philip. So far as this grant is concerned, the honourable member said that the Government should be complimented.

Mr. GARNER: I did not say that the Government should be complimented. I said that I would not compliment them on the giving of this grant or grants of a similar nature.

Mr. COX: When I first came to this House these people received grants which were computed on the basis of a year's pay but owing to the constant agitation of the junior member for the City and other members like myself the Government adopted the principle of computing these grants on the basis of one month's pay for each completed year of service. The trouble is this. Long years before Labourites came into this House, these people never got any gratuities at all. I remember as far back as 1927 reading a case in which a policeman died in harness, so to speak, and when a Resolution came before this House to grant that poor policeman's widow his salary in order to help her bury him, this House, constituted at the time of Conservatives, bitterly opposed it and threw it out. But to-day the position is changed. To-day, whether an employee is rich or poor, high or low, so long as he has worked for the Government and can no longer work, he is given consideration. I am sure that the Government, as is at present constituted, does and will continue to do its best to relieve the suffering of people who have given it years of service.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chairman sincerely hopes that the Government will see its way to change this method of giving grants to people who have served it. I feel that 61 years is much too long a period for which an agricultural labour should carry

on; he should be allowed to retire at a much earlier age.

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

MAINTENANCE, EXPANSION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE FISHING INDUSTRY

Mr. TALMA: The next Resolution, Sir, is for the sum of £24,460 to meet the capital cost of the maintenance, expansion and development of fisheries production, marketing and distribution and to provide for the recurrent expenditure to the 31st March, 1948. Well, Sir, for many years now the Government of this country has been attempting to improve the fishing industry, not only by way of improving the boats actually engaged in the industry but the Government has a scheme, which is well known to members here present, for the construction of bigger and better fishing boats, the erection of beach shelters and the provision of beach rights to enable fishermen and the purchasers of their fish to have access to and from the sea. This scheme has been prepared by the Fisheries Advisory Committee under the directorship of the Director of Agriculture who has done a lot of hard work for many years now towards the development of the industry. To implement the scheme it is necessary that £24,460 should be voted from the Treasury and anyone who claims to be a Labour member or to be liberal and broadminded will appreciate the fact that £24,000 spent along the line of developing the fishing industry by way of providing fish markets at Oistins and Speightstown, beach shelters at several centres—Paynes Bay, Holetown, Reid's Bay, Half Moon Fort, Martins Bay, Conset's Bay, Skeete's Bay, Foul Bay and Silver Sands—will be money well spent. There will be only two other fish markets but there will be about 10 fish sheds. The buildings for these sheds have been bought by Government from Seawell and Charles Fort and will be converted not only into fish sheds but also bathing sheds which will offer facilities to the public who at present find it difficult to get access to the sea to bathe. The Government will purchase land whereby beach rights will be provided. The Government is actually moving along those lines, — lines which any Labour member or liberal-minded individual would agree to—and, therefore, this Resolution should be passed without any great controversial argument. I should be eager and willing to give any information which any honourable member may require but the memorandum by Dr. Saint which accompanies this Resolution more or less explains everything and should normally satisfy every member of this Chamber. I do not care to repeat myself more than is necessary but this is a means whereby the fishing industry will be assisted. We all know that the fishermen are assisted by loans and if they are assisted by loans they should be assisted in marketing their fish. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman,—I have been trying the whole morning—inasmuch as this is a very important matter—to see if I could get some information from the senior member for Christ Church, apart from the information in the tiny addendum to this Resolution but although we have heard a lot of flowery remarks we have not been able to get any concrete information. This, to my mind, is a matter that should be more clearly illustrated to the members of the House of Assembly. When this matter is passed like this and we do not know the details as to how this money is to be spent, we shall not only feel ashamed if we are

asked about it by our constituents and are not able to give them the information which they may seek but we shall feel that we are to blame ourselves for not possessing the necessary information in a matter of this importance. I have heard you, Sir, complain years ago that the Government will not give sufficient information in the addenda to Resolutions that are sent to this House and that we are treated like children in this respect. Now, there is a memorandum which has been issued in connection with this Resolution and in that memorandum there is a number of dubious statements, for example, "purchase of land at six points", "erection of shelters"

Mr. TALMA: I have already explained where those points will be.

Mr. HAYNES: I am very sorry, Sir; but if the honourable member did explain, he left out a very important one—Tent Bay, Bathsheba—and I should certainly like to know if he did so inadvertently or if it has been done with the knowledge of the Government. I think, Sir, that we ought to be given more information on that point. Now, in paragraph 8 of the memorandum it is stated among other things "estimated cost of experimental boat £2,500" but we are not told the purpose for which this experimental boat will be obtained. I thought that we would have been told whether this experimental boat will be used in catching fish in the deeper waters where, I am told, most of the fish are to be seen daily, but nothing like that has been told us and I am hoping that the senior member for Christ Church will give us a little more information on these various items which are set out in paragraph 8 of the memorandum. Personally, I am very much in agreement with this Resolution but I do not see one cent provided for refrigerating plants and I would like to know why that is not done. I am not an expert in fishing but I can imagine that if a few of these plants were in operation we should be able to save a lot of the midnight catches which are thrown away, and in that way provide food for the public.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman,—I listened carefully to the senior member for Christ Church when he referred to the various places at which beach shelters will be erected and I must confess that I heard him refer to one in the parish which I represent, namely, Half Moon Fort, but I heard him make no mention at all of the beaches at Stroud's Bay, Cove Bay, and Pie Corner, which are as important as any other of the places to which he made specific reference. If these places have escaped his attention up to the present time I counsel him to include them at the earliest opportunity, either by a supplementary Resolution or otherwise, in the list.

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman,—I have listened with great interest to the remarks of the previous speakers and it is obvious from the remarks of those who have spoken that everybody is in sympathy with the idea of developing the fishing industry. But, as the senior member for St. Andrew has pointed out, we have not had an opportunity to go into this question thoroughly. The memorandum which is issued in connection with this Resolution really did not accompany it. As far as I am concerned, I received my copy of it only yesterday and probably other honourable members are in the same position; therefore, it is unreasonable to expect that we could at this meeting thoroughly understand the proposition which is put forward in this Resolution. As you know, Sir, when we have important matters like this—and this is a most important matter—to deal with, we usually refer them to a Select Committee and I am suggesting to the

introducer of this Resolution that that method be adopted. In this case, it is not a question of opposition but a question of doing the right thing by the right people. We are all in favour, as far as I know, of carrying out some scheme for the development of the fishing industry but we all know that there is a difference of opinion between the experts—Dr. Brown, the expert who drew up the Fisheries Report in the ten-year plan, and also Dr. Saint—and, therefore, I think that it is only reasonable that a very important matter like this should be referred to a Select Committee, so that we may understand it better. I could not hear very well on this side of the table but I understood the honourable member who introduces this Resolution to say that this scheme is mentioned in the ten-year plan. That is quite correct. It is included in the ten-year plan but there are some amendments to that. The amount of money which is proposed to be spent has not been reduced but I want to impress upon the honourable member that although this scheme is included in the ten-year plan, the plan has not been accepted or adopted by this House and unfortunately our financial position has changed very considerably for the worse. We are all well aware of that, and, therefore, we have to be cautious before we proceed further. Personally I think that this is one of the schemes in the ten-year plan that should be proceeded with but I am not yet convinced that the suggestions which are put forward in the memorandum co-ordinate with what is required. I think that the correct way of dealing with this matter is to move that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed, with the object of having it referred to a Select Committee when the House resumes. I beg to move that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed for the reasons I have stated.

Mr. WARD: I beg to second that motion. I myself feel that although we have had the ten-year plan before us for quite a while, this memorandum has only been in our hands for a day and then you take into consideration the different changes in the scheme I think we should have a little more time to consider the matter. I would not like to sit here and in trying to do something good for the fishermen, do something which will militate against them. If you are going to have boats built at a cost of £450 each, unless the Government gives these fishermen the money to build these boats, you will be throwing the fishermen out and a different type of person will be engaged in the fishing industry. We all know that the present fishermen are men of small means and if you put forward recommendations which they would not be able to carry out owing to their financial position, it will mean that the fishermen will have to go out and become the servants of other persons who are financially able to build boats of that particular type. The memorandum states that there is an experimental boat to be built at an estimated cost of £2,500. Well, Sir, we should know what that means. We should know whether that boat will have refrigeration and what type of boat it will be. We do not want to spend £2,500 for this purpose without being able to tell the fishermen what we are doing. It would make us appear as if we are not interested. If this Resolution was allowed to go to a Select Committee where more particulars would be given I feel that when it comes back the House, as a whole, would give its assent to it. The main thing we want is more information and if we get that information I feel confident that so long as the proposal is for the benefit of the people of this country, every member of this House will give it

his support because this is an industry which should be protected and given financial assistance.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Before you put the question, Sir, I should like to make a few observations on this matter. On the last occasion when I spoke about fishing in this House, some honourable members dubbed it a fishy debate. To-day this is, I consider, a fishy Resolution, although it is a Resolution which is worth the very serious consideration and support of every thinking member of this House. The several changes which are mentioned in the memorandum will take some studying and I do not think that the senior member for Christ Church who is in charge of this Resolution would seriously object or could seriously object to a short postponement just for us to get a little more information. In the first place, this Resolution is for 24,000 odd pounds to render the necessary assistance to fishermen and, as such, the inhabitants of this country must benefit because the fishing industry will eventually be enhanced. Dealing with the memorandum I would like to inform the honourable member—

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to inform the honourable member for the City that he should not deal with the memorandum except by way of showing why we should have the postponement.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am doing that. In the memorandum there are, for instance, recommendations by the Fisheries Advisory Committee and I am at a loss to understand how up to now no one with any practical experience has been yet appointed to this Fisheries Advisory Committee. Now, there is a feeling, and rightly so too, Sir,—

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member talks about experience. In what? Housebuilding?

Mr. MOTTLEY: In fishing, Sir. I thought you would have appreciated that I meant experience in fishing. There is a feeling that persons who overnight, merely from the financial end of the matter, came into fishing are selected and pitchforked on this Committee and not one of these people who for generations have braved the seas have been asked to sit on the Committee. Now, Sir, some honourable members, I know, can accept with grace congratulations to the Government for doing anything but they hate to hear you criticize the Government for not doing the right thing. As far as this Fisheries Committee is concerned I want to be given the opportunity—and I think that the honourable members who ask for the postponement of this Resolution are of the same feeling—of finding out the reason why persons with practical experience—fishermen or small fishing-boat owners—and not merely a man who has 25 or 30 fishing boats as an investment in the business are not appointed on this Committee. I feel that it is my duty to agree to the postponement on that score and have my point of view as well as the point of view of the fishermen and the small fishing boat owners put before a Select Committee. It is only yesterday, so to speak, that you could refer to people in this island other than small fishing-boat owners for advice in matters relating to fishing and I am at a loss to understand how only a large fishing-boat owner can be pitchforked to this Committee. I am not saying that the Government is responsible but I know that I am not responsible for it. Those of us who move about the fishermen and the fishing folk can hear expressions of opinion of that sort. Now, this Resolution is for 24,000 odd pounds to help the fishing industry and it has been suggested that in this scheme or whatever scheme is put forward, the fishing gear should be imported duty free but that no one man because

of his financial position—and I am strong on this—should be able to go to the lumber yards and get all the gear for his boats while the small man gets none, although he is told that the Government is protecting him. This is the sort of argument you can hear from fishermen and small fishing-boat owners who gather in the tens and twenties about the streets: "We cannot get this or that; it is not that the stores do not have it but they are keeping it for persons who have already paid for it." There is a lot of truth in that argument; it is absolutely true. I would like to say this in passing. Every member of this House has the greatest confidence and respect for the Chairman of this Fisheries Advisory Committee—The Director of Agriculture. His energy and integrity and eagerness to assist in whatever he attempts to do in this colony for the benefit of its inhabitants are too well known but because, Mr. Chairman, you may have that type of person as Chairman of, or associated with, this Committee that should not prevent any of us from being made aware of conditions and from expressing our views in a matter of this sort. Everyone appreciates that the Chairman of this Advisory Committee is one who would do everything possible to further this scheme and see it carried through in a proper businesslike manner. As regards the sites, that is not worrying me. The senior member for Christ Church has, I agree, omitted to mention several important sites and I think that that is another reason why this Resolution should be postponed to enable us to acquaint ourselves with more of the facts. I repeat that the postponement could not be honestly and seriously objected to by any member of the Government whether he be in charge of this Resolution or not. The postponement for a week can do no harm and I strongly suggest that it be done unless people are going to butt their heads against walls. As far as I am concerned it does appear to me that the postponement is in the interest of all concerned.

Mr. ADAMS: Perhaps when I am finished speaking, other honourable members will not bother to speak. If other honourable members say, as the junior member for St. James has said, "We received our copies of the memorandum only yesterday and have not had time to go through it, therefore, postpone the matter for a week," what member of the Government would object to a plea like that? Many of us come in here without having done as much research in connection with matters that are brought before the House as we should do and if I were not a member of the Government I would say exactly what the junior member for St. James has said, that is, "I have not done what I would like to do. I have not gone back over Dr. Brown's report which is now four years old, or the report of the West Indian Conference which was held in this Island in March, 1944—more than three and a half years ago—and re-read the appendix to the ten-year plan to which Dr. Saint refers in his memorandum. That is what I should like to do." It is a quite reasonable plea to ask that inasmuch as we received Dr. Saint's memorandum only yesterday, let us have a postponement of this Resolution to refresh our memories as regards the recommendations which have been made. But do not let us waste time by sending this Resolution to a Select Committee. All honourable members should do is to read Dr. Brown's report, the report of the West Indian Conference that was held in March, 1944, and the appendix to the ten-year plan and if they need any further information, it is the easiest thing in the world to get, between now and next Tuesday,

any extra factual information from the Fisheries Advisory Committee. If honourable members read the memorandum, they will see that there is nothing in it that they would not be aware of if they had time to study it as it should be studied and I do sincerely ask honourable members not to waste time by sending the Resolution to a Select Committee. As regards the sites, honourable members must know that nothing has been done in respect of them, without consulting the fishermen on every beach around the island.

Mr. CRAWFORD: This Resolution is for the maintenance, expansion and development of fisheries production at a cost of £24,220. Well now, Sir, this is an appreciable sum of money; it is over \$100,000 and apart from the large sum of money involved, the industry with which the Resolution deals is in my opinion one of the most important in the colony. It is important from the industrial point of view because if we can expand our fisheries production we may be able eventually not only to satisfy our local needs but to export some fish. In addition to that, fish is of infinite importance with regard to the ordinary diet and nutrition of the population. Now, in an important matter like this, involving the expenditure of over \$100,000, honourable members of this House and the public outside are entitled, I submit, to the most comprehensive explanation at the hands of the honourable member who introduced this Resolution. I had expected, Sir, to hear the honourable member who introduced this Resolution explain in detail the manner in which it is proposed to spend this 24,000 odd pounds and to give the Committee some of the information which I am absolutely sure he has.

Mr. TALMA: On a point of explanation. If the honourable member had been in his seat at the time I gave the information he would have heard it.

The CHAIRMAN: It is much better for the introducer of the Resolution to wait until an honourable member is finished speaking and then reply; he will be more effective.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do not know if the honourable member's eyesight is defective but I never left my seat while he was speaking.

The CHAIRMAN: I would very much prefer that no remarks be passed which would appear to be personal.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable member in his interruption said that I was not in my seat.

The CHAIRMAN: Which I think is quite right.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I never left my chair while the honourable member was speaking and what he did say does not correspond with the memorandum we have before us. At page one of the memorandum, paragraph 6, sub-paragraph (b) states that the Resolution envisages the purchase of land at six points. The honourable senior member for Christ Church in his remarks spoke of ten.

Mr. TALMA: I spoke of beach shelters.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable senior member for Christ Church is quite correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD: He has spoken of beach shelters and we have a paragraph of this memorandum which deals with beach shelters. Am I to understand that the Chair is attempting to interpret for me what I am reading in this memorandum?

The CHAIRMAN: It is unfortunate that the Chair cannot.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Paragraph 6 sub-paragraph (b) of the memorandum states:—"It is further considered that £1,750 of the original

£4,300 estimated to be required for the erection of 'Beach Shelters' be allocated towards the cost of the Station. This sum will assist to finance the erection of curing sheds, oil extracting room, net drying racks, enclosing the area, etc. It is now considered that a capital sum of £2,550 will be sufficient to establish the Beach Shelters which will be less elaborate than originally envisaged. The estimate is as follows:—(1) Purchase of land at six points £700, (2) Erection of Shelters £1,750, (3) Cupboards and scales £100, total £2,550." Well now, if the senior member for Christ Church or the Chair is going to tell me—

The CHAIRMAN: I want to call to the attention of the honourable senior member for St. Philip that he must not make any reference to the Chair that even appears to be disrespectful. The Chair is only trying to perform its duty.

Mr. CRAWFORD: But the Chairman said that the senior member for Christ Church was quite right—

The CHAIRMAN: I am not a superman. I allow members a certain amount of latitude—too much latitude sometimes, I admit—while they are speaking. The motion before the Committee is that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed but the Chair feels that it is its duty to allow honourable members to give their reasons why they think that the Resolution should or should not be postponed.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I intend to give my reasons. I was saying that even where the senior member for Christ Church has attempted to explain what the Resolution really seeks to attain, he was absolutely wrong. As a matter of fact I go further and say that this question of beach sheds is in my opinion very important because I sat on the Committee which submitted the 10-year development plan and we originally decided at that Committee to erect eight beach sheds. Then when I received a copy of the memorandum I saw the Government had decided to erect only six. To-day I hear the senior member for Christ Church say that he wants to erect ten. So I asked myself, "Where are we? What is going to happen?" I came to this House to-day with the intention of discovering why these two sheds were omitted from the Government's plan because I remember very well that the ten-year Development Committee reduced to an almost irreducible minimum the number of points throughout the island at which these sheds should be erected and they decided on only eight. As far as I recollect the sheds were originally to be erected at Reid's Bay, St. James, Cove Bay, St. Lucy, Conset's Bay, St. John, Skeete's Bay, St. Philip, Foul Bay, St. Philip, Silver Sands, Christ Church, Tent Bay, Bathsheba, and Half Moon Fort, St. Lucy. When, therefore, I heard the Leader of the House say *sotto voce* that a supplementary Resolution might come down for Tent Bay I ask, "Where are the six points to be? Why have two been omitted? What is the reason for omitting two?" Now, the position is this. In the addendum to the Resolution it is stated that particulars of the entire scheme which cover the expenditure in this Resolution are given in the memorandum which forms Appendix 2 to the ten-year development plan. I received this Resolution early last week. Yesterday I read the appendix to which it refers and between the hours of last night and this morning I spent some time on the memorandum in reference and I assumed that any information I wanted would have been given me to-day by the honourable member in charge of the Resolution. As a matter of fact, last week when I received the Resolution I rang

the particular government official for the information and he told me that he had discussed the matter with the senior member for Christ Church who would be in a position to give all the information I wanted. In other words, if that had been done—and it should be done to the satisfaction of honourable members—there would be no question to-day of the postponement of the Resolution because the information would be available—I see the honourable member with a big file before him—and all that would be necessary is an intelligent and competent perusal of the file. As a matter of fact I think the exhibition to-day is a very serious blow to all their ambitions for ministerial power and what not. Now, to get back to the question. I do not know if it is any use my asking the senior member for Christ Church but I certainly want to get some information about these points at which beach sheds are to be erected. I want to know the reason for the emasculation of the scheme which was originally put forward by the 10-year development Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: The junior member for St. James has asked for the postponement of the Resolution in order that it might be sent to a Select Committee for that purpose.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I submit that all a Select Committee can do is to discuss the Resolution and the memorandum. What I want to do is to explain for the benefit of the honourable members who are responsible for the introduction of this Resolution that I do not agree with this emasculation on the part of the Government of the fundamental recommendations of the 10-year Development Committee. Apart from reducing the number of fishing sheds, the 10-year Development Committee sat for over a year and paid a lot of attention to these recommendations before they finally appeared in print. Now the appendix in the Committee's Report which deals with maintenance, expansion and development of fisheries production, states, under sub-head "B"—The Multiplication of Operating Units, this:—"Multiplication of operating units should when necessary be assisted by Government credit facilities particularly in financing boat building. During the past three years the Government has made loans to fishermen to assist in the repair and building of boats. It is considered, however, that these schemes do not go far enough and, if the multiplication of operating units of an improved type is to be encouraged still further, free grants of say £25 or not more than 20% of the actual cost of the boat should be provided." In other words, the Committee recommended, with a full sense of their responsibility, that the fishermen should be assisted with free grants for building boats of an improved type. Now, the Government has completely emasculated that from the appendix to the Committee's Report. Not one cent to assist the fishermen in providing improved types of boats is suggested in this memorandum! Not one cent! On what grounds? We know, Sir, the hazards which the fishermen in this country—those who go down to the sea in ships—take in making their very important contribution to the welfare of the country. We know that even during the War, in spite of the dangerous happenings in our waters, they went out day after day, night after night in order to provide the people of this country with a supply of fish. Now, the Government has no appreciation at all for the contribution made by these people, repudiates a suggestion made in a report on which the ink is hardly dry, and refuses to implement this recommendation. On what grounds, Sir, has this omission been made? Is it because it is proposed to

establish a Fishery Experimental Station for the island and to carry out practical demonstrations at this station? Because we are going to put down this station, are we no longer to bother with the free grants to fishermen? If we turn to Agriculture, Sir, another industry in this island, we realize that in our plans for expanding our agricultural production and assisting peasant proprietors we have also established experimental stations but the fact that we have established these experimental stations has not prevented us from giving free grants to peasant proprietors to assist them with irrigation units for their plots. This same 10-year development Committee, following on the lines suggested by the Moyne Commission, recommended a scheme for assisting peasant proprietors by way of establishing experimental stations at several sites throughout the island and also giving free grants up to £100 of the cost of an irrigation unit to a number of peasants. Well now, in a comparable industry, the fishing industry, the Committee went ahead and also recommended a free grant up to £25 each—that is all—to a member of fishermen for the purpose of making an improved type of fishing boat, not the ordinary type. So I want the senior member for Christ Church—rather I should not put it that way because we have been told here that in the Government's opinion we should not go on with that part of the scheme—but I want to say that I am not in agreement that we should refuse to give free grants to fishermen. It was recommended in the original scheme. It will mean a lot to these men, many of whom have followed this calling from childhood until now they are almost in their old age and are still poor men; they have not become rich out of fishing. The day they do not go to sea, they do not have a shilling and if the 10-year Development Committee recommended that they should be given assistance in this manner I see no reason why a Government, with the political pretensions to which the present one lays claim, should be so unmindful of the interests of this deserving section of the population. Now, what I have not got—and I was expecting to hear something about it from the senior member for Christ Church—is information as to the method which is going to be employed at this proposed Fishery Experimental Station for curing and preserving fish, oil extraction and diversifying the type of fishing gear. This station is going to cost us £6,850 and we are entitled, I think, to some detailed information as to the manner in which it is proposed to carry out the experiments at this station or, at least, a comprehensive summary of the methods which they propose to employ, that is to say, whether the fish is going to be cured in brine or oil—some information as to what they propose to do. They cannot just say they want £6,850 and do not tell us a single word about the methods that are going to be employed for curing fish. And, finally, Sir, we are asked to vote £300 for improving facilities at certain beaches throughout the island. In the appendix to the 10-year Development Committee's report, the Committee also suggested £300 for improving paths to the principal beaches where fish is landed. I remember that there was some difficulty with regard to the acquisition of land for three of these paths. I think they were Foul Bay, The Crane, and Conset's Bay. Since then I understood there was some difficulty with regard to the acquisition by the Government of land at the Crane and the Government itself states in this memorandum that it is impossible to acquire the land at Conset's Bay and that it proposes to rent it. Well, I want the senior member for Christ

Church to explain exactly what is meant by the Government finding it impossible to acquire land for this purpose. The memorandum states:—"One site at Conset's Bay which belongs to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel cannot be purchased but the authorities concerned are prepared to rent a suitable site on this beach for the sum of £6 per annum." Well, I do not know if the Government is justified in renting land for this purpose and I want my ignorance to be enlightened as to why the Government cannot acquire land for any purpose. Under the Compulsory Powers Land Act I have always understood that the Government, even Vestries, Highways and Sanitary Boards, are entitled to acquire land for their uses.

At this stage, 2 p.m., Mr. SPEAKER resumes the Chair and adjourns the House until 2.45 p.m. in accordance with Rule 40 (a).

REPLIES LAID

On re-assembling,

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to lay on the Table of the House the replies to questions Nos. 13, 21 and 22, all standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to lay the replies to questions No. 8 standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Joseph.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (A)

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to move the suspension of Rule 61 (a) in order to resume Government Business.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Rule 61 (a) be now suspended.

Mr. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to.

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

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

MAINTENANCE, EXPANSION AND DEVELOPMENT OF FISHERIES PRODUCTION.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House was in Committee of Supply before the adjournment we were considering a Resolution to place the sum of £24,460 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to meet the capital cost of the maintenance, expansion and development of fisheries production marketing and distribution and to provide for the recurrent expenditure to the 31st March, 1948.

The honourable senior member for St. Philip was speaking.

Mr. CRAWFORD: When the House adjourned for lunch we were discussing the availability of land to be purchased by the Government—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I want to remind the honourable member that the motion before the Committee is for the postponement of the Resolution and the honourable member will not be allowed to carry on much longer.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a motion like this honourable member will speak—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: According to the Rules of the House the motion for the postponement will be put. The Chair has given quite a lot of latitude already and the honourable member will not be allowed to carry on much longer.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The practice is for honourable members to bring forward any points on which they want information otherwise the postponement will be useless; and when we come back the honourable member will not have the information required.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Definitely.

Mr. CRAWFORD: In paragraph 6 sub-paragraph (c) of this memorandum this is what is stated: "It is proposed to purchase land at some twenty-four beaches and the cost is now estimated at £5,350. One site at Conset's Bay which belongs to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel cannot be purchased but the authorities concerned are prepared to rent a suitable site on this beach for the sum of £6 per annum." I am amazed at the expression that this site cannot be purchased therefore I want the honourable senior member for Christ Church to explain why the Government has made use of this expression. After all, if the owners or lessee or whoever may be responsible for receiving this £6 per annum—there is no talk about any lease and we do not know where we will be within two, three or five years. Therefore some information on this particular point will be very acceptable. Finally, we have been fixing the paths to these beaches. In the original ten-year proposal we were supposed to allocate £300 for improving the paths at three beaches of the island which fishermen use fairly extensively. Foul Bay is almost inaccessible; the fishermen get there with difficulty and it was proposed to improve the paths at the Crane and Conset's Bay; I understand that there was some difficulty in getting the land at the Crane and Conset's Bay; as far as I know the difficulty has not been overcome and yet the original £300 asked for in respect of these beaches still remains in the old proposals. I take it that the difficulty has been removed and it is possible to get the necessary land at these three sites. I should like that statement verified by the honourable senior member for Christ Church so that I shall be in a position to explain the matter to people who are interested. As a matter of fact one or two of the Highway Authorities concerned are also interested and we have been trying to get the Vestry to take some steps in the matter. If it can be done in this way it will probably be done more expeditiously. (Mr. HAYNES: We hope so). I think that those are the main items on which I want some information and the other points which I intend to make will arise out of the replies which I get.

Mr. TALMA: Before you put the question, Mr. Chairman, I should like in fairness to the honourable member who has just sat down and other honourable members who try to elicit information, to try to assist or at least try to satisfy them with any information which I have at my disposal. As far as the honourable member who has just sat down is concerned, it is time that he realise that I always try to disclose as much information as there is at my disposal. If he wants everything verbatim I am in a position to give him. (Mr. CRAWFORD: I do not want it verbatim). Actually nine beach shelters have been erected: there is one which I have been endeavouring to secure, therefore I mention ten instead of nine. The nine beach shelters are at Paynes Bay, Holetown and Reid's Bay (St. James); Half Moon Forte (St. Lucy); Martin's Bay and Conset's Bay (St. John); Skeete's Bay and Foul Bay (St. Philip) and Silver Sands (Christ Church). As I have already said,

nine beach shelters have been erected and I am hoping to secure one for Tent's Bay (St. Joseph). When I said that there were ten beach shelters I said so knowingly and fully aware of what I was saying. As far as rights of way to the beaches are concerned these are in respect of Paynes Bay, Half Moon Forte, Cove Bay, Martin's Bay, Conset's Bay Foul Bay, Skeete's Bay and Silver Sands. As far as refrigeration is concerned, I know that the honourable senior member for the City has tried his best to bring that about. We have been given competent and expert advice that unless and until proper refrigeration can be supplied such a scheme cannot be properly implemented. It is not that the Government has not got any scheme in mind but we are not out to endanger the community as a whole. If people are allowed to take fish out of cold storage and hawk them about the streets that will only result in destruction to the community. That is the view which you, Mr. Chairman, have expressed in this House on a former occasion. With regard to the Fishery Experimental Station, that was not in the original scheme but the establishment of this Station has since been recommended and in this connection it is proposed to spend £6,850. I shall read out to honourable members how this money is envisaged to be spent. I did not happen to be a member of the Government at that time and it sounds very badly to hear that a former member of the Government is so ignorant of what happened when he was a member of the Government. This money is to be spent under the following Heads: Structural Improvements in Flying-Fish Boats £450; the Multiplication of Operating Units £2,500; Improvement in Fishing Methods for large Pelagic Fish and in the design, Construction and Operation of Fish-Pots £1,400; Shark Fishing £250; Improvements at Beaches:—Emergency hauling-up, gear £150; Beach Shelters £1,750; and Beach Rights £350. So far as the experimental Station is concerned, as I have already said that recommendation was implemented subsequently. That will be the means whereby bigger and better boats will come to light in the not too distant future. In connection with this Station it has been suggested that certain Government lands at the Reef be utilised. At present these lands are occupied by Messrs. Cable and Wireless Ltd. They are attempting to remain there for another year or so probably in order to train their pupils, but the Government is doing its utmost to have them give up these lands so that this Station will come into being more quickly than at present envisaged. I presume that honourable members have read the Ten Year Development Plan and it is well known to them. If they refer to section 24 on page 48 they will see this: 'It is proposed to purchase land at some twenty-five beaches and the cost is estimated at £5,700. One site at Conset's Bay which belongs to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel cannot be purchased but the authorities concerned are prepared to rent a suitable site on this beach for the sum of £6 per annum.' This Report of the Committee appointed by the then Governor to prepare this Ten Year Plan is dated 10th June, 1947, and I hope that if honourable members who have spoken on this Resolution have forgotten what was stated in the Report they will re-read it. The honourable senior member for St. Philip who was very adamant a few minutes ago was a member of this Committee and he is ignorant as to what took place. With regard to markets, the Speightstown Market is to have a capital expenditures of £2,060; Oistin's Market, £3,110, making a total of £5,170. All this has been the work of the Fishery Advisory Committee constituted as it is and well known to many hon-

ourable members. I admit that the honourable senior member for the City made a point when he stated that the Fishery Committee did not comprise any fishermen. I found it in this way; I had nothing to do with the composition of this Committee. For my part I am of the opinion that about three fishermen from different parts of the island should be there. (Hear hear). I shall do my best to see that this Committee is properly constituted. As long as I happen to be here I shall always try to assist the fishermen whom I have tried to help in the past and in whom I have as great an interest as anybody else. I think that I have already mentioned that the beach paths have been built up by people who happen to own money and who are engaged in building schemes. I think that the time has definitely come when the Government should take some definite steps to procure rights to the beaches whereby the average member of the public can have access to the sea—one of the only privileges enjoyed by Barbadians or visitors to the island. I can hardly recollect any point which I have not made particular mention of and although it has been suggested that a postponement of the Resolution is necessary, yet in truth and in fact anyone who is desirous of helping the fishermen should see that the Resolution is passed today. This is something which we have been sitting on for about three or four years. I am not eager or willing to press for anything; I shall never adopt a certain line of action. Although this memorandum was sent out yesterday and was not just passed around the Table yet I shall be willing to agree to the postponement of the Resolution.

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

The Resolution was postponed.

SUPPLEMENTARY VOTE *re* EMERGENCY EXPENSES.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—The next Resolution is to place the sum of £6,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement resolution No. 37 of the 26th March, 1947, to meet expenses in connection with the present emergency. Honourable members will have copies of the Statement showing the amounts expended in connection with the Emergency Expenditure. This is the usual Emergency vote; there is only one additional item with respect to which a note is provided. This item is in connection with the visit to Washington of the former Governor, Sir Grattan Bushe and the Labour Commissioner, Mr. Guy Perrin, to obtain a quota of labourers for Barbados. When these officials visited Washington in May, 1944, no funds were provided for the purpose. The other items are perfectly normal and I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

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

The Resolution was passed.

COST OF ENGAGING THE SERVICES OF A FIRE BRIGADE OFFICER

Dr. CUMMINS: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is to place the sum of £2,740 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to meet the cost of engaging on contract for a period of two years the services of a Fire Brigade Officer. The Government feels that it would be advisable to get an expert on fire-fighting apparatus and equipment

to come to Barbados to improve or at least to advise in the improvement of the apparatus and equipment which we now have at our disposal. Those of us who have read Superintendent Calver's Report will have seen his criticism as regards the equipment and personnel which we now have in Bridgetown. I feel sure that the members of this Committee will agree with me when I say that with a City of the size of Bridgetown thickly populated as it is and with the types of houses which we have—some of stone, the majority of timber, others of timber and stone—we do need to have the best protection, the best possible equipment to protect us from devastating fires. Within the last few years we have had one or two fires which, with the situation of the buildings—I have in mind the fire at Plantations Ltd. which was very threatening to the surrounding buildings and those in the vicinity of Suttle Street. I have been informed that, but for the heroic intervention of the Volunteer Brigade, we might have had very disastrous results having regard to the vicinity in which there is a Church. The fire proved to be a very big one and the firemen were exhausted. The Volunteer Brigade turned out and rendered very valuable assistance. It is up to us to see that our fire-fighting equipment is improved and with that in view the Government has sent down this Resolution. I know that it will be argued that we have plans for a new Fire Station in Probyn Street and it is not necessary for an expert of this kind to come to Barbados. But towards the end of his Report on the Fire Brigade Superintendent Calver says this: "These views are presented, not from any claims of being a fire-service specialist but from a member of associated service." If he thinks that the projected new building is unsuitable and if he lays no claim to be any specialist, I do not think that we have any specialist in the ranks of our Fire Brigade and we should get the opinion and advice of a specialist. I am not authorised to disclose the name of the person who is recommended to us to come down from England; but he is a man of considerable experience and one who has risen high in the ranks of fire-fighters in London. He has now retired and from his experience we will be able to get some advice as to the kind of Fire Station we should build, the kind of equipment we should have and the most modern methods of training our firemen. I want to draw to the attention of the Committee that this person has to come down for a limited period of two years and he will be asked to select one or two men whom we will be prepared to send abroad for further training in modern methods of extinguishing fires; so that his services immediately after he has gone will be reflected in the men who will be chosen on his advice after due observation and who will be sent abroad for this training. The figures set out in the addendum are to cover a period of two years and are as follows:—

- (a) salary at £800 per annum;
- (b) a consolidated allowance of £150 per annum;
- (c) free passages for himself and family (not exceeding five) to and from the United Kingdom;
- (d) travelling allowance at approved Government rates.

I think that a man of this type is highly desirable so that Bridgetown will no longer be allowed to remain in the position in which it now is—potential danger of big fires. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. GALE: I have listened very carefully to the honourable senior member for St. Thomas and I am afraid that he has not convinced me that we

should spend this large sum of money so as to bring out this expert to review the Fire Brigade services of this island. In the first place, it is all right for us to have an expert to come out here and tell us how our firemen should do their duties and what new equipment is necessary so that we should have an up-to-date Fire Station. But, Mr. Chairman, at the present time I think we are suffering from a great shortage of water, and you might have the most efficient fire-fighting apparatus that is known; however, if we have fires taking place in certain districts where there are no hydrants the Fire Brigade will be just as useless as they are to-day. I think that we are beginning from the wrong end; I think that the water supply of this island should first be made available in districts where it is not available at present. In certain residential districts in this island there is the absence of fire hydrants and even if we have the most ultra-modern Fire Brigade, they will be useless without the water with which to quench the fires. Secondly, sometime ago when this new Fire Station was about to be built, Superintendent Calver made a Report to the Government in 1945, I think, and he criticised adversely the plans which had been made for this Fire Station. As far as I know, the plans have been revised and I think I am correct in saying that the amount of money to build this new Fire Station was put in the Estimates for the current year and on the motion I think of the honourable junior member for the City who objected to certain expenditure of a capital nature being put in the Estimates, the item was removed. I think therefore that the Government must have had some new plans for this new Fire Station. In these times when we are faced with a very serious situation—we have had a very long drought in this colony, one of the worst in the last fifty years—I think it would be unwise for this Government to go in for this expenditure. This question of a fire hazard is a very serious one as the honourable senior member for St. Thomas has said, but I think that with our present appliances and our personnel the Fire Brigade have always endeavoured to do their work very satisfactorily indeed. We have had one or two big fires but, fortunately for us, most of our buildings are separated from each other; we have not got huge blocks of buildings as in big cities and, consequently, the fire hazard is very much less than it is in big cities. We have in the neighbouring colony of Trinidad a very highly efficient Fire Brigade which has just been brought up-to-date and I suggest that one of our present Superintendents of Police be sent to Trinidad or further abroad for a certain time so that he will be able to get the same information which this gentleman who has retired is able to give. I believe that that would be a very much cheaper way of getting the same thing done.

Mr. DOWDING: I am not at all in agreement with this Resolution. What the honourable mover of the passing of the Resolution suggested at the end of his remarks should be the actual thing before us now. This island is suffering from the experts who are building clouds over us and will not let the sunlight get to us. I fail to see how, in our Police Force to-day, there is not a man who is capable enough of going to England now and finding out all about this equipment and coming back here to stay with us and carry out his duties. (Cheers). Sir, I am against these retired experts (Cheers). These highly costly gentlemen are being constantly brought to Barbados and it seems to me that Barbados is considered incapable of finding people to do anything that these experts can do. I would like to see this whole matter re-considered; I would like to see a Barbadian sent out to learn what this gentleman has learnt and then

return here and give us the benefit of his knowledge. I feel that there are people in Barbados who are quite capable of going to England—

At this point, it now being 3.30 p.m., Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and stated that it was now time for the consideration of Private Members' Business.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (B)

Mr. ADAMS: If there is no objection, I ask leave to move the suspension of Rule 61 (b) so as to continue Government Business. I have not enquired of honourable members as to whether they want to go on with this Resolution or not.

Mr. GARNER: I object.

ADDRESS *Re* INSURANCE OF PEASANTS' CANES

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy:—To move the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor relating to the Insurance of Peasants' Canes.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker,—In moving the passing of this Address I will remind honourable members of the wording of it in case there is any honourable member who has not got a copy of it before him at the present moment. The Address reads as follows:—

The House of Assembly To His Excellency The Governor

1. The House of Assembly begs to point out to His Excellency the Governor the fact that Fire Insurance Policies are not issued in respect of peasants' growing canes.

2. The House respectfully requests that His Excellency shall initiate the necessary steps whereby it shall become possible for peasant proprietors (like plantation owners) to insure their sugar cane crops against loss or damage by fire.

Mr. Speaker many of us are aware, especially those of us who are in the legal profession, of the number of occasions on which fire destroys the whole of a peasant's cane crop. Unlike the plantation owner he does not have the advantage offered to him of insuring his crops against loss by fire. As you know Sir, the plantation owner can get his canes insured; if he does not insure them that is his fault; but in so far as the peasant's quarter of an acre, half an acre or acre lot is concerned, I have made an investigation and have discovered that no insurance Company operating in Barbados effects insurance on such small lots. Canes are acceptable for insurance at the value of £25 per annum and the premium is 1½%; so that the premium on a quarter of an acre lot would be 45 cents. Insurance Companies like the Barbados Fire Insurance Company claim that if it were not for the fact that the plantations and factories had other things to offer for insurance it is doubtful whether any cane insurance would be available for them. The local Fire Insurance Companies allege that even in the case of plantation canes they would not insure them if the plantation owner who is connected with the factory, did not have other insurance business to transact with these Companies; and they claim that this is not the most profitable line of insurance business. It happens every now and then that a peasant's cane crop is destroyed. Sometimes it is the result of an accident, at other

times it has been proved to be the result of the work of an enemy of the owner of the crop; but in neither case is the peasant able to recoup the loss. If it is the deliberate act of a fire bug and he is discovered, charged, tried and convicted, he goes away for a long number of years, and for an equally long time the peasant has to mourn and suffer the loss of that crop without any means of being reimbursed for the loss of his crop unless he carries around a "brief". That happens with those who can least afford to bear the loss and have to suffer it; but the plantation owner who undoubtedly has shares in the factory and who can bear the loss of his crop is protected by insurance. The peasant has no means of protecting himself and every now and then in the life of the peasantry we hear that some poor peasant has to go around with a "brief" asking people to assist him because his whole crop has been lost. It seems that the lot of the peasant of this community is a very unhappy one; sometimes he suffers by fire, at other times by the price he receives for his canes and also by the weights recorded at the scale beams. One wonders at the hardihood of this section of the community. In spite of the many handicaps under which they have to labour they still put their plots year after year under a certain amount of sugar-cane. As you know, Mr. Speaker, sugar-cane is the vital economy of this island and the average Barbadian would be very reluctant to plant anything else in his little plot. Consequently, year after year he plants his sugar-canes taking not only the normal, but apparently incidental and inescapable risk of their being destroyed by fire. The peasant will have manured his crop, paid for labour at an increased rate more than what the plantation owner has paid and then his whole year's expenditure on his quarter of an acre, or half an acre plot as the case may be goes up into smoke. I know the reluctance of the Government to go into any field of insurance. I recall that a session or two ago an Address was passed in this House and afterwards the matter was discussed on a motion for adjournment as to why there was so much dilatoriness on the part of the Government in instituting a scheme of insurance under the Workmen's Compensation Act. After the discussion had taken place in this House a private insurance company believing that the Government might give consideration to schemes of insurance, got ready with their schemes for Workmen's Compensation Insurance under the Act and the result is that tons and tons of money are now being exported from the island. I understand that about £60,000 is going out annually to private capitalistic concerns overseas for this type of insurance. This Address asks the Government to take the necessary steps whereby it shall become possible for peasant proprietors to be put on the same basis as plantation owners and be able to insure their sugar-cane crops against loss or damage by fire. If the Government feel that they cannot devise any means of providing insurance for the peasants then I suggest that they consider an alternative scheme whereby the peasants can be assured that if they suffer any loss by fire they will not have to bear the burden imposed upon them; that they will be given some form of Governmental assistance so that they will not have to go around cap in hand asking people to subscribe to a brief. I am not suggesting that every day or night the peasants' canes are burnt but I cannot recall a year in which there have not been some fires which have destroyed peasants' canes. I suggest that in cases where a complete and thorough investigation has been made and the Government find that the peas-

ants were absolutely not at fault but that the fires were the work of some foul play and the peasants have no means of recouping their loss, a resolution by way of an *ex gratia* payment should be brought before the House so that the peasants will not have to suffer the loss. (Mr. ADAMS: Who would worry to reap canes then?) There are many honourable members around this Table who might have different views as to the best method of protecting the peasant who has suffered the loss of his cane crop through no fault of his own and which crop he had no means of insuring. There may be various suggestions and ideas from brains which are perhaps more fertile than mine, but I am sure that every honourable member will agree with me that this section of the community comprising as it does in the vicinity of 20,000 of the most hard-working, long-suffering, patient and forbearing members of this community should have some assurance that in the event of a fire caused through no fault of their own they will not have to suffer the loss or continue to be in the same position in which they now are. I am very happy to assure any honourable member who has any suggestion which he feels is better than mine to deal with this matter, that I will support that suggestion so long as I am satisfied that it will achieve the end which I have in view, namely, that this protection will be given the peasant who cannot now get such protection in respect of loss or damage to his crop by fire. I beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to second the motion. Not very long ago in this Chamber we were discussing matters affecting the peasants and I would like to say that gradually an economic system must be evolved which can give peasants a greater amount of security so far as the crops which they have to grow are concerned. In this matter of insurance I believe that Barbadians are not as insurance conscious as they would like to be. In many cases there are economic factors prevailing but I believe that any section of the community which is willing to pay the cost of giving themselves a necessary economic protection like insurance, and insurance of an industry in which the peasants play an important part, I feel that all means and measures should be adopted to assist them. On the whole, the peasantry of Barbados has been given an economic blow: there are a number of small people who are struggling against this and I am glad to see that the Government has made a start so far as the training of a Co-operative Officer is concerned so as to give the peasants a better opportunity of working on a co-operative basis. As regards this specific Address, I feel that there will be very few hon. members who will speak against it even although it may differ from some of their views; but in so far as the policy for agriculture is concerned I feel that there will be no harm in allowing these people to have some safeguard relative to their crops. We have had some fires in 1945 and I do not know for myself how much the peasants were affected by those fires; but I will say that if the peasants were affected by those fires similar to the way in which the large estates were affected then they must have had a very hard time because the amount of money lost was nearly one million dollars. You can see that if the peasants had to share in any of that loss without any hope of a return, many briefs and more than briefs would have had to be brought forward in order to give these people some measure of relief. That is why I feel that responsible people who take their duties conscientiously and with a deep sense of duty will realise that any measure which can give security to any sec-

tion of the community is worthy of consideration. With regard to this matter of insurance it is not ready made and I do not think that any honourable member or any sane person would make the peasants believe that even if we pass this Address this afternoon they can see an insurance plan ushered in at the beginning of January. These matters have to be investigated and planned so that you can do the best for the people for whom you desire to do something. In the same way that we have a system of insurance in respect of houses and plantation crops undertaken by private companies we can have a system of insurance for peasants' crops. We can only pass measures such as this and ask the Government to institute such a system of insurance. I am not challenging the rights or wrongs of private people to insure peasants' canes; of course it is within their province to undertake this insurance or refuse to do so. I say that it is within the province of the Government to analyse and examine all the possibilities in relation to this question of the insurance of peasants' canes. I think that sympathetic consideration should be given to these peasants taking into consideration the amount of sugar-canes which they grow, and we should put this section of the community on an economic basis similar to that of their richer contemporaries. I feel that this is a move so far as progressive legislation is concerned and I hope that the honourable member who has introduced this Address will see the need in the very near future for something more ambitious and economic in the interest of these people. I am willing to support any honourable member who can see that the peasantry of this island should be given the opportunity to keep their heads above water. They have never had this opportunity; from the time I knew myself it was a matter of Hobson's choice. I feel that on the whole the insurance of peasants' canes will lead to bringing the peasants into one block so that they can be of greater use to the island's economy.

Mr. SYMMONDS: Mr. Speaker,—I would suggest an amendment to this Address namely, that in paragraph 2 the word "initiate" occurring in line 2 be deleted in order to insert the words "consider initiating." I feel that this matter is of such importance that there is hardly any honourable member of this Chamber who will refuse to lend his support in granting this relief to a section of people of this colony who have no protection whatever from insurance companies in relation to the loss which they very often suffer from fire. This is a very knotty problem but it is one which is worthy of our putting our heads together and trying to do something to alleviate what is a very hard case among an unprotected section of this colony. I beg to move that amendment which I understand the honourable junior member for St. Lucy is prepared to accept.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member accepting that amendment?

Mr. BRANCKER: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WILKINSON: This is a very vexed question. The right thing to do is to stop all fires and there would be no need for any such thing as insurance. Unfortunately, during the last few years the number of fires have increased enormously, the result being that Companies which had undertaken insurance had lost. Only to-day the Company with which I am insured informed me that the rates will be increased by 50%. Personally, I think that the peasants do suffer when they get their small homes burnt when they are not insured, and I feel that we should get some schemes to effect insurance on these people's homes. I do not say that insurance should not be affected on their canes

but I think that insurance on their homes is more important to them. Even when these small people's canes are burnt they are reaped almost immediately afterwards and there is very little loss. Although I am not against the passing of this Address at all I think honourable members are giving the Government a pretty hard job. Anyhow, I have not the slightest doubt that they are capable of dealing with it. (Hear, hear).

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Address do now pass. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye"; those against will please say "No." I think the "Ayes" have it. I will ask the honourable junior member for St. Lucy to present this Address.

Mr. BRANCKER: As Your Honour pleases.

INVITATIONS TO GOVERNMENT HOUSE "AT HOME" DISCUSSED ON MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSAY: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes in order to speak on a matter which, to my mind, is of vital importance. It strikes at the very core of this our country. It is a matter in which we should be unanimous in this House because it strikes at the undoubted rights and privileges of members of this Legislature. His Most Gracious Sovereign Lord the King's daughter, Princess Elizabeth—I do not remember the correct title—has just been married to an illustrious personage, the Duke of Edinburgh and all over the British-speaking world there have been tokens of respect, tokens of loyalty and tokens as to the popularity of the partnership. I read in a certain newspaper that that partnership has been the most popular partnership in the world; yet in a country like ours it has pleased the Chief Executive, the representative of His Majesty the King at a function which was considered to be a public function—I knew nothing about it except from a reference in the newspaper that members of the Legislature were invited to an "At Home" at Government House. I am a representative of the people—I may be poor and humble but nevertheless I am as loyal as anybody else to the British Throne. I, as representative of the people, have not been invited to a function which purports to have been brought about on account of that marriage of those whose names I have called! I am saying Mr. Speaker, that as far as going to Government House is concerned, your humble servant does not desire it; but as a representative of the people I feel that it is the duty of the Chief Executive Officer to extend to me as much courtesy as he would extend to the honourable junior member for St. James. (A MEMBER): I was not invited either). I understand that it a custom to invite people to Government House if they signed the Visitors' Book. I am not breaking any regulations; I know that several members of this Chamber have been invited there and they have not signed the Book. All over Bridgetown I have been asked why Mr. So and So was invited to Government House and you were not invited? Well, your humble servant did not sign the Book and therefore he was not invited. I am not a tea-drinker, I do not want to push myself where I am not invited; but I maintain that when His Majesty the King's daughter has been married. I as a humble British subject have the right to be invited to Government House. I mix with all types of people in this country; I mix with the people in the gutter, I mix with the middle classes and I mix with the rich people. As a representative of the

people I say that the people who are here to advise the Chief Executive Officer in this place should advise him that this is a dangerous practice.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the honourable member to be very careful.

Mr. RAMSAY: I just want to bring it forcibly to the Chief Executive Officer of this colony that he has committed a grave indiscretion. I will withdraw anything which will break the Rules of this House. I have one safety valve. I am a loyal British subject and I personally feel hurt that as junior representative of the people of St. Peter I was not invited to Government House on that occasion. I am hurt about it to my core. I think that whoever is responsible for sending out these invitations should know that any member of this House whether he signs the Visitors' Book or not has the right to be invited to Government House. The Book is there for persons who are not known; but how in the name of truth can anybody say that he does not know your humble servant? I say that this is a condition of things which must be remedied before it begins. I do hope that the Chief Executive Officer has only made a slip without knowing the peculiar repercussions which may occur and I say that it should never happen again.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second the motion. It would definitely appear to be peculiar if honourable members sat here and did not appreciate what was said by the honourable junior member for St. Peter. As I understand it, the honourable member is not at all attempting to voice any personal grievance although he makes it clear that he has been hurt to the core. I think the point which he is making and honourable members should appreciate, is that although it has been the custom and tradition for people to sign the Visitors' Book, it has been brought to his notice and if it is a fact that from time to time people have been invited to Government House without having signed the Book, then there is the feeling that something is wrong. On the other hand, let me say that I have no grievance whether I am invited to Government House or not. I have reached the stage where it makes no difference to me; but, as a member of this Chamber, I am bound to agree with the sentiments which have been expressed by the honourable junior member for St. Peter. On such an occasion when the marriage of His Majesty the King's daughter is being honoured, Heads of the various Departments have been invited to Government House and one would have thought that any Head of the Administration or whoever is responsible for issuing the invitations would have invited the elected members of this Chamber whether they had signed the Visitors' Book or not. The elected representatives of the people have a right to be invited to attend a function of this sort irrespective of the tradition of signing the Book.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member has reached the point where he is criticising the Head of the Administration.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I will make it quite clear; no honourable member of this House would venture to suggest that the Head of the Administration would be directly responsible for issuing the invitations—

Mr. SPEAKER: By putting it in that way you are making such a criticism.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is to the contrary. I am referring to those who are responsible for issuing the invitations. I am beginning to feel, as the honourable junior member for St. Peter has said, that a slip has been made and it is a slip which, if honourable members of this House give expression to their feel-

ings in the matter, will not be made again. On a former occasion, not under the Administration of the present Head, there has been some ill-feeling in this colony about invitations being issued to Government House and it was felt very strongly and very rightly so that where amongst several dozens of people at Government House only four men of colour were seen to mix with the congregation, that was not all to be desired.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is again criticising.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am just making a reference. I am only saying that in a mixed community it is well for people who are here to administer the affairs of the colony to know that a thing of this sort cannot be countenanced. I hope that honourable members will appreciate that, like the honourable junior member for St. Peter, I have absolutely no personal grievance; but it is a question as to whether there is still that dignity attached to being an elected member of this Chamber. It must appear peculiar that only if you have the opportunity to sign the Visitors' Book you will be invited to Government House. In the daily Press after the persons who were invited to Government House were mentioned, it was made clear that they had signed the Visitors' Book. I am sure that honourable members saw that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that I did not follow it as closely as that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It comes down to this that at a celebration of this sort where there are members of the Legislature who are as loyal to the British Throne as anybody else but who have not had the opportunity of going to Government House or whose business had not brought them to Government House, only the four members of the Executive Committee who had signed the Visitors' Book would have the opportunity to pay their respect. Like the honourable junior member for St. Peter I feel that it is not a matter affecting me, but as things have taken the turn which they have taken, it is a matter affecting this honourable House.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I hope that I will be able to discuss this matter without infringing any of the Rules of the House. I say that it is unfortunate that an incident like this should have occurred. All of us know my colleague well enough; we know that he is not the kind of individual to whom a social gathering would mean anything. We know his nature; he is one of those peculiar persons whom it is difficult at times even to analyse; and when it comes to social gatherings we can say that he does not fall within that category where things of that nature would mean anything to him. I feel that the honourable member has been hurt from a different point of view. The relationship between the Head of the Administration and this House is a very close one; the affairs of this island are administered by the Head of the Administration, the Executive Council and the Legislature and the right relationship should always exist among these bodies. This is the highest legislative Chamber in the land and honourable members have the right to be invited to attend public functions. We usually have the courtesy of being invited to functions held by private people and I will say that if private people invite us I feel that as members of this House the relationship between the Head of the Administration and the members of this House should be closer. I should like to say that the Head of the Administration is as much a mixer as the honourable junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think you had better keep the Head of the Administration out of it because as

soon as an honourable member says one thing, another honourable member will say something else.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I want to steer clearly so that no one might gather that we are trying to accuse the Head of the Administration of anything. It is unfortunate that this incident has occurred. When you read in the Press that the Legislature was invited to an "At Home" at Government House, that was a mistake because it would not be true to say that the Legislature was invited when an honourable member has not received any invitation. I feel that we are now only attracting attention in responsible quarters so that a similar occurrence will not take place again. We can well appreciate that the honourable junior member for St. Peter is here by the will of the people and there is a certain amount of respect which should be attached to honourable members' position in this House. As I said at the beginning, it is unfortunate in the extreme that we should have to discuss a matter such as this this afternoon. I believe that this will be a historic occasion; I doubt very much whether the adjournment of the House has ever been moved so as to discuss a matter like this. I feel that what the honourable junior member for St. Peter has said is sufficient to cause a change in our procedure.

Mr. TALMA: I feel that this is one of the few occasions on which no form of censure should be placed on the Head of the Administration.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to remind the honourable member that I have ruled that any criticism of the Head of the Administration is out of order.

Mr. TALMA: As far as I have heard from this debate points have been raised which fall under the heading of procedure in so far as attending Government House is concerned. In the first place, one has to register one's name in the Visitors' Book at Government House. Everything calls for a certain amount of procedure and if it has not been complied with by the honourable junior member for St. Peter the blame lies at his door and not at anybody else's. If the procedure is that the Visitors' Book has to be signed, unless and until the honourable member complies with that it stands to reason that if he has not been invited to Government House he has to blame himself and nobody else. All the members on this side of the Table, with the exception of the honourable junior member for St. Peter who has made this motion, were definitely invited to Government House and they were present.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that you need go into that.

Mr. TALMA: I was just trying to explain the position. I can assure honourable members that it was not a question of inviting people of a particular colour, class or creed, or of anybody having been left out intentionally or otherwise. Although I have been debarred from referring to the present Head of the Administration, when compared with others who were here, I must say that he is the most hospitable one we have had for many a year. (*Cheers*).

Mr. GARNER: This is something which is much to be regretted and I must support honourable junior member for St. Peter because whoever is responsible for sending out these invitations should see that the elected members of this Chamber are invited to Government House on such occasions. Speaking for myself, I do not care whether they send me an invitation or not because I do not intend to go there. I will go in the interest of the people but on social occasions I know the Head of the Administration does not want me and I do not put my mind there.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member can say what he likes about himself but he must be very careful in referring to the Head of the Administration.

Mr. GARNER: During the late Governor's regime I was invited to Government House but to tell me that it is incumbent on the members of this House to sign the Visitors' Book, I do not understand that. Your very election to membership of House should qualify you to visit Government House; and it comes as an insult to honourable members to tell them that they must sign this Book before they can go there. I hope that those who are in charge will see that it is unnecessary for us to sign this Book in order to visit Government House but that we are entitled to go there by virtue of our being the people's representatives in this Chamber. My aim and sole desire is to represent not only my constituents but the people of this island on the floor of this House without any social distinction; and I say that in fairness to the members of this House, the Head of the Executive or whoever is in charge of sending out invitations should not look to see who has signed this Book. We are entitled to go to Government House socially or otherwise so long as we are members of this House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do not claim to be an Emily Post. Under the recognized social conventions, I believe that His Excellency the Governor or his consort is entitled to assume that so long as one refuses to sign the Visitors' Book at Government House, one does not want to be invited there. Therefore in issuing invitations to Government House it was felt justifiable to exclude persons who have not paid the customary courtesy call. But I know, Mr. Speaker, that in the past it has been the practice to invite members of the Legislature to functions at Government House whether they have signed the Visitors' Book or not. If the present Incumbent feels like sticking more closely to the general practice I presume that he is entitled to do it. Bearing in mind the fact that the practice has been to invite members of the Legislature whether they have signed the Visitor's Book or not and also bearing in mind the fact that members of this Chamber are entitled to the customary recognition on the part of officials, I believe that the Head of the Administration would be well advised to pay attention to the remarks which have been made here this afternoon, and for the future extend invitations to members of the Legislature to Government House whether they have paid the courtesy call or not.

Mr. ADAMS: I speak partly as a member of the Legislature and partly as an ordinary individual. I agree entirely with everything that the last honourable member has said except the last sentence. There is no Government House in any part of the British Empire in which this custom is not observed. There has been a certain amount of relaxation in Barbados from time to time, but if it has become necessary for one reason or another to restrict your invitations, what is the normal practice that any individual would adopt? I hope I will not say anything which might give the impression that I am in favour of keeping any ancient, traditional and perhaps snobbish conventionality. If, for instance, a lady refused to speak to you because you did not take off your hat to her will you blame her? In another case perhaps it might be thought strange if you took off your hat to her. I have at some time or other been to Government House entirely against my will; one does not always like to put on a dress-shirt to attend a dinner but you have to put up with it. In the first place, there

has been all this talk about a public function, but this was a private function and the Head of the Administration could have invited whom he liked. It is a common, everyday practice for this sort of thing to happen. We all agree that going to Government House to attend any social function would not appeal to the honourable junior member for St. Peter, but when the House have heard that every honourable member sitting on this side of the Table was there except the honourable junior member for St. Peter, how can it be suggested that the Head of the Administration is unmindful of us? If you are supposed to wear a black tie at funerals why should you wear a red one? If it is customary for persons to sign the Visitors' Book at Government House how can you complain if you have not been invited there? I remember that when the Moyne Commission came out here I was not invited to Government House; I did not care to put my name down. As the honourable senior member for St. Philip has reminded the House, it was the practice not to put down your name if you did not want any invitation. I used the same argument that has been used this afternoon. I spoke with Mr. Morgan Jones with respect to racial discrimination—at that time it was customary to invite officials and their wives to Government House on social occasions. I was not invited to Government House at the reception of the Commission and in conversation with Mr. Morgan Jones the first question he asked me was whether I had signed the Visitors' Book. How can you complain about not having been invited to Government House when you did not have the ordinary, simple courtesy to sign the Visitors' Book? Let us protect our rights, let us hate social distinction but do not let us be stubborn and want the rules to be broken for us. The relations between the Executive and the Head of the Administration are much different now from what they were in the past. I have been to Government House before and felt as if we were in the eighteenth century; but now that this snobbish attitude is being killed in this island I say that it is tragic for a debate of this sort to take place in respect of persons who merely ask you to pay them the courtesy of telling them whether you want an invitation or not. It is a clear intimation that you do not care to accept an invitation when you do not put your name in the Visitors' Book. I am sorry that I had to speak at all but it would have been wrong if I did not say what I had to say. The Head of the Executive cannot answer for himself and I felt that both as a member of this House, along with the honourable junior member for St. Peter, as well as being the Leader of the House I should make these observations. I cannot, for the life of me, see why this debate was necessary at all. It may be that the honourable junior member for St. Peter has argued from what appeared in the society gossip columns of the "Advocate". I say nothing more except that I hope the honourable member will see that this is not one of those instances where no regard was paid to a particular individual because he belongs to a particular race. I hope the honourable member will withdraw his motion.

Mr. RAMSAY: I want to thank the honourable senior member for St. Joseph for his gratuitous advice which is absolutely of no use to me. (Laughter). Barbados has a culture of its own. When it is seen in the Press that the junior representative of the people of St. Peter was not invited to Government House it was because he was discourteous enough as not to sign the Visitors' Book! There is always cause and effect; the cause for signing the Book has the effect of showing a person's

existence. I say with a full sense of responsibility that there were persons invited who have not signed the Visitors' Book. I have brought this matter to the notice of the public and in future I hope that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph will let the Head of the Administration know that the representatives of the people are entitled to be invited to Government House whether they have signed the Visitors' Book or not. I now ask leave to withdraw my motion.

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

NOTICE OF AN ADDRESS

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to give notice of the following Address:—

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency the Governor

1. The House of Assembly have the honour to thank Your Excellency for a copy of the Report of the Commission, appointed by Your Excellency to investigate the prospect of recruiting Barbadian labour for employment in agricultural work in Surinam, which has been laid on the table of the House.

2. The House respectfully suggest that steps should be taken by this Government to implement as soon as possible the recommendations of the Commission in order that some relief in the local employment situation may be gained by emigration to Surinam.

It is necessary for the Barbados Government and Surinam Government to get together as soon as possible in this matter of recruiting labour for employment in Surinam.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave that the consideration of this Address be made the First Order of the Day under Government Business at the next meeting of the House.

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

THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. ADAMS: In fixing the Order Paper, Committee of Supply and the Chase Pension Bill will be Orders Nos. 2 and 3.

Mr. WILKINSON: I ask leave that Order No. 21 on to-day's Order Paper under Private Members' Business be made Order No. 8 for the next meeting.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I object. We have just passed the first Address and I do not think that it is fair after we have been into the ballot box to try to push up these Orders.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I ask leave that Order No. 55 be made Order No. 2.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Again I have to object.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I beg to move that Order No. 55 on to-day's Order Paper be made Order No. 2 for the next meeting.

Mr. ADAMS: I had to do this same thing in the case of the honourable senior member for St. Michael so that nobody could accuse me of taking sides. If we have the ballot system what is the use of trying to bring Order No. 55 up to Order No. 2? I suggest that these items be not taken out of their Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Any honourable member has the right to make a motion so as to have an Order taken out of its position; but ordinarily speaking, he has to make a motion for the suspension of Rule No. 60. Anyhow the honourable member's motion has not been seconded.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I think that this is a question which the House have to decide by vote. The occasion will arise when a matter is of such tremendous importance that it should be dealt with out of its position.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to this day week, the 2nd day of December, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon.

Mr. RAMSAY seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER accordingly adjourned the House to this day week, the 2nd day of December, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon.