

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT).

SESSION 1947—48

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 21st October, 1947.

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

Present:

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

Prayers are read.

VISITORS REQUESTED TO REMAIN OUTSIDE DURING PRAYERS

Mr. SPEAKER: Before we start the business of the House I want to impress upon those persons who come in as visitors that while prayers are being read they must remain outside the Chamber.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 14th October, 1947, having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

Messrs. BRANCKER, MOTTLEY and CRAWFORD enter the House and take their seats.

DOCUMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received Statements of Revenue and Expenditure for the half year ended 30th September, 1947, from the Commissioners of Highways for the parishes of St. Philip and St. James.

PAPERS LAID

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

Quarterly transactions in rum to 30th September, 1947.

Statements showing gross Customs and Excise receipts for the months of May and June, 1947.

Report of the Public Librarian for the year ended on the 31st of March, 1947.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT enters the House and takes his seat.

PETITIONS

Mr. GALE: I beg to present a petition from the Members of the Board of Management of the Barbados Cricket Association praying the House to pass a Bill to amend the Act of this Island which incorporated the said Association to enable them to borrow any sum of money necessary for the carrying into effect the objects of the said Association.

Mr. FOSTER: I beg to present a petition from the Vestry of St. Andrew praying the House to pass a Bill authorising them to borrow a sum not exceeding £2,000 to purchase suitable sites in the Belleplaine, Hillaby and Shorey Village districts in the said parish and to erect thereon Public Baths and Latrines.

Mr. DOWDING: I beg to present a petition from the Vestry of St. George praying the House to pass a Bill to authorize them to raise a loan not exceeding £6,000 to enable the said Vestry to repair St. George's Church, St. Jude's Chapel and St. George's Rectory.

Dr. WILSON, Messrs. GARNER and WARD enter the House and take their seats.

Mr. FOSTER: I beg to present a petition from the Vestry of the parish of St. Andrew praying the House to pass a Bill authorising them to raise a loan not exceeding £1,000 for the purpose of repairing or replacing the roof of the Parish Church.

Dr. WILSON: I beg to present a petition from the Commissioners of Highways for St. John praying the House to pass a Bill authorising them to raise a loan of £600 to enable them to complete the purchase of a Diesel Motor Roller for the use of the said parish.

NOTICES

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution to place the sum of £32,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to provide additional accommodation at the Lunatic Asylum.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Resolution to place the sum of £500 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to make a grant to the Commissioners of Highways of the parish of St. John to oil and grit the Newcastle Hill Road.

Resolution to place the sum of £132,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement resolution No. 91 of the 6th September, 1947, and to provide for the subsidisation of flour, salt fish, salt pork and balanced animal feed to the 31st of March, 1948, in order that the prices of these commodities may be stabilised at such prices as may be fixed by the Competent Authority.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of £6,600 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to meet the cost of completing the construction of the Training College at Erdiston.

Mr. TALMA: Bill to amend the Provost Marshal's Act, 1904 (1904-6)

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. GALE: A Bill to amend the Barbados Cricket Association Act, 1933.

Mr. DOWDING: A Bill to authorise the Vestry of Saint George to raise a loan not exceeding £6,000 to enable them to repair St. George's Church, Saint Jude's Chapel and Saint George's Rectory.

Dr. WILSON: A Bill to authorize the Commissioners of the parish of Saint John to raise a loan not exceeding £600 to complete the purchase of a Road Roller.

Mr. FOSTER: A Bill to authorise the Vestry of Saint Andrew to raise a loan not exceeding £2,000 to purchase sites and erect Baths and Latrines in the parish of Saint Andrew.

Mr. FOSTER: A Bill to authorise the Vestry of Saint Andrew to raise a loan not exceeding £1,000 to repair the Parish Church.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Of the following Address:

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor*

The House is of the opinion that steps should be taken to provide a proper and comprehensive scheme of Social Security for the people of Barbados, with special reference to the Unemployment and Sickness Pay, Family Allowances and Retirement Pensions and respectfully request that the British Government be asked to send out to the island an expert or experts from the British Ministry of National Insurance who, along with a representative local committee, should make the necessary investigation and draw up proposals along the line of the British National Insurance plan.

2. In the meantime, the House respectfully urges that

- (a) In view of the inadequacy of the Old Age Pension, and the dire need of those in receipt of it, a cost of living allowance of \$2.00 per month should be provided immediately by means of a Resolution for all persons who are entitled to receive the Old Age Pension.
- (b) In view of the grave economic situation which faces the colony, and the difficulty, even under normal world conditions, of providing employment for all the people in this country until such time as greater industrial development and other economic reforms have taken place, an Unemployment Insurance Scheme should be put into operation,

employers and employees to contribute specific sums per insured person each week, the Government to add to the fund one third (1/3) of the joint contributions of employers and workers.

QUESTIONS

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

Will Government consider an increase of:—

- (a) The number of Bursary Scholarships for boys of 14 years and over?
- (b) The age limits for Elementary School children?

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

Will Government say whether a decision has been made in regard to the building of a centrally situated Post Office in the parish of St. Lucy?

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

1. Whether the Book of Rules and Regulations as recommended by Superintendent Calver for the Barbados Police Force, has been completed?

2. Will the Government say whether a decision has been made in regard to the creation of the rank of Sub-Inspector referred to in paragraph 50 of the Calver Report?

3. Will the Government say whether a decision has arrived in regard to Superintendent Calver's Recommendations recommending that the practice be discontinued whereby the Police Department acts as "key holders to other than Government Departments?"

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

1. Whether Government is aware of widespread dissatisfaction amongst persons in this Island eligible as Jurors at the Assizes at the scale of remuneration provided for them by law?

2. Will Government take the necessary steps for the provision of adequate daily remuneration and travelling expenses for such public spirited persons as are required to do Jury Service at the Court of Grand Sessions?

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

Will Government inform this House of the outcome of the enquiries which, on 1st April, 1947, Government assured this House, it was making in regard to the possibility of Emigration to Canada of workers from this Colony?

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

Will Government inform this House of the result of the enquiries which Government on 1st of April, 1947, assured this House were being made as to the possibility of finding employment in the United Kingdom for female workers from Barbados?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. TALMA, seconded by Mr. ADAMS, a Bill to amend the Provost Marshal's Act, 1904—6 is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. DOWDING, seconded by Mr. WARD, a Bill to authorise the Vestry of Saint George to raise a loan not exceeding £6,000 to enable them to repair Saint George's Church, Saint Jude's Chapel and Saint George's Rectory is read a first time.

On the motion of Dr. WILSON, seconded by Mr. BRANCKER, a Bill to authorise the Commissioners of Highways of the parish of Saint John to raise a loan not exceeding £600 to enable them to complete the purchase of a Diesel Motor Roller is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. GALE, seconded by Mr. S. A. WALCOTT, a Bill to amend the Barbados Cricket Association Act, 1933, is read a first time.

Mr. WILKINSON enters the House and takes his seat.

On the motion of Mr. FOSTER, seconded by Mr. COX, a Bill to authorise the Vestry of Saint Andrew to raise a loan not exceeding £2,000 to enable them to purchase sites in the Belleplaine, Hillaby, and Shorey Village districts in the said parish and to erect Public Baths and Latrines thereon is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. FOSTER, seconded by Mr. COX, a Bill to authorise the Vestry of Saint Andrew to raise a loan not exceeding £1,000 to enable them to repair the Parish Church is read a first time.

REPLY TO THE GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph.—To move the consideration of the Report of the Select Committee appointed to prepare a draft Reply to His Excellency's speech delivered on the 7th October, 1947.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—The Select Committee appointed to prepare a draft Reply has with commendable brevity submitted a Report which I beg to move in form of an Address as follows:—

The House of Assembly To His Excellency the Governor

1. The House of Assembly thank Your Excellency for the Speech you were pleased to deliver at the opening of the Legislative Session 1947-48 and for your comprehensive review of the events of the past session.

2. The House note with satisfaction the sound financial position of the island.

3. The House fully appreciate the many matters of importance referred to in Your Excellency's Speech, and assure Your Excellency that any measures for the good of the island will, when laid before the House, receive their careful and sympathetic consideration.

4. In conclusion Your Excellency may be assured that the House will do all in their power to further the best interests of all sections of the community.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—The senior member for St. Joseph commented upon the brevity of the Report. It is rather vague. One would have thought that two very important matters which are mentioned in His Excellency's speech would have been referred to in this Report. I am referring first of all to the paragraph of the speech which states that "the membership of the Council might well be appreciably increased so that wider representation may be given to various shades of opinion in the community, and

the work of the Chamber facilitated by the presence of experts in such matters as agriculture, finance, and the like." I said that the Report is vague because this is a very important matter and one would have thought that some comment would have been made in respect of it. As that paragraph reads, it would appear as though the idea of putting officials on the Council seems fairly evident and I think that the Address in reply should state the feeling of this House in the matter. The other very important matter, in my considered opinion, which makes the Report appear to be more vague than ever is where His Excellency deals with what he considers as the dollar crisis. The paragraph in reference says:—"I should warn you, however, that there will certainly be a heavy reduction in imports from all sources." It can well be argued that although the Report is vague it is comprehensive enough in its last paragraph to cover every phase of the speech but I do think that in view of the food situation in this colony, some specific mention should have been made in this Report as to the feeling of honourable members about His Excellency's expression in the paragraph to which I have just referred. It is true, Sir, that it may have been difficult to have incorporated in the Report anything that would make us appear to be disloyal but I feel sure that with the necessary time and patience honourable members can find the appropriate phraseology which will convey our feeling without allowing it to appear that we are in any way disloyal. I view, Sir, this food situation very seriously and I do not think that this Report should be allowed to stand as it is when these words appear in His Excellency's speech:—"I should warn you, however, that there will certainly be a heavy reduction in imports from all sources." There must be imports of a certain nature and the members of this House as the representatives of the people should express their feeling in this Address in respect of the food situation in this colony,—a situation of which they should certainly be aware.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Before you put the question, Sir, I also would like to say that the brevity of this Address does not commend it at all to me. The Address merely thanks His Excellency for the speech; it expresses satisfaction with the financial position of the island but makes no comment on the fact that we have been warned by the Head of the Administration that this financial position cannot remain sound much longer; it then goes on to state that it appreciates the matters of importance referred to in His Excellency's speech and assures the Governor of something of which he is already aware, that is, that this House will give its careful and sympathetic consideration to any measures laid before it and calculated to promote the public good. Well now, I hope the members of the Select Committee will forgive me if I say that this Address, as it stands, bears little, if any, relation to the remarks made by the Governor in his opening Address to the Legislature. I would expect—and most of the public would expect too—this House to couch this reply in fundamentally different terms from those suggested in the Address before us. So many important matters were raised in the speech by the Governor that it more or less should be expected that the House had given due attention to the points raised and would go further and express its opinion either pro or con with regard to the sentiments expressed by the Governor on those particular issues. I take, for instance, one very important point to which we, as professed guardians of the public purse, should pay

more than passing attention. On page 3 of the official copy of the opening speech made by the Governor we read this: "Secondly, as regards what is popularly known as the 'dollar crisis'. The seriousness of the foreign exchange position is well known to you. It has been the subject of a lengthy personal message from the Secretary of State to all Colonial peoples and it has made necessary a drastic revision of import control policy I do not propose to speak on this subject at greater length here. I should warn you, however, that there will certainly be a heavy reduction in imports from all sources. Such a reduction will inevitably be reflected in the Colony's revenue figures." So far, so good. Then lower down on the same page His Excellency says this: "I believe the time has come when a number of activities, generally accepted or of proven value to Barbados, hitherto financed under the Colonial Development and Welfare Act, should for various cogent reasons be taken on our Estimates. I have in mind such projects as the Erdiston Training College, the Fisheries Development Scheme and the Maternity Training Hospital. There is also the normal expansion in expenditure of departments to be provided for, to say nothing of the innumerable directions in which Government assistance is sought to create better conditions of life and work in Barbados." Personally speaking I must say that I have been perturbed by those two statements. If in view of the dollar crisis our imports are going to be considerably reduced and, in consequence, we shall have a decrease in our revenue figures and if we are expected to fulfil our other commitments—such commitments as the increase in old age pensions which we have in mind, increased salaries for policemen and other government servants, and other commitments which will involve heavy expenditure—if we are faced with a decrease in revenue, how is it going to be possible for us to add to our shrunken budget the expenditure of those schemes which up to now is being defrayed by funds from Colonial Development and Welfare? It does appear to me as if we are being told to go ahead and run the colony bankrupt,—go ahead and see that within the shortest possible time we have our balance in the red. After all, it is a question of elementary mathematics. We should not commit ourselves at this stage, in view of the position with which we are faced, to adding anything more to the expenditure of this colony than we have to, even though we agree that such schemes as the Erdiston Training College, the Fisheries Development Scheme, and the Maternity Hospital are of vital importance to the island. If Colonial Development and Welfare cannot possibly carry out these projects, well the correct thing, in my opinion, for us to do is to let them remain where they are until such time as our prospects for maintaining our revenue at a more normal level are more rosy. It is almost the negation of statesmanship to tell a people that with a decrease in revenue they must at the same time commit themselves to increased expenditure when they do not know where this increased money is to come from. It is impossible, Sir, in discussing this question, not to refer to the other official pronouncement on this matter, made by the Colonial Secretary on the very day after His Excellency the Governor made this speech in public.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you going to move an amendment to the Address?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I think we shall have to go into Committee on the Address.

Mr. SPEAKER: If that is so, the sooner you do so, the better.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I intend to move that we go into Committee but before I do so I think that in fairness to honourable members I should give the reasons which are operating in my mind and which would justify my asking the House to go into Committee. After all, this is one of the most important matters we shall have to deal with during this session. It is the blue print for legislation during the session and it is also the blue print for the financial situation of the country for another year. If we accept it as it is, without any specific reference to the points to which we object, then it means that we are accepting, in principle, all the suggestions made by the Head of the Administration and I want to make it perfectly clear that I am in complete disagreement with more than one of the more important observations made in His Excellency's speech. I go on to say that it is impossible not to refer, in conjunction with the Governor's speech, to a speech made the following day by the Colonial Secretary. I am only quoting it for the purpose of supporting my remarks on this Address.

Mr. SPEAKER: You may be initiating a debate on a speech apart from that of the Governor's speech.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The speech of the Colonial Secretary was actually promised by the Governor himself.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think you should confine your remarks to the Governor's speech.

Mr. CRAWFORD: As Your Honour rules but we cannot forget that we were told on the day after these pronouncements—

Mr. SPEAKER: Aren't you going contrary to my ruling?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am merely making my speech and in doing so it is impossible not to refer to any other official pronouncement on these matters. I say, Sir, that on the one hand we have been told about this decrease in revenue which we must expect in consequence of the dollar crisis. From an equally official source we have been also told that in consequence of the same dollar crisis to which the Governor refers, we shall be expected to lower our standard of living. Well, although those specific words are not used here, the general import of the speech is the same because if we are going to add to our expenses, faced with a decrease in revenue, it does mean that at least we shall have to retrench and cut down the salaries of Governmental employees if we want to try to approximate our expenditure with our revenue. Though it is possible that in certain brackets in government employ a decrease in salaries is practicable, yet still the majority of people in the Government Service can hardly live on what they are getting now. Therefore, we should make it perfectly plain in our reply to the Governor's speech, if nothing else is made clear, that we as holders of the purse strings do not intend to willingly put the colony into a state of bankruptcy. I am amazed that some of the members who are on the Select Committee did not think it necessary to pay even passing reference to the situation that is envisaged in the speech before us. It is fraught with the most serious consequences for the future of this colony and at a critical time like this when every other West Indian island by means of special committees or otherwise is expressing in no uncertain terms the opinion of the public on this particular matter it certainly comes, to say the least of it,

with bad grace from us, if in the only official pronouncement we have had so far we ignore it completely and do even worse by our silence on the matter, giving grounds for the inference that we are willing to adopt in principle any suggestions, however practicable or impracticable or against the interests of the colony, that are put before us.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, are you going to make a motion now?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am going to move that the House do now go into Committee on this Address.

Mr. GARNER: I beg to second that.

The question that Mr. SPEAKER leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Address is put and resolved in the negative, the division being as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. BRANCKER, CRAWFORD, GARNER, MOTTLEY, DOWDING, and S. A. WALCOTT—7.

Noes: Messrs. RAMSAY, LEWIS, SMITH, F. L. WALCOTT, COX, MAPP, TALMA, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, HAYNES, GALE, WILKINSON, WARD, and Dr. CUMMINS—14.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker,—Before you put the question I would like to move an amendment to this Address. In his speech His Excellency says "Much time was also occupied in the lower House by private members' business which included discussions leading to the presentation of Addresses, or to the passage of legislation relating to such widely diverse matters as the divorce law, the curtailment of the powers of the Legislative Council, the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church of England in Barbados, nationalisation of public utilities, relief works against unemployment, and emigration." Now, Sir, it would appear as though His Excellency considers that an Address has been passed by this House in connection with this matter and I think that this is an opportune time to make reference to it. As you know, Sir, this matter was well debated during the last session.—

Mr. SPEAKER: What matter are you talking about?

Mr. HAYNES: The matter of the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church of England in Barbados.

Mr. SPEAKER: We cannot debate that now.

Mr. HAYNES: I want to make reference to it in this reply. I am suggesting that in place of paragraph 4 of this Address as printed, the following be inserted:—

"The House agrees with Your Excellency that during the past session much of the time of the House was occupied in discussions on matters introduced by private members, including the question of the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church of England in Barbados; unfortunately, however, the session ended before a decision was taken in this important matter. The House, therefore, respectfully requests Your Excellency to send down without delay for the consideration of the Legislature, the necessary legislation for the disestablishment and gradual disendowment of the Anglican Church in this Island." I beg to move that that be paragraph 4 of the Reply to His Excellency's speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that the honourable member is in order. The honourable member is attempting to get in by a side wind in this Reply to His Excellency's speech an Address dealing with the question of the disestablishment and the disendowment of the Church of England in Barbados. That part of the honourable member's

amendment asking His Excellency to send down legislation dealing with the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church of England in Barbados is not in order, so far as including it in the reply to His Excellency's speech is concerned. Of course, the House can decide whether my ruling should be upheld or not.

Mr. FOSTER: I beg to second the amendment of the senior member for St. Andrew.

Mr. RAMSAY: Speaking on the amendment I should like to say—

Mr. SPEAKER: I have ruled the amendment to be out of order and I am not going to allow a debate on it.

Mr. LEWIS: I understand your Honour to say that the amendment is not in order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The matter was under discussion during the last session and the House reached no decision on it. The honourable senior member for St. Andrew is endeavouring by his amendment, to include in the Reply to His Excellency's speech a statement which will practically commit the House to saying that it agrees that legislation should be sent down for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church of England in Barbados and I rule it out of order on the ground that the honourable member is trying to get in by a side wind in this Reply to His Excellency's speech a matter which the House discussed during the last session but on which no decision was reached.

Mr. LEWIS: I respectfully submit to Your Honour that the senior member for St. Andrew cannot insert that in this Reply; it would have to be inserted on the decision of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I rule it is out of order.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—I heard an honourable member refer to this Address as the blue print of legislation which will come down to this House during this session and I did not hear Your Honour object to that statement. His Excellency the Governor, at page 4 of his speech, says that he is sending down Bills such as the Quarantine Bill, the Bill to amend the Prisons Act, the Bill to amend the Apprenticeship Bursaries Act, the Land Acquisition and Town and Country Planning Bills, and a Public Health Bill and I think that this House should tell him some of the other things we want sent down. If the House agree to the sentiments expressed in the amendment of the senior member for St. Andrew, I submit that it will be in order to include them in this Reply to His Excellency's speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: I rule it out of order. You can make a motion that the question be referred to the House and let the House give its decision on it.

Mr. LEWIS: I would be very reluctant to do that. Mr. Speaker, I would like you to direct me because my feeling in the matter is that this is the time to mention items such as the one referred to by the senior member for St. Andrew. This is a Reply to His Excellency's speech and it should foreshadow legislation which the House would desire should be passed. I see no reason why the House should waste three or four afternoons discussing matters with the view of passing Addresses and having them presented to His Excellency, if we can include those matters in this Reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: I rule the amendment out of order.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—I am very pleased to-day to hear the comment by the senior member for St. Philip on the brevity of the reply to His Excellency's speech because last year when I tried to impress upon the House that their Reply should foreshadow legislation I received no assistance at all. The brevity of the last Reply was satisfactory to

nonourable members and I am very pleased to see a change in attitude to-day.

Mr. CRAWFORD: While I appreciate what the honourable member has said I want to assure him that my remarks are not to be construed to mean that I am in agreement that the Reply to the Governor's speech should foreshadow legislation. Nothing of the kind. As far as legislation is concerned, that is the duty of the Government. The tail cannot wag the dog; at least it should not. All I am saying is that we should reply to any important issues which are mentioned in the speech.

Mr. LEWIS: I still am grateful for the comment, this time, that the Reply is brief. I would like to say that I too agree to the suggestion that it would be well for the House to express some concern about the financial condition in which we are likely to find ourselves. But, Sir, judging from the numerous Addresses of which notice has been given since the opening of this session I have no doubt that these matters will definitely find their way under discussion here and the opinion of the House transmitted to His Excellency the Governor.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member going to make a motion?

Mr. LEWIS: No, Sir, I am commenting generally on the speech and the proposed reply. I notice that in paragraph 4 on page 2 of his speech His Excellency the Governor has made a mistake and it should not go down in history that that is so and as far as I understand the amendment of the senior member for St. Andrew, it would have corrected this mistake. His Excellency says: "much time was also occupied in the lower House by private members' business which included discussions leading to the presentation of Addresses or to the passage of legislation relating to such widely diverse matters as the divorce law, the curtailment of the powers of the Legislative Council, the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church of England in Barbados" Now, Sir, the discussion, as you rightly said, on the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church of England in Barbados led neither to the presentation of an Address nor the sending down of legislation. No Address on the subject of the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church of England in Barbados was ever presented to the person to whom Addresses are presented.

Mr. SPEAKER: The expression which His Excellency used is "leading to the presentation of Addresses."

Mr. LEWIS: All right, Sir, if you interpret it that way. In my opinion it did not lead so far. There is one comment I would like to make in respect of the food crisis. If I understand the official pronouncement correctly, it is envisaged that there will not be a heavy reduction in the imports of food; further, there was a further discussion on the same subject somewhere else and it was stated, also officially, that Barbados could not afford to cut down her imports of food. That is what I remember reading. So far as the tacking on our Estimates of Colonial Development and Welfare schemes is concerned I take it that that cannot be foisted on us. We will have to agree to accept those schemes because of their usefulness to the community and where they can definitely be undertaken by us, they will be shown in the financial position of the colony. I have no fear on that score because it will be the duty of the House of Assembly to decide these matters and if we get into bankruptcy we certainly cannot blame the Government for it. It will be our concern if we do wrong. Now, at the top of page 4 of His Excellency's speech, there appears a number

of Bills which will be re-introduced. These are Bills that apparently at one time were before the Legislature, if not during the last session, but in a string of Addresses that have been actually presented there was one dealing with rent restriction, Sir, and we have got no expression of opinion on that. There is an old Bill that was before this Legislature dealing with the vital matter of the educational policy of this country—the Education Consolidation Bill—and this is the second occasion on which a speech was made at the opening of a legislative session without any comment whatever about that Bill. I think it is incumbent upon the Government to let us know what it intends to do about that matter. In the second paragraph appearing on page 4 of his speech, His Excellency uses the word "compromise" in connection with the proposal to remunerate members of the Executive Committee and the House of Assembly and I suggest that it would have been better if the word "solution" (Laughter) had been used instead. I think, Sir, that it was not entirely in place for the Head of the Administration to suggest that a "compromise" was necessary; a "solution" is all that he should be interested in. In the last paragraph on page 2, His Excellency says, in connection with nominations to the Other Place: "But whatever may be the decision on this specific point I believe that the time is coming, if it has not already come, when quite apart from the powers of the Legislative Council and with no specific political point in view, the membership of the Council might well be appreciably increased so that wider representation may be given to various shades of opinion in the community and the work of the Chamber facilitated by the presence of experts on such matters as agriculture, finance and the like" Well, Sir, we cannot attempt, nor would I be a party to attempting, to tell the Head of the Administration whom to appoint to the Other Place but I feel that it would be my duty to say that I personally would not welcome the appointment of more Civil Servants to that Body. I may be wrong but I read into this statement that perhaps the Director of Agriculture and the expected Financial Adviser may be put there. It may be a good thing for the colony but as far as I can see it now, the advice that such Civil Servants can give should be freely given to the Government and not necessarily expressed in the Legislature by them. I consider that it may not be out of place for the House, whether it puts it in the Reply to His Excellency's speech or not, to say that it would welcome the taking of such steps that will prevent the Other Place from destroying legislation that has been passed by the people's representatives in this Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER: I asked the honourable member at an early stage of his speech if he is going to make a motion.

Mr. LEWIS: No, Sir, I am merely expressing what I feel should be expressed on the speech that we were pleased to receive from His Excellency and the proposals that are to be made to this House. I am not proposing any amendment but I merely express my own sentiments so that even if they are not incorporated in the Reply, responsible members of this House may, for what they are worth, transmit them elsewhere for consideration.

Mr. WARD: We have heard very much criticism of the Governor's speech but I feel, Sir, that what we should criticise is the Select Committee's Report because this House is not in a position to tell the Governor what he should say. The Governor says what he feels and we should reply in our way. Although the report is very short I consider

that it refers to a number of the subject matters which have been already dealt with. The Report states that the House notes with satisfaction the sound financial position of the island; everybody should realise that after reading His Excellency's speech. The Governor himself knows it, so it is no good telling him the same time over again. What His Excellency said about the reduction of imports into the island will, if carried into effect, mean a reduction in the colony's revenue. As far as the expenditure is concerned, that is in our hands. If we feel that the island cannot afford to spend certain monies on certain schemes, it is our duty to say that we cannot spend those sums at the present time and ask the Government to shelve the schemes which are not necessary at the present moment. I beg to move an amendment to this Address by inserting the following paragraph to be numbered (4) instead of paragraph (4) as printed in the Address:—

"4 The House view with grave concern the possibility of heavy reduction in imports from all sources and trust that all essential commodities will be obtained for the people of the Island."

Mr. Speaker, the reason why I feel these words should be in the Address is because the Governor said that there will be a heavy reduction in imports from all sources. We really do not know what sources the Governor has a mind and I feel that this House knowing conditions as they are to-day in respect of the food situation, should ask the Governor to see that foodstuffs, things that are absolutely necessary for the livelihood of this community, should not be reduced and that more reductions should be made in luxuries which can be done without for the time being. In view of the very hard crop year which has just passed in this island and of the shortage of food, it should be the great desire of everyone to try to encourage the importation of commodities which are absolutely necessary for the people to live on and I consider that this paragraph should be inserted in this Address so as to let the Governor know how this House feels on this matter.

Mr. GARNER: I beg to second the amendment. It is true that those of us who have read and studied the Governor's speech think seriously over his warning that there will certainly be a heavy reduction in imports from all sources. That statement carries a lot of weight in this colony because everybody knows that Barbados produces very little foodstuffs and as a result we are passing through a period of starvation.

Mr. SPEAKER: Under Rule 141, you cannot second the amendment, though you can speak on it if it is seconded by some other honourable member.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I beg to second the amendment.

Mr. GARNER: I was interrupted but I will still go on. I repeat that in view of the gravity of that statement by His Excellency and in view of the prevailing conditions—it is true that Barbados is in for a very terrible time if this drought is not broken; some of the crop which we have already planted is drying up—anyone who knows about the condition of our people will not take that statement lightly and if no mention is made by the Select Committee in their Report about the seriousness of the food situation I attribute it to the fact that the Report was prepared in too much of a hurry and the honourable members who took part in the preparation of it can readily be excused for viewing this matter so lightly. I do not know if they think that this is part of the austerity plan. Up to now, things are very serious in this island. People are becoming

more and more hungry day after day; some of them when they go to their tables to eat are very hungry again before they finish eating and when they are told that there will be a heavy reduction in imports from all sources—it does not say from some sources—I think that somebody should issue a warning to those in power. Barbados has always been a country within the austerity plan. While some people revel in luxury, the poor inhabitants of this island have always had to draw their belts and go to sleep hungry. I say that we cannot afford to permit that state of affairs any longer and I hope that some steps will be taken in the right quarters to see that this statement is not carried into effect. We cannot afford to stop the people's food from coming in. If the Treasury went broke we will have to give the people food to eat. Anyone who has any real idea of what is really going on in this country will subscribe to the philosophy or agree with me that this is the time to import our food and see that we get it quickly. Our yam crop has failed; sweet potatoes are almost non-existent. When a plantation opens a field of potatoes in less than six hours' time the whole field is gone. I do not know what the food situation is going to be and I caution anybody who has anything to do with this Government to ask His Excellency to rescind that statement and see to it that as much food as possible is imported, so that the inhabitants will get something to eat. I pass on to certain expenses which His Excellency has warned us we, in time, will have to shoulder. I know that Great Britain is going under a financial strain at this moment. Due to the fact that the food situation is so serious I have great pleasure in supporting the amendment and I hope that when it is carried to the right quarters, if the matter was overlooked in the first instance, it will not be taken lightly now because each day we are getting sunshine and no rain and we are becoming worse off. Each day the rain keeps away, we are a more hungry people. Our crops are decreasing and it is true up to a point that our revenue for the coming year must be considerably less because our staple industry is sugar and when you take a glance at the canes at present in the fields you must agree that unless by means of some magic wand, there will be some great loss in our revenue and I will say that taking that into consideration it will be hard on us if the British Government threw the burden of financing certain schemes back on us.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member was speaking about the proposed reduction in imports and about steps being taken to ensure that supplies of foodstuffs are obtained for the people in this island but the honourable member is going on to something else.

Mr. GARNER: Well, Sir, I think that sugar is an essential commodity also. Sugar is one of our main diets. Anyhow, if Your Honour rules me out of order to speak on that point I will bow to your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am only suggesting that we should complete the debate on the amendment and get it out of the way.

Mr. GARNER: I think I have said all I want to say on the amendment. I shall bow to Your Honour's ruling but I do say that the Government will be well advised—I do not know what is Your Honour's attitude towards what has been said here to-day—to see to it at once that food comes into this island for the people, irrespective of the country from which it is purchased. Because there is an austerity plan in Great Britain, we cannot help her in this instance. During the War we may have sent

our sons but that was a case of the survival of the fittest. Our people cannot afford to make this sacrifice. I am told that even now in Great Britain the Government gives the children cod-liver oil and orange juice to keep away malnutrition and we have no such scheme here.

Mr. SPEAKER: I really think the honourable member is going out of order. The whole point is that steps should be taken to see that as much food as possible is brought into the island. You are now dealing with the question of diet.

Mr. GARNER: I take it that that is a counterpart to the scheme. Had it not been for the crisis in Great Britain, that statement would not have been made by the Governor. I take it as a counterpart and that is why I make reference to that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The amendment deals generally with all those things.

Mr. GARNER: As Your Honour rules.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I want to suggest to the mover of this amendment that he insert a few words:—

Mr. SPEAKER: Have you not spoken already?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I moved that the House go into Committee on the Address and my motion was lost.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. The honourable member spoke on the general motion and then he moved an amendment that the House go into Committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am speaking on this amendment that is before the House now.

Mr. ADAMS: May I suggest to Your Honour again on a point of order that if Your Honour is correct in your ruling honourable members can speak half a dozen times if there are half a dozen amendments.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I was suggesting, Sir, that the senior member for St. Lucy insert a few words in his amendment. I suggest that after the word "commodities" the words "or materials needed for the production of essential commodities" be inserted. It has been drawn to my attention that I cannot move the amendment myself and I am merely suggesting to the senior member for St. Lucy to insert those words in his amendment. Whether he will accept my suggestion or not I do not know.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are dealing with this amendment?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Yes, Sir. And I am giving my reason for the suggestion I have made. The reason is that one of the restrictions is that materials for capital works will not be allowed to come into the island unless there is going to be a saving in dollars.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member has already dealt with that matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I merely suggest to the honourable member that either he or anybody who agrees with his amendment should insert those words.

Mr. TALMA: I rise simply to say that so far as the amendment moved by the senior member for St. Andrew is concerned—

Mr. SPEAKER: I have ruled that out of order; therefore you cannot speak on it.

Mr. TALMA: I intend to speak on both amendments. I feel, Sir, that in view of the fact that a Committee has been appointed by this House to prepare the Reply to the Governor's speech everyone of us should have the right to express our sentiments in a matter of this sort and any insertions that are to be made can only be made at this stage. I certainly feel that we should be granted

the prerogative to insert anything we want to insert in this Reply to the Governor's speech. In so far as the remarks of the senior member for St. Philip are concerned, there are many points which he raised and which one would have thought might have been stated in other terms. He referred to certain schemes whereby unemployment may be solved—

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am sorry to interrupt the honourable member. If he is referring to my remarks I would ask him to tell me where I referred to schemes for solving unemployment.

Mr. TALMA: The honourable member referred to parts of the Governor's speech which he has in mind—

Mr. CRAWFORD: I cannot allow these misapprehensions to go abroad in the public Press. If the honourable member was sleeping, I should like to tell him that the problem of constructing Erdisten Training College was solved months ago. That is not now a project to solve unemployment. He must know that, if he lives in Barbados.

Mr. TALMA: I can listen, and learn and understand but the honourable member's memory seems to be very short. There are certain schemes mentioned in the Governor's speech; the honourable member condemns, so to speak, certain things that have been recommended and I am suggesting that more schemes should be included and implemented to relieve unemployment.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable members are making speeches which lead to nothing being done.

Mr. GALE: I beg to move the insertion of "or goods needed for capital development or materials needed for the production of essential commodities" after the words "commodities" in the amendment of the senior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. WARD: I accept the amendment of the junior member for St. Michael.

Mr. RAMSAY: Mr. Speaker,—It is indeed very difficult for honourable members to follow the amendments to this Address as intelligently as they might and although I am somewhat in sympathy with the amendment of the senior member for St. Lucy, yet I think it is superfluous. I will tell you why I think so, Mr. Speaker. If we read paragraph 3 of the Address and if we are not quibbling—and I know we are not—we will accept the Address as it is. Paragraph 3 says:—"The House fully appreciate the many matters of importance referred to in Your Excellency's speech and assure Your Excellency that any measures for the good of the island"—that is the sum total of the whole thing—"will, when laid before the House, receive their careful and sympathetic consideration." What the senior member for St. Lucy has added amounts to the same thing. If we were to go into His Excellency's speech and reply to it in detail it would require reams of paper. I am going to make a suggestion and it is this. When His Excellency the Governor is pleased to make a speech in future, let the House of Assembly write it for him. (Laughter).

The question that the amendment proposed by the senior member for St. Lucy be paragraph 4 of this Address is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. ADAMS: If your Honour will permit me to speak during the extra ten minutes I will say that it is merely because of my position in the House that I feel I should reply to one or two points. I do not want to say anything that affects matters which seem to be controversial but if we are to follow recognized practice—I say this with great respect to Your Honour and without even a suggestion that I am

questioning your ruling—it seems to me that this House may very well draw attention to the fact that it does not approve of any legislation sent down by the Governor or suggest to him that it would like certain legislation sent down. That is the normal English practice.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that we can debate that now.

Mr. ADAMS: I should like to remind honourable members that the late Mr. Walter Reece, while he was a member of this House, had stated on more than one occasion that it is not necessary to do more than thank the Governor for his speech and say that the House will give favourable consideration to what he sends down. I think the junior member for St. James must have, from his long and valuable experience in this House, realized that and influenced the other members of the Select Committee to be brief in their Report. It is only in recent years, since some long-winded people like myself got into the House and were in opposition to the Government, that all sorts of long statements were made in the Reply to the speech which the Governor delivered at the opening of a legislative session. The Reply is intended to be a reply to a comment on current events and it is surprising that the senior member for St. Philip differs from what this Address implies when we remember that the junior member for St. Lucy is the Chairman of the Select Committee that submitted the Report. The amendment which has just been passed is an excellent thing but I do wish honourable members would remember that even though it is considered that some of us are nit-wits all of us are not. Does anybody seriously consider that if the Government could import goods cheaply and in large quantities it will refuse to do so? We are not yet a Republic. We can draw to the Government's attention that such and such a measure is going to hit us hard, as we did on the occasion when it was proposed that the importation of manure should be restricted but to give the impression that this Government could import foodstuffs and will not do so, is to talk as if we were a republic. As regards the allegations about tacking on to the Estimates expenditure in connection with schemes like Erdiston Training College, the only reason for doing that is to save time; this expenditure will eventually be met from Colonial Development and Welfare funds. There is no additional expenditure which a falling revenue would have to meet. As far as the nomination of members to the Other Place is concerned, of course it would be wrong, in my opinion, for us to say anything except that we are determined that they shall not upset the will of the members of this House. Speaking for myself, if experts are to be appointed to the Other Place, provided they cannot upset any policy of this Chamber, it should be an excellent thing. There should not be two Legislative Assemblies. There should be one Legislative Assembly consisting of members elected by the people and the Other Place can be an assembly of experts in business and agriculture or anything else to advise us. I hope the time would soon come when we shall abolish the Other Place or transform it into a purely advisory body.

The question that this Address, as amended, do now pass is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—In accordance with Rule 30, I suggest that Your Honour communicate with the Governor and arrange for the presentation of this Address.

Mr. SPEAKER: I shall do so and shall communicate to this House the date and the time which have been arranged.

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

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (A)

On reassembling,

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—There are no replies to questions ready and I am asking leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (a) in order to proceed with Government Business.

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

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

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day under Government Business 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.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

His Honour left the Chair, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY RESOLUTION RE ORGANISATION FOR DEALING WITH REMITTANCES OF WORKERS IN U.S.A.

Dr. CUMMINS: This Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is for £200 to supplement resolution No. 41 of the 30th of April, 1947, to provide the necessary staff and stationery for, and to meet incidental expenses in connection with the carrying on of an organisation for banking the compulsory savings of Barbadian workers employed in the U.S.A., for the payment to their nominees of the allotments authorised to be paid under the terms of the workers' contracts, for the payment of any Court order in respect of the maintenance of any persons dependent on the workers, for the reimbursement of any monies paid by the Government of Barbados in respect of duties in the U.S.A., and in respect of advances made to the workers by way of cash or in order to effect insurance.

This Resolution is of a similar type to those which come before us from time to time. As honourable members are aware, it has to do with the voting of money to carry on the establishment which is at present working to carry out the terms of an agreement in connection with money remitted by the emigrants in the U.S.A. I understand, Sir, that it is felt in some quarters that the time has come when this organisation should be done away with. I take this opportunity to say that in my opinion and in the opinion of the Government this organisation cannot be abandoned because there are still about 400 or 500 emigrants in the U.S.A. Consequently we have to carry on the organisation until that number of emigrants has been substantially reduced before we can think of doing away with it. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. DOWDING: The honourable mover of the passing of this Resolution has suggested something about doing away with this organisation; I hope that before it is done away with the money which these workers have paid by way of income tax since 1944 will be forthcoming to them. These people have not yet got this money which is due to them and I would like some information from the honourable member as to why this is so. It is very hard for people who have worked for money in U.S.A. to be suffering in this island and unable to get that money. I have spoken with several people who have been to me in connection with this matter; I have examined one of these people's papers and I am quite certain that there is an amount of more than \$20 due to him since 1945. This is now almost 1948 and I would like some information as to this matter.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Before this money is voted, I would like to know one or two things. I would like to know firstly if this Department has been given an efficient staff to deal with the auditing of accounts. I understand that several requests have been made to the Government quite recently in this connection and nothing has been done. I would also like to know if a Department which is responsible for several million dollars should be carried on without some special means of auditing accounts. I would further like to know if the Government has given effect to the requests made quite recently for the appointment of somebody connected with Government auditing to look after the auditing of these accounts.

Mr. WILKINSON: Before the honourable member replies, I would like to support the remarks of the honourable senior member for St. George. I have also been interviewed by some of the men who went to U.S.A. in 1945. They have worked for good money, it is true, income tax has been deducted and they were told that if they returned to Barbados within a certain time their income tax would be refunded. I understand that the payment of these funds has been deferred since 1944. I hope that the Government will do their best to speed up the payment of this money if it is due.

Dr. CUMMINS: I do not know what money honourable members are referring to but I promise that I will make some enquiries about it. As regards the remarks of the honourable senior member for the City, this is the first time that I have heard anything about any request having been made for the auditing of accounts at this Department. For obvious reasons, that is unknown to me and I will make enquiries about that matter as well.

Mr. LEWIS: I am one of those persons who feel that this organisation might have been conducted to help persons who have been to the U.S.A. for the first two years but after that it would seem to be out of place. The money advanced to these people by the Government must have been repaid or arrangements should have been made for it to be repaid within the first period of their engagement. The payment of Court orders in respect of the maintenance of persons dependent on the workers would seem to be an infringement of the right of these workers to do as they like with their wages. There are people working in places like Curacao and Aruba and these facilities have not been set up for them. I take it that this organisation had to be set up because the Government had to insure the people who were leaving here and make advances to them when they landed in the U.S.A. Undoubtedly the Government set up this organisation to collect the money that was loaned to these people and to facilitate the payment of Court orders and things of that sort. I

think that that stage has been passed; these workers are now engaged for a longer period than was at first intended and I think that they should be allowed to remit money to their families as they think fit; Otherwise the Government should give every Barbadian worker these same facilities. I think it is right that these workers should have their money remitted direct to their relatives and dependants and they should be able to do as they like with the money for which they work. That, I say, is the prescriptive right of every wage-earner. I feel that with emigration at this stage, unless we are going to have emigration to the U.S.A. in future, this organisation has served its usefulness and must be stopped. I repeat that these people must have repaid the Government and they must be allowed to remit money in the way they want to remit it. I think the organization was an attempt for the Government easily to get hold of the American money and give people the West Indian equivalent. I am wondering whether it is not an infringement of the right of the individual to take his money and pay it out. I think that the Government should keep out of this business altogether and let the people remit their money as they have been doing for decades.

Mr. FOSTER: I think that this organisation is one of the best organisations that could have been set up. The emigrants can realise some money. I have received a letter from a friend of mine in Panama to the effect that hundreds of people are awaiting repatriation to this country. A few of them have already been repatriated. As Churchwarden of St. Andrew I say that there are a few of them in the Almshouse; they are naked, penniless and everything else. If we allow this organisation to fall through, I presume that the majority of these workers will come back here in the same condition. Therefore I think that this organisation is one of the best organisations that the Government could ever have thought of.

Mr. TALMA: If this Resolution is properly read it will be seen that it is a supplementary Resolution to provide the necessary staff, stationery, and so forth, to carry on what has been carried on for many years. The question which has been raised by the Honourable senior member for St. George relative to the payment of income tax is one which has engaged my attention for some time and I happen to know something about. The position is that income tax has been deducted from the earnings of workers in the U.S.A. and it seems as if certain people who have been there are being taxed again. That is not a very satisfactory state of affairs. The words "duties incurred" have been used in the Resolution and the question really is what the word "duties" means if it means anything at all. If we can define "duties" then we can understand the whole situation. I am not yet clear as to what this word means. The whole crux of the matter hangs on the meaning of this word. I know from personal experience that many workers have suffered the greatest hardship in being taxed twice. That is what I suppose the honourable senior member for St. George has referred to.

Mr. DOWDING: I am not quite clear as to what the last speaker was talking about.

Mr. TALMA: I merely attempted to explain what the honourable member was trying to say.

Mr. DOWDING: I thank the honourable senior member for St. Thomas for his reply and I regret that he cannot give me any more information. I feel that this is a very serious state of affairs which should be gone into very forcibly. These people went to the U.S.A. and worked for their money a

part of which was deducted according to the law in the U.S.A. for the payment of income tax. If they worked for under \$500 the amount deducted for income tax was to be refunded to them; if they worked for over that amount a certain percentage of the money that was collected according to the amount they worked for was to be returned to them here. I have been to the Labour Office and enquired into this case of payment due since 1945 in particular. I know from the time I was in the U.S.A. that income tax is regulated from year to year. I cannot understand why this money has not been paid to these people. I understand that even in respect of 1944 people have not received what is due to them. I hope that this organisation will not be abandoned until these people are told exactly what the cause for the delay of the payment of this money is, and when they will receive the money which is due and owing to them.

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

The Resolution was passed.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. TALMA, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee and that the Committee had asked for leave to sit again.

The House resumed and Mr. SPEAKER reported accordingly.

On motions of Mr. ADAMS seconded in each case by Mr. TALMA, the Resolution passed in Committee was read a first and second time and agreed to.

FISHING INDUSTRY CONTROL REGULATIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for Christ Church:—To move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution to approve Regulations made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee under section 5 of the Fishing Industry Control Act, 1947 (1947-4).

Mr. TALMA: I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. These Regulations speak for themselves; they are really made for the purpose of safeguarding the lives of the fishermen; enabling them to obtain bigger and better fishing boats and ensuring that the fishing industry is carried on on a better basis than was the case in the past.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. GARNER: I would appreciate if the House would go into Committee on these Regulations; I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on these Regulations.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT seconded the motion which was agreed to.

His Honour left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Regulations, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed I should like to say that it is the decision of the Chair that these Regulations be dealt with one by one because I feel that the House want them to be dealt with in that way.

Regulation 1 was read and passed.

Regulations 2 was read as follows:—

2. In these Regulations

“the Act” means the Fishing Industry Control Act, 1947;

“fishing boat” means any boat which is used for the purpose of capturing fish for gain;

“inspector” means an inspector appointed under the provisions of the Act;

“owner” in relation to a fishing boat includes the person having for the time being the principal charge and care of such fishing boat;

“year” means the period of twelve months beginning on the first day of October and ending on the thirtieth day of September next following.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to move that Regulation 2 stand part of these Regulations.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I should like to ask whether this definition of a fishing boat is sufficient to cover a new boat. I have an opinion as to the definition of a new boat and it is that a new boat would be a boat which is to be used for capturing fish. According to this definition here it would mean that the boat has been previously used for capturing fish.

Mr. TALMA: I should like to draw to the attention of the honourable member that these are Regulations whereby all fishing boats whether they be new or old will be registered.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: That does not answer the point raised by the honourable junior member for the City. The honourable member's point is that a new boat could not be registered because it has not been used for capturing fish.

Dr. CUMMINS: Regulation 3 (1) will answer that question. It says: “No fishing boat shall put to sea unless it has been inspected and registered in accordance with the provisions of these Regulations.”

The question that Regulation 2 stand part of these Regulations was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Regulation 2 was passed.

Regulation 3 was read as follows:—

3. (1) No fishing boat shall put to sea unless it has been inspected and registered in accordance with the provisions of these Regulations.

(2) In the event of failure to comply with the provisions of this Regulation in respect of any fishing boat, the owner of such fishing boat shall be liable for such failure.

(3) No proceedings shall be taken in respect of any failure to comply with the provisions of this Regulation until the expiration of three months after the coming into operation of these Regulations.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to move that Regulation 3 stand part of these Regulations.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to take this opportunity to say that I have heard of a Fishery Officer who has an office somewhere in Queen's Park connected with the Department of Science and Agriculture. We are now regulating the fishing industry and hitherto this Officer has not had to register these boats. I am wondering if this Officer will require a staff to do this work or whether the Government considers that he already has this staff to do this work as I see it in these Regulations.

Mr. SMITH: I would like to know who this inspector is going to be, whether he will be a person appointed locally, whether he will be imported and whether he will be one who knows about fishing boats.

Mr. TALMA: I feel that information such as been asked for should be within the grasp of those honourable members who have asked for it. The honourable member for the City should know the answer to his question in view of the fact that he is a senior member of this Assembly. In order to answer that question specifically I should like to state there is a Fishery Officer, there is an Assistant known as in-

spector and there is a small staff which happens to be functioning fairly well up to now. As necessity arises, as soon as the fishing industry is enlarged as soon as bigger and better boats are provided in the various centres a bigger staff will be provided to do the work involved.

Mr. SMITH: My reason for trying to find out who this inspector is going to be is this; there is a lot of dissatisfaction among the fishermen at Tent Bay because it is said that the Fishery Officer has valued their boats at little or nothing. It is said that a boat which costs \$400, particularly a new boat has been valued at \$200.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if the honourable member is speaking from the point of view of insurance.

Mr. SMITH: I want to know about the valuation of these boats because, as I say, there is much dissatisfaction among boat owners and fishermen at Tent Bay as to the valuation of the boats.

Mr. TALMA: The point is to know how much money can be loaned on an economic basis. The object of the valuation of the boats is to know how much money can be loaned as in the case of a mortgage.

Mr. SMITH: If this Officer has undervalued the boats people will not be able to get much money loaned on their boats. In my opinion, that makes the case worse because if they are valuing these boats with the expectation of making loans by way of security and they are undervaluing the boats, the fishermen will get very little money on their boats. I hope that this inspector will be someone who knows about building boats. The Fishery Officer may not know how much money is required to build a boat. I repeat that I hope this inspector will know something about building boats and how much money is required to build a boat to-day.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: In borrowing money on anything you do not get the full value of it; you get a reasonable amount.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I support the honourable junior member for St. Joseph in the question which he has asked. I do not want to know the name of the person who will be the inspector but I should like to know what method is going to be employed in inspecting these boats. These are new Regulations made and they must affect a number of poor people who work for their living by the fishing industry and people who invest their savings in fishing boats. Certainly this Committee is entitled to know something as to the method which is going to be adopted in inspecting these boats before we pass something which will affect a number of people. I am wondering if the honourable senior member for Christ Church can tell us what method will be adopted in the inspection of these boats.

Mr. TALMA: The object of this Resolution is to provide the means whereby proper assistance will be granted the fishermen. If the opposition feels that these Regulations should not be passed, they are delaying the hands of progress. These Regulations are the means whereby the fishermen will be given assistance and the opposition is adopting a *laissez faire* policy. We are making an effort to give assistance where the fishing industry is concerned and we are meeting opposition from people who should render assistance in matters of this nature. We have a Fishery Officer and an Inspector; we are getting a bigger staff and here it is that we are getting opposition even from among our own ranks.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have no intention of delaying any legislation in this House; when I feel like talking I will talk. I agree with the honourable juni-

or member for St. Joseph, these are new Regulations and nobody, least of all myself, would attempt to delay the passing of Regulations which will have the effect of assisting the fishing industry. I am not interested in the inspector or anything like that. Regulation 3 (1) says: "No fishing boat shall put to sea unless it has been inspected and registered in accordance with the provisions of these Regulations." What I am asking is this: what type of inspection is going to be carried out? They may appoint somebody who knows about racing or anything else to do this job but he may not know anything about fishing boats.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I have no desire to delay the passing of these Regulations. In a Regulation you cannot state specifically the method of doing anything. The question asked by the honourable senior member for the City is childish in the extreme because, I repeat, you cannot in a Regulation state the method by which you are going to do anything. If you do that you are putting in something which you cannot foresee. You want to inspect the boats for their seaworthiness; it is not so much a question as to the method you are going to adopt. Can you say that you are getting something by which you will measure the beams of the boats or the banks on which the boats are going? What method can you envisage to say that that is the method which you are going to use to inspect these boats? Are you going to say "Let us bring in some fishing fleets from Nova Scotia and let us use this or that method of inspection?" I should like to say that any honourable member who, at this stage, would try for any reason to make the passing of these Regulations a difficulty is being more or less ungrateful. During the War years when we suffered terribly from the want of fish and the fishermen could not get the means of putting their boats out to sea, the Government came to their rescue. Normally the fishermen would not have been able to help themselves and I am pleased to see that the Government is now seeing to it that these fishermen have proper boats. It is all very well for people to talk about helping the poor but there are those who only help the poor when they are dead and gone. Sometimes fishermen have to work boats for people and we should be interested in seeing that these fishermen go to work in boats in which their lives can be protected. The fishermen have the right to go to sea in boats which are seaworthy and it is the duty of the Government to see that they are thus protected apart from any sentiment as to whose pockets are touched. To my mind the method of inspecting the boats is a matter of detail and this is only drawing a red herring across the trail.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I want to draw this matter to the attention of the Committee. If an honourable member rises to speak and another honourable member catches the eyes of the Chair, it is the duty of the honourable member who rose to speak to take his seat.

Mr. SMITH: I do not want to oppose this Resolution; I simply want to know if this inspector or officer knows anything about the cost of building a fishing boat, because the honourable member in charge of the Resolution tells me that the officer is valuing these boats as security for the purpose of loans being made by the Government. Any person can be an inspector of a boat because if the body of the boat does not take in water he will believe that it is seaworthy; but the inspector may not be in a position to value the boat correctly. He may not know how many pounds of nails are required for building a boat or anything like that. I want to safeguard the fishermen; I do not want to oppose the Resolution

in any way. I do not want any hardship to be created on the fishermen and it is for that reason that I asked the question.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have said on several occasions that whenever the Leader of the House or any member of the Government rises to speak I am going to hear him.

Mr. ADAMS: While I am embarrassed by what you, Mr. Chairman, have said, there is a precedent for it in the House of Commons although I do not want by any means to avail myself of it. With great respect to honourable members I think that the honourable member in charge of this Resolution is taking some of these things too seriously. Does my colleague seriously suggest that if, for instance, he has to present his motor-car for inspection and some car owner who may not know the real value of the car values it, the Government is not going to find out what is the real value of the car? You get somebody valuing a property at £2,800 and somebody else will value it at £5,000. These things happen all the time. It is the duty of the Government to have motor vehicles, fishing boats, and so on inspected. All we are asking here is for an inspector to inspect and value these boats so as to see whether they are seaworthy or not. If the inspector does not know his job a report can be made to the Colonial Secretary and he will appoint someone who knows his job. The honourable junior member for St. Joseph seems to have forgotten that we voted money to send out the Fishery Officer to take a course and it is to be presumed that he knows something about his job.

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

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (B).

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (b) in order to continue Government Business. These Regulations are of sufficient importance that we should pass them this afternoon.

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

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

Mr. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to.

FISHING INDUSTRY CONTROL REGULATIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the time for Private Members' arrived the House was in Committee on a Resolution to approve Regulations made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee under Section 5 of the Fishing Industry Control Act, 1947 (1947-4).

Mr. ADAMS: Before the consideration of this Resolution is resumed, it may be in order to point out that as far as these Regulations are concerned—I thank your Honour for reminding me—there is a ruling by the Attorney General as to the power of the House to amend these Regulations as distinct from rejecting them if honourable members disapprove of them. I do not know if it is the intention of honourable members to amend the Regulations; if it is their intention to do so, I suggest that we postpone consideration of this Resolution until we know whether the Acting Attorney General is also of the opinion expressed by the Attorney General. If honourable members feel that we can pass them; but if they have any intention to amend any of them I suggest that we postpone consideration of the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee on the Regulations, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House was in Committee on these Regulations we were discussing Regulation 3.

Mr. LEWIS: There is a lot to be said for every point of view that has been expressed in connection with this Regulation. In order that we may get ahead with the consideration of these Regulations I am making a suggestion and it is this; I feel that all that is necessary to be done is for the honourable member in charge of this Resolution to assure honourable members that the Government will appoint persons who are capable of making this inspection and when that is done we can only rely on them. We are dealing with the inspection and registration of fishing boats; we are dealing with people who have followed the rule-of-thumb method—a very primitive method which they have enjoyed—and we have to be very careful about interfering with these people. I am in sympathy therefore with honourable members who have expressed some anxiety about this matter. I repeat that, in my opinion, all that is necessary to be done now is for the Government member in charge of this Resolution to give honourable members the assurance that none but the best persons will be appointed to do this work. We have heard that it is not lawful for us to amend these Regulations and if anything is even wrong with them we cannot alter it; we will have to reject all the Regulations. We have to bear that in mind in dealing with a Resolution of this sort and therefore honourable members' questions must be answered as well as possible. It is not the law of the land for us to amend these Regulations.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It is customary in introducing a Resolution of this sort for the introducer to make a few remarks outlining the policy which the Regulations more or less seek to put into practice. Now these are Regulations to an Act of which, apparently, the minds of honourable members need a little refreshing. That is all there is to the matter. If in introducing the Resolution some attempt, no matter how brief it was, had been made to remind honourable members of the policy of the particular Act and of the general principle underlying these Regulations, we should not now have all these questions being asked and all this protracted debate taking place.

Mr. GARNER: I do not think that all is well with these Regulations. I am not——

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I want the honourable member to deal with Regulation 3.

Mr. GARNER: That is as far as we have got, Mr. Chairman. I do not think that all is well with these Regulations down to Regulation 3. We have just passed an Act and we have passed a Resolution for £3,000 in connection with the fishing industry. Everybody in the community knows that meat is scarce and we have to depend upon the fishermen to catch fish so that we can get it with our meals. Fish is an essential article of diet and I do not see why we should make all these Regulations and place them around the necks of the people who are putting food into other people's mouths. I feel that these Regulations are laudable but this is not the time for making them. We have just been considering the Governor's Speech as to the position facing the colony and I do not see why we should be putting a ring around the fishermen's necks. This is foolishness; it is——

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member must not refer to matters in this House as foolishness.

Mr. GARNER: It does not make sense. We have already voted £3,000 in connection with the fishing industry and these people may not be able to comply with these Regulations. The honourable junior member for St. Joseph is quite correct in

asking that question. In other words, he wants to be assured that the boats will be valued by someone who knows about them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said that the Government will not appoint anybody to do this job unless the person is capable of doing it.

Mr. GARNER: It would be well if this Committee were to reconsider their opinion as to these Regulations. We have just had Regulations—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is a Rule of this House, I think it is No. 135 which says that honourable members must not interrupt when a debate is taking place. If the interruption continues I shall have to call the names of honourable members. That will be very uncomfortable but it will have to be done.

Mr. GARNER: I was saying that I would counsel this Committee to go cautiously with these Regulations because we know the effect of the Dairy Regulations on that industry. People have to keep their premises under certain conditions before they can sell milk and the plantations have refused to keep cows and sell milk; and when you open a tin of condensed milk it goes in two minutes. On account of the Regulations the poor people cannot get any fresh milk. If you take this particular industry unless you are going to assist it—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There are several Regulations before us and I would like the honourable member to confine his remarks to the particular Regulation.

Mr. GARNER: I think that I am dealing with Regulation 3. Regulation 3. (1) says this: "No fishing boat shall put to sea unless it has been inspected and registered in accordance with the provisions of these Regulations." It will mean that if these Regulations are enforced the fishermen will not be able to put their boats to sea and we will not be able to get any fish. I have just drawn an analogy as to the Dairy Regulations which prevent people from getting milk; and I say that it would be wise for this Committee to allow these Regulations to remain over until the food situation is a little easier. Do not let us put any rings around these people's necks; they are unable to carry out these Regulations. It is all very well and good for us to talk about passing these Regulations but when the fishermen cannot put their boats to sea they will almost damn the passing of these Regulations to-day; they will be sorry that you ever lent them money for the purpose of repairing their boats. I say that all of them will not get this money and are we going to send a carpenter to do a shoemaker's job?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable senior member for St. Joseph made the position clear long ago.

Mr. GARNER: They always do that and we are not sure that they are absolutely divorced from that procedure. It is as well, therefore, that we ask questions about it. I think it would be well for us to put aside these Regulations until the food situation eases a bit.

Mr. GALE: The strain of honourable members' remarks would make it appear as if the Government is trying to hinder the fishing industry, not to encourage it. We have already passed a Bill for the encouragement of the fishing industry in these parts, and I take it that these Regulations were made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee to encourage the industry, not to hamper it. I fail to see the reason for all this controversy. If a schooner is going out to sea a certificate has to be obtained from the Harbour and Shipping Master to the effect that it is seaworthy; and the Government is only asking here that if a fishing boat is going out to sea a certificate be obtained from the inspector to the effect that the

boat is seaworthy. The valuation of the boat has nothing to do with that; what the reason is for all this fuss over the passing of these Regulations, I do not know.

Mr. TALMA: The object of making the loans is to cause the boats to be seaworthy and the object of appointing the inspector is to have the boats valued in order to see how Government funds are being dealt with. The object of this debate is incomprehensible.

The question that Regulation 3 stand part of these Regulations was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Regulation 3 was passed.

Regulation 4 was read as follows:—

4. (1) Every application for the registration of a fishing boat shall be made to an Inspector, who, on receipt of such application shall inspect such fishing boat, and if satisfied that the same is seaworthy, assign to such fishing boat a number (hereinafter referred to as the registration number) and shall issue to the owner of such fishing boat a certificate of registration thereof.

(2) Every certificate of registration shall be in such form as shall be approved by the Director of Agriculture and shall contain the following particulars in respect of the fishing boat for which it is issued:—

- (i) the registration number
- (ii) the name
- (iii) the usual place of anchorage
- (iv) the name and address of the owner
- (v) the dimensions namely, the length (from bow to transom), the beam, and the approximate draught
- (vi) the number of the crew usually employed, distinguishing between persons above the age of sixteen years and other persons.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to move that Regulation 4 stand part of these Regulations.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I would like an explanation of the word "seaworthy". (Laughter). I, personally, do not consider any fishing boat seaworthy because I would not go out to sea in any of them. If the inspector has the same opinion as I have, none of the boats would be seaworthy. The opinion has been expressed that fishing boats should be half-decked or quarter-decked so as to make them seaworthy. There are fishermen who will tell you that they cannot catch fish with the boats which we have at present. If the word "seaworthy" only means that a boat is strong and it is not taking water—in fact the word "seaworthy" should have been explained just as other words are explained in Regulation 2 of these Regulations. If the inspector says that the boats should be quarter-decked what will we do? If he says that they are not seaworthy there is no right of appeal to anybody and the fishermen will have to keep their boats ashore. I would like to have an explanation as to that.

Mr. TALMA: "Seaworthy" is an ordinary English word which any normal honourable member can understand; it means the fitness of a boat to go to sea at all. I am surprised that the honourable member cannot appreciate the meaning of a word which is used in ordinary, everyday language. The honourable member probably knows how landworthy an agricultural labourer might be. The word "seaworthy" speaks for itself: it means the fitness of a boat to go to sea. The honourable member should

know that and I believe that he has several dictionaries at his home.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: This is a question of a different seaworthiness. I know that it is held that our boats are not seaworthy. If you bring an inspector from England I do not think that he would pass any of these boats. I know the meaning of the word "seaworthy" just as any honourable member knows it.

Mr. BRANCKER: What is worrying me in this Regulation is that there is no time-limit placed on the inspector for inspecting a boat, after the application for registration has been made. It says that every application for the registration of a boat shall be made to an Inspector but it does not say anything about the inspection of the boat with respect to the date of the application for registration. You might have a lethargic inspector claiming to be very busy and taking his time over making an inspection. I would like to see some reasonable time-limit put in this Regulation for the inspection of a boat after an application has been made for its registration. I think that a reasonable time-limit of, say, seven days should be put in the Regulation for this inspection to be done following the application for registration because some boat owners may be kept back for days or even weeks while an inspector is claiming that he is busy. I would recommend the insertion of the words "within seven days after such application" after the word "shall" occurring at the end of line 2 of Clause 1 of this Regulation so as to ensure that the inspection of the boat will be carried out and the owner will not be kept waiting unduly.

Mr. TALMA: The honourable member happens to be a lawyer and he should know that no stipulation such as that is placed in Regulations such as these; but a reasonable time is inferred.

Mr. BRANCKER: A reasonable time for an inspector might be three or four weeks but that would not be a reasonable time for a boat owner who might want to put his boat to sea. That is why I recommend that this time-limit be seven days or even fourteen days so that the inspector will be tied down to a certain time-limit.

Mr. COX: I am hoping that the honourable junior member for St. Lucy will withdraw the point which he made after hearing me. These Regulations are similar to those made in respect of motor vehicles and no time is stipulated for the inspection of these vehicles. I do not see the necessity for what the honourable member has suggested. With the present Government constituted as it is, the honourable member can rest assured that it is a reasonable Government and it is prepared to do nothing that will harm the poor people. As far as the remarks of the honourable senior member for St. James is concerned, he appreciates the fish more than the lives of the fishermen.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think that that statement is unfair, unnecessary and uncalled for, the honourable senior member for St. James has never insinuated anything like that.

Mr. COX: The honourable member wants to find out what the fishermen will do if the Inspector says that the boats are not seaworthy. What does the honourable member mean by that? He means that if the inspector refuses to pass these boats the fishermen will be out of work and they must be allowed to carry their boats to sea anyhow. I am saying that the time has come when these fishermen should be protected. Every now and then we hear of a boat having drifted away or sunk when

engaged in catching fish, and I think that the Government is acting wisely and well when it sees that these boats are seaworthy.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is regrettable that the honourable senior member for St. Michael made use of the words which he used. The honourable senior member for St. James intimated that it has been held that the boats should be quarter-decked. It does not get us anywhere to carry on with remarks that are uncalled for.

The question that Regulation 4 stand part of these Regulations was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Regulation 4 was passed.

Regulations 5 to 9 inclusive were read and passed.

Regulation 10 was read as follows:—

10. (1) The owner of a fishing boat shall, if required so to do by an Inspector, submit such fishing boat for inspection at the time and place named by such Inspector.

(2) If on any such inspection the Inspector shall be satisfied that the fishing boat is unfit for purposes of fishing, he may cancel the certificate of registration of such fishing boat and such fishing boat shall thereupon be deemed to be not registered.

(3) The owner of any fishing boat the certificate of which has been cancelled under the provisions of paragraph (2) of this Regulation may within seven clear days after such cancellation appeal in writing to the Director of Agriculture against such cancellation, and the decision of the Director of Agriculture shall be final.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to move that Regulation 10 stand part of these Regulations.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: In case the Inspector says that the boat is unfit to go to sea you have to appeal to the Director of Agriculture. At present the Director of Agriculture is head of the Inspector so that this is a question of appealing from Caesar to Caesar. I think that this appeal should be made to the Harbour and Shipping Master. Does the Director of Agriculture know whether a boat is seaworthy or not? I cannot see how he can come into the question at all. I beg to move that the words "Director of Agriculture" occurring in lines four and five of Clause 3 of this Regulation be deleted in order to insert the words "Harbour and Shipping Master."

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member must bear in mind that we cannot make any amendment to these Regulations because they will all go overboard.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I beg to move that the consideration of this Regulation be postponed.

Mr. GARNER: I beg to second that.

Mr. TALMA: I should like to point out to the honourable senior member for St. James that this is not a question of appealing from Caesar to Caesar but appealing to the head of the spring.

Mr. COX: My opinion is that we should agree to these Regulations in principle and let the Government to work out the details. We are assuming now that we are experts and the Government is a nit-wit. Let us pass the Regulations; the Government has its experts to go into the details. This is just a matter of wasting time and preventing the work from going on.

Mr. ADAMS: When you have a Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries in England he might not have seen the sea in his life; but as the Head of the Department he is the final Court of Appeal. It does

not mean that he will go and see after a matter; he will call in an expert. Whenever the Chief Justice sits in connection with a case of arbitration it does not mean that he knows about shipping; he consults an expert.

Mr. GARNER: I do not think that any honourable member is willing to stop any legislation in this House; but if things do not appear to be right you have the right or privilege of enquiring about them. I feel that these Regulations will hamper the catching of fish.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question before the Committee is that the further consideration of this Regulation be postponed. The honourable member will have to confine his remarks to that.

Mr. GARNER: I have seconded the motion for the postponement of this Regulation for many reasons and I think that the Committee would do well to postpone it. There are just a few final remarks which I would like to make before I sit down. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has made mention about experts looking after these matters and I am sure that that is what beats England now. There are too many experts and the actual work is not being done. That is the whole trouble. We are getting high-falutin people to put rings around the necks of these fishermen and time is going to tell.

Mr. MOTTLEY: My position is this: I have not the slightest idea of voting for the postponement of the Regulation because I am satisfied that the Director of Agriculture will be the arbitrator, so to speak, and he will appoint people who know about boats in case of an appeal. But what I am worried about is this; even the Government cannot deny it—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member can only speak on the question of the postponement of the Regulation.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am speaking on that, Mr. Chairman. When a certificate has been cancelled—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member can only speak on the postponement of the Regulation.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I cannot just say postponement; I am only trying—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member must not bandy words with the Chairman.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Am I not entitled to give reasons as to why the Regulation should not be postponed? I am saying that this Regulation should not be postponed because I believe the Director of Agriculture will have a staff who will know about these matters. This Regulation only gives the right—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member will speak on the postponement of this Regulation.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am giving the reasons why this Regulation should not be postponed and I would like to get some more information, before you put the question, as to why nothing is said about the granting of certificates while mention is made of the

cancellation of them. If a certificate is refused there is no right of appeal; but if it is cancelled you have the right of appeal.

Mr. ADAMS: I entirely agree with the honourable member. I suggest that it is our duty to make supplementary Regulations but we cannot put in anything here. I ask honourable members to pass these Regulations and the members of the Executive Committee will bring the matter to the notice of the Government and the Governor-in-Executive Committee will make supplementary Regulations.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank the honourable member very much. That seems to be the spirit to be adopted in these matters, not to try to bully-rag people.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The word "bully-rag" is one which is well known to members of this House.

Mr. WILKINSON: I think that it would be advisable to use the words "Harbour and Shipping Master" instead of the words "Director of Agriculture" in this Regulation. I am in favour of the postponement of the Regulation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the consideration of this Regulation be now postponed. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Noes" have it. The question now is that Regulation 10 stand part of these Regulations. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. WILSON, Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. LEWIS, SMITH, F. L. WALCOTT, COX, MAPP, FOSTER, TALMA, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, GARNER, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, DOWDING, GALE, BRANCKER and Mr. SPEAKER—18.

Noes: Messrs. S. A. WALCOTT and WILKINSON—2.
Regulation 10 was passed.

Regulation 11 was read and passed.

On the motion of Mr. TALMA, seconded by Mr. ADAMS, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Regulations in Committee.

The House resumed and Mr. SPEAKER reported accordingly.

On the motion of Mr. TALMA, seconded by Mr. ADAMS, the Resolution was passed.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to this day week, the 28th of October, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER accordingly adjourned the House to Tuesday next, the 28th of October, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon.