THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT).

SESSION 1947—48

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 17th August, 1948.

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. G. B. EVELYN, (*Speaker*); His Honour Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, (*Deputy Speaker*); Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Messrs. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, F. L. WALCOTT, M. E. COX, D. A. FOSTER, R. G. MAPP, A. E. S. LEWIS, C. E. TALMA, H. D. BLACKMAN, J. A. HAYNES, B.A., V. C. GALE, G. H. ADAMS, B.A., and J. H. WILKINSON, O.B.E.

Prayers are read.

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

MINUTES.

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 10th August, 1948, having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

DOCUMENT.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Colonial Treasurer's Financial Report for the month of July, 1948.

PAPERS LAID.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I have the honour to lay the following Papers:—

Message No. 14/1948 from His Excellency the Governor, with reference to the Address from the Honourable the House of Assembly dated the 22nd day of June on the subject of the salaries of the Official Reporters of the Legislature.

Message No. 15/1948 from His Excellency the Governor, with reference to the Address from the Honourable the House of Assembly dated the 13th of July on the subject of the repair of houses damaged by recent winds and rain.

Despatch from the Secretary of State for the Colonies regarding the work of Information Departments in the Colonies.

Statement showing the Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for three months ended 30th June, 1948.

NOTICES.

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Dr. Cummins: Resolution to authorise the Governor to enter into an Agreement with a person to serve in the office of Organiser of the Government Housecraft Centre subject to the conditions set out in the Schedule to the resolution.

Mr. TALMA: Bill to amend the Witnesses and Interpreters (Payment) Act, 1891 (1891-14).

Mr. TALMA: Bill to amend the Petty Debt Act, 1899 (1899-3).

Dr. CUMMINS: Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921 (1921-3).

Mr. BLACKMAN: Resolution to approve of the moving of a Stand Pipe in Deacons Road, St. Michael.

Mr. WARD, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. DOWDING enter the House and take their seats.

Mr. ADAMS: Of my intention, in accordance with Rule 196, to move the passing of a Message to the Honourable the Legislative Council with respect to the selection of Representatives from this Colony on the Standing Closer Association Committee.

MESSAGE TO THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL *RE* SELECTION OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE STANDING CLOSER ASSOCIATION COMMITTEE.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move the following Message to the Honourable the Legislative Council:—

The House of Assembly
To
The Honourable The Legislative Council.

The House of Assembly have the honour to inform the Honourable the Legislative Council that they desire to confer with Your Honourable Board on His Excellency's Message No. 9/1948 relating to the closer association of the British West Indian Colonies and the selection of Representatives from this colony on the Standing Closer Association Committee.

The House have the honour to invite Your Honourable Board to appoint a time and place for such conference.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY enters the House and takes his seat.

QUESTIONS

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

In view of the immediate necessity which exists for providing certain essential facilities for the people of the colony and also for furnishing work for the considerable number of unemployed, will the Government consider soliciting the good offices of His Honour the Speaker of the House of Assembly, G. B. Evelyn, Esq., King's Solicitor, and authorising him on his forthcoming visit to the United Kingdom as a delegate to the Conference of the Empire Parliamentary Association to interview the Colonial Office and the Crown Agents for the colonies for the purpose of impressing upon them the exigencies of the local situation and endeavouring to ensure that all materials needed by the Government for the carrying out of public works projects, especially steel pipes, water pumps and machinery, service mains etc., are despatched at the very earliest date possible?

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

1. For which of the works provided for by the Resolution for £158,190 passed by the House of Assembly on June 15, 1948 does the Government intend to award contracts?

2. If any, will the Government advertise for tenders for such contracts?

3. Will Government stipulate such terms and conditions on which any contracts will be awarded as will guarantee that such works will benefit, to the greatest possible extent, workers from the parishes in which such works are to be carried out as well as those from outside?

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

1. Whether Government has been informed that the motor omnibus concessionaire for St. Lucy has discontinued the omnibus service through Josey Hill, St. Lucy?

2. Is Government aware of dissatisfaction in St. Lucy at discontinuance of this service, without even any prior notification to the residents of that district when such discontinuance was contemplated?

3. Will Government intimate to the Department of Highways and Transport the immediate need of restarting the service through Josey Hill district for the convenience of that thickly populated area?

Dr. WILSON enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. MAPP: To enquire of the senior member of the Executive Committee present in the House at its next meeting:

1. Is Government aware that representations have been made to the Director of the Highways and Transport Department regarding the inadequacy of the bus service operating on Route 3?

2. Were any "follow through" buses which have been running along this route in order to relieve the situation allowed on two occasions recently to be transferred elsewhere in order to be used on excursions?

3. In view of the fact that such transfer caused serious inconvenience to persons in the parish of St. Thomas using this Route, will the Government take steps to prevent the recurrence of such incidents and to relieve the situation on this route?

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

1. Does the Government intend to establish class room facilities at Erdiston Training College for training students in modern methods of teaching children?

2. If the answer is "Yes," when does the Government intend to establish such facilities?

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

1. When does the Government intend to make available to agricultural labourers and sugar factory workers loans to build or repair their houses from the Labour Welfare Fund as stated by the honourable the Colonial Secretary in the Other Place to have been agreed upon by the Governor-in-Executive Committee?

2. Will Government ensure that such loans will become available in the very near future in order that those workers may guard against the effects of the rainy weather now being experienced?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. TALMA, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, a Bill to amend the Witnesses and Interpreters Act, 1899 (1899-3) is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. TALMA, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, a Bill to amend the Petty Debt Act 1889 (1889-3) is read a first time.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. TALMA, a Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921, is read a first time.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

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

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

EXPENSES IN CONNECTION WITH SENDING BARBADIAN WORKERS TO THE U.S.A.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman,—The first Resolution to be dealt with is for the sum of £12,000 to supplement Resolution No. 51 of the 12th of September, 1945, to meet expenses in connection with the sending of Barbadian workers to the United States of America for temporary employment, including the making of advances by way of loans, insurance, passages, welfare and other expenses incidental to the recruitment and sending of the workers, and for the part payment of return passages.

I think that it is pretty well known to members of this Committee that 302 emigrants are being sent to the U.S.A. The first 200 have left and the remainder are now being medically examined and getting ready to leave. This Resolution is to pay expenses in connection with the recruitment and incidentals. The addendum sets out the details very clearly and I beg to move that this resolution do now pass.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. GARNER enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. WILKINSON: I would like the Government to tell me how many people it is expecting to

send to the U.S.A. this year. When the Government asks for £12,000 to pay these expenses, it must have some estimate of the number of people who are likely to go. We are all very interested in knowing what the prospects are, in respect of our people going to the U.S.A. to work. I read in the newspapers that 200 have gone but I should like the Government to give us some information as to the number of people who are expected to be sent during this season to assist in the reaping of the harvest in the U.S.A.

Dr. CUMMINS: I thought I said in my opening remarks that 200 people have gone; they have gone to Florida. There is another batch of 120 who were at first to go to Indianapolis but the Stokely Food Corporation cancelled that arrangement and they are now going to another Company, called the Krier Company. That fact will not affect this Resolution because the total number is about the same as was originally intended. The only thing is that these people are going for the short period of eight weeks, consequently there will be an increase in the deduction from their wages to reimburse the Government for money it is spending. Originally it was arranged that there should be a deduction of ten per cent. from wages but on account of the period having been shortened to eight weeks, it has been found necessary to increase the percentage to twenty per cent.

Mr. WILKINSON: I thank the honourable member.

Mr. LEWIS: Before this Resolution is passed I think that some member of this Assembly, while offering congratulations to the Government should at the same time state that the members of the Government have, no doubt, found themselves victims of circumstances. They could not, after clamouring for emigration, refuse at any cost to assist these labourers to get to the U.S.A. but I repeat, Sir, that they have become the victims of circumstances. It would seem to me as if employers in the U.S.A. want work done and they are not willing to pay for the people to come to do it. They claim, all the time, that the Barbadian workers are the best they can get from the West Indies but when they are looking around for workers from the West Indies, they say "well, it will cost less to get them from some other place;" so that they seem to contradict themselves. When they come to search for workers and they know that there is a bargaining position to be faced they sit up. As long as we are willing to do this, they will play one island against another and you may find eventually that they will get the workers from these islands free of charge, as far as transportation is concerned. However, I repeat that the members of this Government are the victims of circumstances and they will have to do this or they will be accused of doing nothing to assist in the emigration scheme. This is a Resolution for £12,000 to send about 300 people to the U.S.A.—£40 a person—and when you hear that they are going for only eight weeks, it would pay you better to keep them here and give them £5 a week each as a dole rather than create this precedent. As far as I understand, no worker who is emigrating should, by international agreement, pay any part of his transportation cost. Anyhow, it looks as if advantage is being taken of these colonies in these arrangements, especially when it is considered that leases were granted to the U.S.A. to establish bases in these parts at a time when they needed protection for themselves. They know that Barbados is suffering from a surplus population; they broadcast, whenever they can, that the Barbadian labourers give them satisfaction and it is strange that when they are crying out for assistance like this, employers are willing to squeeze everything they can get out of employing a few people up there for the short period of eight weeks.

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

SUBSIDISATION OF RICE IMPORTED FROM BRAZIL.

Mr. ADAMS: The next Resolution is for the sum of £10,000 to provide for the subsidization of 550 tons of rice imported from Brazil.

As the addendum to the Resolution states, owing to a shortfall in the allocation to Barbados of rice from British Guiana, the International Emergency Food Council has allocated 550 tons of rice from Brazil for shipment in September, 1948, at a cost greatly in excess of the British Guiana rice. It is proposed to subsidize this rice so that it may be sold retail at 9c. a pint. The figures are stated, and from them, honourable members will see that the amount of the subsidization is roughly £10,000. I think most, if not all honourable members, know the unfortunate—I wish to say nothing that will offend our friends in British Guiana—recurrence of the trouble in getting rice from British Guiana for years and years. It reminds me somewhat of the reasons which Scotsmen give for drinking whiskey—it is either too dry or too wet; it is either too dry or too cold—but for some reason or other, you cannot get rice just as you cannot get whisky. I do not say that the reasons are not sound or that the Government of British Guiana is trying to hold us up to ransom but it is unfortunate that sometimes the weather conditions in British Guiana are such that it cannot keep its promises to us to provide us with 80 per cent. of the quantity of rice we bargained to buy from it for a period of five years. As a result, the Executive Committee, acting on the advice of the Controller of Food Supplies, the Financial Secretary, and one of its own members, Dr. Saint, decided that we should buy this 550 tons of rice from Brazil. This rice is easily discernible from British Guiana rice and we are subsidizing it at 9c. per pint and leaving the British Guiana rice at 6c. per pint, in the hope that those of us who can more afford to do so, will buy the Brazilian rice at 9 cents and leave the British Guiana rice to be purchased by the poor sections of the community. To mix them or subsidize them at the same price will mean—it is not necessary for me to finish the sentence because we have heard it emphasized over and over again. If there is any further information honourable members wish me to give them I shall be only too glad to give it. We received a communication a day or two ago stating that the position in British Guiana is likely to improve and honourable members may know from the daily Press or otherwise that 1,000 bags of rice have recently come. As far as this Brazilian rice is concerned, although it is promised for delivery in September, we have sent urgent cables asking the Secretary of State for the Colonies to try to expedite the delivery of it this month and not wait until September. The important period is during the next four to six weeks; after that period I am assured — the honourable senior member for St. James will correct me or bear me out — that the food crops of this island are likely to be very plentiful. So that the real important time is the next four to six weeks. We have to effect this transaction through the Secretary of State for the Colonies because he has advised us that it has to be done through him and that there can be no direct communication

in the particular matter between Brazil and ourselves. Up to Saturday a further cable was sent asking that this rice be shipped before the end of this month. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. TALMA: I rise to second the motion for the passing of this Resolution. In doing so I would like to say that this present Government is thoroughly aware of the hardship and suffering and privation which are being experienced by the vast majority of the people of this country and when a Measure such as this comes before this Assembly, one can understand that the Government bears in mind the fact that privation and starvation are being experienced by people in this island. As the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said, in another four to six weeks, now that the rain has started to fall, the question of the shortage of food crops will be circumvented but at present we need rice from any source whatever; we need at the present moment rice or anything to eat from any source that can provide us with it. The Government has gone all out to provide food for the people. Food is coming from Brazil on this occasion but food can also be obtained from the U.S.A. and I feel that the question of obtaining food supplies from the U.S.A. should be entertained because we get dollars from the U.S.A. and we should buy their food. I say that this gesture by this Labour Government to find food from any source whatever and to subsidize and bring it within the range of the working-class in this community, goes to show that we, the Labour Government, have the interest of the people at heart. I do not care to add very much more but this Resolution is the answer to the statements about starvation and things of that nature. We are trying to find food for the people and that food must be found now, not when there is glut in the supply of potatoes but now.

Mr. GALE: The idea of importing rice from Brazil is an excellent one and, no doubt, we have to congratulate the powers-that-be on trying to get this rice in view of the short supply from British Guiana. It is well known that there is a shortage of locally grown foodstuffs at present in this island and it is really necessary to have this rice. But, Sir, I cannot agree with the suggestion of the mover of the Resolution that rice should be sold to one lot of people at 9 cents per pint and to another lot of people at 6 cents per pint. That can only be done if you ration rice and say that people in a certain class should buy the rationed rice at 9 cents per pint and people in another class should buy the rationed rice at 6 cents per pint. At the same time, I cannot see how you can ask a grocer to differentiate between a person who is rich and a person who is poor in the selling of rice. A grocer can only sell the rice which is in his possession. If he has only the 9 cents per pint rice he can only sell that; similarly, if he has only the 6 cents per pint rice he can only sell that. I would counsel the Government to subsidize this Brazilian rice to the full extent, so that all rice can be sold at 6 cents per pint. I fail to see how it is going to work otherwise. The quantity is only 550 tons and as a temporary measure it will cost only £8,000 more to subsidize the whole lot so that it can be sold at 6 cents per pint and I would counsel the Government to do that (Hear, hear and Cheers).

Mr. ADAMS: Before any other honourable member repeats what the honourable member who just sat down said I would like to say this: Nobody is going to say that Dr. Saint did not take immense pains as regards the system of rationing during the War. We had different prices for imported salted meat and different prices for salted fish and it worked admirably. The person who could afford to pay 24 cent per lb. for salted fish bought it from Goddard's or the Colonnade and the person who could not afford to pay that amount of money bought his salted fish from the small shopkeeper at 16 cents per lb. and I repeat that that system worked admirably . We made an appeal along that line during the war and the people who could afford to pay for the better quality salted meat and salted fish bought them and the people who could not afford to buy the better quality bought the lower grades. If people like ourselves would preach as much as some of us did during the war, the people who can afford to buy the Brazilian rice would buy it and leave the British Guiana rice to be purchased by the poor sections of the community. In that case, the small shops would have the British Guiana rice to sell and not the Brazilian rice. I repeat that that system worked well during the war and will work equally as well again.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I want to associate myself with the remarks of the junior member for St. Michael. I do not think that the proposal to sell rice at two different prices is practical. It is not on all fours with the proposal to sell salted meat and salted fish at different prices, for the simple reason that for the past 4 or 5 years rich and poor alike in this country have got accustomed to using the rice from British Guiana. It was not a question of being able to get rice of a better quality but a question of getting what you can; therefore everybody got accustomed to purchasing the British Guiana rice at 6 cents per pint. I think that this is a commendable act on the part of the Government and I agree with the senior member for Christ Church that we should not wait until there is a glut in the supply of locally grown foodstuffs to obtain this rice but should do so now. Everybody knows the conditions that exist to-day in respect of food and that is why I endorse the suggestion of the junior member for St. Michael that the Government should subsidize this Brazilian rice to the full extent, so that it can be sold at 6 cents per pint. It is only a month's supply and if we have rice being sold at 6 cents and 9 cents per pint respectively I can imagine the well-to-do people buying up the 6 cents per pint rice and putting it down and leaving the 9 cents per pint rice for the poor man to buy. The Government says that this Brazilian rice is a sort of white rice but I repeat that for the past four years, the middle class, the rich, the poor — everybody alike — have been eating one grade of rice from British Guiana; they have got accustomed to that grade of rice and they are not going to turn up their noses at it, now that the Brazilian rice is obtainable. Therefore, I can imagine, I repeat, the well-to-do buying up the British Guiana rice at 6 cents per pint, putting it down and leaving the Brazilian rice at 9 cents per pint to be bought by the poor people and human nature being what it is, no amount of appeal from from the Government over the radio or otherwise will prevent that from being done. This is a question of economics and the most wealthy person will try to buy the cheaper rice, put it down and leave the more expensive rice to be bought by the poor people. A few weeks ago, when the people of this community were literally faced with starvation the Government issued a communique stating that it had been offered rice from Brazil and from the United States of America and in a paltry statement without giving the general public any reasons it stated "we refused the American rice." Well, there are those of us who can think and may be able to reason why the American rice was refused but surely the Government, in these days when there is absolutely nothing

to buy — no cornmeal, no rice, nothing at all — should not make such a paltry statement—"we refused the American rice" — without stating a word as to why it refused the American rice. You leave the thinking members of the public to say that you refused the American rice just because you could refuse it. I appeal to the Leader of the House to clarify that statement. He might not have been in the island at the time when that communique was issued but I can tell him that it caused a lot of stir. There is no question of rejecting this Resolution. Nobody would attempt to reject it but the proposal should be practical. I counsel the Government to postpone the further consideration of this Resolution with a view of coming back to the House with another Resolution for an amount to subsidize this 550 tons of rice imported from Brazil so that it can be sold at 6 cents per pint, having regard to the fact that it is only about one month's supply.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I agree with the honourable member who has just spoken. From the figures which the senior member for St. Joseph gave this House on a previous occasion this 550 tons of rice is roughly one-tenth of the supply of rice to the whole island in the course of a year and according to his argument this one-tenth will serve the rich at 9 cents per pint and the poor can buy the British Guiana rice at 6 cents per pint. Well, Sir, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has also stated on a previous occasion that only one-half per cent. of the population of this island is rich and if that one-half per cent. of the population purchases one-half per cent. of this 550 tons of Brazilian rice, it is obvious that the poor would have to buy the remainder at 9 cents per pint. I certainly do not consider that this is the time to increase the price of the poor man's food, and rice is the poor man's staple diet. I would not go so far as the last honourable member has gone and state that the rich would buy up the British Guiana rice at 6 cents per pint; but my argument is that the percentage of rich people in this island is so small that they will buy only a small portion of this 550 tons of rice and the poor man would have to buy the remainder at 9 cents per pint. I think the Government should postpone this Resolution and come back with another to subsidize this rice so that it can be sold at the regulated price of 6 cents per pint.

Mr. WARD: I myself feel that it would be wise for the Government to postpone this Resolution and come to the House at some future date with a Resolution to subsidize this 550 tons of rice so that it could be sold at 6 cents per pint. If this 550 tons of rice was going to be spread over a year, that would be a different position altogether but this quantity is going to be used within a month. It is common knowledge that the poor classes of this country use more rice than the other people and the majority of this rice will be sold to poor people. Personally I feel that although you may ask an individual to buy the more expensive rice he would say "I am accustomed to using the British Guiana rice all these years and I will go on to use it." That is my opinion. I feel that the Government has money and can well afford to subsidize this rice to the fullest extent for the people during the next four weeks. I do not feel that it would be a commendable thing for the Government to fix two prices for rice. When you talk about different prices for salted meat and salted fish, that is quite a different matter. You cannot compare salted meat and salted fish with rice for the simple reason that an individual who is hungry will always prefer to buy rice than salted meat or salted fish. I feel that it would be well for the Government to close its eyes at the additional £8,000 and subsidize this rice to the full extent, so that people will be able to buy it at 6 cents per pint. We have just passed a Resolution for £12,000 to meet expenses in connection with sending 200 or 300 people to the U.S.A. to work and I think we could spend £18,000 in subsidizing this rice for the benefit of the remaining 191 odd thousand people in the island for the next four weeks. Although we commend the Government on trying to get this rice, yet I should like to point out that this was done in Trinidad before we did it here. Trinidad was getting rice from Brazil before us, so there is nothing so commendable about this Government importing rice from Brazil after all. What would be more commendable is if the Government would subsidize this rice to the fullest extent, so that it could be sold at 6 cents per pint. As the senior member for the City has said, nobody wants to reject this Resolution but we feel that it would be a wise act on the part of the Government if it postponed this Resolution and came back with another Resolution for an amount which would enable everybody to buy rice at one price, that is, 6 cents per pint.

Dr. CUMMINS: What the Government was faced with was not the question of spending the additional £8,000 to subsidize this rice, so that it could be sold at 6 cents per pint. The position is this. The Government has been informed that the supply of rice from British Guiana is likely to improve as times goes on and we have already placed the order for this 550 tons of rice from Brazil. If this rice from Brazil is subsidized to be sold at the same 6 cents per pint as the British Guiana rice and if, as we have been told, the position with regard to the supply of rice from British Guiana improves as the weeks go by, we would be having rice of two qualities being sold at the same price. That is the position. It is a small quantity — 550 tons — and consequently it was thought that it would be monopolized by probably a certain section of the community and the poor people would get none of it. The supply of rice from British Guiana, as we have been told, has improved and only last week a further shipment arrived. If you have two qualities rice being sold at the same price, which are you going to take? And the quality of the Brazilian rice is far superior to the quality of the rice from British Guiana! So you can very well realize where the 550 tons of rice from Brazil will go. That is the position with which the Government is faced. We feel and do know that certain people, if an appeal is made to them, would buy the better quality rice despite the difference in price, and leave the other grade for the poor man and that is why we made this difference in the prices. As far as the American rice is concerned I do not have the figures here but the cost of the rice from the U.S.A. was rather prohibitive, almost twice the price of the rice from Brazil, so we left the American rice alone and took the Brazilian rice.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I look upon this Resolution from two points of view; one is the serious shortage of the food supply and the other is the economic position of this island. If I agree to the postponement of this Resolution I do so to enable the Government to reconsider the question of allocation and not on the grounds stated by the senior member for St. James, namely, that only about one-half per cent of the people of this island is rich and the large majority is poor and, therefore, the greater portion of this rice will be purchased by the poor people. I

would remind the honourable member and this Committee that if that were so, this place would be the safest spot on earth to live, as far as food supplies are concerned. But this one-half per cent of the population monopolizes all the foodstuffs — even for their horses — that come to this island. Do not let anybody fool you. The rich people in this island monopolize, whenever they get the opportunity, the foodstuffs that come to this island because they have the money. The people with money can buy all the butter when a shipment comes to this island and the poor man who works for $12 a week cannot buy any of it. I look upon this proposal in this way: If you raise the price of rice by 50 per cent, it would work a hardship on some people in this community who cannot get sufficient work to do. It is on those grounds I view the question of a subsidy. I know that some rich people, not only the poor people, would be glad to buy rice at 6 cents per pint. The poor people in this island have been poor for "donkey" years and none of the rich people who were in authority came to their assistance. It is not that they really want poor people to get cheap rice; they cannot fool me to that extent. They bring in the poor people in these matters because it would sound well if they did so but whenever mention is made of food supplies, most of them have uppermost in their minds the thought of how much they would benefit from those supplies. Purely from the economic point of view I believe that the Government could better spend the £8,000 in this way than distribute it among the people who are already pressing it for relief. I will make this point: If the mover of this Resolution bears in mind what I have just said, he would see clearly for himself that it would be wiser for the Government to have a subsidy placed on rice which would make the situation more evenly than what is envisaged at a price of 9 cents per pint. I am sure that as soon as you put rice on the market at 9 cents per pint a howl will go up to the heavens that rice has gone up from 6 cents to 9 cents per pint! It will mean a steep ascent for the poor people to climb and there can be no getting away from that fact. The man who has been accustomed to get his rice at 6 cents per pint will be affected. I know that it is going to affect me. I do not know how the rich people get the things but they get them while fights go on week after week in Baxters Road and Tudor Street between the poor people in their endeavour to get a pint of rice each. There should be a better means of distribution and the Food Inspectors should be instructed to see to it that better method of distribution is properly carried out. I know that it is hard for the Government to subsidize this rice and then to realize that some of the people monopolize it but I feel that some of it will still trickle through to the poor people by some means or other. To talk about setting up an organisation to ration 550 tons of rice is a joke! The organization would be bigger than the quantity of rice to be rationed. I prefer to take the chance of putting the burden of subsidizing this 550 tons of rice on the Government rather than putting 3 cents more on every pint of rice which the people have to buy. I know the position of the people to-day; they are begging for work to do. Every member of this House must have had the experience of people coming to them and asking them to try and get them to the U.S.A. to work. Half of the population of the island want to get to the U.S.A. to work, so you can realize how difficult it is for people in this island to get something to do. I prefer to have this rice subsidized to the fullest extent so as to prevent any confusion.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I argued that this 550 tons of rice is about one-tenth of the quantity that is consumed locally in the course of a year. (When the honourable senior member for St. Peter listens, he does not understand what I say and now that I am trying to explain to him what I said, he would not listen). I quoted the senior member for St. Joseph who said on a previous occasion that the number of rich people in this island is one-half of one per cent. of the population. If this rice is to be purchased by the rich people it will mean that one-half per cent. of it will be purchased by them and the remainder must inevitably be purchased by the poor people at 9 cents per pint. That is what I have argued and the honourable member cannot dispute the fact that it would be very hard on the poor people to increase the price of their staple diet — rice — from 6 cents to 9 cents per pint.

Mr. CRAWFORD: With regard to the marketing of this rice which is imported from Brazil the honourable senior member for St. Joseph said that the Government is proposing to subsidize it at 9 cents per pint in the hope that those who can most afford it will buy it out 9 cents per pint and leave the British Guiana rice to be purchased by the poor people. Sir, that only goes to show the vanity and stupidity of those who run the Government. To imagine that in this community or in any other community in the world an appeal is going to be made to one class to buy one quality rice at 9 cents per pint and leave the other quality to be bought at 6 cents per pint by the other people and that the former would hearken to that appeal! Then the honourable member went on to say that during the War, the Authorities asked certain people to buy the more expensive codfish and salted meat and leave the less expensive codfish and salted meat to be purchased by the poor class of people, suggesting that because the idea worked well in the case of salted fish and salted meat it will work in the case of rice. Now, what is the position? The salted fish and/or salted meat of food quality that came here during the War was sold at the luxury groceries in Broad Street—Goddard's and Colonnade—and not one half-pound of it found its way in the small shops. People who patronized the groceries in Broad Street got the better quality salted fish and salted meat and the poor classes never had the opportunity nor the desire nor the means to buy that first-class quality salted fish or salted meat, so they had to content themselves with, and were only too glad to buy, the cheaper lot. With regard to rice, it is an entirely different matter. Nobody has any control over the two different qualities of rice that will be arriving in the colony. You may have Brazilian rice this week and next week you may have British Guiana rice and the point made by the senior member for the City was exceptionally well taken, that is, that people whose financial position enables them to hoard will hoard by buying the cheaper rice by the half bags and storing it and the man who is working for a small salary and could only buy from day to day what he needs will then be forced to pay the higher price for the Brazilian rice. That will happen as surely as night follows day and nothing will stop it. The junior member for St. Michael suggests that the only way to stop it is by rationing rice. Apart from the expenses involved in the setting up of machinery for rationing the rice, I find it difficult to understand how you are going to ration a commodity according to class, so to speak. You will have to prepare ration tickets with the idea that the rich people must buy the 9 cents per pint rice and the poor people must buy the 6 cents per pint rice;

then you have to go ahead and find out who is rich and who is poor. It is impracticable to talk about rationing rice on a class basis, when only the wealthy class will be able to buy the more expensive rice and the poor class the less expensive rice. The senior member for Christ Church has said that the Government has arranged to spend the amount asked for in this Resolution in order to bring the price of rice within the range of the working class. Nobody is surprised to hear a government member say that, because the Government has shown, on more than one occasion in the past, that it knows absolutely nothing about the position of the working-class; it is as far removed from the actual position as the moon is from the earth.

Mr. TALMA: I rise to a point of explanation. The honourable member refers to the Government. I happen to be a member of the Government and I cannot allow his statement to go unchallenged. There are two qualities of rice and two prices for rice, one at 9 cents per pint and the other at 6 cents per pint.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable member has tried to explain something and I suppose he thinks that he has succeeded in doing so. But nobody understands his explanation or wants to understand it. I am quoting him as saying that in his opinion — and apparently in the opinion of the Government too — 9 cents per pint will put that rice in the range of the working class who work for a very limited period of the week. On the other hand certain of us are suggesting that the Government may as well go the whole hog and spend £8,000 more, so that both qualities could be marketed at 6 cents per pint. If, Sir, the Government wants to ensure that the wealthy class do not buy up the cheaper rice in large quantities or the better quality rice, what the Government might do would be to see to it that the Brazilian rice is distributed in proportionate quantities to the luxury groceries in Broad Street and that Goddard's and Colonnade and the bigger food stores do not get unproportionate quantities of the better quality rice because the result would be that people who can afford to pay the higher price for rice would get more of the better quality rice and little of it would be passed on to the middle and lower classes. The impression I got from the previous speakers on behalf of the Government is that the Brazilian rice is of a better quality than the British Guiana rice. One more point before I sit and it is this: If even it were a fact to state that the position with regard to salted fish and salted meat would apply in respect of rice and that merely by making an appeal to the wealthy class not to buy the less expensive rice but leave it to be purchased by the poor people, they would hearken to you, one has to bear in mind that the quantity of salted meat or salted fish which is consumed by the working-class is in no way comparable with the quantity of rice which they consume; so there again you will have another argument for ensuring that both qualities of rice are marketed at the lowest possible price. In view of what has been said I am, therefore, going to move that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed with a view to the introduction of another Resolution allowing for the subsidization of this 550 tons of rice at a figure which would enable it to be sold at 6 cents per pint.

Mr. HAYNES: I rise to second the motion of the honourable senior member for St. Philip. We have heard a lot about rice to-day and I think that a lot of time has been wasted over the matter because it is obvious that the selling of rice at two different prices will never work. I do not see why the Government should be so hesitant about subsidizing this Brazilian rice to the fullest extent because I understand that owing to the reduction in the price of flour in Canada there will be a considerable saving in the amount which has been already voted for subsidization purposes. So I have been told and, therefore, I do not see why the Government could not use some of that money which has been saved from the subsidy on flour to subsidize this rice to the fullest extent.

Mr. GARNER: I am very glad that I am not a member of the Government to-day (Laughter) because I would have to counsel the Leader of the House to submit at once. But fortunately or unfortunately I happen to be a backbencher and I am free to speak as I choose. In this matter, as on other occasions, I am for cheap food for the mass of the people and as I have said on some other occasion it does not matter what colour a man is or what is his political outlook, so long as he wants cheap food I am with him. That needs no Solomon to solve it.. One honourable member said that an appeal would be made to a certain class of people to buy the more expensive rice. Well, Sir, that is as far from being practical as my asking Mars to pick me up now. I have known, Sir, certain ladies who would go to Broad Street and buy a piece of cloth at, perhaps, $2 or $3 a yard but would also find their way to Baxters Road bargaining with a grocer for salted fish or potatoes at a cent cheaper; so that statement about appealing to certain people to buy the more expensive rice does not bear weight at all. Nobody is going to listen to that appeal. Economics are economics wherever you go; cost of living is cost of living wherever you go and nobody wants to spend 9 cents when he can spend 6 cents. And when it comes to the wealthy, you will be surprised to know that they care more about a cent than the man in the street does because they know the value of it. This Government does not know what it is doing. This Government does not know what the working people want. I censure this Government to-day. £8,000 is only a bagatelle to be used in subsidizing rice. I am looking forward to the time when this Government will have to dole out £8,000 rather than go on sitting and letting the people suffer. Does this Government expect to keep money in the Treasury while the people are doing nothing but walking about suffering? What do you think you have money in the Treasury for? To pass it on to posterity? No! We want food for the people. We want the people to live decent lives. Take the money out of the Treasury and spend it on the people. The British Government owes us a lot. Let them send and reimburse the Treasury. Let them give us some money before you federate, federate, federate. (Laughter). We want something in our stomachs before you can talk about federation. We want this rice subsidized to the fullest extent. The people who will be affected by the fixing of the price of rice at 9 cents per pint are the men in the street; they cannot even now buy rice at 6 cents per pint because the plantations are giving work for only two or three days a week. Potatoes came here a short while ago and your humble servant had to throw away four barrels which cost me $18 a barrel. Why? Because the price of 12c. per lb. for those potatoes was too prohibitive and the people could not buy them. Another shipment of potatoes arrived subsequently; the price of those was fixed at 9½ cents a lb. and when I could sell, formerly, 3 barrels of potatoes on a Saturday night I have not been able to get rid of 50 lbs. of this lot. Not that the people do not want the potatoes but the price of

them is beyond their means. If the potatoes were sold at 4cents or 5 cents per lb. the people would buy them but the price is beyond their reach and now you are going to place rice in the same category—beyond their reach. I thought that as soon as an honourable member got up and said "let us subsidize this rice at the same level of the British Guiana rice", the Prime Minister would have got up and replied "Oh, yes, boys. I agree." But it is not so. That shows me that this Labour Government is incapable of catering to the needs of the class whom they were elected to represent. I fear that this Labour Government which does not see what the people want will be found wanting. Food is a crying need. The people want food. They are not interested in politics. You can play your politics when you come here but the people want to know that there is enough food in the island that they can get their share of it. I am very sorry but this Resolution will not be allowed to pass; it will have to be postponed and let the Leader of the House go back to Government House and tell the incumbent that the boys down here say "Nothing doing" (Laughter) or otherwise I will talk on this matter for days on end. Sometime ago, the Prime Minister and I clashed on this question and we will always clash on it because I am sure that I am not here for sentiment I am not here for emotion. I am here for business. I am a businessman. I cannot see this thing but from the business point of view. We have to give the people this rice at a price at which they can buy it. 9 cents per pint is too much; they cannot pay that. As I said, the price per lb. for English potatoes is beyond their reach and they have no food from the land. Right now, there is no ordinary family, whether middleclass or poor, that can go to sleep on any night with their stomachs fairly full; they cannot do it because there is not enough food around and what is around they cannot purchase because they do not have the wherewithal. I hope that my words will not fall on deaf ears but that the Prime Minister will go back to Government House and inform His Excellency that the boys down here say "No; can't do." (Laughter and Cheers).

Mr. COX: Judging from the remarks made by some honourable members on the other side of the table, I hardly think it is necessary to subsidize this rice at all, especially after the remarks of the senior member for the City who happens to know the rich people better than they know themselves. He told us that he can imagine the rich people buying up the British Guiana rice and putting it down and leaving this Brazilian rice to be purchased by the poor people. But, Sir, when one hears some honourable members keeping noise inside this House, as if they were in a fish market, one wonders what is going to happen if people like these are continually elected to this House. I have heard one of those members, when rice was being sold at 4c. per pint, say "remove the subsidy and let the rice be sold at 6c. per pint." That happened a couple of years ago when wages were lower than what they are to-day and at the time when the poor man was also hungry. There are some businessmen who buy peas at 5½c. per pint and sell them to the poor people at 14c. per pint. I have reliable information as to that. When you hear them talking about the poor man, they are only wasting time. They only want to fool the poor man; they get him to team and march and the next thing is the gun. Now, Sir, what is the position as regards this rice? We all know that we get rice from British Guiana and that it is sold at 6c. per pint but when there is no British Guiana rice to be had, everybody will use this rice from Brazil. I can remember when we used to get rice from Burma, a better quality rice than the British Guiana rice, and the people bought it. Like the senior member for St. Joseph I feel that when this more expensive rice is in the island the rich people will buy it and give the poor people the chance to buy the less expensive rice. If, as we heard the senior member for the City say, the rich people will buy up the less expensive rice and put it down, what will that show? It will show that they have absolutely no sense of responsibility, in the first place, and, in the second place, no sympathy because if they buy up the less expensive rice, hoard it and prevent the starving people from getting it, it means that they are absolutely indifferent to the needs of the poor people of this island. I am not going so far as to say that but I know that in many cases foodstuffs that come into this island and foodstuffs that should be distributed among the poor people, foodstuffs such as milk and butter, are hoarded by the well-to-do. When it comes to butter, many a shopkeeper refuses to sell a poor person an ounce of butter at the schedule price simply because a rich person will pay a little more for it in the black market. Everybody knows that the rich people can go to Goddard's or Colonnade and buy their butter by the pound or by the tin but many a shopkeeper instead of distributing his tin of butter among as many poor people as he can, often sells it to rich people because they pay a greater price for it and when certain people come to this House and shout about the poor man I only wish to God that the poor man would be allowed the scales to be removed from his eyes so that he may be able to see! Mr. Chairman, I respect honest people; that is all; for my part the others need not exist. I see absolutely nothing to be gained by postponing this Resolution. If this rice was not subsidized it would be sold at 13c. per pint but it is proposed to subsidize it so that the people will be able to pay 4c. per pint less for it. If it is subsidized to the full and is sold at 6 cents per pint, the rich people will get all of the rice because we have been told that they would buy up the rice at 6c. per pint and put it up. I thought that this Resolution would have had an easy passage through this House. The Government has done its best and has made every possible effort to bring food into this country, so that rich and poor alike would be able to get a share and to-day we are having this display of cheap politics by certain members who say "subsidize this rice to the full extent so that the poor people could buy it at 6 cents per pint." Mr. Chairman, we hear a lot to-day about the subsidizing of commodities but who was the pioneer in this matter of subsidization? For years, the senior member for St. Joseph fought the very people who are now clamouring for subsidization before they would come to a decision to subsidize and now you hear the same people — even those who would have removed the subsidy on rice and increase the price from 4 cents to 6 cents per pint—criticizing the Government for not subsidizing this, that or the other commodity. I repeat that it is cheap politics to make the poor believe that the Leader of this House who, I know, has sacrificed his all for years in the interest of the poor, does not have their interest at heart; it is wicked and depraved and it is only a move to get the rich people back in power and the poor people back to slavery.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I did not intend to speak again on this matter but you will observe, Mr. Chairman, that I refrained from interrupting the senior member for St. Michael although he misquoted me more than once. Honourable members will appreciate, from experience in this House, that

it is hardly necessary to correct him because it is difficult for him to understand anything; that is due to his mentality. However, I would like to make my position clear. I never said anything about the rich buying this rice and putting it up. What I said was this; "If you have two sets of rice being sold in the market at the same time — one at 6 cents per pint and the other at 9 cents per pint — people whose financial circumstances can afford it, having become accustomed to the use of the British Guiana rice, will continue to purchase the rice at 6 cents per pint. That is obvious. No appeal would make them buy the 9 cents per pint rice when they could get rice at 6 cents per pint; the Leader of the House would buy it (Mr. ADAMS: Speak for yourself.); anybody would buy it, human nature being what it is. When you hear all this talk from that dangerously ignorant type of paltroon on the other side of the table who would like other people to believe that they observe all this strict honesty I tell you that there are some agencies in this island who hold rice in order to speculate with it. But, Sir, human nature being what it is, show me the person who is going to listen to an appeal from the Leader of the House or the Head of the Administration himself not to buy rice at 6 cents per pint when they can get it?

The senior member for St. Michael recklessly misquoted me and any mentality that is warped and practically corrupt will reflect itself in those terms. When members on this side of the Table set out to support the suggestion of the junior member for St. Michael, what did we first do? We commended the Government on its action in attempting to get this rice and then further attempting to subsidize it. Now, Mr. Chairman, in commending the Governor ment we also suggested that in view of the conditions as we see them, in Barbados, the Government should not only subsidize this rice to enable it to be sold at 9 cents per pint but, in view of the fact that this 550 tons of rice is only one month's supply and in view of the shortage of the food supply in this island, should also subsidize it to the fullest extent, so that it could be sold at 6 cents per pint. I wonder if any of the members of this House think that they fool anybody when they represent themselves as being poor! Some of them may be in straitened circumstances but which of them on this or that side of this table think that they fool any man in the street that they are poor and go to sleep starving? When we ask that this rice be so subsidized that the people will be able to buy it at 6 cents per pint, what is in that to suggest that we are playing politics? Anybody who can think for himself and does not have to hold on to somebody else's coat-tail would appreciate the position. If there is one man around this table who knows the wants of the man in street and the unwashed, it is I. When you get members on that side of the table saying that they alone know about the wants of the man in the street, this is a joke. We on this side feel strongly in this matter and we have put forward our suggestion in good faith. There are hundreds of people in this island who are out of work; there are many more who get only two or three days' work a week and two pints of rice will go a long way in a family. There is no comparison between salted meat, salted fish and rice There is nothing destructive about my criticism. If this Resolution was brought to this House in the month of October or November when people are getting more work to do and there is a plentiful supply of locally grown food, none of us would be so reckless as to make the suggestion we have made. Sometimes it is better for some people to keep their mouths shut and be considered fools than to open their mouths and let other people confirm the fact that they are fools.

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

REPLIES LAID

On re-assembling,

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to lay on the Table of the House the replies to questions No. 55 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy with regard to deductions made from salaries of members of the Civil Service for payment to Widows' and Orphans' Fund.

SUSPENSION OF RULES 61(a) AND 61(b)

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to move the suspension of Rules 61(a) and 61(b) so as to continue Government Business. I propose to finish the Resolution with which we were dealing before the luncheon interval, to proceed with the Bill dealing with the personal rates of income tax and then if there is any time available, to deal with the rates of income tax affecting companies.

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

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

Mr. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to.

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

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

SUBSIDISATION OF RICE IMPORTED FROM BRAZIL

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House was in Committee of Supply before the adjournment for lunch, we were considering a Resolution to place the sum of £10,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to provide for the subsidisation of 550 tons of rice imported from Brazil.

Mr. SYMMONDS: Much time has been spent and much heat has been generated in discussing a matter which affects everybody in this island. There is a shortage of food, there is a shortage of every item of food in this island, and while I am very pleased to see the members of this House who are planters advocating and supporting the importation of rice from Brazil into this colony, I am sincerely hoping that they will support the planting of more Indian corn as requested in an Address passed by this House recently. Only yesterday I spoke with a man in this community who told me that when his wife died it was advertised over Radio Distribution that she died from the lack of something to eat. I commend the Government for acting so quickly in this matter of getting rice from Brazil, but I want to support those honourable members who have advanced the suggestion that rice sold in Barbados should be sold at six cents per pint. As an impartial observer I can say that the art of mixing is one which at times reaches a high degree of fineness; if you have one grade of rice being sold at 9 cents per pint and another grade at 6 cents per pint, the art of mixing is going to be practised on so large a scale that the poor people of this island who are unemployed in large numbers and who still have to buy rice will be forced to buy the bulk of their rice at 9 cents per pint. You will find that a member of a family who enquires for rice

will be told : "There is none at 6 cents per pint, but we will spare you a little at 9 cents per pint." I think it is well that the Government face this danger; that in trying to help people with a greater supply of rice, they inflict a general price of 9 cents per pint for the next month at least, on every purchasing member of this community. I feel that this measure should be viewed from the point of view of feeding the people. The people cannot get any food and if during this period of acute food shortage, it is necessary to subsidize rice to the extent of £8,000 a month for the next 12 months so as to keep people alive, I am one of those who would be willing to agree to that. The people are definitely frantic because they are starving. When you ask for items of food the answer repeatedly is that there are none. It is a common practice among many retailers to-day that if you are to get a pint of rice you must buy $4.00 in other articles. I therefore suggest in the interest of the masses of this island, that the Government in this particular case, see that the price of rice kept at the uniform price of 6 cents per pint irrespective of whether it comes from Brazil or anywhere else.

Mr. MAPP : I have listened to this debate very carefully and I say that I have heard a considerable number of surprising statements mixed with what I can only term as preposterous arguments and a great deal of propaganda. I have come to that conclusion very sincerely and I will set out to prove how I have come to that conclusion. This Resolution concerns a quota of rice from Brazil estimated at 550 metric tons. Our average yearly consumption of rice is estimated at about 9,300 metric tons. (Mr. GARNER: Those figures are not correct). These figures are not supplied by the honourable junior member for St. Philip so that they would not be correct: they are supplied by the Competent Authority. British Guiana can only supply us with 7,480 metric tons per annum which averages about 80% of our total requirements. Already we are experiencing a severe shortage due to the fact that British Guiana cannot supply us with more than 50% of that 80% of our requirements. That average yearly consumption of about 9,300 metric tons works out at 779 metric tons per month and the amount of rice which we are being asked to subsidize to-day is 550 metric tons, a little more than a half month's supply. You hear that the working classes want rice subsidized at 6 cents per pint and that people will store up half bags of rice. The Government is not infallible and I hope that it will take any criticisms in the best spirit. We are being asked to subsidize a little more than a half month's supply of rice to-day, and those same members who have raised this hue and cry to-day will hoard half bags of rice. Apparently people will not hoard the expensive rice but they will hoard the rice from British Guiana. We are getting all this propaganda by honourable members in an attempt to influence the Government against its better judgment. You hear that the price of rice should be brought down to 6 cents per pint and then you find that the poor people for whom we are particularly subsidising it will not be able to get any. Who could agree to such silly arguments which are merely for propaganda and political purposes? I say that a cheap move has been made by the other side to carry out their own ends. That brings me to a point which I have taken up with certain members of the Government and to which I am now going to refer now. If Trinidad rations her rice I cannot see why we cannot ration ours. I have heard some mention made as to the question of the cost of rationing the rice; but people are dissatisfied over the distribution of rice. they say that other people can get a pint and a half of rice and they cannot even get half a pint. I say that in order to allay public anxiety and to disabuse the minds of the public of any idea that something wrong is being done, the Government should set up a rationing scheme. Even if people are reduced to half a pint of rice under the scheme, they will be satisfied because they will be getting the same amount of rice as anybody else. We would be traitors to the working classes if we agree to any preposterous scheme of subsidising rice so that people would be able to hoard it. If the Government does not intend to ration rice, then it is perfectly justified in subsidising it to this extent; but I am advising the Government to ration rice, then it is perfectly justified in subsidising it to this extent; but I am advising the Government to ration rice. Trinidad spends money in rationing rice and I say; let us allay the fears of the public. If you say that there is a shortage of rice and people feel that others are getting it they are not going to be satisfied. That is the whole basis of the trouble. I repeat that it would be a safe and sound policy for this Government to ration the rice and then I would agree to any scheme of bringing the price of it down to the same level; otherwise, human nature being what it is, certain people will hoard rice and then the poor people for whom the scheme was set up will not get any of the rice. I say that we should tax companies and pay for rationing the rice; there are some people who will say that we should spend more money but those same people do not want to be taxed. I repeat that the Government should ration the rice and then I would agree to the postponement of this Resolution. I have never heard such a deliberate misleading of the people as I have heard to-day. I hope that the Government will act upon the suggestion which I have made, a suggestion which I have made with the best faith.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman,—Preposterous arguments and cheap move from this side of the Table! Delightful! I can see no more preposterous argument than to say let us tax people on one hand and on the other hand, give them this £10,000 because this is a case of subsidising food for the rich. We are being asked to vote £10,000 for the purpose of subsidising this rice so as to bring it down to 9 cents a pint which the ordinary man cannot pay, and you are saying that you are going to tell the rich people to go and buy this rice! That is preposterous and absolutely stupid. Are we here to subsidise food for the rich people? If that is the argument which is going to be used, I say definitely "No;" we are here to subsidise food for the working man, the man in the street, the man who is unable to purchase it. All this talk about the rich man is only eye-wash; this £10,000 is for the purpose of subsidising rice so that a particular class of people can buy it at 9 cents per pint, but why do they not let the rice come in at the full price and let the rich peop'e buy it? This proposal before us is completely wrong; rice is the food of the man in the street; it is not for the rich man about whom everybody is talking. The price of all the rice should be at the same level. I thought that honourable members had been convinced of this but it seems to me that there are some honourable members who are still left unconvinced. I sincerely hope that after what I have said they will see the point that instead of subsidising food for the rich they should subsidise it for the poor. (Cheers).

Mr. LEWIS: For the second time to-day I see that the Government has found itself in a difficult position and it has tried what it has considered by its advisers to be the best way out of the difficulty. In Barbados we have been suffering from drought while there were floods in Demerara. I am sure that when

the floods have subsided in Demerara they will get the same quantity of rice but at a different time. In the meantime food had to be found for the people in Barbados and the Government had to seek food somewhere else. The Government turned down an offer of rice at an extremely high price and took the one for which it is paying now. The Government wanted to subsidise this rice and naturally it called in the people who know about the scheme. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has called the name of the genius, Dr. Saint and he drew the analogy between the salt fish and the salt pork; he said that some sort of moral appeal would be made to the rich people to buy the rice at the higher price and leave the cheaper rice for the poor people. That means that this rice from Brazil would be distributed along with the rice from Demerara, and if that is so, then this rice from Brazil should not be subsidised at all. If you have this supply of rice you will be surprised to see who are the rich people; you will always have to play on the idiosyncracies of the people. Actually, if you set up a rationing scheme to ration rice alone, that will cost a lot of money; you will have to put people in false jobs, you will have to keep them there for a long time and then there will be a howl when you have to put them out of those jobs. Therefore if you can avoid this rationing you should avoid it, and if you can avoid subsidisation you should do so. As you try to manipulate these things you find out how dangerous it is to do so. If there was a Resolution to subsidize this rice at 6 cents per pint, there are those who would say that the rich people would get it and the poor people would not see any of it at all. We are at the stage where the General Elections are just around the corner and no matter how we try to avoid it, we must play politics with the people's food. That is a safe and sound game to play. The Government are entitled to do something and if they have made a mistake let us show it to them in the best way possible. In my opinion no appeal which is made to the rich people will make them by this rice. If you have this rice at the higher price, you will be surprised to see how it will be sold because of the vanity of the people. There are peculiarities with people so that if you bring the price of this rice too near to that which is for the poor people, there will be difficulty. I sympathise with the Government in the decision which they have made and I do not think that the four members of the Government would claim that they were so mixed up with the rationing scheme as to know much about it. The name of a person called to-day, a person whose opinion whatever it is, would have been accepted by the House; but today it is a question of criticising the Government and therefore that person has lost the good name which he had during the War years. The Leader of the House has hinted that both grades of rice will be here at the same time and while I am sympathising with the Government if this is their way of not allowing people to say that they tax them but do not try to help them, I say that the Government should try and avoid these difficulties by making this rice a rich people's rice at 13 cents a pint. We are giving the impression that there is a lot of money in the Treasury and I say that this money which it is proposed to spend in subsidising rice could be used to provide the poor people with what they had to do without for 300 years. That is how I feel about the matter. This high-priced rice is not even a month's supply, and especially as that is the case, I say that the best way to handle it is to leave it at the rich people's figure and you will be surprised to see how it will be sold. I have this question to ask: I would like to know, having regard to the freight charges in respect of this rice, whether we have arranged to send our own bottoms using nautical terms, for the rice. I see that freight, insurance and so forth are mentioned and I would like to know whether our schooners will be going to Brazil for this rice.

Mr. FOSTER: I agree with the honourable junior member for St. George that the masses are hungry and for that reason I am appealing to honourable members not to postpone this Resolution. It is obvious that every honourable member of this House would like the masses to get rice as cheaply as possible. If this rice comes down at 12 cents a pint it will be sold; I am sure about that. As I say, the people are hungry and I appeal to honourable members not to keep them hungry any longer. I appeal to honourable members to allow this rice to come in; let this Resolution be passed and let the people get some food to eat.

Mr. ADAMS: I do not wish to delay this matter but one or two questions have been asked and one or two things have been said to which I have to reply. I suggest that we can say what we want to say and we should try to be helpful in any matter occasionally instead of having to shout. I congratulate the honourable junior member for St. Philip for having such a regard for the poor people and I highly respect that; but I want to say that heat is not light. If the heat which has been generated were equivalent to light then we would be all blind. If the honourable junior member for St. Philip has a good case he can present it coldly and dispassionately and let us see that his judgment is superior to ours. Merely shouting that people are hungry and starving makes no appeal to people's judgment because we all know that people are hungry and we have to provide for these people. As regards the honourable senior member for St. George, this is not the first time that we have heard such an appeal from him and I have no doubt that he will serve for Radio Distribution; but that sort of thing does not get us anywhere. The honourable senior member for St. Andrew has made one or two points. As regards the remarks about money having been saved, the price of some articles went down but we used the money thereby saved to get more flour because of the cornmeal situation and the situation as regards English potatoes, let alone our own potato situation. All these arguments about the price of rice we have heard *ad nauseam* during the debate as to whether we should subsidise items other than those which are subsidised. The honourable senior member for St. Andrew and the honourable junior member for St. James, the financial genius of this island have always been pointing out that we come down month after month and year after year with Resolutions for money for various purposes but none of us ever sat down and related our expenditure on various items, therefore we wanted a Financial Secretary. We have never considered whether we can afford to spend 20% of our revenue on the Civil Service, 10% on the Police, so much on the Church and what not. We have a Financial Secretary now and he goes into the working of subsidisation as it is at present, and I should like to inform honourable members that we are coming down with a Resolution for another £130,000 roughly. I want to point out that even the best milch cow will go dry especially when those who supply the fodder object to supplying it. It will take more than the one million pounds which is in the Treasury to carry out the Housing Scheme and later there is going to be a howl as to the raising of income tax on companies. In any case people are

merely following the tradition of attacking the Government and therefore I will not use the argument which I was going to use. The argument that if you do not agree with the majority you should oppose might have been sound in the Middle Ages but it is hardly sound nowadays. The Colonial Office and the Ministry of Food have considered Dr. Saint as the best Food Controller during the War, and is his advice worth nothing now? He has worked out schemes where there has been a difference in the prices of commodities. Some honourable members, with a disregard for logic, have used the word "rich". A lot of us will never be rich but people like ourselves who have got more money to spend than the working classes, will, we hope buy the more expensive grade of rice. There are two grades of rice one of which the Government is asking certain people to buy and to leave the other one for the poor people. We say to them: "Do not buy the cheaper grade of rice, leave it to be bought by the poor people." The poor people will soon be addressed by the honourable senior member for the City; but the honourable member who is opposed to making the poor people's food expensive, and whose heart bleeds for them, when the Government asks people to leave the rice which is sold at 6 cents a pint to the people who cannot afford to pay 9 cents a pint for it, has the courage to say on the floor of this House: "I will go into the shops and buy the Demerara rice." How can the Government be guided by arguments of that sort? We have had the advice of the Financial Secretary who is relating the expenditure on various items. We have got a Financial Secretary who advises us, we have got the advice of Dr Saint, we have got the advice of the Controller of Supplies and now we are told that the people are hungry and starving. What is the good of that to the Government? If we did not take the advice of people who are best qualified to give us advice, we would have been failing in our duty as a Government. We have had the advice of Mr. H. O. Emtage, not on matters of policy, but as regards the rice from Brazil as compared with that from Demerara, as to whether it is distinguishable and so on. We have got advice before coming to any conclusion. It is easy to curse Mr. Emtage but let me repeat that he has only been asked whether this grade of rice is distinguishable from that grade of rice. The only thing which I did not anticipate in this debate today is the extreme warmth of the honourable junior member for St. Philip who is vying with Mars; I suggest that it would be a good idea to keep a little of this warfare for the realm of Mars. After the decision was taken in Executive Committee to purchase this rice from Brazil, we reinvestigated the position and it is our considered judgment following the advice of people who are best able to advise us, that we should come before the House with this Resolution for the subsidisation of this rice. This is a fair amount of money to spend on subsidising this rice and I repeat that in a fortnight's time we are coming down with a Resolution for £130,000 for the subsidisation of commodities for the next six months. We are told by the Other Place that we have not got an inexhaustible Treasury; we who have the facts at our disposal have to use our best judgment as to how much money we should spend and we would be failing in our duty to the community if we did not use our best judgment in this matter. I quite agree that we ought to have a sense of responsibility and we owe a duty to the community; but we cannot allow passion, or prejudice or fear to becloud our judgment. Some of us have an ear for the Press; they attribute to me the use of the word "rich" which I have never used. I have never enquired as to what percentage of the community is rich or otherwise: I suppose that would have to be worked out on some income level.

Some honourable members have not paid attention to the second part of the argument which I used. The honourable senior member for St. Philip only spoke half of the truth when he referred to salt fish being consigned to luxury stores. It is possible for the Control Board to say: "We cannot allow one grain of Demerara rice to go into that store." I will say, according to enquiries which I have made and according to reports from the Food Control Inspectors, that the merchants and the small shopkeepers have been on the whole very co-operative in carrying out the request of the Control Board not to sell more than a certain amount of rice to anybody; and the only complaint which we have received is a suspicion that some people get more rice than they should get. I repeat that we have made enquiries and reports have been received to the effect that the shopkeepers are very co-operative. His Honour the Speaker will remember putting to me a question to be put to the Executive Committee as regards rationing because with His Honour's experience he felt that it would have been a good thing to do. That matter has been seriously investigated and if we have got advice from the Food Control Inspectors that the voluntary system of rationing has been working exceptionally well, why should we introduce rationing? I repeat that the distribution of rice can be worked quite well. I heard some *sotto voce* remarks as to whether some poor people do not shop at Goddard's too; if we have information that a certain number of poor people shop at Goddard's, then the rice can be distributed according to the information we receive. It is quite possible for the honourable senior member for the City to get into his car, go to a small country shop and buy Demerara rice and it is quite possible for others to do the same; but the present organisation can be improved and the distribution of rice to the shopkeepers can be regulated with a view to keeping the Brazil rice mainly in luxury stores, and the Demarara rice in the shops which are patronised only by the working class people. I cannot accept any motion for the postponement of the Resolution; I say that the Government have considered this matter very carefully, we have had a separate day for considering it and we have come to this decision after considering the financial aspect of the matter as well as the possibility of working on the experience of the past. I suggest that a combination of proper distribution and the knowledge by certain people that if they buy Demerara rice they are forcing the poor man to buy Brazil rice will prevent them from going out of their way to buy the Demerara rice, in spite of the remarks of the honourable senior member for the City about human nature being what it is. Figures which are just given off-hand do not necessarily help honourable members but inasmuch as some figures have been given I will just give one or two more. Demerara has never been able to supply us with more than 80% of our requirements. The figure of 9,200 tons has been given as our 100% consumption and we should expect 613 tons a month. Those were the figures which were given to the International Emergency Food Council when we asked them to supply us with rice. As regards general consumption, 473 tons would be a little more than a half month's supply. Some honourable members must know that the stocks are carefully distributed. When 1,000 bags of rice arrive from Demerara, that rice is not sold to the shopkeepers straightway, it has to be distributed carefully. Rice came spasmodically from Demerara so that while it might not be obtainable in shops at certain times it is there for distribution. Therefore

the question as to the distribution of rice from Demerara and that from Brazil is an easy matter. If Demerara says that she can supply us with rice for the remainder of the year, then 80% of our requirements will be supplied from there. Before I sit down, I should like to remind some honourable members and to inform others that the food situation is very much better now than it was; about 500 bags of rice have left or were due to leave Demerara on Saturday for this colony and presumably that rice is here now. The honourable junior member for St. Philip was unfortunate to get rotten potatoes. One thing more I should like to mention and it is this: the Government approached Trinidad and asked them to allow us to have some of their Brazil rice as their rice had arrived before ours. Trinidad is a very rice-hungry country and they replied: "We would have preferred if you did not ask us about this rice but perhaps we can spare you 150 tons." I do not think that we will get that 150 tons now. I see that the honourable senior member for St. James is anxious to get up and read from the *Official Gazette* what I am reported to have said; if it is the report of a speech which I had the opportunity of revising, I will say "Yes, that is what I said," if not I will say otherwise. (A MEMBER: Then the Reporters had better go home).

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: This is what the honourable senior member for St. Joseph said when he did not agree that rice should be sold at two different prices. To-day he has changed his tune. The honourable member said this at that time: "It is said that the Government should fix the price of the super quality rice which the rich man can buy at 6½ cents or 7 cents or 7½ cents per pint and let the poor man get the other quality at 4 cents per pint. I ask any honourable member whether he is going to have the face to get up in this Committee and say that the rich people in this island will consume anything near 25% of 9,200 tons in a year; they do not eat rice as a rule, not in the way in which the working class people in this island eat it." I think therefore that my calculation as to the percentage of the rich is right.

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable member can read but he cannot think. What I am saying is that we with our sense of responsibility can afford to pay more for our rice than the working class man. I have always been making that distinction. I do not depart from what the honourable member has read. Some of us will never be rich; but although we are not rich, we are more able to buy this rice than the working class man. That is the whole point I am making.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: What I am arguing is that the poor man cannot afford to pay 9 cents a pint for his rice; if we pass this Resolution as it is today, the poor man will have to pay 9 cents a pint for his rice.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has made a very long speech in reply to the arguments which have been advanced today; but when that speech has been stripped of all its padding what are the chief points which the honourable member has made? One is that within the next two weeks the Government will be coming down with a Resolution for £130,000 to continue the subsidisation scheme. That point would have some weight if this £130,000 were considerably in excess of the amount which we habitually spend on subsidisation. It is not. Not only is the amount not abnormal, but the honourable member knows that we no longer have to spend thousands of pounds by way of Emergency expenditure and we are now only spending money on subsidisation to the same tune as we have been spending for the last four or five years. Therefore there is no point in trotting out that you are coming down with this Resolution for £130,000. Another point made by the honourable member is that this matter was considered carefully in Executive Committee and they came to this conclusion. What has happened is that they considered the matter carefully and came to the wrong conclusion. They might have spent a week or longer in considering the matter; all we are saying is that they came to the wrong decision. While it is true to say that Dr. Saint might have good intentions, not even the honourable senior member for St. Joseph would be so shameless as to suggest that Dr. Saint knows more about the actual needs of the people than you, Mr. Chairman, or the honourable junior member for St. Philip. Dr. Saint's position there is merely official and Civil Servants cannot run this country; the Financial Secretary cannot formulate the policy of the Government on the question of food. We might have Dr. Saint as Controller of Food Supplies and we give him people like you, Mr. Chairman, or the honourable junior member for St. Philip, people who, it is presumed, know the actual conditions of the country to advise him. That is why we have an Advisory Board to the Control Board composed of people who, it is presumed, know something about the conditions so as to advise in making them better. Who do you think formulates the policy of the British Government as regards food?—The Minister of Food, not anybody in the Civil Service, and he is an elected representative of the people of Great Britain. Nobody can come in here and tell us that we must place undue emphasis on what Dr. Saint says on this matter; what does Dr. Saint know about the concrete case presented by the honourable junior member for St. Philip, namely, that a crate of potatoes rotted in his grocery because the price of 12 cents a pound places them beyond the reach of the people in the honourable members's district? (A MEMBER: Does he not give people credit?) With foodstuffs both local and imported in short supply, these potatoes are beyond the reach of the working classes because of their price. The supply of these potatoes is not particularly great but you can go into the grocery and buy 50 pounds if you have the money to pay for them. If these potatoes were cheaper you could not even get 5 pounds because they would not be there. Sometime ago you had to cajole and beseech people so to get 5 pounds of these potatoes; two dealers called me up last Saturday to know if I wanted some potatoes and I repeat that the potatoes would not have been there if they were cheaper. Now we hear a lot of argument as to where this considerably small sum of £8,000 is to come from. (Mr. COX: Who asked that?) We hear that the commitments which we have before us make it necessary for us to be very cautious in spending money even this £8,000 in further reducing the price of rice. Only in March this year in introducing the Budget the honourable senior member for St. Joseph admitted that the revenue from Customs alone was estimated at £331,000 in excess of the original estimate and we are asking that £8,000 of this excess of £331,000 be spent in giving people rice at 6 cents a pint in order to tide them over a difficult period of their existence. And some of us are cavilling at that! It is the prerogative of anybody in this Chamber to be obstinate and stiff-necked and to stick to a point whether he is proved to be wrong or not: and of course there is sometimes a certain amount of merit in going down with your flag flying in the

face of tremendous odds. But in this case there is no merit, there is merely the failure to realise that a wrong decision has been arrived at in the first instance, and the failure to realise that the facts have not been carefully considered. Now that the facts have been pointed out there is merit in acknowledging that you are wrong and others are right. There has been a lot of argument as to who started subsidisation and when it started, but we are following Trinidad and getting rice from Brazil and we also followed Trinidad some years ago and started subsidisation. As a matter of fact, both Trinidad and British Guiana started subsidisation before we started it. I am further expressing my support of the motion which I have made, namely, that this Resolution be postponed—not postponed indefinitely or because the Committee refuses to subsidise the rice from Brazil—but for the purpose of substituting for the Resolution another Resolution for an amount in excess of the present Resolution which would permit this rice to be sold at 6 cents per pint.

Mr. LEWIS: I should like to remind the honourable senior member for St. Joseph that he has not answered my enquiry as to the bringing of this rice here. I enquired as to whether the schooners which normally bring rice here would be going to Brazil for it. I want to say in connection with what I have heard and which is a different argument from the one before us, that if a country shopkeeper comes to Bridgetown and takes up potatoes at 9 cents a pound, he must have known that the people could buy them. The honourable junior member for St. Philip has only discovered his mistake after he had put the potatoes in his shop, but he should have known the people. A country shopkeeper who knows the people would not come to town and take up a commodity to be sold at a price at which he knows the people could not buy it. I expect that a shopkeeper would know the people and that is why I ask that this rice be not subsidised but left for the rich people. When this rice is 13 cents a pint the poor people will know that it is not for them.

Mr. GARNER: I did not intend to speak again but after hearing the honourable member express his master's voice I shall have to reply. I am telling this Committee in no uncertain terms that because of the price of the potatoes, they were not sold. The price of potatoes jumped from 8 cents to 12 cents per pound and what is true in my case is true in the case of other shopkeepers. I anticipated the people, I thought that they would buy the potatoes but they did not have the money to buy them. The honourable junior member for the City buys cotton and that will last if it is not sold, but potatoes are perishable. The honourable member should not give the impression that I have told an untruth; my contention is that the price of the potatoes soared far above the people's ability to buy them. Whatever commodity you have and the price of it is raised beyond the purchasing power of the people, it becomes bad; every businessman knows that.

Mr. LEWIS: I was not replying to anything which the honourable member has said at all: I was replying to the inference drawn from what the honourable member said. I was not referring to what you said.

Mr. BRANCKER: The honourable member should address the Chair and talk across the Table. He has been a member of this House long enough to know better than that.

Mr. GARNER: I still maintain that the moment certain items go beyond a certain price they are taken out of the purchasing power of the masses. What is true of luxuries is also true of necessities, and you cannot get away from the fact that potatoes being sold at 12 cents a pound are absolutely beyond the means of the masses. Mr. Chairman, you can bear me out on that point. It is a fact that potatoes even at 9½ cents a pound with people faced with a scarcity of work and money, it is hard for the people to buy them. If you put rice at 9 cents a pint it will be just as hard for the people to buy it as in the case of the potatoes at 12 cents a pound. After all, it is a question of economics; you must measure the ability of the people to buy and I make no apology for anything which I have said today. I have a special mission in this House; I represent people who look like me and I repeat that I have no apology to make to anybody for what I have said. (Mr. ADAMS: You should not let people see when you are hurt.)

Mr. MAPP: There has been a lot of talk about the cost of living and so forth, but I do not think that there is anybody here who knows the burdens of these things more than I know them. I can hardly buy a good suit. As regards what the honourable junior member for St. Philip has said, I think that the potatoes must have come down rotten.

Mr ADAMS: In reply to the honourable junior member for the City as to how the rice will be brought here, we have received a message that they are arranging for this shipment of rice. We are not sending our schooners for the rice, they are sending it.

The question that the further consideration of this Resolution be now postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative on the following division:—

Ayes: DR. WILSON, MESSRS. SYMMONDS, BRANCKER, CRAWFORD, GARNER, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, DOWDING, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON and WARD—12.

Noes: MESSRS. COX, FOSTER, MAPP, LEWIS, TALMA, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, DR. CUMMINS and MR. SPEAKER—9.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. TALMA, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee, the postponement of one, that four were not considered and that Committee had asked for leave to sit again.

Mr. SPEAKER: Resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

RATES OF INCOME TAX BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph:—Seconding reading of a Bill to settle the rates of Income Tax for the year 1948 and to make provision for certain other matters in connection with the levying of the said tax.

Mr. ADAMS: The rates of income tax as set out in this Bill are the normal rates except, as honourable members will see from the Schedule, there has been a little change. We have taken off 3d. in the lower category and added it on higher up. There has been a balance in that way, the net result being the same. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILKINSON: This Bill levies a tax on individual incomes. I notice from the Schedule that the rates on incomes up to £600 have been reduced by 3d.

and above £600 there is an addition. There is therefore a sort of switch over relieving people in the lower brackets and increasing those in the higher brackets. There is a general impression in Barbados that the people in the higher brackets are not paying as much as income taxpayers in the other islands, but I would like to point out that that is not the case even at the present rates. It is very difficult to make a fair comparison because the allowances vary enormously. In Trinidad if a man with an income of £1,000 has a boy or girl being educated in Barbados at the Lodge School or Harrison College he can get an allowance up to £250. We in Barbados have no allowances on that scale. There is only one fair comparison which I can make and that is to take a married man with no children; he is married and therefore he gets a married allowance. In Barbados there is no tax paid by a married man on an income of £250 and the same thing obtains in British Guiana, and Trinidad. On an income of £500 the tax in Barbados is £15 12s. 6d; British Guiana, £15 and Trinidad £15. You will find that the tax in Barbados on an income of £500 for a married man is 12/6 more than in British Guiana or Trinidad. On an income of £750 a married man pays £43 15s. in Barbados. in British Guiana, £45 and in Trinidad £43 16s. 8d. Similarly on an income of £1,000 he pays in Barbados £96 17s. 6d. in British Guiana, £75 and in Trinidad £84 3s. 4d. Again the tax in Barbados is very much higher. On an income of £1,250 the tax in Barbados is £160, in British Guiana, £135 and in Trinidad, £139 10s. I have the authority of the Income Tax Commissioner to say that these figures are correct. You will see therefore, that far from the individual in Barbados being taxed less than individuals in other islands, he is being taxed more and we are proposing to increase that taxation here today. I am not objecting to these rates today but I am warning the Government that there is a limit to everything, and we would not be wise to kill the goose that lays the golden egg. Some people talk about rich men and judging from the way in which they talk you would think that there are numbers and numbers of people in Barbados with incomes of £1,000. (Mr. ADAMS: Returned incomes). If you take the Government's figures you will find that the number of income taxpayers dwindles as you go from the £1,000 bracket upwards. There are 1,344 in the category of £100; 260 between £401 and £600; 198 between £1,001 and £2,000. 31 between £2,001 and £2,500 and those over £5,000 are only 11. Honourable members will find that the wealth of the island is more evenly distributed now than in the past. I think people should know that there are not hundreds of wealthy people in this island and we have to face the fact that our taxation has got to come from people with moderate incomes in the future. I am supporting this Bill, but I want to warn the members of the Executive Committee that they cannot go on increasing the rates.

Mr. MAPP: It is interesting to listen to the honourable member's argument but the figures given simply relate to incomes as returned to the Income Tax Commissioner. While we do not want to have a poor opinion of human nature, yet I can tell this House that in America one year, before a Committee set up to investigate certain matters relating to income tax there was a millionaire banker who returned figures to prove that he made no income at all that year. Therefore figures can prove everything and they can prove anything. While I congratulate the Government on reducing the rates in the lower brackets, I do not think that the rates in respect of incomes between £2,000 and over £5,000 are progressive enough. I warn the Government, and I hope that they will take heed to the warning, that their commitments for the future are very heavy and they know that the Other Place will throw out any measure which deals with taxing companies. I suggest that we heavily tax incomes from over £3,000. The rich people in this colony have never been called upon to pay an excess profits tax, they have never had their unearned incomes taxed, a surtax has never been levied on the big incomes and if the Government's commitments are expected to be very much higher than in the past, I think that the time has come when the rates in the higher brackets should be more progressive. Another point is this: I would like the Government to do something about the Income Tax Office.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are not now discussing anything about the Income Tax Office.

Mr. MAPP: That has a bearing on the matter but I shall bow to Your Honour's ruling. I think that the Government could very well afford to send an Officer from the Income Tax Department——

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member has accepted my ruling but he is still going on to discuss something about the Income Tax Department.

Mr. MAPP: I was only suggesting that the Government should consider sending out an Officer from that Department to learn the modern methods of collecting taxation. The present method creates a burden on every taxpayer.

Mr. SPEAKER: This Bill only deals with fixing the rates of income tax for this year.

Mr. MAPP: In so far as these rates are concerned, we know that every year the total amount of income tax collected always exceeds the total amount estimated by the Income Tax Commissioner, although this year it is expected that there will be a huge drop owing to the drought last year.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know what the honourable member is going to say, but it seems to me that he is getting to the same point at which I stopped him just now.

Mr. MAPP: I am not going back to that point; I am just saying that while it is true that owing to the drought last year there might be a drop in the total amount of income tax collected, I am hoping that in future the Government will see its way to relieve even further the people in the middle and lower brackets. We make no difference between earned and unearned income and there are vast sources of unearned incomes in this country, incomes which are not taxed. Now that we have a Financial Secretary I think that it is quite time for the Government to revise all these figures and see to what extent we can relieve people in the middle and lower income groups. In spite of the fact that the total amount of income tax collected this year is likely to be less than in the past, I think that the Government have done a good job in relieving the people in the middle and lower income brackets.

Mr. LEWIS: The rates of income tax have always been the subject of much debate in this House and at last the Government has seen fit to offer a little reduction in the beginning of the Schedule of this Bill. In recent years the personal allowance has been restored to its pre-war amount and I understand that there is a Bill on the Order Paper to increase the allowance for children and dependants. Well, Sir, that is a fine gesture by the present Government, but they have not been able to distinguish between earned and unearned income. We have had an Income Tax expert and he did not mention anything about the matter although he told us one or two good things. From the time I have been a member of this House I have been trying to impress on honourable members that the rates of income tax were too high in the lower brackets, but all my appeals fell on deaf ears. As far as the honourable junior member for St. James is concerned, he was a member of the Government when the rates were increased.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member——

Mr. LEWIS: I am going to keep strictly within the ambit of the Bill and the arguments I use will be subject to Your Honour's ruling. The honourable junior member for St. James was either anticipating the other Bill or he was looking forward to the Elections; because when the Government was asked to lower the rates, the honourable member was a member of the Government at the time and he turned a deaf ear to the argument that these rates in the lower brackets were too high. When the comparison with the other islands was made, the honourable member, a prominent member of the Government then, took no notice of it; and now we hear that these personal rates, as compared with British Guiana and Trinidad are wrong.

Mr. WILKINSON: I did not say that they are wrong; I was only making a comparison.

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable member meant that they are wrong and I thought he would have been making a motion in Committee to that effect. He should make a motion in Committee.

Mr. WILKINSON: What I said is that it is very hard to make a fair comparison between the rates in Barbados and those in the other islands because the allowances vary enormously, and the only fair comparison which I could make was in the case of a married man with no children.

Mr. LEWIS: During the War the Government, of which the honourable member was a member, cut down the allowance for a single man at a time when the cost of living was soaring. Let the honourable member deny that. And he was appealed to by honourable members. He is in a false position today.

Mr. SPEAKER: That has nothing to do with the Bill which we are discussing at the present moment; the whole point now is the fixing of the rates of income tax for this year.

Mr. LEWIS: I am glad that the Government has seen fit not only to restore the allowance but to have a proposition before the House to increase it. They have given a measure of relief at the present rates; they have taken off 3d in the beginning of the Schedule of this Bill and I hope that they will regard themselves as trustees to the people and use the money which they collect for the benefit of the people. It is difficult to pay income tax and I say that I have not been able to pay my last year's tax yet. If the Government cannot do anything more on this occasion and they collect a lot of income tax, I hope that they will devise ways and means not only to build houses for the working classes but also to assist the middle classes.

Mr. ADAMS: I must confess that I got the same impression as the honourable member who has just sat down that the honourable junior member for St. James was making a comparison between our rates of income tax and those in British Guiana and Trinidad in order to show that our rates are too high. As a matter of fact, the honourable member spoke about killing the goose that lays the go'den egg. The honourable member has quoted figures but there is a danger in quoting figures. I have to remind honourable members again that we are not yet a republic. We are going to be told that this Labour Government is doing nothing to help industries, but that is not so. We have been told this by Secretary of State after Secretary of State: "You are asking British taxpayers to help with development schemes, to give an increased preference for sugar and look at your income tax rates!" Colonel Stanley, Mr. Hall, Mr. Creech Jones—they have all pointed out to us that whenever anybody asks about income tax they have got to mumble some excuse. Let us show that we are prepared to tax ourselves at a reasonable figure; let us show that we are willing to increase our rates of income tax before we call on the British taxpayers. I assure the honourable junior member for St. James —I have never made any secret of this—that as long as we are being constantly reminded that our rates of income tax are low, as long as we are asking the British taxpayers to give us money and as long as I have anything to do with the matter, I am voting for an increase in the higher brackets. The Government is conscious of the inequalities and the loopholes both as regards the levying of income tax and I do not incur Your Honour's displeasure by mentioning death duties. The levying of death duties is rotten in this Place. Either by way of the introduction of an income tax or death duties amendment Bill we will have to get at the money which is not now being paid into the Treasury; and this Labour Government will do all it can get the Bill passed. It is not a question of our not being conscious of the fact that we have to help the people who are at the bottom; there are some of us who feel that everybody should pay income tax, but I do not go as far as that. While it is easy to say what a worker on the wharf is getting now as compared with what he was getting before the War, or what a domestic servant is being paid now as compared with what she was paid before the War, yet they have to live. I apologize to honourable members for speaking at such length, but I think it is only right that they should know the attitude of the Government. We do not want to kill the goose which lays the golden egg; far from that, we know that the goose can lay not only golden eggs but diamonds.

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

The second reading was passed.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

The three Clauses of the Bill were read and passed.

The Schedule was read and agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. TALMA in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ORDER NOT PROCEEDED WITH.

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to take charge of Order No. 3 standing in the name of the honourable senior member for Christ Church.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I object. I think that we should adjourn at this stage.

Mr. SPEAKER: If you want to make a motion for the adjournment you are at perfect liberty to do so.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to this day week at twelve o'clock noon. I should like to say that I do not think it is right for the honourable member to go on with Order No. 3 now. That Order deals with an amendment to the law relating to Income Tax and it is rather controversial. I think that honourable members are entitled to an adjournment at this time of the evening.

Mr. DOWDING: I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS: I told honourable members on the last occasion that I proposed to ask them to meet on Thursday and deal merely with non-controversial matters.

Mr. MAPP: I beg to move that the words "this day week at twelve o'clock noon" be deleted in order to insert the words "Thursday, the 19th instant at 12.30 p.m."

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: A motion has been made that this House do now adjourn to this day week at twelve o'clock noon. An amendment has been moved that the words "this day week at twelve o'clock noon" be deleted in order to insert the words "Thursday, the 19th instant at 12.30 p.m." The question is that the words proposed to be deleted stand part of the motion. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No." I think the "Noes" have it.

The following division was taken:—

Ayes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. HAYNES, SYMMONDS, CRAWFORD, GARNER, BRANCKER, MOTTLEY, DOWDING, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON and WARD—12.

Noes: Messrs. SMITH, HUSBANDS, F. L. WALCOTT, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, LEWIS, TALMA, ADAMS, BLACKMAN and Dr. CUMMINS—11.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been decided in the affirmative, twelve honourable members voting "Aye", and eleven honourable members voting "No." The question now is that this House do now adjourn to this day week at twelve o'clock noon. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No" I think the "Ayes" have it. This House now stands adjourned.