

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1947—48

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 3rd February, 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*), Mr. J. T. C. RAMSAY (*Chairman of Committees*), Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Messrs. F. L. WALCOTT, M. E. COX, D. A. FOSTER, R. G. MAPP, A. E. S. LEWIS, C. E. TALMA, G. H. ADAMS, B.A., H. D. BLACKMAN, and V. C. GALE.

Prayers are read.

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

MINUTES.

The Minutes of meetings which were held on the 20th and 27th January, 1948, respectively having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

Messrs. DOWDING, WILKINSON, SMITH, and Dr. WILSON enter the House and take their seats.

PAPERS LAID.

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

Tenth annual report of the Peasants' Loan Bank for the period 1st June, 1946, to 31st May, 1947.

Post Office advances for the payment of Money Orders to the 31st December, 1947.

Statement of Gross Customs and Excise receipts to 31st October and 30th November, 1947.

Statement of Expenditure of the Housing Board to 30th September, 1947.

Regulations made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee under section 3 of the Travelling Allowance Act, 1932 (1932-5).

Regulations made by the General Board of Health under section 3 of the Dairies Act, 1941 (1941-17).

Quarterly transactions in Rum to the 31st December, 1947.

Report on Venereal Disease Control in Barbados, by Dr. G. M. Thomson, Adviser to W.I. Governments on V.D. Control.

Report on the audit of the accounts of the Rehabilitation Committee.

NOTICES.

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Mr. TALMA: Resolution to approve the Regulations entitled the Travelling Allowances (Amendment) Regulations, 1948, made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the 29th January, 1948, under the provisions of section 3 of the Travelling Allowance Act, 1932, (1932-5).

Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution to approve the Regulations entitled The Dairies Regulations, 1948, made by the General Board of Health on the 7th of January, 1948, under the provisions of section 3 of the Dairies Act, 1941 (1941-17), and approved and sanctioned by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the 29th January, 1948.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Bill to amend the Exports and Imports (Restriction) Act, 1939 (1939-14).

Mr. LEWIS gives notice of his intention to move the adjournment of the House later in the day in order to comment on a matter of public concern, namely, the absence of elected representatives of the people from Conferences generally and particularly the important Conference now being held in this island.

QUESTIONS.

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

1. In view of the standard of living obtaining at present as compared with the year 1891, will the Government consider the advisability of revising the scale of compensation set out in section 2 of the 1891-14 Act which relates to witnesses at the Court of Grand Sessions so as to provide for increased compensation to the various classes of work people contained therein, especially labourers?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Government take steps to give effect to this at as early a date as possible?

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

1. Is the Government aware of the acute need for playing fields and recreational facilities which exists throughout the island, and especially in the parish of St. Thomas?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Government take steps at an early date to establish such facilities?

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. BLACKMAN, seconded by Mr. TALMA, a Bill to amend the Exports and Imports Restriction Act, 1939 (1939-14) is read a first time.

EXCUSE FOR ABSENT MEMBER

Mr. WILKINSON offers an excuse for the absence of the honourable senior member for St. Lucy (Mr. WARD) who unfortunately is unwell.

Mr. CRAWFORD enters the House and takes his seat.

NOTICE RE RESOLUTIONS PASSED AT MONTIGO BAY CONFERENCE

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker.—In view of the circumstances that surrounded the adjournment of the House last Tuesday when I intimated to members of the House that I proposed to deal with the consideration of the Resolutions passed at the Montego Bay Conference at the next meeting of the House—which, I had hoped, would have been held last Thursday—I am asking leave of the House to give notice of an Address to His Excellency the Governor concerning those Resolutions; that the Address be made an Order of the day and that Rule 60 be suspended to enable the House to deal with it at to-day's meeting.

Mr. CRAWFORD: When the House adjourned on Tuesday last, the motion before it was for the adjournment of a debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House was adjourned last Tuesday until to-day.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 60

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to move the suspension of Rule 60 in order to take Order No. 18 out of its place and deal with it as the first Order to-day; also to deal, if possible, with the Address of which I just gave notice.

There being no objection, the honourable member is granted leave to proceed.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move the suspension of Rule 60 in order that Order No. 18 may be dealt with as the first Order.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

The question that Rule 60 be suspended is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

POLICE (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order is to resume debate on the second reading of a Bill to amend the Police Act, (1908-2). When this matter was being debated on the last occasion, the honourable junior member for St. Thomas was speaking when the interruption took place.

Mr. MAPP: Last week when I spoke on this matter I drew attention to one phase of it that struck me very forcibly, that is, the giving to the employers on the waterfront power to employ additional policemen in order to guard the waterfront opens up, in my opinion, very peculiar avenues, so far as the attitude of policemen towards the workers and the waterfront is concerned. At present, under the Act the employers can pay to have supernumeraries employed on the waterfront; at present, they can also employ watchmen to watch their cargoes on the waterfront. Now, I do not know to which part of the waterfront it is intended to pay special attention. I understand that cargo is suspected of being pilfered from the

warehouses mostly and that, therefore, it is intended that policemen should be employed in the warehouses but I say, Sir, that that aspect of the question should give most of us in this House the greatest amount of concern at the present time because it seems to be the policy at the present moment of some employers at least to arouse the greatest amount of suspicion—whether it be a matter of pilfering of cargo or of transshipment of cargo and foodstuffs—in the minds of persons in this community in respect of workers on the waterfront and the Barbados Workers' Union which controls the bulk of those workers. Well, if that is so, that aspect of this matter must have struck the members of the Executive Committee who are members of this House; it must have struck them forcibly too because they are also connected with that body of workers. You cannot blame them as a Government for bringing down this Measure because impartially at least they must try and protect as far as possible anybody, whether employer or employee, who contributes to the economy of the island. But, Sir, I want to bring most forcibly to the notice of those who may hear me that before I agree to this Bill I must be assured first that there will be no displacements of watchmen on the waterfront, who are at present watching cargo, in favour of policemen, not only watchmen in the warehouses but also watchmen on ships. I must be given that assurance and, further, I hope that the Commissioner of Police will be very careful in the selection of policemen who are to do this duty and will take all necessary steps to guard against their regarding themselves as a special section of the Police Force who are agents of the owners or employers on the waterfront,—agents of people who are suspicious and are pointing at one special branch of employees because they hope to hit at the Trade Union movement. I say that the Commissioner of Police must be very careful to take measures to guard against that. As I understand at present, there will be little sense in opposing this Bill because under the Act, employers have the power to appoint supernumeraries but this Bill is giving the Police greater control and that is an aspect of this matter about which I feel very seriously. These employers are doing everything they can to hit at the Trade Union Movement, either one way or another. They blame the workers for everything. If there is transshipment of cargo, they blame them, forgetting that they are the people with vested interests who opposed a Deep Water Harbour many years ago; they accuse the workers of pilfering because of the Trade Union's activities on the waterfront and in creating a Force which would regard themselves as the agents of these employers, we have to be very careful about the steps we take to do so. As I have said before, the members of the Executive Committee must have paid careful attention to that phase of the matter and, naturally, they must have been convinced that it is in the interest of the island as a whole to take steps to control any pilfering that may, but not necessarily, go on. I am willing, so long as I am assured by the member in charge of this Bill that it will not result in the displacement of workers at present on the waterfront—and I understand that it will not,—to go along with the Government on this occasion because, as I see it, the position is a difficult and peculiar one. It is a matter of weighing the advantage to the community against the apparent disadvantage at which workers and their representatives will be placed, so far as certain suggestions and their effect are concerned. Anyhow, I will not take up any more of the time of the House and I hope that the assurance which I have asked for will be forthcoming.

Mr. HAYNES enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir,—We have heard the reasons for this amendment to the Police Act and it is rather alarming to think that in this day, we should have, so to speak, to increase the Constabulary for the purposes stated to us by members of the Government in this House. One would have thought that with labour organized as it is to-day, the necessity for an increase in the members of the Police Force to stop pilfering would be absolutely unnecessary. I am not in love with this amendment at all. I do not think it speaks well for Barbados. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the only redeeming feature about this Bill is the fact that they will be keeping on, rather than getting rid of in some form or other in accordance with the Calver Report, a number of policemen who in due course would have been laid off. If after all the surrounding circumstances are taken into consideration and the real reason, as is given us by the Government, for this Bill is that the numbers in the Police Force must be increased to prevent pilfering, then I say that I do not accept it. This, in itself, is no remedy and I make that statement because Barbados is not unique as far as pilfering is concerned. In all parts of the world where cargo is handled, pilfering takes place and I do not think—in fact I am almost sure—that more pilfering goes on in Barbados than in any other part of the world; therefore, the argument about increasing the Police Force to prevent pilfering will not cause me to vote for this Bill. I am going to vote for it for different reasons. Someone has referred to the withdrawal of ships from this port and this Bill seems to be the panacea. I cannot agree. It may be politic for some honourable members to suggest that the Police Force should be increased to prevent the pilfering of cargo on the waterfront and thus avoid the withdrawal of ships from this port but on the face of it, to me, it is not the right thing. Cargoes for these parts are put on board ships at ports in the United States of America and Canada and those who have been following this matter carefully realize that quite recently a summary of the pilferage that takes place on the wharves in the U.S.A. before the cargoes actually left them, disclosed that the loss amounted to hundreds of thousands of dollars and it is rather strange that in none of those countries the Constabulary has been increased to meet a situation like this. It has always been felt that that can best be stopped by the appointment of "ship" police, "ship" watchmen—people of that sort. I entirely agree with the junior member for St. Peter who said that what is really necessary is not merely an increase in the number of policemen but that the persons who are employed to look after the landing of cargo should be made to do their job. Now, Sir, I said that I am going to vote for this Bill for reasons other than that given, particularly by the Government. I would like it to be appreciated by the Government especially, that quite a number of honourable members will vote for this Bill so as to avoid the laying off of a number of policemen but not that it is felt that the employment of these men will really afford any relief in this matter or really cause Shipping Companies which have withdrawn their ships from this port to let them come back. No attempt to increase the Police Force merely to prevent pilfering of cargo on the waterfront will solve this problem and I repeat that to let it go abroad that the Legislature of this colony has had to increase its Police Force to control the landing of cargo at this port is a very sad thing, with labour as it is. It is a stigma

on workers for anybody to agree that there is so much stealing in our harbour in the handling of cargo that it is necessary to increase the Police Force to prevent it from going on. Stealing goes on everywhere and, therefore, when I vote for this Bill I do not do so with the understanding that it will cause ships which have been withdrawn from this port to be brought back, so that more cargo can be landed at Barbados.

Mr. GARNER entered the House while Mr. MOTTLEY was speaking and took his seat.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir,—I must say that I am not very enamoured over the proposal contained in this Bill. It does seem remarkable that only now, after so many years, has it been found essential to place special constables on the waterfront to protect the cargo which comes to this country. Apart from the fact that by this proposed action we shall be placing a stigma on the character of the workers involved, I think that if we scratch beneath the surface we may discover that there are fundamental reasons which operate to make this step appear imperative at the present time and, therefore, before we attempt to remedy the effect, our duty is to try to discover the cause. Why in the year 1948, with facilities for the enlightenment of the community more widespread and with the Churches, both Established and Nonconformist, seeking to extend their influence among the population, why should it be necessary to take this extraordinary step to curb the menace of stealing on the waterfront? Or why should this evil have reached such alarming proportions? I think that the answer is to be found in the fact that there is a large number of able-bodied men in this community who cannot find work to do and if work is provided for the unemployed in the country, there will be, in consequence, less stealing. When people find themselves day in and day out without any source of livelihood, the actual consequence, it does seem to me, is an increase in stealing and, perhaps, even worse. I feel, Sir, that this step is really unnecessary until the Government has exhausted every possible avenue to provide work for the large number of people who are at present unemployed; therefore, I am going to vote against this Bill and I suggest to other honourable members to do likewise. Let us postpone action of this sort until steps have been taken to relieve the unemployment situation and then when the people are gainfully employed, if the evil continues we shall be well advised to take the extraordinary steps which are envisaged in this Bill. Not only does it constitute an additional burden on the Treasury at a time when we need every possible penny we can get for essential services but I repeat that I do not like the impression which will be conveyed, especially among our West Indian neighbours who are, more often than not, inclined to credit Barbadians with the special propensity for stealing. You know the old story, Sir, that Barbadians cut cargo bags with their toe-nails and what not and certainly action of this sort by the Government will support the cunard which our neighbours have always been so willing to contribute to us in this respect. I, therefore, feel, Sir, that the further consideration of this Bill should be postponed. Let us exhaust every avenue for finding employment for the people before we libel them in this way and after we shall have done that then we shall be justified in taking any essential steps if the evil continues to the same extent.

Mr. HAYNES: A point about which I have not yet heard anything is this: What guarantee has the Government that these policemen will be kept on

permanently by the mercantile community? Is there a five-year or a ten-year arrangement or anything of that sort? Again, I take it that if these men are enrolled, they would have to be pensioned and I want to know who is going to bear the cost of those pensions. I should really like to be enlightened on these matters before I vote for this Bill because I am inclined to agree with the senior member for St. Philip that this scheme is likely to be a burden on the Treasury of Barbados in the near future. I understand that one line of steamships, and possibly another, is going to stop frequenting our port; that means that there will be less trading done. The Mercantile Association will then say that they have no further use for these policemen and they will be left on our hands. I should like these points cleared up before I give my vote in favour of this Bill.

Mr. SYMMONDS: Mr. Speaker,—I intend to vote for the passing of this Bill because it is a question of not only finding employment for twelve additional persons (Cries of "Shame, Shame") but also because human beings being what they are and society being what it is you will always have crime in some form or another and I do not see anything wrong in increasing the number of people who will assist in the prevention of crime. I feel that it is a wrong thing to wait until a man has done wrong, to stand by and see him do wrong and then seize and imprison him; therefore, if you increase the number of preventive officers in this respect, you will be finding work for a few more persons and the finding of work for a few more people is doing some good in the island. In addition, you will be keeping an additional number of needy persons out of trouble and so I intend to support this Bill.

Mr. GALE: Mr. Speaker,—This question of pilfering cargo is not confined to Barbados. In every country where cargo is being handled, pilfering goes on, for the simple reason that most articles are in short supply and great demand and people are able to sell very quickly anything that is pilfered. Further, if there were no receivers there would not be so many thieves. As long as there is an open port such as we have in Barbados it is very difficult for cargo which is being landed on wharves which are practically highways to be properly protected. In other places where ships go alongside and there are protected wharves, permits have to be obtained by persons to go on those wharves and in that way suspected persons are kept out; therefore, it is very much easier for cargo to be protected from pilferers in those places than in Barbados. I repeat that as long as commodities are in short supply we are going to have a tremendous lot of pilfering, not only in Barbados but in every other part of the world where cargo is being handled for shipment or otherwise. I have received several Bills of Lading but not all the goods which have been specified therein. I have just received a shipment of photographic goods landed here and both cases were broken open and nearly all the stuff was missing. I do not think that that took place at this port. The cases were landed here in a bad condition and the stuff was pilfered either at the other end where it was shipped or on board the ship and that goes on all the time. But I think it is reasonable that we should try to protect as far as possible our cargoes because if cargoes are pilfered, the cost of those goods will be higher; they will have to be replaced and in that way the supply becomes shorter still and the pilfering increases. I repeat that as long as we have this shortage of articles in all parts of the world, we are going to

get a tremendous amount of pilfering but it would still be a good thing for us to try and check up on it as far as possible.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I want to reply to some of the criticism that has been levelled at this Bill. First of all, as the junior member for St. Michael stated, pilfering is not confined to Barbados; it is a world-wide issue and consequently this Bill does not in any way stigmatise or sully the reputation of the people in Barbados who handle cargo either on board ships or in the warehouses. As far back as 1920, this question of pilfering cargo has been exercising the minds of the London Shipping Authority. The question of pilferage is one which is ever present in the minds of all shipowners and in 1920 a sub-Committee of the Shipping Authority in England gave much thought to the subject; therefore, it is not a thing of mushroom growth nor, as I said, is it confined to Barbados. It happens in all shipping ports of the world. "During the war the amount of pilferage has increased"—I am reading now from the "Sydney Journal"—

Mr. SPEAKER: What are you quoting from?

Dr. CUMMINS: From the file which accompanies this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Government members have some advantage over other honourable members in that respect but if you will speak from memory, you will perhaps be more convincing.

Dr. CUMMINS: I have authority to quote from the file.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, but no member is allowed to quote anything without putting it in as a document of the House. I see no reason why you cannot speak from memory what you want to quote.

Dr. CUMMINS: All right, Sir. The "Sydney Journal" states that this question of pilferage is not a new phenomenon and it goes on to show how it has increased during the war years. Further, Sir, Bridgetown lends itself to this sort of thing because there are no government warehouses; there is no exclusive area for the landing of cargo and things of that sort and this Bill seeks mainly to increase the vigilance of the Police along the wharves. I want to correct the impression that the employment of these additional policemen will displace labour which is at present employed on ships or in warehouses and I want to make it clear that the Government is only seeking to give more protection, if I may put it that way, in respect of the landing of goods on the wharves. As far as watchmen on steamships and at other places are concerned, they will not be displaced by the employment of these additional policemen; the employment of these policemen is an added security. As far as the employment of these policemen being a charge on the Treasury is concerned, they will not be paid by the Government directly. In fact, the position will be that when the policemen are employed, the person or persons who employ them will pay their wages in advance into the Treasury and from that money, the policemen will be paid. It will not be an added charge on the Treasury nor will it result in an increase in the number of policemen in the Force. By the latter statement I mean this: policemen who are discharged from the Force will not be replaced by new ones, and that will be done to implement the recommendation of Supt. Calver that the numbers in the Force should be reduced. Nobody is saying that the pilferage is done in Barbados but it is a recognized fact that it is done; whether it is done at the port of origin or on board ships or lighters, or in warehouses nobody is in a position to say but what we do say is that it

takes place and this Bill seeks to give added security to the commercial body and the public of Barbados. When pilferage is done, as has been pointed out by the junior member for St. Michael, it increases the cost of living. Naturally, when the merchants lose goods in this way they are not going to stand the loss out of their pockets; they are going to pass it on to the consumers and eventually the consumers pay for it. As I said, the employers will pay the money in advance into the Treasury when they need these policemen and when they are no longer needed, the employers have to give notice to that effect.

Mr. GARNER: Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. SPEAKER: It is a pity that honourable members do not make their speeches before the member in charge of a measure that is under discussion replies.

Mr. GARNER: I cannot vote for this Bill. In the first instance I do not see anything in this Bill about the pension rights of these policemen and that, to my mind, is a very important matter. If we are going to employ these men on the wharves we must say something specifically about their pension rights; if we are going to take twelve men from the Police Force and put them to do this work, it must be incumbent upon us to say what is going to become of their pension rights. This Bill does not say anything about the pension rights of these men nor about what will happen to them when they are no longer wanted by the merchants. Sir, I am not one of those who believe that all the pilferage that goes on is really instituted at this port because while some of the goods are in transit they are tampered with; so that it cannot be said that our workers are carrying away more than anybody else. If the merchants want to protect themselves I see no reason why they should not have their own policemen as is done in the U.S.A. and other places. They could have their own men each wearing a badge to show that he belongs to a certain steamship office and that is all that would be required. But when we are going to take away policemen from the Force and do not say anything about their pension rights—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member in charge of the Bill having already replied I shall draw the attention of the junior member for St. Philip to sub-clause 44 of clause 2 of the Bill in which provision is made for a contribution to any pension which will be paid to these policemen.

Mr. GARNER: I am referring to the pension rights of these men and sub-clause 44 of clause 2 refers to expenses.

Mr. SPEAKER: It includes pensions as well.

Mr. GARNER: It is thought, perhaps, that a Bill like this would have come from a Conservative Government but coming from this Government and supported by others who have to deal with the same units on the waterfront, it does not ring true to me. It does seem to me that somebody has been trying to re-instate himself in the good graces of the mercantile community and that this is a stepping-stone to better friendship. Anyhow I am not in agreement with it. I feel that, as is done in other countries, the Steamship Agents could have their private detectives or constables or whatever they may be, with their badges around their arms and they would be responsible for the expenses and pensions to be incurred. This will be establishing a precedent and there is no reason why persons who own broad acres of land in this island should not apply for protection by policemen too if their produce is being stolen. I see no reason why certain members on my left who own broad acres should not ask that this be done for them too. I repeat that it does seem to me that this Bill is not so

necessary but is a matter of re-instating oneself in the friendship of the mercantile community and on trying to do one's best to keep one's Union in touch with the people who employ workers on the waterfront.

The question that the second reading of this Bill do now pass is put and resolved in the affirmative, the division being as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. SYMMONDS, SMITH, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. MOTTLEY, F. L. WALCOTT, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, LEWIS, TALMA, GALE and WILKINSON—15.

Noes: Messrs. RAMSAY, CRAWFORD, GARNER, HAYNES, S. A. WALCOTT and DOWDING—6.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee on the Bill, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

Clause 1 is read and is agreed to.

Clause 2. Sections forty-two, forty-three and forty-four of the Principal Act are hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor:—

"42. It shall be lawful for the Commissioner with the sanction of the Governor, on the application of any person or persons showing the necessity for the employment of a constable or constables, (including non-commissioned officers), in their service and on special duties, to employ and authorise to act and keep the peace at any place within the Island, such number of non-commissioned officers and constables belonging to the Police Force as to him shall seem fit; and the Commissioner may replace such non-commissioned officers and constables by as many non-commissioned officers and constables as shall be from time to time required.

43. It shall be lawful for the Commissioner with the approval of the Governor to make and ordain such special orders and regulations for and in relation to the non-commissioned officers and constables to be employed under the provisions of section forty-two of this Act and either in addition to or in substitution for any of the rules, regulations and orders for the time being applicable to the Police Force, and from time to time with the like approval, to add to, vary or annul the same as shall from time to time be deemed expedient for preventing neglect or abuse and securing the efficiency of the non-commissioned officers and constables so employed, and all non-commissioned officers and constables so employed shall be subject to the rules, regulations and orders for the good government of the Force and to any orders or regulations made hereunder.

44. The pay and expenses of any non-commissioned officer or constable so employed as provided in section forty-two of this Act shall be paid monthly in advance into the Public Treasury to the credit of general revenue by the persons making application for their employment at a rate to be fixed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee, who in fixing such rate is hereby authorised and empowered to take into account in calculating such rate the emoluments and allowances authorised to be paid to such non-commissioned officers and constables, the cost of uniform and any other reasonable expenses including any contribution to any pension which the Governor-in-Executive Committee may decide upon as necessary to be paid."

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that that be Clause 2 of the Bill.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: The only thing I would like to ask at this point is whether the members of the Executive Committee present do not consider it necessary that these rules and regulations which are made, in respect of these men, should be laid before the Legislature. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, it will not be necessary to seek our approval of them but at least they should be laid before us, so that we can know what they are and be able to check up on them at any time. I think that the rate of remuneration and the special method of controlling these men may ordinarily be left to the authorities but I am wondering whether I should not move an amendment to the effect that these rules and regulations which are to be made shall be laid on the table of the House or published in the *Official Gazette*. Things like that I think the people's representatives, in addition to the members of the Government, should know because if anything goes wrong, if these special policemen are dissatisfied with the terms of any employment of this nature, they usually have to seek redress in quarters that might read the *Official Gazette* and it might be a good thing to have these rules and regulations recorded in that journal. I would like to hear if any member of the Government present has any objection to that or can give any good reason why it should not be done.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—At present, the regulations affecting the Police Force are dealt with in the same way. Section 36 of the Act makes provision for that and it does not state anything about such rules and regulations being laid before the Legislature, although the subsequent section gives the Governor-in-Executive Committee power to make rules and regulations.

I remember having to search back on one occasion for the origin of these Police regulations and I found that as far back as the time when the Police Force was established, the Commissioner was given power, with the approval of the Governor to make rules and regulations for the good government of the Force. I am not posing as an appraiser of what is best but as far as I have been able to trace in connection with this Act, the Commissioner has always had the right to make rules and regulations affecting the Force, with the approval of the Governor. The Police Force, has been over 100 years in existence—I think they had a Centenary celebration within the last decade—and I do not think that any great deal of nuisances have arisen in respect of those rules and regulations. Again, Sir, I do not want to make a second reading speech but one or two things have been said, to which I could reply in a simple sentence. These men are to all intents and purposes the same as ordinary policemen; they can be used on the wharf to-day and at Bissex Hill to-morrow. The Government intends to implement Supt. Calver's recommendation and reduce the numbers of the Force. When a policeman becomes medically unfit, the Government hopes not to replace him. These men are ordinary policemen who can be called upon to do this work or to put into effect any other emergency measure and the Commissioner can send them to Districts "A," "B," "C," or "D," or on the wharf when a ship arrives or to Bissex Hill.

Mr. LEWIS: If the senior member for St. Joseph feels that we can leave the matter, in respect of these rules and regulations, as it is then all well and good but my experience is that these rules and regulations are very carefully made when the framers of them know that they have to come before the Legislature. If the honourable member would refer to the end of the clause which replaces Section

42 of the Act, he will see these words:— "And the Commissioner may replace such non-commissioned officers and constables by as many non-commissioned officers and constables as shall be from time to time required." Now, Mr. Chairman, that is an absolute impossibility; that is just sheer nonsense written there. That would mean that you would have to fluctuate your engagement of these men with the requirements of these persons wanting their services, and this just can't happen, because they can't be dismissed when they are not required. If you are employing say, ten when twelve are required you may take two from elsewhere but when those required drop to six or three the Commissioner can't dismiss the surplus he has engaged.

I do not like that because it is impracticable. I will accept the honourable member's explanation but this is not like a barometer; it cannot work.

You have to ask these people: how many policemen do you think is the average number you would like to be employed on the wharf and if they tell you a dozen you can take eight hoping to fill in the others you can shift from elsewhere.

There is just one other remark I would like to make before this Bill is passed. Even the Leader of the House says that he does not wish by this Bill to brand people who work on the wharves, as thieves or any such thing. I think if the Government is going to meet the requirements of shipping Agents by this Bill the least the Agents could have done was to have tried and prevailed upon the steamship owners not to take away the transshipment of cargo before this Bill became law. But we have the situation that the principal ships which bring cargo to this port for transshipment to other colonies have withdrawn that transshipment and we are still being asked to supply people to watch cargo that will never come ashore here. That is how it strikes me; there has been a lack of goodwill on the part of some parties to this transaction. I wonder if they are going to employ these policemen now and draft them into the Police Force. I say that certain parties to this agreement have acted against it. The other side did not wait for results; they have taken away the transshipment of their cargo and yet you are training men and need more watchmen to watch cargo that will never be landed at this port.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I would like to ask the honourable member how he reconciles his position now with the fact that he voted for the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. LEWIS: I am not doing anything so that it will be thrown back at me that I acted in a manner which caused this country to lose its trade or commerce. I am merely calling attention to the fact that the other parties to the agreement have taken the matter already in their hands.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What I would like to find out is who are the other parties to the agreement. I thought they were the steamship agents in Bridgetown and not the steamship companies who send their steamers here and I should be very grateful if a member of the Government would explain the position. All along I have been of the opinion that the people who are going to put this money up are the steamship agents in Bridgetown and not the steamship companies. I want to inform the junior member for the City, on this particular matter, that the interests of the steamship companies do not coincide with the interests of the steamship agents; they are entirely separate and distinct things and if there is loss to this port through the withdrawal of the transshipment of cargo from it, it is due to the fact that all the ex-

penses, not only through increased wages but also through making good any losses in the harbour, have been passed on by the local steamship agents to the steamship companies.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—You will remember that I have particularly said that on listening to the speeches which have been made during this debate one would discover that representation has been made to the Government that pilfering has gone on and who would be better able to do that than the steamship agents? We find that a certain steamship Line has taken away the transshipment of cargo which its steamers bring here and I particularly said that it is a pity that the steamship agents did not impress upon the steamship companies to let the cargo continue to be transhipped from this port until this Bill has become law. If the honourable member has not heard that, then something is wrong with his hearing or he is particularly trying to misrepresent what I have said.

Mr. TALMA: I have listened carefully to the senior member for Christ Church. Perhaps the he does not know that an agent represents his principal and that therefore, the steamship agents represent their principals who are the steamship companies; they both coincide but the honourable member is trying to make some distinction between the two. The point is this: no matter how intricate one attempts to cause this Bill to appear, it is patent that the object of it is to prevent pilferage which is done here owing to the amount of unemployment we have here. These policemen will be drafted into the Police Force but all the expenses would not fall on the local Treasury. If we had enough members employed in the Force at present there would be no necessity for this Bill but in view of the fact that Supt. Calver's recommendation has been implemented and is likely to be implemented still further, this Bill becomes necessary and unless it is passed, what little transshipment of cargo there is now may be lost.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It is very illuminating to have this very intricate point of law explained by the senior member for Christ Church. Perhaps the senior member for St. Joseph would tell us whether the senior member for Christ Church is now a full-baked solicitor (A MEMBER: Order). But, Sir, while it is commonplace to say that an agent ordinarily represents his principal, the point is that the expenses incurred by the steamship agents are defrayed by the companies and not by the agents. And the point I was making was this: When the steamship agents have to increase expenses, either for wages or anything else, rather than defray them out of their own pockets they pass them on to the steamship companies, with the result that the steamship companies who have to bear at all times all this increased cost are withdrawing their services from this port. It is quite simple. In other words, every time expenses on the waterfront go up, the profits of the steamship agents remain static and those expenses are borne by the steamship companies.

Mr. MOTTLEY: There seems to be a waste of time. What is the idea of prolonging the debate on this point? The Mercantile Association has absolutely nothing to do with the steamship agents. They are absolutely fooling people. (THE CHAIRMAN: The honourable member must not use the word "fooling" in respect of the remarks of other honourable members). A person may be an agent of a steamer and the cargo which it brings is consigned to somebody else—a matter of indifference to the pilferers. It is fallacious to say that a steamship company withdraws the transshipment of its cargo because there is

pilferage going on; it is not true. Canadian National Steamships call to Gardiner Austin & Co., but may bring goods consigned to Musson, Son & Co. and if there is any pilfering of those goods, that pilfering is a matter for Musson, Son & Co.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: It is very easy for honourable members to get up in their pontifical manner and make statements. It is not true to say that because cargo is consigned to one person and it goes into somebody else's warehouses, the person—

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. I never said anything about warehouses. Apparently the senior member for St. Peter, because of his association with the waterfront, thinks he knows everything that goes on on the waterfront. What I said was that cargo that is brought by a Canadian National Steamship which calls to Gardiner Austin & Co. may be consigned to Musson, Son & Co. I said nothing about warehouses.

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

Clause 3 is read and is agreed to.

Clause 4. This Act shall come into operation on such day as the Governor shall appoint by Proclamation in the Official Gazette.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that that be Clause 4 of the Bill.

Mr. LEWIS: I would just like to know whether this is merely fashionable or there is some good reason for it. Too many Bills are being passed by this House and have to wait until they are proclaimed by the Governor to become law. I am not saying that you may not have the policemen in time but it strikes me that this Act can go into operation and arrangements can be made for the employment of these policemen. I do not see why you have to give the Governor any right to bring this Act into Force by proclamation. Very likely the people for these jobs are picked out already and I am going to object, as part of my duty, to giving the Governor the privilege to proclaim these Acts. They must go through the usual course, that is, through the Legislature, be assented to by the Governor and become law. I beg to move that clause 4 be deleted.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I beg to second that.

Dr. CUMMINS: I did say that these men have to be trained for this work and that is possibly the reason for allowing the Governor to proclaim the day on which the Act should come into operation.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 4 be deleted. Honourable members in favour will please say "Aye"; those against will please say "No." I think the "Ayes" have it.

A division is called for and is being taken as follows:—

Ayes: DR. WILSON, MESSRS. SYMMONDS, BRANCKER, SMITH, LEWIS.

Noes: MESSRS. COX, FOSTER, MAPP, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, DR. CUMMINS, MESSRS. CRAWFORD, GARNER, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, DOWDING, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT.

The CLERK: Mr. Wilkinson?

Mr. WILKINSON: I do not understand the question. You are asking, Mr. Chairman, that something be deleted which has not been passed. How are you going to do that? (Cheers).

The CHAIRMAN: I think the junior member for St. James is right. The question should have been put this way: The question is that Clause 4 stand part of the Bill. Honourable members in favour will please say "Aye;" those against will please say "No." I think the "Ayes" have it.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, the CHAIRMAN reports the passing of the Bill in Committee.

The House resumes and on the motions of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN in each case, the Bill is read a third time and is passed.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE MAHATMA GANDHI

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker,—Before you proceed to call the next Order I want to crave the indulgence of the House to do something which I proposed to do earlier but it slipped me. I feel that this House should place on record its profound regret at the passing of Mohandas Gandhi.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member having said that, I think he should ask the leave of the House to proceed.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I ask leave, Mr. Speaker, to move the passing of a Resolution in connection with the lamentable death of Mohandas Gandhi.

There being no objection the honourable member is granted leave to proceed.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir,—I think honourable members will agree with me that we should pass a Resolution paying tribute to the late Mohandas Gandhi and requesting His Excellency the Governor to transmit the same to His Majesty's Government for transmission to the Government of India. The Resolution which I propose to move reads as follows:—

“Resolved that the House expresses its most profound regret at the tragic passing at Delhi of Mohandas Gandhi and requests that His Excellency be good enough as to convey these sentiments to His Majesty's Government for transmission to the Government of India.”

I think, Sir, that as the elected representatives of the people of a colony who have struggled for their political independence, we should go on record as having paid tribute to the passing of a former colonial who has done more in his generation for the political emancipation of all colonials than any other human being. Of his work and life it is not necessary to speak at length; they are well known to almost all civilized peoples throughout the world. It is, therefore, only necessary for us to express how deeply we feel the sudden end to which he came at the hands of an assassin on Friday last and allow the Indian Government to know that here in the West Indies—thousands of miles away from the great continent of India—we share the deep regret at his passing. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. ADAMS: In seconding that motion, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that when I came into the House the senior member for St. Peter had already drafted a Resolution which, he considered, should be introduced by a member of the Government and he passed it on to me. I added a paragraph to that Resolution and the senior member for St. Philip anticipated me in rising to make the motion. I have no desire to jump before any other honourable member of this House and inasmuch as the senior member for St. Philip has made the motion I shall be content to second it. I think we may divide the Resolution into two parts, one paragraph expressing our sorrow and the other requesting His Excellency the Governor to transmit the Resolution to the Government of India and the members of the family of the late Mahatma. We should express our horror at the murder as well as our sympathy. I suggest that we go into Committee on the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to point out that it is now four minutes after 2 o'clock.

Mr. ADAMS: It is better to adjourn at this stage because if we go into Committee we could not possibly finish the consideration of the Resolution by ten minutes past two o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have no alternative but to adjourn the House at ten minutes past two o'clock in accordance with the Rules of the House. If it is the feeling of honourable members that I should adjourn the House now I shall do so. (After a pause) It being after 2 p.m., I adjourn the House until a quarter to 3 o'clock in accordance with Rule 40 (a).

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (A)

On re-assembling,

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker.—In view of the Resolution with which we were dealing at the time of the luncheon adjournment and also in view of the intimation which I gave at the beginning of to-day's session, I am asking leave to move the suspension of Rules 61 (a) and 61 (b) in order to continue Government Business. Two Tuesdays ago I intimated that there was only one matter to be dealt with to-day, that is the Montego Bay Resolutions, but circumstances have arisen which made it necessary to try and get the Police Bill passed to-day and that is why that Bill was dealt with to-day. But hon. members were well aware that I had intimated that we would deal with the Resolutions passed at the Montego Bay Conference. These Resolutions should take precedence of any sort of public business and naturally we should proceed with them; at least we should make a start with them.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am quite willing to proceed with the Montego Bay Resolutions and I shall vote for the suspension of Rule 61 (a); but there are other matters under Private Members' Business with which I hope we shall deal this afternoon. We should have dealt with the Montego Bay Resolutions and not with the Police Bill earlier to-day; and if the Police Bill was dealt with, that is purely a matter for the hon. member who moved that it be dealt with.

Mr. SPEAKER: I suggest that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph should make separate motions for the suspension of the Rules.

Mr. ADAMS: I will do that. I should just like to say that when hon. members agreed to meet to-day and not last Thursday I specifically said that I intended to deal with the Montego Bay Resolutions; but the Government felt that due to certain circumstances the Police Bill should be dealt with as a matter of some urgency. It could not be suggested that the Montego Bay Resolutions could be dealt with during the first part of the day's sitting, and if hon. members had any objection to dealing with these Resolutions they should have objected at the time when the intimation to deal with them was made.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, Rule 61 (a) was suspended.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE MAHATMA GANDHI.

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to proceed with the Resolution with which we were dealing before the luncheon adjournment, namely, the Resolution relative to the death of Mahatma Gandhi.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: When the House was dealing with this Resolution, the honourable senior member for St. Philip had moved that it do now pass and the honourable senior member for St. Joseph had seconded the motion.

Mr. COX: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Resolution.

Mr. FOSTER seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Resolution, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

Mr. ADAMS: This is a matter of prime importance and it is not a question as to whose wording is adopted. I suggest that we should express our horror at the murder of Mahatma Gandhi and then express our sympathy with the loss to India and the rest of the world. It is not beside the point to add that his life was dedicated to peace. In a separate paragraph we should ask the Governor to transmit a copy of the Resolution to the Government of India and to the members of the family of the late Mahatma. I beg to move that all the words of the Resolution be deleted in order to substitute the following:—

Resolved: 1. That this House record on behalf of the people of Barbados its profound horror at the dastardly murder of Mahatma Gandhi, and its sympathy and deepest sorrow at the irreparable loss to India and the world through the death of a leader and saint whose life has been a dedication to the peace and liberty of people throughout the world.

2. That a copy of this Resolution be sent to His Excellency the Governor with the request that it be forwarded to the Government of India and to the members of the family of the late Mahatma.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I do not believe that any of us would have expected that what happened last Friday would have happened and in passing a Resolution of this nature, deploring the manner in which Mahatma Gandhi came to his end, we are doing honour to one of the greatest men who have walked on this earth since Jesus Christ 1,900 years ago. I do not believe that Mahatma Gandhi could be compared with anyone other than Christ for his sterling qualities. Gandhi was not only a leader of his people or a politician, but his deep spiritual convictions made him pursue a life of non-violence in the midst of violence and it must have taken something more than the ordinary courage of a human being to be able to do that. His life should be a life of inspiration to those of us who in a lesser degree have to pursue the arduous task of living public life; and when we begin to reflect and read the life of Mahatma Gandhi, it should be a source of inspiration to us to strive to carry out some of the things which he laid down in this world. It is good for us that we have the example of a man like Gandhi to follow; he was a citizen of the world, something for which we should strive, and the foundation which he has laid in India is a safe foundation for any nationality to try to lay in any part of this world. I feel that in expressing our feelings in this Resolution, we are honouring a great and noble leader.

Mr. GARNER: I wish to associate myself with all the remarks that have been made about the late Mahatma. I can well remember when I first heard and read about this great man how it moved my soul to think that there are those who care very little for this earth's goods and think more of their fellowman especially when he is suffering. This little man has no doubt set a high standard for those people who would call themselves leaders of the suffering masses:

he has no doubt set a great ideal and his life has exemplified his words. I hope that in years to come when people undertake, as in Mr. Gandhi's case, to lead the down-trodden people, theirs will be the work of service and not that of mere lust for power. Gandhi separated his life from that sort of thing—want of power. What moved me and should move most of us is his conviction of truth; he was strong because he loved truth; he became powerful because he worshipped truth. Gandhi was no self-seeking idle dreamer or politician; his was a love of solid truth, and if we would all dedicate our lives to truth, naturally results must follow. I say that, as one hon. member tells me, from the depths of my heart. There is something in true religion whether it be christianity or what not; if there is truth in your doctrine results must be produced. Having associated his life with truth Mr. Gandhi gained not only world-wide recognition but results for his people at home if not abroad. I say that because, as I read, from a youth he gave up a lucrative practice to associate himself with his down-trodden brothers. That is a very fine example which very few of us would set. Having done that, Gandhi at once connected himself with the source of all good, the source of all truth. He patterned his life according to that of Christ. I am not saying that he was in any way the second Christ or the Messiah or anything like that: but he set a great ideal and whether he lived to achieve it or not history itself will tell. There was something admirable in the character of the man and he has left us to pledge ourselves whether by oath, by mere words or by strength of character, to help our race just as he has done; and not only to strive for political power but for true emancipation. When I speak about emancipation, I mean not only economic emancipation but cultural and spiritual emancipation (Hear, hear) because these are the values which count after all. If we take a leaf out of Gandhi's book to-day we will fight for one issue—the alleviation of the lot of the masses of the people of this colony. Let us sink personal differences, let us stop seeking for power, let us get down to the root of things and fight the cause which we say we are fighting. Let us show what we are doing by deeds and not merely by words. I have much pleasure in associating myself with this Resolution because the lives of men like Gandhi always move me. I shall say no more on this occasion because I must confess that when I read the news of Gandhi's death I had to shed a tear. I did not know Gandhi in person but he was associated with men whom I admire, men whose work will make me know them when I see them. It is the great things in a man's life that will make us remember the man when he is gone, the things which will give a man international recognition. The man becomes not only a citizen of his own country but a citizen of the world. Gandhi was a man who had citizenship everywhere; let us be sad for one moment while this Resolution is being passed. These are appropriate lines:—

"Lives of great men all remind us

We can make our lives sublime,

And, departing, leave behind us

Footprints on the sands of time;"

There is no doubt that Gandhi has done that: he has left indelible impressions on the sands of time. When generations yet unborn read of his life, of his doctrines, of his ideals, not only will they call him a great soul, but they will place him among some of the greatest men who have ever given to this world that religion which brings about peace of mind, brotherly love and christian fellowship.

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman, — Previous speakers have practically covered all the ground in connection with this Resolution, but I have just

risen to say that the members on this side of the House are entirely in agreement with what has already been spoken particularly by the last speaker. Gandhi was a man who has set a marvellous example; I take it from what I have read of his life that he was inspired with a love for his people and a love of his country and he has, as we know, given his life for that cause. I do think, Sir, that if more of us would follow Gandhi's example, the world would be a better place. (Hear, hear). As I have said, previous speakers have so well spoken of Gandhi that there is nothing left for me to say; but I could not sit here and vote silently for this Resolution. I wish hon. members to know that we on this side of the House entirely agree with the Resolution the passing of which has been moved by the hon. senior member for St. Philip and seconded by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. (Cheers).

Mr. MAPP: I do not think that the occasion calls for any lengthy speeches; it rather calls for sincere sentiments which befit such a great man. I feel that we should express our thoughts on this occasion and our Resolution cannot adequately sum up what we feel about the late Indian leader. I think that the late Mahatma had a very powerful mind for such a frail and fragile body. It is remarkable how he used to keep that little body of his alive. That must have been due to a tremendous amount of will-power, something almost supernatural, and I think it is very appropriate that this Assembly should record its grief and express such sentiments as have been expressed at the death of such a great man. Ever since I was a youngster at school I was taught to sing the praises of warriors, of leaders of Colonial overlords and of masters but I hope that we will do even more than sing the praises of leaders like Gandhi; I hope that we will erect a monument of him such as that of Lord Nelson and those leaders of nations and colonial leaders who have striven and made sacrifices so that others might be liberated from the chains by which they have been held for centuries.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am willing to accept the amendment to the Resolution the passing of which I had moved. (Cheers).

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

The Resolution was passed.

On the motion of Mr. CRAWFORD, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Resolution in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the motion of Mr. CRAWFORD, seconded by Mr. ADAMS, the Resolution was passed, hon. members standing in their places at the request of Mr. Speaker.

SUSPENSION OF RULES 56 TO 61

Mr. ADAMS: Before the next Order of the Day is called, I ask leave to move the suspension of Rules 56 to 61 inclusive in order to deal with a matter which is not on the Order Paper.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Rules 56 to 61 inclusive be now suspended.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. GARNER: There is an important Resolution on the Order Paper the Resolution dealing with the supervision of the weighing of canes during the present crop. The crop has already been started the peasants are suffering and this Resolution is of more importance than the Resolutions passed at the Montego Bay Conference.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I would like to make myself clear. Only a few minutes ago we passed a Resolution in connection with the life of a man who lived for unity in the country in which he was born. The motion which is now before us seeks to allow us to deal with Resolutions in respect of West Indian unity which is a matter of momentous importance. I challenge any member of this House to tell me that this is not a matter which not only affects us but posterity. Whatever we decide about these Resolutions means something to the future of our children yet unborn.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What I want to point out is that the honourable junior member for St. Philip did not say that the Montego Bay Resolutions were not important, but he did claim that the matter to which he referred was a matter of greater urgency. Personally speaking, I am inclined to the view that the Montego Bay Resolutions and the Resolution to which the honourable member has referred are both of more importance and are more urgent than the Police Bill which we considered earlier today. The time spent in the consideration of that Bill, which is unnecessary to my mind, could have been devoted to considering the Montego Bay Resolutions. The honourable junior member for St. Philip is claiming that the crop has started and the peasants will possess a certain feeling of security that their interests are being properly protected when they see these Inspectors on their job. Although the salaries of these Inspectors cannot be due before the end of the current month, yet I feel that if we have any time left for Government Business that time can be devoted to the consideration of this Resolution. We have shelved the Montego Bay Resolutions for the last two weeks and dealt with matters of secondary importance and not of any great urgency, and there is no reason why this Resolution should not be attended to today.

Mr. BRANCKER: It is undoubtedly my view that there is nothing of greater urgency than the matter to which attention has just been directed by the honourable junior member for St. Philip. The crop has started and the peasants are worried because they have not seen the Inspectors going around. Every day I receive enquiries as to what is happening about these Inspectors who fulfil a very vital want in the community. The peasants are sending or about to send their canes to the factories but they cannot hear anything about these Inspectors. These Inspectors are relied upon just as we rely upon the Police Force or as sick people rely upon their doctors. In the interest of the welfare of the peasant proprietors there is nothing more urgent than that these Inspectors be put to work. I understand that they are not yet working and we need not be reminded of the great service which they render to the community and of how much the peasants have had to rely on them especially after what took place at Spring Hall Factory during the last crop. These Inspectors should be put to work and not be kept back in view of the fact that there will be a short crop this year. I submit that there is nothing of greater urgency today than the passing of this Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: If honourable members are telling the Government what is the order of priority in connection with Government matters. I ask, is it a matter for them? If the Government feels that such and such a thing is of more importance than another the Government must have taken everything into consideration. The Governor-in-Executive Committee have dealt most exhaustively with this question of proper payment for these inspectors and the mem-

bers of the Governor-in-Executive Committee are just as aware as any other member of this House that the crop has started. I am not aware that if we do not pass this Resolution this afternoon these Inspectors will not be employed; I am not aware of any insuperable difficulties relative to the appointment of these Inspectors. I had this Resolution among others to be considered first on the Order Paper for today thinking that the Montego Bay Resolutions would have been dealt with last Thursday. We have arranged for the priority of matters on the Order Paper, but if honourable members feel that they should spend the remainder of the time for Government Business considering this Resolution I am not averse to doing that. I should like to say that honourable members have no right to assume that the Government is not aware of the order in which these matters should be dealt with.

Mr. SPEAKER: In the next three minutes the time will be 3.30 o'clock and Rule 61 (b) has not been suspended.

Mr. ADAMS: If it is the wish of honourable members—

Mr. WILKINSON: I think the honourable member should make it clear as to what he wants to do.

At this point, it now being 3.30 o'clock, Mr. SPEAKER stated that the time for the consideration of Private Members' Business had arrived.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (B)

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (b) in order to continue Government Business. I should like to point out that the Order Paper was not fixed last Tuesday because of the way in which honourable members voted for the adjournment.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I will vote for the suspension of the Rule if we are going to deal with the Resolution relative to the appointment of the itinerant Inspectors to supervise the weighing of sugar canes during the crop, and then revert to Private Members' Business. Unless the honourable member can give that undertaking I shall be forced to vote against the motion.

Mr. ADAMS: I will not give any undertaking to do that. At any time that honourable members feel that they do not want to continue with any further Government Business a motion can be made that we revert to Private Members' Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (b). An objection having been taken, I shall put the question. The question is that leave be granted the honourable member to move for the suspension of the Rule. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye," those against will please say "No." I think the "Noes" have it.

A division was taken as follows:—

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

Noes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. RAMSAY, SYMMONDS, BRANCKER, CRAWFORD, GARNER, MOTTLEY, DOWDING, S. A. WALCOTT and WILKINSON—10.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been decided in the affirmative, eleven honourable members voting "Aye" and ten honourable members voting "No". The honourable member may therefore make the motion.

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

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question that Rule 61 (b) be now suspended was put and resolved in the affirmative.

The following division was taken:—

Ayes: Messrs SMITH, F. L. WALCOTT, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, LEWIS, TALMA, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, MOTTLEY, GALE, WILKINSON and Dr. CUMMINS—13.

Noes: Dr. WILSON, SYMMONDS, RAMSAY, BRANCKER, CRAWFORD, GARNER, DOWDING, and S. A. WALCOTT—8.

Mr. ADAMS: Inasmuch as this is the time for Private Members' Business normally speaking, I take it that I shall have to ask leave to move the suspension of Rule 60 so that we can go back to the first Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Rule has already been suspended and this is a part of the same day's sitting.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Order No. 2 on the Order Paper be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day therefore is to resume Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Colony.

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

Dr. CUMMINS: I ask leave to postpone the first Resolution.

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

COST OF SUPERVISING THE WEIGHING OF CANES.

Mr. TALMA: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is to place the sum of £1,100 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to meet the cost of supervising the weighing of canes during the 1948 crop year. This has been the means whereby the average peasant proprietor has been granted a certain measure of protection against being defrauded in so far as the weighing of his canes is concerned. For the benefit of certain honourable members, and more especially the honourable junior member for St. Lucy. I should like to say that this matter has engaged the attention of the Executive Committee for many weeks and every attempt has been made to see that the cane-weighing Inspectors receive a remunerative rate, a living wage. Honourable members who may have expressed any fear in that respect therefore need not have any more fear. The crop season is likely to be a short one and every attempt has been made not only to increase the travelling allowance of these Inspectors but also their remuneration generally. Great care and attention has been paid to see that paying these Inspectors on the basis suggested will not do them any harm. The old rate of pay has been adopted. It has to be remembered that these Inspectors work for five months during the course of a year and they have to do a lot of travelling. They travel approximately 3,500 miles in this part-time form of employment and their remuneration is fixed at £175 each. If the crop season happened to be the usual one by all means these Inspectors would have received some added increase in their present low wage. If they were put on a monthly basis and their travelling regarded as set out in the Schedule they will stand to lose. Of this £175 which they each receive £75 will be allocated to travelling expenses. In order to avoid any question which may be asked I will go to the limit of trying to explain the matter in some detail. There are six Inspectors and they

have to do any amount of travelling; all the sugar factories in the island have to be visited. As to the duties of these Inspectors they are as follows:—(a) The test checking of the weighing of canes at a group of factories which will be allotted to them by the Labour Commissioner. They may however be required at times to visit some factories outside this group. The group to which they are assigned may be changed or re-arranged at any time; (b) The investigation of any dispute arising out of the cutting or weighing of canes either from estates or from peasants. In order to do this it may be necessary to visit any estate supplying canes to any factory; (c) The making of weekly reports to the Labour Commissioner on Saturday morning; (d) The keeping of a diary showing the estates and/or factories visited each day; and brief reports of any disputes they have had to investigate or of any unusual conditions they have discovered on estates or factories and (e) The keeping of records showing in respect of each factory in their group the following: (i) The price paid per ton for peasants' canes and estate canes respectively; (ii) The total tonnage of cane received from each estate and the total tonnage from peasants and labourers; and with respect to each estate in their group. (i) The names of the owner, attorney and manager; (ii) The acreage of canes reaped by the flat rate per ton; (iii) The acreage cut by any other method and (iv) The number of man-days worked by cutters and total wages paid to cutters for the 1947 reaping season. The approximate mileage to be covered is 3,500 and the Inspectors have to travel by car because it would be superhuman for anyone travelling by bicycle to cover the area allotted to each Inspector. Without trying to disclose any secret I say that the Inspectors are put under the control of the Labour Department; but I believe that it is the intention of the Government to see that they are put under the control of the Department of Science and Agriculture where they will be provided with employment of a more reliable nature. They will thus be more easily absorbed in that Department than in the Labour Department which really has no use for them after the crop season. In the interest of the peasants and honourable members who are anxious to see that they are protected, the crop having been already started, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: I would just like a little information with regard to this matter. Of course, my view about these Inspectors is well known, it is that there is not a sufficient number of them, and I wonder if the Government has given any consideration to increasing the number. We want more of these Inspectors so that they can drop in at any time when the factory scales are working incorrectly. People have been wondering why these Inspectors have not yet started to work; normally the Labour Department allows them to start working feeling sure that the House will pass the Resolution for their remuneration. We do not know what is happening at Spring Hall Factory apart from any other factory and if this Resolution is not passed by the other Chamber until this day week will that mean that those Inspectors will not start working? My view is that they should start working the same day on which the crop begins; the factory owners should not be given one day in which to rob the peasants. We have already given them two weeks, this is the third week and the Inspectors should have been on duty to see that the peasants do not lose a quarter of a ton of canes on every lorry load. I hope that members of the Government will cause instructions to be given to the

Head of the Administration to the effect that these Inspectors start working from tomorrow.

Mr. DOWDING: I would like to make a remark in connection with the last part of the honourable introducer's speech which I think is the most important part. These Inspectors are of great benefit to the sugar industry but they are only supplied with work for the period of the crop. It is very hard for them, knowing that they are going to be employed during the following crop, to obtain work and they find it hard to maintain a position which they should maintain. I was very pleased to hear that some scheme has been thought of so that their work will become somewhat of a permanent nature rather than of a temporary one. I hope that the greatest and earliest consideration will be given to putting their employment on a permanent basis.

Dr. CUMMINS: In reply to the honourable junior member for St. Lucy, I would like to say that it was felt by some members of the Executive Committee that on account of the mileage which we have heard the emoluments of these Inspectors should be increased. That called for greater investigation and the Resolution was held up for a week or two longer.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I must echo the sentiments of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy in this respect. In so far as the employment of these Inspectors is concerned, the position with regard to their emoluments would not have been changed if they had been employed at the time of the beginning of the crop. It would have been a simple matter to pay them retrospectively. It is a bad feature for a part of the industry not to start when the industry starts. We have had experience where people have been sent abroad and when we voted the money to send them abroad they were already there. I do not know whether the people had the private means to take them abroad or not. I just wanted to show that things have been done and then the money for doing them was voted. In this case the Inspectors did not stand to lose anything and the peasants as well as the cane-cutters are affected.

Mr. LEWIS: There is a little misunderstanding in my mind which I would like cleared up. I understand that these Inspectors are given a salary of £175 per annum for doing this work and they have to provide their own conveyance for getting around to the sugar factories. I would like to know if the salaries of these Inspectors and their travelling allowance are now regarded as separate.

Mr. TALMA: It is hardly necessary for me to reply to that question at all, but I can assure honourable members that every avenue has been explored whereby these Inspectors will receive a proper, living wage. That is the first step to be taken and then we can consider increasing the number of Inspectors. We have to put those Inspectors which we have on a proper basis first and then consider increasing the number.

Mr. LEWIS: I forgot to mention just now that if these Inspectors were not employed because the passing of this Resolution was being awaited, I must say that I highly commend that; because if it is known that the crop is started in January this Resolution should be placed before this House long before now. I commend the person who paid the House the respect of waiting until they passed the Resolution to pay the salaries of these Inspectors because on another occasion I may criticise them for having done otherwise.

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

The Resolution was passed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

NOTICE OF AN ADDRESS.

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to move the suspension of Rules 61 and 63 inclusive in order to give notice of an Address to His Excellency the Governor affecting the Montego Bay Resolutions. These Rules set out the order in which the business of the day is done. Strictly speaking these Rules ought to be suspended in order to give notice of the Address which should be handed to the Clerk. I have seen that done very seldom but strictly speaking if the Rules are not suspended—

Mr. SPEAKER: I think you can ask leave to do that.

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to give notice of an Address affecting the Montego Bay Resolutions so that it can appear on the Order Paper for the next meeting.

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

Mr. ADAMS: The Address is as follows:—

The House of Assembly To His Excellency the Governor

1. The House of Assembly beg to thank Your Excellency for your message No. 1/1948 concerning the Resolutions passed at the Montego Bay Conference on the closer association of West Indian colonies held in Jamaica in September last, and for copies of the memorandum containing the said Resolutions.

2. The House beg to inform Your Excellency that after a careful consideration of the said Resolution in the light of Mr. Creech Jones's observations they are in agreement with the Resolutions passed at the aforesaid Conference as set forth in the said memorandum.

ABSENCE OF ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES FROM CONFERENCES

Mr. LEWIS: In accordance with the notice which I gave earlier to-day, I am moving the adjournment of the House for five minutes in order to comment on a matter of public concern, namely, the absence of the elected representatives of the people in this Chamber from important conferences and delegations. Inasmuch as the matter is very current, I feel that I should be allowed to deal with it at this stage. As far as I remember there was a Conference dealing with Oils and Fats held in this area; there was a delegation appointed in connection with a Rice Agreement with British Guiana; there was such a thing as a Shipping Conference and there is at present a Conference dealing with imports and currency control. On none of these Conferences has an elected representative of the people been chosen to form part of the representation from this colony.

Mr. SPEAKER: Can the honourable member tell me who makes the appointments?

Mr. LEWIS: I am not censuring anybody and if necessary I will withdraw the motion. I am

drawing the matter to the notice of the people's representatives here forming the Government and you will see the nature of my observations.

Mr. SPEAKER: Within the last few weeks honourable members have been making motions for the adjournment of the House to discuss matters of importance. We have nothing to guide us so far as the Rules of this House are concerned, but I find that in England motions have been ruled out of order when it appears that the Administration or the Government is not in fault. That is why I am asking who make these appointments to these conferences. If the appointments are not made by the local Government it seems to me that this would be a matter which you should not discuss on a motion for the adjournment of the House for five minutes.

Mr. LEWIS: If the local Government makes the appointments, would I be in order to discuss the matter?

Mr. SPEAKER: You would be in order to discuss it.

Mr. LEWIS: I have made enquiries from an elected representative of the people in Trinidad and he tells me that the matter was discussed in their Executive Council which corresponds with the Executive Committee here. I feel therefore that I would be in order in bringing up the matter; at least it is the current conference which is being dealt with. I should like to draw honourable members' attention to the fact that this House is being asked to ratify Agreements made by the Oils and Fats Conference without having any one of its members appointed to the Conference. If your Honour will allow me to continue you will agree and the House will agree with me that this is a serious matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that you can give notice of a motion and deal with the matter in the ordinary way: but not by a motion for the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LEWIS: If you look further on in "May" you will see that these motions deal with current matters.

Mr. SPEAKER: Always assuming that the Administration or the Government is responsible. If the Administration is not responsible the motion does not come under that head.

Mr. LEWIS: I feel that the Administration is responsible because we have it from a responsible member of the Legislature of another colony that the appointment of delegates is discussed in the Executive Council of that colony, and it is because of that that he is representing the island of Trinidad. I do not think that I could have a better authority than that. I say it is regrettable that—

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to ask the honourable senior member for St. Joseph if he can throw any light as to the making of these appointments.

Mr. ADAMS: As far as I am aware appointments are made to conferences either by ourselves if the Secretary of State for the Colonies has specifically asked us to appoint people or else the Administration appoints. The Colonial Development and Welfare Department does not appoint any person outside of its own body to any conference that may take place at their premises or elsewhere. In the case of the Montego Bay Conference and the Caribbean Conference delegates were appointed by the Legislature because the Secretary of State for the Colonies invited the Legislature to appoint members to these Conferences. In the case of the Oils and Fats Conferences, and other similar Conferences the delegates are appointed by the local Administration.

Mr. SPEAKER: In this particular case by whom were they appointed?

Mr. ADAMS: By the Administration, not the Governor-in-Executive Committee. That is not to say that the Executive Committee have not been informed by the Governor of appointments or prospective appointments.

Mr. LEWIS: Then I am at liberty to criticise them. I feel that if the Colonial Office has sent out here to set up some sort of responsible Government or felt that Barbados should have ministerial responsibility, it behoves the Administration or Government to see that the members of this House get as much experience as possible in connection with the Conference which is now taking place affecting the people. We have ratified the Rice Agreement and now we have been asked to ratify the Agreement of the Conference on Oils and Fats. We have had a Shipping Conference and who knows whether some of the things which we have heard about shipping would have been avoided if some of the people's representatives were at the Conference? I do not know whether the loss of the transshipment of cargo was discussed there; no member of this House was asked to be at the Conference. People are told by the Government that the laws made by the House prevent them from getting this or that and yet when a vital Conference is being held the people's representatives are left out! I find that that does not happen in other important islands. At the Conference which is being held at present, Jamaica has an elected representative, British Guiana has one, Trinidad has one and Dominica has one but Barbados has none. You will find that trade and commerce has been discussed and no member of this House is there at this important Conference. What about the honourable junior member for St. James? He may not represent my point of view in politics, but can anyone say he knows nothing about the Trade and Commerce of this Island? As regards the Other Place a member of that Place and also a potential member of it have been appointed; so that when matters come before them they can speak with authority and they can criticise the members of this House for our ignorance as to the questions we were discussing. Imagine our being placed in this position at a time when we are told that we are being given ministerial responsibility in the running of the colony! We cannot discuss a matter of vital importance with any intelligence unless we have a peep inside of it. We are giving up our right of making appointments and we are becoming members of a debating society in future. I find that a delegation is going to Canada to tell them that they are buying our West Indian produce too cheap and we are buying their food too dear, and Barbados is left out! From the trend of things in this colony I say that no Conference should be held here unless members of this Legislature are asked to take part in it. We have intelligent members who can attend these Conferences and who can answer to the people if anything goes wrong. I am making this motion and I want to see if any other member will say anything about this matter. I feel that this is a matter which should be drawn to the attention of the Government; we should appoint members to attend these Conferences even if they go there merely as observers. The Bank of England is interested in this present Conference: two people who were being sent out from the United Kingdom to the Conference have got killed and we know nothing about what is going on at this Conference! We have a visitor to the island welcoming the delegates to the Conference on behalf of the island and I think that the Head of the Administration should be doing that. I feel that

discourtesy is being meted out to the representatives of the people in that they have not been asked to attend this Conference. When the entire membership of this House is surveyed how could you leave out a member like the honourable junior member for St. James who is mixed up with every form of trade and commerce in this island? I repeat; I am not willing to censure anybody and if necessary I will withdraw the motion; but I would like to hear an expression of opinion from some member of the Government.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to second the motion. I should like to say, like the honourable junior member for the City, that if we are evolving towards a true sense of our political self-reliance it is incumbent upon us as the people's representatives to make ourselves acquainted with matters. We should make whoever is responsible for matters of this sort know that we are not here on our own choice; we are not here because we have a desire to be here, but we are here because the majority of the people in this age have put us here; therefore when it is a question of vital matters affecting this colony, this House as the supreme Legislature should be given the opportunity of representing the people's point of view. These conferences are basically economic conferences and in any community you cannot say that you are reaching real political status unless you are paying sufficient attention to the economic foundation of your community. How then can any honourable member feel that he can represent the people but he should not know anything about the economics of the country? As regards the Montego Bay Conference, when you review that Conference you can say that it was a big Conference bringing the people of these Colonies together, and it was said that representatives of the people in the various Houses of Legislature should be there. But we have Sub-Committees and offshoots of this Conference—there is the Oil and Fats Conference, the Shipping Conference and so on—and I want to say that there is no necessity for any superhuman ability at these Conferences so that members of this House would not know anything about what is going on. It is a fact that the introduction of certain people in this Chamber has made it difficult for people to feel that others have the ability for doing anything. We have been selected by the people to represent them in every respect. Nobody claims that he knows everything in the community, but as the honourable junior member for the City has said, when you become a member of this Chamber you are blamed for everything that goes wrong in the community. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that you go in such lowly places as to hear the remarks of the lowly and the humble, but these people feel that when anything goes wrong the members of the House are responsible for it because they are in the position of making it right. That is proof positive that members of this House should be in a position where they can clarify anything. I have had the experience of meeting some of these people. Today a man may be engaged in one sort of business and then he may become the director of another concern of which he has no previous knowledge at all. I feel that as soon as you are elected to this House you are holding a different position from that which you previously held in the community. The representatives of the people should be invited to attend these conferences and they can become acquainted with, and even experts in, various subjects. Sometimes people attend conferences for the first time to learn things; it may be that some other person is there as the leader but these representatives are present. I feel from what I have experienced that members of the Barbados

House of Assembly have as much ability to be delegates to these Conferences as any other people. At a Conference like the Oils and Fats Conference you have to deal not only with the question of price; there is also the problem of labour because in many cases labour is employed. Those who say that they are representing the working classes should be in a position to see that matters are really going along the lines that would help these people, and when the factories in connection with Oils and Fats are running we want to see that the people are benefiting. No honourable member can represent the people as much as he would like to represent them if he is debarred from attending these Conferences. In this island with our political set-up we find that whenever there is any matter which needs a united front there are experiences with which we are familiar. Barbados had no representative of the people at the Oils and Fats Conference and one of the matters discussed there had engaged the attention of the Montego Bay Conference. It has to be remembered that one of the reasons for the presence of the Colonial Development and Welfare Department in the West Indies is the strengthening of the position of the West Indies. It seems to me that as long as you retain political power it does not matter what rights you gain; but I feel that we want to be on the right track for progress. It is felt that members of this House cannot be appointed to attend these Conferences but all the blame will be put on the House when anything happens. When we are asked to ratify Agreements that is a serious state of affairs if none of the people's representatives can attend any of these Conferences. Let us take the honourable junior member for St. John; he has had experience in the General Post Office and in business generally and nobody could tell me that with that experience the honourable member would not know anything about a Shipping Conference. The same thing applies to the question of imports and currency control; a man with the ability of the honourable member could very well attend such a Conference. I feel that it would be strange for anybody to believe that because of an honourable member's political ideology he cannot attend any of these Conferences. If honourable members believe that these Conferences require expert knowledge I do not subscribe to that view; the expert is in the Chair and those who sit around him are lay people. How can we feel that we are representing the people of this colony when we who have the ultimate responsibility for the running of the colony are not asked to attend these Conferences? There are some unscrupulous, dishonest people who make dishonest statements so as to blame members of the House because it is good, cheap politics. If we have to carry the blame let us carry some of the other things too. Speaking for myself, I intend to carry my responsibility through and through. I say that if there is a conference going on, let us have someone from this House attending it; if we believe that members of this House have not got sufficient brains for that purpose then we do not believe in democracy. As I said earlier this afternoon, Gandhi strove for his country and was successful to live to see India get independence, one of the things which he had preached. He said that it was better for the people to kill one another and eventually rule themselves than to be ruled from outside. I do not say that we should not get advice from outside, but do not tell me that the members of this House generally should be ignored from the Executive Committee back down. I heard the honourable junior member for the City say that the honourable junior member for St. James should have attended this Conference, but I would like to say that the honourable junior member for St.

James is in the same position as the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. As a member of the Executive Committee you would always find that the honourable junior member for St. James would have been appointed to attend some of these Conferences. That seemed to have been the right to these things—

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the honourable member is going beyond the scope of the motion.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I did not intend to say that. The name of the honourable junior member for St. James was mentioned but I do not mean to cast any reflection on the honourable member. I feel that we suffer in relation to these Conferences because sufficient appreciation of the will of the people is not shown. If we are to represent the people really and truly we should be given the opportunity to know whatever happens at any of these important Conferences. Again, let us take the honourable junior member for the City; he is a business man and he knows business methods. There are those of us who represent business and I maintain that we should have more say in these matters. If we are to reach ministerial status there is no use saying that that will come one of these days without giving us an opportunity to make our mistakes and then eventually perfect ourselves in any form of Government. I feel that constitutional Government is a matter of practice and I repeat that we should be given the opportunity to attend these Conferences. I second this motion not for the purpose of censuring any particular person but that the matter should be brought to the notice of those who are responsible for making these appointments. I should like them to know that the members of this House still feel that in matters such as these greater importance should be attached to the people's representatives.

Mr. ADAMS: Inasmuch as the honourable member who made this motion expressed the hope that some member of the Government would say something in this matter I can only say that the function of the Executive Committee is to advise the Governor in matters of legislation. In view of the step which we have taken regarding the Constitution I see the force of the honourable member's remarks and I will draw the matter to the Governor who is Head of the Executive Committee and of the Administration. I shall make a suggestion with some diffidence because I may be an interested person some day. It seems to me that the natural evolution of Government such as ours would always be that some person from each of the two Houses of the Legislature should be present at all times as delegates; that the matter should be discussed by the Government before the Conference takes place, because the selection will be made from among the four members of the Executive Committee in this House and there will also be the Colonial Secretary in the Other Place to put the results of every Conference before the Legislature with the hope of getting the Legislature to accept the proposals. It is my personal feeling that one of us in control of Government Business should always be present at these Conferences because questions of policy will arise. Sometimes questions are taken with a view of knowing whether the majority of Governments will accept the findings of a conference. No one should be sent to a conference whether he knows anything about the subject or not unless he is the member of the Executive Committee in charge of that special subject and in that case he should have an adviser to supply facts and figures to support any policy which the Government may afterwards ask the Legislature to accept. I do not see any point in sending a politician to a Conference as an adviser. There should be a delegate and an adviser and the latter a man with the best experience in whatever the subject

is. In some cases you may have a member of the Civil Service or a member of the planting community. Although it is purely a matter for the Administration proposals have been made by the Executive in a general way, it may be said, when questions of selection have been brought to the notice of the Executive. I shall do my best to bring the feeling of the House to the notice of the Governor so that he will know what they think in this matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I would be the last member of this House who would not insist upon the right of honourable members to speak on behalf of the people of Barbados on any and every possible occasion, but in this matter it does appear that previous speakers have overlooked quite a few of the more important points. For instance, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said that these matters should be discussed beforehand by Government. Let us take the Conference which is going on at present; this is a highly specialized Conference and the two officials who were coming down from London, were not coming to pry into our affairs. These Officials were coming down as specialists from the Colonial Office who are *au fait* with the policy of the Imperial Government with regard to import control, and who know best what the policy of the Imperial Government is. What has happened is that both this House and the Other Place have expressed to the Government the view that a Committee should be appointed to allow the elected representatives of the people and the commercial men to present their point of view. A Committee was appointed and the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, the hon. junior member for St. James and I presented a report which is now in the hands of our delegate to the Conference. In other words, our delegate has been briefed to appear at this Conference with a specific mandate from the Committee which sat in connection with the matter. It is not fair to suggest that our delegate is there with an entirely open mind as to what he thinks best or as a rubber stamp as regards legislation. In the final analysis every Agreement reached at the Conferences mentioned has been referred to this Chamber for ratification. As to the Oils and Fats Conference we have before us now for ratification the Agreement which was reached. At least one of the speeches made in support of this motion is, in my opinion, a vital argument for excluding members of the House from attending these Conferences. (A MEMBER: I quite agree). Anybody who knows anything about the Oils and Fats Conference will agree that it had nothing to do with wages or labour. The Conference was called by the Imperial Government as a result of the world shortage of food and it was a question of allocating available supplies and seeing that areas in which the supplies were sufficient did not get too much and *vice versa*. We in the West Indies for that matter were asked to participate in conference with people with specialized knowledge relative to the available supplies and inform the British Government as to whether these areas had a sufficient supply of oils and fats or whether we wanted supplies from the Gold Coast or East Africa. When an Agreement was reached, it was sent to the Legislature for ratification; if we agree with the findings of the Conference we will say that we agree with them or *vice versa*. Similarly with the Rice Agreement; we sent to the Conference people with specialized knowledge of the matter, the Agreement was placed before the Legislature for ratification and we agreed with what had been done. I was really amused to hear the honourable junior member for the City refer to the fact that we are giving up our power to appoint members to various Committees.

The honourable member sat here and voted for the section of the Hospital Bill where we asked to give up the power which we had to appoint the Advisory Board. Now the honourable member comes back and decries the fact that he has done so. I maintain that until such time as we have ministerial responsibility in truth and in fact, we should keep this power in our hands. I am really gratified to learn that the honourable member has been reconverted and to realise that it has come to his knowledge that he has made a mistake. One final point; it is true that in the majority of cases the delegates to these high-level Conferences are men who possess specialized knowledge on the matter which is to be discussed. If the honourable junior member for the City suggests that because the honourable junior member for St. James is an elected member of this Chamber he should be appointed as a delegate to a Conference of this sort, we may reflect that, after all, we have Mr. Cuke who has similar specialized knowledge to the honourable junior member for St. James, unless the honourable junior member for the City wants to tell us that the point of view expressed by the honourable junior member for St. James will be different from that expressed by Mr. Cuke.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point we are discussing is whether members of this House should be appointed as delegates to these Conferences.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am suggesting that we have someone who will express the same point of view as the honourable junior member for St. James. I say finally that we are entitled to emphasize our rights, we are entitled to claim on any occasion that we are the true voice of the people of this colony; but we must bear in mind all the surrounding factors, we must have a proper realisation of the peculiar conditions which give birth to these Conferences and the particular purpose for which they have been convened. It would be ludicrous to ask a member of this Chamber to attend this Conference and express an Imperial point of view with regard to exports and imports or currency restrictions; and the honourable junior member for the City will know that when it comes to matters on which we are supposed to present the views of the people of this colony the Colonial Office itself has suggested that the members of the Legislature should have a say. That was done when the Montego Bay Conference was being called and if you go through the Report which is before the House you will see that it is suggested that the Committees dealing with the control of the public services, fiscal matters and any of the other matters should be appointed by the Legislature. I am sure that all the Conferences to which the honourable member has referred were specialized Conferences at which specialized delegates were needed, and even if there are representatives of the people from the other colonies present at this Conference they are present in the capacity of advisers. Mr. Spence, for instance, is entirely within his power to over-rule or ignore any advice tendered by Mr. Joseph in his capacity at the Conference. In my opinion it is a fallacy to suggest that in all cases elected representatives of the people should be appointed as delegates to these Conferences.

Mr. RAMSAY: I shall be very brief. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has mentioned certain things and I am glad that he mentioned them. The idea of any member of this House who has not got the full qualification to be a delegate or representative at a conference being appointed as a delegate to the conference reminds me of what Major Nott said when mention was made about loyalty, namely that he would add intelligence to

loyalty. I think that honourable members should be more careful. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said that it is not necessary to have a politician at a conference; the appointee may be a person from the Civil Service or a commercial man and that is what I wanted to say. I am not casting any aspersion against any member of this House but we are too full of politics; what we want is intelligence in the particular department. When we are appointing delegates or representatives to these conferences we must see that they have the qualification aback of their heads; we must see that they have experience and not simply follow the majority which are sometimes wrong.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to reply to the honourable senior member for St. Philip and ask him to rise to the stature of a statesman. The honourable member started off by saying that this Conference is a highly technical Conference and experts were coming out from the United Kingdom. The experts from the United Kingdom sent import instructions out here and the commercial community, the honourable member in his newspaper and others said that they were wrong. A protest was made and modifications of the instructions have resulted.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I never said that they were wrong. I said that they were injurious if applied to the full extent to the community.

Mr. LEWIS: Eventually the experts had to modify their instructions; the Imperial policy turned out to be wrong. If they are adopting any policy they have to come here and learn something from the people out here.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your point is that they should learn it from the people's representatives.

Mr. LEWIS: I say that members of this House should attend these Conferences. The honourable junior member for St. James could give advice on matters of trade and commerce in this colony.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your point is that members of the House should attend these Conferences so that when any debate comes up in this House they would have information about any matter.

Mr. LEWIS: I should like the honourable member to see what he wrote some time ago when Mr. Cuke and Mr. Perrin were appointed—

Mr. CRAWFORD: I would like to ask the honourable member if he was perfectly satisfied with—

Mr. SPEAKER: What has that got to do with the matter which we are discussing?

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable member has suggested that these representatives would know something more about the particular matters than the members of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the honourable member was saying that the experts in certain matters would know more about these matters than members of the House. Your point is that members of the House should attend these Conferences whether they are experts or not.

Mr. LEWIS: There are present at Conferences delegates, advisers and observers. When Mr. Cuke and Mr. Perrin were appointed to represent the colony some time ago, the honourable senior member for St. Philip opposed Mr. Cuke. The honourable member said at the Montego Bay Conference that Mr. Cuke represented a minority of people in Barbados. (Cheers).

Mr. SPEAKER: That has nothing to do with it.

Mr. LEWIS: It would seem as if the honourable member has had a change of heart and is now

adopting the commercial and sugar merchants' excuse. (Cheers). I would select for this Conference a member who would know something about trade and commerce. I said that the honourable junior member for St. James could represent us and my point is that when there is any question about the ratification of any Agreement reached at the Conference I would have the honourable member here before me. I cannot have Mr. Cuke before me unless he was elected to this Chamber.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable member suggested that the honourable junior member for St. James could very adequately represent the people at this Conference, and I asked what was the justification for saying that the honourable junior member for St. James would present any different point of view from that of Mr. Cuke. Both would be the same.

Mr. LEWIS: When they present the same point of view the honourable junior member for St. James will be in this House, not Mr. Cuke.

Mr. WILKINSON: I think we are going too far in these personalities.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your point is that you want a representative from this House to attend these Conferences so that when any question is raised that representative will be here to give the House information as to what took place.

Mr. LEWIS: We have those who can represent the people's point of view. Governments are being blamed for the lack of supplies and everything else and therefore the people's representatives should attend these Conferences on the people's behalf. I have made this motion in the interest of Barbadians and perhaps more in the interest of people like the honourable senior member for St. Philip than myself. I hope that the honourable member will appreciate the point that there are those who can represent the people intelligently. Mr. Speaker, you must allow me to reply to the statement that I have changed my opinion about the composition of the various Boards. I should just like to remark in passing that the honourable senior member for St. Philip went to the country with a Party—

Mr. SPEAKER: What has that got to do with the matter?

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable member said that I have changed my opinion. The honourable member went to the country as the leader of a Party wanting to try out this matter and the country returned less of his members than those of another Party. The people of this country want this experiment and I have to try it. I am not obstructing the Government once they have put the position as I feel it should be put. People who have no policy always get in difficulty when they try to criticise others and the only thing left for them to do is to bring charges against others. I have made an honest attempt on behalf of Barbados and the elected representatives of the people to bring this matter to the attention of this House. The four members of the Executive as policy-makers should insist upon members of this House attending these Conferences. I ask leave to withdraw my motion.

Mr. GARNER: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member should have spoken before the honourable junior member for the City asked leave to withdraw the motion.

Mr. GARNER: I did not anticipate the honourable member.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think I should ask the honourable member not to speak. A similar thing happened earlier today; the honourable member was in

the House all the time and it was very easy for him to say that he wants to speak.

Mr. GARNER: I just want to make a few remarks. It is a pity that we should revel in such nonsense. I take this as sheer nonsense this afternoon; honourable members come here and act like little children. After all, every intelligent person knows that you send to a conference people who know something about a conference, not because they are politicians, because there are some ignorant politicians. (Hear, hear). We have just had a statement from one of them. It is time that a stop be put to this nonsense. This is what you hear at dice games and so forth, not among responsible people. When the Government or the Head of the Administration wants a matter gone into thoroughly for the benefit of the community are you to be selected just because you happen to be a member of the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: It has been suggested that the member selected would be the most suitable person.

Mr. GARNER: Anyone who listened to the remarks of the honourable junior member for the City would come to that conclusion. The honourable member said that at these Conferences some member of the House should be in attendance and he referred to the honourable junior member for St. James. If the honourable member wanted to be fair he should have mentioned the Head of a Department. We have a technical man here who knows about these matters. The honourable member should have mentioned Mr. Coppin who is the Head of a Department.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member was dealing with a principle: the whole question is one of principle, not of persons.

Mr. GARNER: The honourable member made a very wide comparison and he referred to persons; he spoke about Mr. Cuke. I think it is good for us to see that what we are doing here this afternoon does not make sense. When you want a carpenter you should not look for a mason, and when you want a tailor you should look for a tailor. You do not select a man for a Conference because he is a member of the House. When you come to economics some of us are dumb to that; we may have in politics people who may be good talkers, but when it comes to practical things or a knowledge of things they are nowhere; we want people who know about these things. I may have good friends whom I can help but they may not know proper weights and so they will not be of any use to me in my business. I say that if we appoint a person to attend a Conference on Oils and Fats for instance, because he is a member of the House that cannot serve any useful purpose at all. It is time that we get down to business and stop seeking for

power so as to make ourselves look big in the eyes of the community.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking leave to withdraw his motion. If there is no objection leave will be granted the honourable member. There being no objection, the honourable is granted leave to withdraw the motion.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ADAMS: I have suggested that there should be a special day for dealing with the Resolutions of the Montego Bay Conference and I am hoping that honourable members will agree to meet again on Thursday for that purpose. I hope that honourable members will see that the consideration of these Resolutions is likely to occupy the greater part of a day's sitting and no other business is likely to be done. For that reason I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Thursday next at twelve o'clock noon.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. SYMONDS: I beg to move as an amendment that the words "Thursday next" be deleted in order to insert the words "Tuesday next".

Mr. GARNER: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: A motion has been made that this House do now adjourn to Thursday next. An amendment has been moved that the words "Thursday next" be deleted in order to insert the words "Tuesday next". 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: MESSRS COX, MAPP, LEWIS, TALMA, ADAMS and BLACKMAN—6.

Noes: DR. WILSON, MESSRS RAMSAY, SYMONDS, F. L. WALCOTT, CRAWFORD, GARNER, MOTTLEY, S. A. WALCOTT and WILKINSON—9.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been decided in the negative, six honourable members voting "Aye", and nine honourable members voting "No." The question now is that the word "Tuesday next" be inserted in the blank created. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, the 10th instant, at twelve o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.