

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1947—48

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 27th January, 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. J. A. LEV. WILSON, Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Messrs. F. D. McD. SYMMONDS, L. E. SMITH, M. E. COX, D. A. FOSTER, A. E. S. LEWIS, C. E. TALMA, H. D. BLACKMAN, J. A. HAYNES, B.A., H. A. DOWDING, V. C. GALE, and D. D. GARNER.

Prayers are read.

Mr. ADAMS enters the House and takes his seat.

MINUTES.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the last meeting are not yet completed, so there are no Minutes to be confirmed to-day.

PAPERS LAID.

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

Message No. 2/1948 from His Excellency the Governor, with reference to the Address from the House of Assembly dated the 25th November, 1947, regarding the insurance of peasant proprietors' canes against loss or damage by fire.

Report of the Committee appointed by His Excellency the Governor to advise on the restriction of imports.

NOTICES.

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Mr. TALMA: Resolution 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.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Resolution to authorise the Governor-in-Executive Committee to adopt and give effect to the recommendations of the Conference on Oils and Fats which was held in Barbados from the 18th to the 2nd of July, 1947, as set out in the Schedule.

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

QUESTIONS.

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

1. Is the Government aware that Barbados is about the only place where licences have not been issued or renewed to Radio Amateurs since the war?

2. Will the Government please see that the Licensing Authority issues licences to the Radio Amateurs of the Island without further delay and explain why these licences were not issued long ago?

SELECT COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

Mr. GALE: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to present the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on His Excellency's Message No. 30/1947 relating to Resolution No. 30 /1947 affecting the new Pay Ward "A" at the Barbados General Hospital.

Messrs. WILKINSON, F. L. WALCOTT, and MAPP enter the House and take their seats.

SELECT COMMITTEE'S REPORT *RE* NEW PAY WARD "A".

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph,—To move the consideration of the Report of the Select Committee *re* New Pay Ward "A" at the General Hospital.

Mr. ADAMS: I do not quite know why this Order is in my name. Perhaps it is because I suggested at the last meeting that we should deal with it as a matter of urgency that it is in my name but inasmuch as the senior member for St. Thomas is the member of the Executive Committee in control of medical affairs in the House I shall ask that he be allowed to deal with it.

There being no objection, the senior member for St. Thomas is allowed to proceed.

Dr. CUMMINS: Honourable members will remember, Sir, that during last year a Message was received from His Excellency the Governor having for its object the grant of additional funds in connection with the construction of New Pay Ward "A" at the

General Hospital. It was not set out in the Message how the money should be spent and it was taken for granted that of all it would be spent on the construction of the building. Subsequently it was discovered that a mistake was made and that part of the money should be used in providing furniture and equipment for the Ward and Message No. 30/1947 from the Governor is, in effect, to correct that error. I beg, therefore, to move that the following Address, which embodies the terms of the Select Committee's Report, do now pass:—

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency the Governor

The House of Assembly beg to acknowledge the receipt of Your Excellency's Message No. 30/1947 relating to Resolution No. 30/1947 which authorized the expenditure of £5,063 on the erection of a New Pay Ward "A" at the Barbados General Hospital.

In accordance with Your Excellency's request, the House beg to inform Your Excellency that they agree with part of the funds provided by the above-mentioned Resolution being used for the purchase of furniture and equipment for the new Pay Ward "A".

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. RAMSAY: Mr. Speaker,—I do not know if this is an innovation but I have no Report before me. I cannot see how any intelligent member of the Government can expect the House to pass a Report that we have not even seen. I suggest that the further consideration of the Report be postponed until honourable members have received their copies of it. Certainly no honourable member can vote for a thing of which he knows nothing. I move that the further consideration of the Report be postponed and let it be circulated among honourable members, unless we are mind readers or became prophets overnight. I do not know how other honourable members feel about it. They have the right to speak as representatives of the people but I cannot see how we can consider something that has not been put before us. It is a peculiar state of affairs. Honourable members have it in their power to do what they like but I beg to move that the further consideration of the Report be postponed until it has been duly circulated among us.

Mr. ADAMS: I shall make a few brief remarks peculiarly for the benefit of the junior member for St. Peter and nobody else's. Everybody has read about the voting of this money for the construction of the New Pay Ward "A" at the General Hospital. I would just like to remind the honourable member that the Resolution authorized the payment of £5,063 for the erection of this Ward but owing to an oversight it was not explained that the funds should be used partly for the building and partly for the supply of furniture and equipment. The Governor, in a Message dated 6th October, 1945—the honourable member had plenty of time to read it if he wanted to do so—pointed out that part of the money should be used for the purchase of the necessary furniture and equipment and this is an Address in reply stating that the House agrees to that being done. What more time does the honourable member or anybody else want to consider this matter?

Mr. DOWDING: I beg to second the motion of the junior member for St. Peter. I think this is quite a wrong procedure. We have not had the opportunity to consider this Report on a matter in connection with which one has been referred to as possessing

an infantile mentality when one asked certain questions about it. I personally think that the Report should be circulated among honourable members so that the opportunity be given to point out that when one asks questions one's mentality is, after all, not so infantile.

Mr. GARNER: I am going to support the junior member for St. Peter because on more than one occasion it has been pointed out to this honourable House that these matters come before us in a haphazard manner; that we have really no time to scrutinize them to see what benefits are to be derived from them and are likely to make gross errors. It is true that this is only a reply to a Message from the Governor but if this reply is to correct an error that was made, we should have a chance to see the reply before we agree to it. I am going to vote for the honourable member's motion because it is quite in order.

Mr. MAPP: I do not think that this calls for a debate. The intellects of some honourable members are peculiar. If ever there was a storm in a tea-pot, this is one. The matter is a simple one. I was a member of the Select Committee and this matter did not call for any long discussion at all. All that was necessary was to agree that this money should be used for the erection of the building as well as the purchase of furniture and equipment and the Committee so agreed. The mistake of not circulating the Report can be characterized by the honourable member as a serious mistake, yet I do not think it is worthy of this serious attention being paid to it.

Mr. GALE: I think that if there is any blame to be attached, it should be attached to the members of the Select Committee. I happen to be a member of that Committee and when we first met it was not possible to get the signature of one of the members of the Committee and that is the reason why the Report was held up. The junior member for St. Peter is quite within his rights to say that the Report should be circulated but I would say that that is a trivial matter and in the meantime the Hospital wants the equipment and furniture to enable them to carry through their programme. I fail to see any reason why this matter should be held up to-day.

Mr. MOTTLEY enters the House and takes his seat.

Dr. CUMMINS: As has been stated by my colleague, this is a storm in a tea-pot. Honourable members will remember that on last Tuesday it was specifically mentioned that if honourable members had no objection this matter would be dealt with to-day. Consequently, the junior member for St. Michael who was Chairman of the Committee tried to expedite the matter so that it could be dealt with to-day. It is not a question of voting any fresh money. As has been pointed out, this money was voted last year—£5,063—and if honourable members had only taken the trouble, after it was pointed out last Tuesday that the matter would be dealt with today, to refer to the Message from the Governor, dated 6th October, 1947, they could have studied it in the interim. At any rate, this Address is just to say "yea" or "nay"—whether or not we agree that part of the £5,063 should be used for the purchase of furniture and equipment. As I said in my opening remarks, the House thought that the whole amount was intended for the erection of the building. That has proved to be a mistake and in the meantime the furnishing of the new Pay Ward "A" is being held up. There is terrible congestion at the Hospital at the present moment. Only last week I tried to get a bed in Pay Ward "A" for one of my

patients and he had to be accommodated in Ward 2. That is happening every day simply because the reply to this Message is being held up. The urgency is even greater in view of the fact that the Hospital is now being run as a Government Department and the officer in charge is anxious to have this matter settled so that this new Pay Ward "A" can be furnished for the convenience of patients who need hospitalisation. I am appealing to honourable members to pass this Address as it is only a question of saying "yea" or "nay" and not one of voting fresh money.

Mr. CRAWFORD enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. RAMSAY: Mr. Speaker,—I crave your indulgence to allow me to reply inasmuch as I made the motion for the postponement of the further consideration of the Report.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot speak again. A motion has been made that this Address embodying the terms of the Report do now pass. To that, an amendment has been moved that the further consideration of the Report be postponed. The question is that the words proposed to be deleted stand part of the motion. 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.

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

Noes: Messrs. RAMSAY, GARNER, DOWDING and S. A. WALCOTT.

Messrs. CRAWFORD and MOTTLEY start to leave the House while the division is being taken.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable members will not be allowed to leave the House while the division is being taken.

Mr. MOTTLEY: We do not know what we are about to vote for.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I refrain from voting.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable members in the House when a division is being taken have to vote. I can explain to the honourable members who are about to leave what the division is about. His Excellency the Governor sent a Message to the House stating that a certain sum of money which has been voted for the New Pay "A" at the General Hospital should have included not only the erection of the building but also the purchase of furniture and equipment and enquiring whether the House agrees that part of the money should be used for the latter purpose. The question now before the House is whether the Report of the Select Committee which reported that it agrees that the money should be used for both purposes should be accepted.

Mr. RAMSAY: The Report not having been circulated.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes; the Report has not been circulated.

Mr. CRAWFORD: No.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Aye.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question that the words proposed to be deleted stand part of the motion has been resolved in the affirmative, seventeen honourable members voting "Aye" and five voting "No". The question now is that this Address do now pass. Honourable members in favour will please say "Aye"; those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it. I will ask the senior member for St. Thomas to be good enough to present the Address to His Excellency the Governor.

Dr. CUMMINS: As Your Honour pleases.

PENSIONS (PENSIONABLE OFFICES) ORDER.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order is to resume debate on the passing of a Resolution to approve the Order entitled the Pensions (Pensionable Offices) Order, 1947, made by the Governor on the 3rd day of December, 1947, under the provisions of section 2 (1) (a) of the Pensions Act, 1947 (1947-20).

Before we proceed I want to draw attention to the fact that the Order Paper, in respect of this Order, is not in order. The final paragraph refers to the meeting of the 20th January but what is stated therein does not apply to this Order at all; it applies to Order No. 1 under Private Members' Business. When this matter was being debated on the last occasion, the honourable junior member for St. George was speaking when the interruption took place.

Mr. SYMMONDS: Mr. Speaker,—When this matter was debated on the last occasion, it was at the request of the senior member for Christ Church that it was postponed and I am wondering whether he can tell us, at this stage, whether certain people who are not mentioned in the schedule and who should have been included, had been inadvertently left out. This is a matter which affects persons in the humble walk of life and since, up to this stage, no provision by statute has been made whereby persons who are ordinarily characterized as casual labourers, because of the definition which has been put upon the work of some of the very hardworking employees in the Public Service, who in many cases give this Government 20 years—in some cases more than 20 years—of faithful service, and who eventually have to go cap in hand depending upon the good graces and favours of the Executive Committee to give them gratuities, I am going to move that this Resolution, together with the Order, be referred to a Select Committee in order that the entire matter may be gone into. Unless we get an assurance that the Government is going to make some adequate provision for those who have been left out in this schedule and for the many other persons who are now classed as casual labourers but who are very hardworking government servants in reality, I for one will not be prepared to vote for the passing of this Resolution and this Order. They are definitely based, perhaps not intentionally, on the principle of class legislation; the upper and middle classes are well represented and the needy poor among government servants are excluded.

Mr. WILKINSON: Before the question is put, Sir, I would just like to obtain some information from the honourable member who has introduced the Resolution and the Order. I see at page 3 of the Order under Head, Medical, the offices, Chief Medical Officer, Sanitation Officer, and Airport Visiting Officer mentioned. I presume that the Airport Visiting Officer is a medical man. Well, I have visited Seawell Airport several times and I do not think that I have ever seen a medical man stationed there to inspect passengers. I presume that a medical man is appointed in case of emergency but it does seem to me that if that is the cause for putting him in the list of pensionable offices then I think that that is going a little too far.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that under the Quarantine Act, the inspection at Seawell Airport is done by a Sanitary Inspector.

Dr. CUMMINS: In connection with what the honourable member has said—

Mr. SPEAKER: You have already spoken. The senior member for Christ Church who introduced the Resolution and the Order should reply.

Mr. DOWDING: I would like to obtain a little more information on this matter. I understand that

the plumbers at the Waterworks are left out and that there are certain other public employees who have been left out. I would, therefore, like to get some information as to why certain employees have been left out, particularly those whom I have mentioned.

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

Mr. SMITH: I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS: If honourable members will pay me the compliment of listening to me I do not think any difficulty will arise in their minds as to the passing of this Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will clear the atmosphere by putting the question that I do now leave the Chair.

Mr. ADAMS: I should like to speak on that motion because after I have spoken, the honourable members who moved and seconded it, may not want to press it. The position as regards pensions is that people who receive salaries from the Government come under two classes—public officers and public employees. Public officers are on what we would call the clerical staff of the Government and they come under the Pension Act of 1925 or any Acts amending same. The 1925 Act is like the 1947 Act and will be fresh in the minds of all of us. It sets out who are public officers, how pensions are to be computed and so on. It starts off by stating, "For the purposes of this Act 'public officers' includes every person, lay or ecclesiastical, who receives the salary or allowance attached to his office from the Public Treasury and the officers of the Savings Bank or any person employed in the Public Service under an agreement for a limited period."

Then it goes on to show how people get grants, the conditions of the grants and states that they must be in the service of the Crown for a period of not less than ten years—I emphasize that for the benefit of the junior member for St. George—to be entitled to receive a pension. Then it tells how the salary is to be computed for pension purposes, brings in the Chief Justice in respect of West Indian Court of Appeal fees, and shows how to compute the amount of pension of persons who hold professional and other special qualifications.

In 1937, the Public Employees Pension Act was passed and that made a distinction between public officers and public employees, as far as pensions are concerned. All the persons whom we are anxious to see put on the same footing as those in the upper and middle classes come under the 1937 Act,—a very short Act which states:—"In this Act 'public employee' means a person who although not a member of the Civil Service is a wholetime employee of the Government of this island."

In short, the 1937 Act puts all the Waterworks employees and people like them on the same footing as public officers, as if they come under the Pension Act, 1925. It goes on:—"Every public employee mentioned in this schedule to this Act shall be eligible for an annual pension according to the terms and conditions relating to the granting of pensions to public officers under the Pensions Act, 1925, and under the Act amending the same in so far as the provisions of that Act are applicable." Then the schedule follows:—Artisans, Caretakers, Cleaners, Crews of Harbour Craft, District Foremen, Gardeners, Labourers, Lorry Drivers, Meter Inspectors, Porters, Range Wardens, Scrubbers, Turncocks, Watchmen; so that every single one of the more poorly paid employees of the Government is covered by the 1937 Act. They could not be included in the schedule to

this Order because they are in a different category; they are deemed by the law to be public employees and not public officers having the connotation of being public officers of the Government. Now comes along the 1947 Act which provides that this Order should be made and this schedule is a repetition and an expansion of the schedule to the 1925 Act. The schedule to the 1925 Act, as honourable members will see, is only a portion of a page of the Statute Book while it is fuller in the Order before us to-day. Every wholetime employee of the Government as a public officer is included in the schedule which we are now discussing. Every employee, that is to say, every person employed by the Government who is not a person within the meaning of the 1925 Act, is already covered except he is a casual employee because the Act speaks of wholetime employees of the Government. Let me remind honourable members that a public employee or a public officer cannot get a pension except he has been ten years continuously in the Government Service, so that honourable members will appreciate the fact that casual employees could not be included. A casual employee would have to be a person who has worked for the Government for ten years continuously, otherwise he would be put in a better position than that in which public officers are, so far as pensions are concerned. I suggest to honourable members—I cannot say it is the official view of the Government as a whole but it is certainly my view and the view of my colleagues in this House who are members of the Executive Committee—that casual employees should be provided for in a special Act. Instead of these employees having to approach the Government every now and again with cap in hand, as some honourable members say, asking for a gratuity or a pension, we could pass an Act making provision for the payment of pensions to casual employees and part-time employees as well. For instance, the Solicitor General is not included in the schedule to this Order because he is a part-time officer. Or I suggest that a certain sum of money should be put in the Estimates every year from which the Governor-in-Executive Committee could pay a pension to casual employees who come within certain principles laid down by the Legislature. For example, if a person works with a firm for 250 days in a year he is entitled to holiday with pay and we can establish some such principle in respect of casual employees who work for the Government for at least 200 days in a year. Under the 1925 Act and the 1937 Act, a person has to be working for the Government ten years continuously in order to get a pension; he cannot leave the Government Service during those ten years, go and work in Broad Street and then come back and work with the Government to earn a pension; his employment with the Government must be continuous for ten years to entitle him to a pension. I hope the explanation has been clear. The Government feels that casual employees who come out to work regularly when there is work should receive gratuities when they are no longer able to work. In view of the remarks which have been made by the honourable members I intend to bring the point to the notice of the Executive Committee, so that a Bill may be sent down to put casual employees and part-time employees on a proper footing as regards pensions. Pension Inquiry Officers come within the category of part-time officers and the question of dealing with part-time officers, as far as pensions are concerned, is giving the Government a bit of a headache. I will say that their case is also being considered by the Government. If there is any point which I have not covered, I hope honourable members will remind me of it. The only people who are not covered are casual em-

ployees. It is the feeling, unofficially at any rate, that any person who works for the Government should not be put in the position of having to come and beg when they can no longer work. The junior member for St. James has asked about the Airport Visiting Officer. He is put under the Head, Medical, in the same way as the Matron is put under the subhead, Lazaretto; he is normally a civilian, a non-medical man, who, if there is the necessity for a medical man, telephones for one immediately; his office is bound up with the general question of quarantine regulations for the West Indies—in fact for the World now because of air travel. I can assure honourable members that the Government is well aware of all those who appear to be omissions but they will find that those omissions come within the categories I have mentioned and that special Acts should be passed to cover their case, inasmuch as the 1947 Act deals with only wholetime continuous offices.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE'S REPORT *Re* EMIGRATION TO SURINAM.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph,—To move the consideration of the Report of the Select Committee *re* Emigration to Surinam.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I am going to ask for leave to move the suspension of Rule 60 because the Select Committee met earlier to-day, and hopes to submit its Report later in the day. It is also hoped that in view of the urgency of the matter we shall be able to deal with the Report today. On the other hand, if honourable members feel that the Report should be printed and circulated, then it will be dealt with at a subsequent meeting.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the Report should be printed and circulated and I shall give instructions to have that done.

Mr. ADAMS: In view of Your Honour's ruling I ask that this Order, No. 3, be postponed.

There being no objection, Order No. 3 is postponed.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House resumes Committee of Supply, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

ENGAGING THE SERVICES OF A FIRE BRIGADE OFFICER.

Dr. CUMMINS asks for and is granted leave to postpone the further consideration of the Resolution for £2,740 to meet the cost of engaging on contract for a period of two years a Fire Brigade Officer.

EX GRATIA GRANT TO JAMES GORING.

Mr. ADAMS: The next Resolution is for the sum of £66. 13. 4 as an *ex gratia* grant to James Goring, formerly employed as a porter at Queen's College, in consideration of his 8 years' service at the College. This Resolution, Sir, has been reconsidered by the Executive Committee but it is felt that the principle has already been established, namely, that gratuities should be paid on the basis of one month's salary for each completed year of service at the retiring age of 65 years, and, therefore, the Executive Committee does not see fit to depart from that principle. Consequently, I am asking honourable members to pass this Resolution as it is.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I am extremely sorry that the Government did not see its way to accede to the wish of the members of the House. This gentleman is not entitled to either a gratuity or a pension and I do not know that there is any agreement that he should retire at the age of 65 years. I may say that the fact of his having been allowed to go on working for 4 years longer enabled him to draw the full salary instead of a gratuity or a pension but still, Sir, we are not actually paying him a pension and we can give him a gratuity for his number of years' service including the 4 extra years. I repeat that I am sorry that the Government did not see its way to view the matter in that light and grant this gentleman a month's salary for every year of service that he completed.

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

REFUND OF CUSTOMS DUTY TO D. M. SIMPSON & CO.

Mr. BLACKMAN: The next Resolution is for the sum of £189. 14. 10 as a refund to Messrs D. M. Simpson & Co., of the Customs import duty and package tax paid on a hand sprayer and tools and on a diesel road roller, tools and equipment imported for the Commissioners of Highways for St. Peter. It is customary for the Government to refund Customs duty and package tax in cases of this sort and I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Before the question is put I have a little information which I want to pass on to the members of the Government and perhaps, too, members of Highways Boards that are present. It is this. I understand that in some of these parishes, road rollers are imported which are much too heavy for the work to be done, with the result that instead of the surface of a road being compact, the stones are crushed to powder, the roads have to be continually repaired and the money is wasted. I understand that that is a fact. I understand that in the parish of St. George the Highways Commissioners have a roller which may have produced that ill effect. I wonder whether that is not the reason why the senior member for St. George is asking every meeting that the roads be repaired. I understand that what I have stated has happened or is likely to happen and I ask the Highways Commissioners of the various parishes to be careful in a matter of this sort. This is no fun making on my part and I am passing on the information to the Government and those who have to do with the importation of these road rollers.

Mr. GARNER: I do not want to prolong this debate unnecessarily but as I happen to be a Commissioner of Highways of the parish of St. Philip I do not think it is fair to the Commissioners that we should be attacked by members of this House as though we are nonentities. The Commissioners of Highways are advised by engineers as to the type of road rollers which they should import and there is no truth in what the honourable member has just said. In fact, if a roller is too heavy, the Commissioners will be able to construct a better road because it would cause the boulders to sink into the earth far better and make the road so substantial that the stones would not be washed away; so that there is no sense in what the honourable member has said. I do not know that the Commissioners can change the engineers who advise them. They have some of the best engineers in the island who advise them. Honourable members who know everything may wish to advise the Commissioners but until they can qualify

the Commissioners will rely on the advice of persons who have sat their examinations and are fit to perform these duties.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman,—I do not think that statements such as the one made by the junior member for the City should be allowed to go unchallenged. It is not right for him to come here and suggest that the parish of St. George has a heavy roller when the fact is that that parish has a light roller. The honourable member spoke like an irresponsible person and I do not think that he should be so gullible as to have allowed information of that sort to have gone down his throat and then come out of his mouth without being able to substantiate it.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I will promise the honourable member some further information on the point. As regards the remarks of the junior member for St. Philip are concerned, he did not have to tell us who the engineers are because they are mentioned in the Resolution and if you ask Messrs. D. M. Simpson & Co., whether they are Road Engineers they will tell you that they are not.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY VOTE TO MEET THE COST OF ENQUIRY INTO THE ORGANISATION OF THE POLICE FORCE.

Dr. CUMMINS: The next Resolution, Sir, is for the sum of £71 to supplement Resolution No. 77 of the 16th October, 1945, to meet the cost of carrying out an enquiry into the organization, discipline, and conditions of service of the Barbados Police Force.

Honourable members will remember that in 1945 the sum of £625 was voted to bring Superintendent Calver here to make an investigation into the conditions of service of the Police Force and this £71 is to complete the cost of that enquiry. Paragraph 3 of the addendum sets out clearly why this money is needed. The Government of Trinidad, on behalf of this Government, paid £81. 13s. 4d. to take Superintendent Calver back to the United Kingdom via Baltimore and the Government of Jamaica has to refund £27. 10. 2 of that amount. There is now in hand a balance of £11 and this £71 is the difference required. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. TALMA, the Chairman reports the passing of three Resolutions and the postponement of one in Committee of Supply and asks leave to sit again.

The House resumes and on the motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. TALMA in each case, the three Resolutions which are passed in Committee of Supply are read a first and a second time and are agreed to.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for Christ Church,—To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Regulations entitled the Travelling Allowance (Amendment) Regulations, 1947, made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the 29th day of November, 1947, under the provisions of section 3 of the Travelling Allowance Act, 1932 (1932-5).

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker,—These regulations result from a certain amount of hardship which is being experienced by the majority of officers who

receive travelling allowance in the Government Service. Certain representations were made to the Governor-in-Executive Committee and to the Heads of the Departments concerned and the Whitley Council went into the matter in great detail with the aid of an expert on matters of this sort who is well known to all of us. I refer to the Hon. H. A. Cuke. The travelling allowance to officers being paid on an annual basis instead of a monthly basis, as is set out in these regulations, less travelling is done in the course of a year, with the result that the work of the various Departments suffers because an officer would not place himself in the position of being out of pocket at the end of the year, as far as his expenses for travelling are concerned. So the whole object of these regulations is to avoid hardship by putting the officers' travelling allowance on a better footing. The regulations set out that for the first 200 miles each month the rate shall be 10d. per mile; for an additional 150 miles each month, 3d. per mile, and for any mileage over 350 miles each month, 2½d. per mile. That is so far as travelling by motor cars is concerned. With respect to travel by motor cycles, the rates are to be: 6d. per mile for the first 200 miles each month, 2d. per mile for an additional 150 miles each month, and 1½d. per mile for any mileage over 350 miles each month. The average mileage which an officer is expected to travel each month is 350 miles and that will hardly be exceeded, except perhaps in the case of officers of the Police Department. This matter, as I have said, has received the attention of the Whitley Council which looks after the affairs of members of the Government Service and when they, along with Mr. Cuke, have reported along these lines, no honourable member can hardly be found to raise any strenuous objection to these regulations. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Speaker,—This is a Resolution about which some honourable members want a little more information and I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into committee on this Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I want to second that motion because doubtless there are some points which can be more easily discussed in Committee.

Mr. RAMSAY: Before you put the question, Sir, inasmuch as I shall be in the Chair if the motion of the junior member for St. James is agreed to I want to be able to discuss this matter from a broad angle. It seems to me peculiar; it does not appear to me as if the rates for motor cycles are in correlation to the rates for motor cars. Most of us know the value of a motor cycle as compared with the value of a motor car and whereas a motor car can hardly travel more than thirty miles to a gallon of petrol a motor cycle can travel as many as 60 miles to the gallon. How then could they fix the rate for a motor cycle at 3c. per mile and the rate for a motor car at 5c. per mile? These rates do not appear to me to correlate; they are, in my opinion, out of proportion. For the first 200 miles which are travelled you propose to give the owner of a motor cycle 12c. per mile and the owner of a motor car 20c. per mile. I am not saying that the owner of the motor cycle will be getting too much but to me, the rates seem to be out of proportion. As regards the Whitley Council, their decisions should not be regarded as standards for this House to be guided by. This House has its own brains and I counsel honourable members to go very carefully into these rates. The gap between the rates for motor cars and the rates for motor cycles is too wide. When it is considered that some motor

cars cost \$2,000 or more it seems to me that the rates for motor cars should be twice as much as the rates for motor cycles.

The question that Mr. SPEAKER do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Resolution is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into committee on the Resolution, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—You, Sir, said quite a lot of what I intended to say. I wonder, Sir, if those who are responsible for putting forward these rates thought in terms of the horse-power of motor cars! A flat rate is fixed for motor cars. Well, it must be an understood fact that here in this community there are American and English cars which give ten, eight, seven, and five miles to a gallon of petrol and, therefore, greater consideration should be given to the owners of motor cars. I go further regulations provide for the cost per mile of transportation and if I am to be told later on that consideration is given merely to big cars I should like to state that everybody must know by now that owing to the dollar crisis, all the cars we are getting here are English cars. No licenses are granted for the importation of American cars of high horse-power which give less mileage to the gallon. I do not know on what basis they arrived at these rates. Again, there are in this country no cars of a standard make which are used by Government Officers for travelling; they may use any type of car, from a "Baby Austin" to a "Packard," and one would have thought that there would be some difference in the rates per mile for cars of a small horse-power and cars of a big horse-power. Then again, Sir, there is the point which you raised by about the difference in mileage done by a motor car and a motor cycle. A motor cycle may travel 80 miles on a gallon of petrol and its owner will receive allowance at the rate of 3c. per mile, while the owner of motor car which travels 10 miles on a gallon of petrol will receive allowance at the rate of only 5 cents per mile. I fail to see the equity in this and I am sure that there are honourable members who fail to see it also. I would hate to have the passing of this Resolution delayed because there is a number of Government officers waiting to have the present rates regulated but even the honourable mover of the Resolution is bound to agree that this matter is deserving of more consideration. I understand that in the sister colony of Trinidad arrangements have been made for some time now for the advancing of money to public officers who must travel to enable them to purchase motor cars. I am wondering whether the mover of this Resolution can tell us what steps, if any, have been taken to put such a scheme into effect locally, actually to see to it that officers who must travel are not put at a disadvantage by having to purchase worn-out cars and who, in many instances, cannot get the type of car which must be used in a particular type of work. What I would like to point out is that with no standard type of car being used, the rates should not be fixed as they are in these regulations and I think the mover of this Resolution would be well advised to have it postponed for further consideration.

Mr. BRANCKER: What strikes me about these regulations for motor cars is the big difference between the rate per mile for the first 200 miles each month, namely, 10d. and the rate per mile for an additional 150 miles each month, namely, 3d. This difference in the rates really seems to be intended to discourage officers from travelling those extra 150

miles each month. Those officers who have to travel very seldom and who do not travel more than 100 miles each month will be guaranteed their \$40 per month but subordinates like the overseers of the Highways and Transport Department who have to travel several hundred miles will be paid at a low rate for the additional mileage they have travelled after the first 200 miles each month. Either one is too much or the other is too little. If 10d. is adequate for the first 200 miles, then 3d. per mile is inadequate for the additional 150 miles each month. As to the point about the inadequacy of the rates for motor cars when compared with the rates for motor cycles I heartily join the chorus of objection to the difference between 3d. per mile for an additional 150 miles each month for motor cars and 2d. per mile for an additional 150 miles each month for motor cycles. That difference of 1d. per mile between the rates for an additional 150 miles travelled each month by motor cars and motor cycles respectively is another example to show that the rates for motor cars are too small. Before people can purchase petrol to travel, they have to have vehicles and the upkeep of a vehicle is as important as the travelling to be done. Officers who can afford to purchase "Chryslers" and "Packards" can keep them out of their salaries but the officers in the lower grades who have to buy second-hand, jaded-out little English cars — they cannot afford to purchase new ones—have to keep them going out of their travelling allowance—not out of their salaries—and this rate of 2½d. per mile is really too low when compared with the rate of 1½d. per mile for motor cycles. In my submission, the discrepancy is too great. Of course, these regulations, I gather, came into force on a certain day after they were made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. If we pass them as they stand, they will clearly work a hardship on a certain type of officers. Perhaps the points which have been raised in this House to-day never struck the persons responsible for the framing of these regulations but now that they have been brought to their notice I suggest that they give further consideration to these regulations in the light of the discussion on those points.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I understand that expert advice has been obtained in this matter and that these rates are based on the depreciation of a car valued at £400 original cost, and giving an average of twenty miles to the gallon. That is how they have been somewhat worked out and they are supposed to represent what is fair and just. So far as I have been able to discover, there are no motor cycles to which this travelling allowance applies but the rates for motor cycles are included, in case there may be officers who travel on motor cycles. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have a little objection to make—perhaps I should have made it in the House—and it is this. I do not approve of the departure from the method of attaching regulations to Resolutions. I believe that the practice in the past has been an excellent one and should be followed now and in the future. If you look at this piece of paper we have before us you will see nothing on it to show when these regulations were laid on the table of the House. The addendum to the Resolution states that these regulations have been laid on the tables of both Houses of the Legislature. When? All regulations—dairy regulations, workmen's compensation regulations—are usually attached to the particular Resolution that we pass approving of them and I sincerely hope that that practice will be followed in the future. I do not like the idea of separating the Resolution from the regulations and I hope that it is going to be remedied in future.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I want a little information. I understand that the Civil Service Association has been for some time considering a scheme under which the Government would advance the capital cost of motor vehicles to members of the Service who do travelling. Quite a few officials who would benefit under the scheme and who find themselves compelled in recent days to buy new vehicles at the present high cost have involved themselves, hoping that in the near future this scheme would have been put into operation and I was hoping, when I first heard travelling allowance referred to on the day when this Resolution and these regulations were introduced, to hear that the Government had in mind implementing this scheme at the same time. I repeat that there is a number of officers waiting on it and that some have actually involved themselves by borrowing money on a short-term basis, hoping that this scheme would be put into operation in the very near future. I can see no reason why there has been such delay in putting it into operation and I shall be very glad to hear that the Government proposes to take the necessary steps to implement it at the earliest possible opportunity.

Mr. WILKINSON: I have calculated some figures in respect of the rates for motor cars and they appear to me to be fairly reasonable, especially when it is taken into consideration that depreciation is a fairly heavy item. But as regards the rates for motor cycles the comparison, as you yourself have stated, Mr. Chairman, is ridiculous. As a matter of fact, I do not think that any motor cycles are used by officers in the Public Service, except officers of the Police Department and, as I have said, when you compare the proposed rates for motor cycles with those for motor cars, the comparison is ridiculous. Personally I dislike motor cycles very much even when I was a young man and I would like to discourage the use of them. I suggest that we delete the regulations relating to motor cycles or if it can be done I shall move an amendment for the reduction of the rates for motor cycles.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am told that the honourable member cannot amend the rates. What the honourable member can do is to vote against the Regulations.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: There is something in these regulations that is causing a lot of trouble and confusion. I understand that in actual practice there are no public officers who use motor cycles for travelling except in the Police Department and these regulations do not cover them because the motor cycles are the property of the Government which pays all expenses in connection with them. If motor cycles were not included in these regulations, there would be no comparison between them and motor cars and this debate would have been concluded sometime ago. I should like to take this opportunity of saying something similar to what the senior member for St. Philip has said. I should like the Government to give attention to the question of assisting public officers, who are called upon to purchase motor vehicles for travel in connection with their work, in purchasing those vehicles. Barbados is a small island and we know one another quite well. I do not like the situation in which you have public officers compromising their positions with private persons in business. A public officer who cannot purchase a motor car has to go and get credit from one of the dealers in Bridgetown and having to do that, he must compromise his position with some dealer in some respect or other. I do not feel that government officers should be placed in

that invidious position and I ask the Government to pay attention to the question of assisting its officers in purchasing motor vehicles. I know that there are public officers who would not require any assistance from the Government in this respect because their salaries would enable them to put by savings to buy a car but there are officers in the lower grades who have to travel and I would not like them to have to compromise their positions with dealers by having to ask for credit. That is an aspect that is more or less complementary to these regulations. I do not know why the government has included motor cycles in these regulations if they really do not exist; it has caused a prolongation of this debate.

Mr. ADAMS: I have no intention to trespass on the honourable senior member for Christ Church who has all the facts at his finger-tips and I am addressing my remarks more especially to the junior member for St. James. The regulations which are now in existence were agreed to in 1941 as the result of a recommendation by a Committee comprised of the junior member for St. James, the Honourable G. D. L. Pile and the then Attorney General and their recommendation was: 5d. per mile for the first 2,000 miles per annum for motor cars and 3d. per mile for motor cycles. What the Executive Committee has done is merely to double both of those rates. The junior member for St. James, perhaps, can explain why motor cycles were included.

Mr. WILKINSON: I am afraid that I cannot remember why that was done but this is an entirely different principle. In those days, the Committee recommended rates which should be paid for the first 2,000 miles travelled per annum; in this case it is a question of paying for the first 200 miles travelled per month, a matter of 2,400 miles per annum, and I can well see the point in respect of motor cars. I do not think that motor cycles were used by any public officers for travel in 1941 and I doubt whether they are being used to-day. But still that is not the point. They may be used but the rates in respect of them are, in my opinion, too high. I am not disputing the regulations in respect of motor cars and I understand you, Mr. Chairman, to say that we cannot amend these regulations; that the only alternative is either to postpone or reject them. I am sure that nobody wishes to reject the regulations relating to motor cars and I, therefore, beg to move that the further consideration of this Resolution and these regulations be postponed, so that the regulations can be referred back to the Executive Committee.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that motion.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman,—It is very regrettable that the honourable member who moved the postponement of this Resolution did not think it fit to allow me to reply before he made his motion. As far as the point which was raised by the senior member for the City and supported by the senior member for St. Philip and the senior member for St. Peter is concerned I shall allay their fears by telling them that the Government has adopted the policy of helping officers to purchase small cars which cost £350 or thereabouts. The Whitley Council has always insisted on the purchase of large cars—"Chevrolets", "Studebakers"—but owing to his small salary it would not be possible for the average government employee to purchase other than a small English car. Now as regards the point raised by the junior member for St. James in respect of motor cycles, the honourable member was a member of a Committee that was appointed years ago to go into this matter and that Committee recommended that the rate for motor cycles should be 3d. per mile for the first 2,000 miles

per annum. The Executive Committee has merely doubled that rate for the first 200 miles per month, so as to put an officer who travels on a motor cycle on a better footing, as far as travelling allowance is concerned. To me, the proportion seems reasonable. In any case, there are not many motor cyclists, except the speed cops of the Police Department. The officers who travel are divided into three groups and the increased expenditure, as a result of these new rates, will be about £2,500, so that the rates do not seem to be unreasonable.

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

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (A)

On re-assembling,

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to move the suspension of Rule 61 (a) in order to resume Government Business. The honourable member who is in charge of the Order with which we were dealing before the luncheon adjournment is postponing the consideration of that Order and the honourable senior member for St. Thomas is going to proceed with Order No. 20 as the next Order of the Day if leave is granted to move the suspension of the Rules. This Bill is somewhat urgent and I had hoped to finish it last week. I will not proceed with any further Government Business after that.

Mr. GARNER: I object. There are many matters standing in my name for consideration and I would like to get them finished.

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

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. CUMMINS, MESSRS. SMITH, F. L. WALCOTT, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, TALMA, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, HAYNES, DOWDING, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT and WILKINSON—14.

Noes: MESSRS. BRANCKER, CRAWFORD and GARNER—3.

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

Mr. ADAMS: In making the motion I would just like to say that under the Bill with which I propose now to deal, the Government is giving permission to the Commissioner of Police to add to the Force a number of Police Constables who will be used purely as watchmen in connection with shipping. Several complaints have been made by shipping interests as to theft of goods on the Wharf and the Government has given its word to the mercantile community that it will endeavour to get these policemen early. We are therefore asking that this Bill be passed today and we will not proceed with any further Government Business. I beg to move that Rule 61 (a) be now suspended.

Mr. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 60.

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to move the suspension of Rule 60 in order to take Order No. 20 out of its place.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Rule 60 be now suspended.

Mr. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to.

POLICE (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day therefore stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas:—Second reading of a Bill to amend the Police Act, 1908 (1908—2).

Dr. CUMMINS: As the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has pointed out, this Bill seeks to empower the Commissioner of Police to appoint more policemen so that they can render service where the loading and unloading of goods around the harbour is concerned. As the honourable member has also pointed out, complaints have been made, whether they are justifiable or not I am not in a position to say, by the mercantile community as to the pilfering of goods on the Wharf and those complaints have been increasing. For some time now the mercantile community have been seeking authority to employ special policemen to perform duties in this direction and it has been pointed out that that cannot be done because it would be creating a special Police Force. It has therefore been thought advisable to amend the Police Act in order to give effect to the requests of the mercantile community. There is a similar body of policemen called the London Shipping Police for the purpose of performing functions similar to those which are proposed to be performed in this Bill. The local Shipping Authority which is known as the Shipping and Mercantile Association of Barbados is prepared to pay for the services of these policemen and the money paid by the Association will be paid into the Treasury; so that the small body of policemen to be appointed will not be considered as a special Police Force but a part of the Barbados Police Force. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. COX: Before the question is put, I would like to say that I am in agreement with this Bill because I feel that the greatest measure of protection should be given to an industry such as has been referred to more especially when so many of the working-class people deal with it and when so many people's reputation is at stake; but I am supporting the Bill in the hope that the Government is not prepared to increase the number of policemen at present. I think that Superintendent Calver recommended—and I know many people including policemen are in favour of it—a reduction of the staff by 156. If the Government is prepared to carry on with the present staff and use supernumeraries to do this type of work I am in wholehearted agreement with the proposal. I am hoping therefore that this Bill will not cause any increase in the staff of our Police Force.

Mr. WILKINSON: I am supporting this Bill. As the honourable member who introduced it has already explained, it is needed. Barbados has lost its good reputation for the transshipment of cargo for many reasons as honourable members are no doubt aware. One of those reasons, I am told, is the extraordinary amount of theft which goes on during the transshipment of cargo left here for only a few days, and we have already lost one important shipping line for that class of business. Anything that can be done to encourage transshipment of cargo from here means a lot to the island especially where labour is concerned, and therefore I have much pleasure in supporting this Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: I think I ought to say a little on the second reading of this Bill. The loss to which the honourable junior member for St. James has referred cannot be attributed to the fact that it is said that there is a great deal of pilferage in this harbour. I have no comparative figures to show whether pilferage in this harbour is any greater than any other part of the West Indies let alone large seaport towns like Cardiff, Plymouth or Liverpool; but it would seem remarkable that Barbadians who have no reputation for being wholesale thieves should on the waterfront be of a different nature from their brothers in different occupations. It is indeed remarkable how similar are accusations brought against this and that body of workers or of poor people in every part of the world. As soon as a Housing scheme is suggested in Canada, in East End London or in Bridgetown people hold up their hands and say that it is of no use giving this class of persons decent housing because they will soon convert the bath-room into a toilet and so on. The accusation about pilferage in our harbour leaves me cold as to whether it is any worse than anywhere else.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think what you have said is quite sufficient in answer to the honourable junior member for St. James; but really it has nothing to do with the Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: Except that it has been suggested that the pilferage is so great that these policemen should be appointed. I want to make my position clear both in respect of my association with a trade union, the waterfront division of which I think contains 99% of workers on the waterfront and as Leader of the House. I do not want it to be thought that this Government is guilty of either of two things; firstly, that it is going along with the opposers to trade unionism, opposers to the working-class movement, and is now branding workers as such thieves that more policemen are needed; and secondly that because you are associated with a trade union you do not want to give a substantial body of the community this protection although the Act provides for it. I suggest that the Workers' Union is guilty of neither of these accusations. We have an arrangement whereby whatever case of pilferage is reported to us it is investigated by us whether it goes to the Law Courts or not, and anyone who is found guilty is punished very often more substantially in the loss of work than in the case of a fine imposed by a Police Magistrate. Neither the Government nor the trade union movement is doing anything to encourage pilferage and it is not admitted that pilferage here is worse than anywhere else in the West Indies. One of the reasons which caused one steamship agency to transfer its transshipment business to Trinidad from Barbados is because of the activities of the trade union in getting higher wages for waterfront workers.

Mr. SPEAKER: Again that has nothing to do with this Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: Purely on the general principle that it is claimed that the whole cause of the Bill is something which has been advanced by the Mercantile and Shipping Association and they claim that as the ground for taking advantage of this section of the Police Act. My reply to them is that we will meet them halfway and give them the same right as the Agricultural Society have to employ policemen when they are holding their annual Industrial Exhibition, the right which people have in other parts of the world to employ supernumeraries of the Police Force, without pleading guilty that Barbados is a black spot and we have to pay a lot of policemen to clean it up.

Mr. LEWIS: I am naturally very chary about voting for a Bill which, on the face of it, appears to be making provision for a permanent increase in the numbers of the Police Force. We have just spent a considerable sum of money, which we have had to augment by a vote only today, to have an enquiry made into the administration and otherwise of the Police Force; and we got it from the expert that the numbers of the Police Force in Barbados are large and perhaps larger than they are in many parts of the world. It therefore appears to me that something is wrong as to the distribution of the personnel of the Force. It is a well-known fact that we have been talking about one-way traffic and regulating the traffic in Bridgetown for some considerable time but nothing has been done about it. I understand that if that matter were dealt with, that would relieve a number of men who are already in the Force for any special duties such as those of which we have heard to-day. I think that this matter should have been dealt with long before any suggestion is made to increase the numbers in the Force. What we are doing now might look as if we are giving a few more men some employment. If we go on increasing the number of policemen we will have more men employed and they will have to get less money at some time in the future when perhaps retrenchment is necessary. I hope that that will never take place, but I am very chary about voting for this Bill before we have done our best to conserve the energies of the Police, so to speak, and to shift them from one kind of service to another. What we have heard as to the necessity for supervision in the harbour might mean that the number of Harbour Policemen should be increased; but it appears that we are now going to have a special set of land policemen as a secret service or some sort of gestapo. I repeat that I am very chary about voting for this Bill. As regards the argument that there is a lot of pilfering taking place on the waterfront and that cargo will not be transhipped from here, it was said that that was because we did not have a deep water harbour; now the people who were opposed to the construction of this harbour want it carried out. It would appear to me that these matters should be carefully considered from every angle. The Police Act makes provision for the employment of supernumeraries for special purposes and perhaps we could employ people who are interested in doing this work for a period of a year so as to help us to discover exactly what is going on and how to stop it. I cannot vote against this Bill when I hear that we are losing trade because we cannot trace what is taking place. I happen to know something about shipping cargo from here to other islands and everything does not arrive in the other places entirely without pilferage. I think that this is a matter which can be dealt with without creating any special police force for the purpose. I had thought that our Police Force after having had an expert to enquire into it, was well supplied with numbers so as to be able to take care of these matters. If we boast that we have law-abiding citizens we can be told that we have more policemen to the population than any other part of the world; and are we now being told that we need more policemen? I hope that this provision will redound to the interest of the Police and to the island as a whole; but I would like to feel that it is more of a temporary nature than it appears to be.

MESSAGE FROM THE OTHER PLACE RETURNING INCOME TAX BILL WITH AMENDMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a Message from the

Other Place returning the Bill to amend the Income Tax Act 1921 (1921—6) with three amendments.

POLICE (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. RAMSAY: Speaking generally on this Bill, I think it is a very bad thing to inaugurate. Of course there is a certain amount of complaint about pilfering taking place in the harbour, but I would be loathe to think that we will employ a regular police force to deal with that. I sincerely hope that when the Police patrol that area it will redound to their credit for having patrolled it. I hope I have said enough. I would have much preferred if the Commissioner of Police had decided, as is done all over the country, to employ certain policemen who have retired as special constables to do this work but not to provide them with any police uniform. We do not want any regular police force to perform these duties at the harbour: we should employ special constables comprised of retired policemen and I hope that they will not put these constables in uniform to watch cargo which is coming into this island. Many of these men rose to supremacy in their calling and I hope the same thing will happen at the Harbour. Putting these special constables in uniform savours to me of very little taste and my vote will be against that. I say that the Commissioner of Police should be given the opportunity to employ private or special constables for this work. I see these special constables at Queen's Park and I see them at Kensington wearing little tags. I invite honourable members not to vote for any extension of the Police Force; I repeat; let the Commissioner of Police have power to employ special constables and we can bring in island constables as well. I do not mind increasing the Police Force if the numbers are inadequate. Drastic diseases need drastic medicine if the old principle is right. If the necessity arises to increase the Police Force we can vote for that and give them more pay if necessary; but in this case I think that special constables will foot the Bill. As soon as we employ these special constables the revenue of this colony will be increased. If we agree to increase the number of policemen that will come like a tax on personal property; we start it with one thing and we never get rid of it. I hope that honourable members will give the Commissioner of Police the authority to employ special constables and that we will not have any extension of the Police Force.

Mr. BRANCKER: I am afraid that I do not agree with those who suggest that there is any objection to adding to the strength of the Police Force. As a matter of fact although we voted money to obtain the services of Superintendent Calver for the purpose of carrying out an investigation into the administration and otherwise of the Police Force, and he recommended in paragraph 100 of his Report that there should be a reduction in all ranks of 156 members, yet I am sure that very few people would feel that we are justified in reducing the Force by that number. If only as a means of relieving unemployment which is so rampant in this colony we should welcome a Bill such as this. The disease which this Bill seeks to cure can only be further evidence of the inadequate numerical strength of the Police Force as it exists today. Too few people have to work for many hours for inadequate remuneration and, consequently, you have to employ more people in order to relieve the situation. I hope that this Bill will be regarded as an indication that the Government is not enthusiastic or, to put it mildly, that they are lukewarm about paragraph 100 of Superintendent

Calver's Report dealing with a permanent reduction in the personnel of the Police Force. If we had reduced the strength of the Force by 156 members this Bill would have had to be brought before this House much earlier. Because we have paid a substantial amount in order to have this Report which we have read and which is of interest to us, we are not bound to follow every word that is in it. It does not mean that we regard the money which we have spent as having been misspent if we do not adopt every recommendation that is contained in the Report. I therefore disagree with those who suggest that every recommendation in the Report should be implemented. No one who pays a visit to a country can tell the necessity for certain things like those who reside in the country. I am not therefore in favour with the recommendation contained in paragraph 100 of Superintendent Calver's Report.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I would like to deal with the background in connection with this Bill. This Bill seeks to amend the Police Act for the purpose of giving more police protection in the Harbour.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Bill does not say that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The Bill is for that reason and that is why I mentioned it. When you hear the question raised as to the pilfering of cargo, that should lead honourable members to think of the vital question as to the construction of our harbour. I think it is necessary to give this protection because we have an open harbour with roadways on either side of the wharves. I would like to say that many persons who work with cargo have been accused of the larceny of this cargo and very often the cargo can be stolen by people who have no connection with it at all. There is a road running from Nelson's Statue down the wharf and there is another road running on the other side. As honourable members know, cargo is unloaded on the roadside; it is very difficult for people to pass when that is being done and you have this situation that this cargo is delivered to many warehouses on the road-side. I hope that just as the Government are taking steps to provide this police protection they will see that they curb as much as possible the delivery of cargo on the roadside. Instead of delivering various items from the lighters to handcarts which is a very dangerous practice, the Government should have a warehouse for storing these items and this Bill would possibly not have to come before us today because the police would already be in the warehouse. In answer to the honourable junior member for St. James as to the pilferage of goods left here for transshipment, I say authoritatively that the reason he has given for the loss of transshipment business is far from the truth. The people in the smaller islands have always been contending that it costs them more to have these goods transhipped and they would like the goods delivered directly to them. It is not a question of the pilferage of the goods but the cost of their transshipment; and it must cost more if goods have to be transhipped from one island to another. In Trinidad goods are brought alongside the wharf and there is no necessity for lighterage. In so far as this Bill is concerned, the main purpose of it is to give protection to the business of a body of people who have to pay for it because it is their business; but I feel that in the long run this is in the interest of the colony. If they can curb larceny of any kind it is the duty of any Government to see that they curb it. It is the Government's duty to see that sufficient protection is given to curb larceny especially when goods come into this island because when the cost of items increases it would be as a

result of pilferage. I have no objection to this Bill because of the reasons I have given; but I cannot agree that we should increase the numbers in the Police Force for this special purpose. (Hear, hear). I do not think that what is now proposed should be a permanent feature in our community so that it can be said that there is a great demand on the waterfront for an increase in the numbers of the Police Force. We can employ these constables as a temporary arrangement and I feel it is better to have people who look as if they have authority rather than have those who do not represent the law in the eyes of some people. I agree that this measure should be a temporary one and I say finally that I cannot subscribe to an increase in the numbers of the Police Force. I say quite plainly that I cannot agree to an increase in the numbers of the Force as a means of finding employment for people unless I am satisfied that there is sufficient justification for it; because if you want to find employment for every person in the community you can say that you want to take the water from the sea and I am sure that you will not find a sufficient number of people to do that. The honourable junior member for St. Lucy referred to Superintendent Calver's Report; we cannot agree with every line of anybody's report, we have to analyse the recommendations and see whether we can agree with them or not. In a final analysis I say that this Bill would be a means of giving protection to the character of certain people who have been accused of larceny.

Mr. TALMA: I rise simply to attempt to amplify a few points. In the first place Superintendent Calver's Report is at present being implemented with the result that the Police Force is much smaller than heretofore. That being the case, you can well understand that with the conditions existing in the harbour at present, it is essential that an additional number of men be appointed to perform duties there. Section 42 of the Police Act, 1908, provides for the appointment of supernumeraries so that if supernumeraries were to be appointed under the Act the remarks of the honourable junior member for the City in connection with creating a gestapo would more or less come into line; and that would be creating a private Police Force over which the Commissioner of Police would have no proper control. The object of this Bill is to obviate such a state of affairs from coming about. If the "Objects and Reasons" of this Bill are carefully gone into, that would save any very lengthy debate on this Bill from taking place. I cannot agree with the suggestion that we should appoint men who have retired from the Police Force to perform these duties when there are a number of young men awaiting their opportunity to be employed in any way in which they can be employed.

Mr. MAPP: I do not want to prolong this debate but there are just one or two points which I would like to make. I quite agree that there cannot be any serious objection to this Bill because it is only a matter of giving permission to the Commissioner of Police to appoint members of the Police Force for special duties on the waterfront. However, I would like to issue a warning. I happen to know that very often when you appoint people under such terms and conditions they regard themselves as the agents of other people who suspect that a certain body of workers is responsible for certain thefts which are taking place, and these people so employed will in time become a kind of gestapo. That is a very serious state of affairs. When I was employed as a Clerk in the Police Courts — I do not want to say anything to the detriment of the Police Force — but I have seen policemen look with suspicion at certain

people against whom there should not be any suspicion at first sight. Even more so will this be the case where people are employed by others who suspect that the people on the waterfront are guilty of theft. I say that it calls for good sense on the part of men employed on the waterfront—

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

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61(B)

Mr. ADAMS: I am entirely in the hands of honourable members. In view of the fact that I have pointed out that the only reason for proceeding with this Bill today is because of its urgency, I take it that honourable members are willing to agree to the suspension of Rule 61 (b) purely in order to finish the consideration of the Bill. If honourable members approve of the principle of not worrying to debate this Bill we will get through with it in a few minutes. I therefore ask leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (b).

Mr. GARNER: Again I have to object.

Mr. ADAMS: I ask honourable members to agree to the suspension of the Rule if it is merely for the purpose of dealing with the amendments to the Income Tax Bill and giving the honourable junior member for St. John the opportunity to present the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Address in connection with emigration to Surinam.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking leave to move the suspension of Rule 61 (b) in order to resume the consideration of the Bill to amend the Police Act and also—

Mr. ADAMS: Rather than have the question decided in the negative I am asking leave to move the suspension of the Rule in order that the Report re emigration to Surinam can be presented, that the amendments to the Income Tax Bill can be dealt with and if honourable members do not want to continue with the Police Bill we will stop there.

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

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

SELECT COMMITTEE'S REPORT RE EMIGRATION TO SURINAM PRESENTED

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to present the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Address relative to emigration to Surinam.

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS TO INCOME TAX BILL.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that the amendments of the Other Place to the Bill to amend the Income Tax Act, 1921 (1921-6) be dealt with forthwith under Rule 262.

Mr. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS: The amendments to the Bill are as follows: the insertion of the word "under" after the word "Order" in line 1 of Sub-paragraph (3) of Clause 4; the insertion of the following words after the word "section" occurring in line 7 of Paragraph 57B: "the expression foreign tax means any tax payable in that territory which under the arrangements is to be so allowed, and". That is a long printer's omission which clears up the point

which honourable members were asking about relative to foreign tax. The last amendment is the omission by me to insert a retrospective Clause at the end of the Bill when we were dealing with it. This Clause as inserted by the Other Place reads as follows: "5. This Act shall be deemed to have come into operation on the first day of January, one thousand nine hundred and forty eight." I beg to move that these amendments be now read a first time. If honourable members think that the amendments need to be printed and circulated they need only say so.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. RAMSAY: The object of Rule 262 is to afford us the opportunity of agreeing to amendments when they are of a casual nature. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has read these amendments but I think the proper thing to be done is to have them printed and circulated. This is not a case where the amendments are of a casual nature; this is a case where there is a multiplicity of amendments and I am forced to vote against this motion. I do not understand these amendments and I therefore beg to move that they be printed and circulated.

Mr. MAPP: I beg to second that. I intimated to the honourable senior member for St. Joseph what the honourable junior member for St. Peter has just said and he agreed that they should be printed and circulated. I must say that what the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has read out sounds like Greek to me. I do not know if the amendments will still be Greek to me if they are printed and circulated.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House has already decided to deal with these amendments forthwith; however I will put the question. A motion has been made that these amendments be now read a first time; an amendment has been moved that the amendments be printed and circulated. The question therefore is that the words proposed to be deleted stand part of the motion. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye," those against will please say "No." I think the "Ayes" have it. The question now is that these amendments be now read a first time. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye," those against will please say "No." I think the "Noes" have it.

Mr. ADAMS: If honourable members did not call for a division and got the motion for the postponement agreed to, they are in duty bound to agree to the first reading of the amendments or they are throwing the whole Bill overboard.

Mr. RAMSAY: If by any chance an honourable member makes a mistake it is not a matter of the laws of the Medes and Persians which altereth not. I am not fully conversant with the amendments.

The question that these amendments be now read a first time was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. SMITH, F. L. WALCOTT, COX, FOSTER, LEWIS, TALMA, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON and DR. CUMMINS—12.

Noes: DR. WILSON, Messrs. RAMSAY, SYMONDS, BRANCKER, MAPP, CRAWFORD, GARNER, MOTTLEY and DOWDING—9.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that these amendments be now read a second time.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I hear some honourable members say that there are in difficulty and I feel that we can get out of the difficulty. I think that the first reading of these amendments is a formal thing and the debate takes place on the second reading of them. I would like to get your assistance on this point, Mr. Speaker, and I am asking the honourable

senior member for St. Joseph if he will accept a motion that the further consideration of these amendments be now postponed. I feel that I am in order in making that motion. The first reading of a Bill enables you to print and circulate it and the second reading would be an opportunity for the House to give an expression as to their feeling about the Bill. I feel that we are in a dangerous position; I cannot vote for the amendments unless I understand them and if we do not agree to these amendments it seems that the Bill will die. The Bill might be a very helpful one and we will be throwing it out entirely. I am in an awkward position now because I have an amendment which I am going to offer on this occasion.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the principle which is always adopted with regard to amendments is that they are printed and circulated when there are more than ordinary verbal amendments. These amendments now before the House consist of the omission of a word, a definition which should have been in the original Bill and a retrospective Clause. I do not think therefore that honourable members should have any difficulty in their minds as to what the amendments really are.

Mr. LEWIS: I quite agree with your Honour but there is at least one amendment which is a fairly extensive one. I refer to the definition of "foreign tax." I feel that the question which I am raising now has not been raised before. We have agreed to consider these amendments to-day but if it is a question of having them printed and circulated, it can be said that we have given them a certain amount of consideration and we have reached a point during the consideration where we feel that we should have the amendments printed and circulated. If we postpone consideration of these amendments today it would be in Your Honour's discretion to have them printed and circulated. It is not necessary to make any motion to that effect; no motion is made for a Bill to be printed and circulated. I feel that these amendments should be in print before us and I am moving that the further consideration of them be now postponed.

Mr. SPEAKER: What you could do is to make a motion that these amendments be read a second time some time later.

Mr. LEWIS: I am willing to move that they be read a second time this day week if I get an indication from the Leader of the House that he will agree to that; otherwise I have an amendment to offer in connection with the retrospective Clause. I take it that I can move an amendment to any amendment which comes down from the Other Place. The Leader of the House has indicated that he will accept an amendment to his motion, namely, that the amendments be read a second time this day week. I beg to move that the words "and shall expire on the thirty-first day of December, one thousand nine hundred and fifty" be added to the last amendment. I think that over a period of three years we will have an opportunity of getting statistics; we can enquire from the Income Tax Department as to how this Bill is operating. Sometime before the Bill expires the Government can go into the matter and they will be able to say, if they find it so, that the Bill is an excellent one, that they stand to lose little by it and they can ask that the date of expiry be deleted.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am wondering whether you should not move the House into Committee if you want to amend that Clause.

Mr. LEWIS: I am counselling honourable members that no harm can be done if they give the Income Tax Office the opportunity to supply them with statistics as to the operation of this Bill. They

have the word of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph that we are not likely to lose anything by the operation of this Bill but nobody can state that definitely. The whole method of trading may be altered in the course of three years especially in the post-war period and it would be well for us to see how this Bill is operating before we commit ourselves to it. If we have the necessary data we can say that this is a good Bill and we will continue with it.

Mr. MAPP: In seconding the motion I say that I do not know if at the end of 1950 we will be able to understand certain things about this Bill better than we understand them now. Nevertheless the Bill may be far-reaching in character and no harm can be done if we allow ourselves the opportunity to review it before it expires and see whether it is working harmoniously or not.

Mr. ADAMS: I am of the opinion that this motion is out of order and I will give my authority for that opinion. My namesake, Mr. G. H. Adams, when moving the passing of this Bill in Nyassaland pointed out that the Bill either had to be taken as it is or be rejected. The Convention was not made for three years and there is no danger as the honourable junior member for the City believes. At any time in 1949 the honourable member can move the repeal of the Bill. Using the authority which I have just used, it looks as if these amendments are like the Regulations with which we were dealing this morning, we either accept them as a whole or reject them as a whole. I have discovered from my copy of the Bill that this definition was in the Bill but in the preparation of the Bill to be sent to the Other Place, the words were left out. I think that it is only in the printing between this Place and the Other Place that these words were omitted.

The question that the words proposed to be added stand part of the amendment was put and resolved in the negative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs RAMSAY, SYMMONDS, BRANCKER, MAPP, LEWIS, TALMA, CRAWFORD, GARNER, and DOWDING—9

Noes: Dr. WILSON, Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. SMITH, F. L. WALCOTT, COX, FOSTER, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, MOTTLEY, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, and WILKINSON—12.

The amendments were read a second time.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that these amendments be now agreed to.

Mr. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to.

EXCUSE FOR ABSENT MEMBER

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker,—Before we proceed with any further business, I beg to offer an excuse for the absence of my colleague who is indisposed.

RENT OF WATER METERS DISCUSSED ON MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. RAMSAY: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move the adjournment of the House for a few minutes in order to discuss an important public matter. It is a matter in connection with the Waterworks Department having meters on the premises of taxpayers who are charged meter rent.

Mr. ADAMS: What is meant by a few minutes? There is no motion before the House.

Mr. RAMSAY: I beg to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes in order to discuss this matter. This is no joke; this is a serious matter. I do not want honourable members to waste any time

about it; I am just bringing it to the notice of the Government so that they cannot truthfully say that they did not know anything about it. A serious state of affairs exists with regard to the Government allowing the Waterworks Department to charge rent for a meter which you are not permitted to use. I need not say that there is a scarcity of water and as loyal citizens we are quite willing to put up with it; but in respect of the meter which you have on your premises, you are warned about using the water and you are still charged for the meter although they will not allow you to use it! Years ago when the Waterworks first came about that might have been all right. To my mind, if I am allowed to say it, that is being dishonest; there is no honesty about it. I know several people who are suffering from it. I am asking the Government to send down a Bill in the near future—perhaps next Tuesday—to amend the Act so as to relieve the poor taxpayers who go into their baths on mornings, turn on the taps and find no water. The Government ought to amend the Act and not call upon people to pay for water which they do not use. I hope that I am in order to say this, but the Waterworks Department are in the same category as the Electric Company which charges people rent for their meters. I have heard a member of the Government quarrel about it. The Electric Company are justified in charging rent for their meters if the Government allow the Waterworks Department to charge rent for meters which people do not use. The Government are no better than the Electric Company. The matter has been brought to my notice and I thought that the Government were wrong to do that and they are failing in their duty to the taxpayer. Honourable members will know that the Executive Committee is in charge of the Waterworks Department and therefore we can see that this state of affairs is remedied under the aegis of the Executive Committee. It is their duty to cease collecting meter rent from these poor taxpayers. The Government cannot expect the Biscuit Factory, the Telephone Company, the Electric Company or any other business place to go in the right way if they fail to set the example. Now that the sugar crop has started the factories are using water, and when the taxpayers go into their baths and turn on the taps they hear a suction but there is no water! Yet we are prepared to pay the water rates because we know that water is a necessity. I am asking the Government to cease collecting this vicious and atrocious tax on water meters where the taxpayers do not get any benefit from it. Now that the matter has been brought to the notice of the Government I expect that they will cease collecting this tax.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to second the motion. I am in agreement with the honourable member's remarks and I should like to add to them. Last year we had a very severe drought throughout the island and in certain parts of the island it was more severe than in others. As a result, the water shortage was more acute in some areas than in others. The water shortage was extremely acute in the parishes of Christ Church, St. Philip and St. Peter. I remember going to St. Peter with the Manager of the Waterworks Department and in one area there were many householders who had water turned in for weeks but never got any at all. Although the Government has no control over that, I submit that for a period of over a month when no water was available, some rebate should be made on the water rate for that particular quarter. The people of St. Philip and St. Peter approached the Manager of the Waterworks Department in connection with the matter

and naturally he had to be sympathetic with them because he knew that they had no water and it was hardly reasonable to collect the rates for a period during which people had no water. Under the Act the Waterworks Department has no alternative but to collect the rates. I submit that when attention is paid to the point raised by the honourable junior member for St. Peter, attention should also be paid to the possibility of granting relief on occasions of prolonged drought to people who get no water during the period of drought.

Mr. ADAMS: I should like to point out that members of the Government have water services; they are in drought areas and they also suffer. This is a matter in connection with which members of the Government get daily surprises. I think hard to pay water rates when for weeks I have been sending somebody to drain a little water from a standpipe. Honourable members must not think that the matter is an easy one to handle. Are we going to appoint inspectors to see how many people's taps are dripping and how many people are getting no water at all? It seems hard to the Government for people to pay water rates when they are not getting an adequate water supply; but unless the water supply is cut off for a quarter, you do not know how much the supply is and you cannot divide the rates. I ask honourable members to have sufficient patience to believe that the Government will work out some method for dealing with the matter if a solution can be found without appointing inspectors to go round to see how much water is being obtained. This is not a matter of which the Executive Committee is unaware.

Mr. RAMSAY: I think my motion has served its useful purpose and I am going to withdraw it; but the argument raised by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph can well be applied to the domestic rates. My argument is that for the last nine ten or twelve months people have had to pay meter rates and the Government ought to cease collecting these rates from people inasmuch as they do not use the water. Every person is not a liar and I take it that under British justice a person is innocent until he has been proved guilty. I say that inasmuch as the Government have called upon people to cease watering their gardens, they should cease collecting that 7/6 per quarter for the tax. I now ask leave to withdraw my motion.

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

SHORTAGE OF CEMENT DISCUSSED ON MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. GARNER: I beg to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes in order to make a few observations on a matter of vital importance to the colony as a whole. It is a matter which affects the lives of many of our artisans. There is around us a group of people who are building theatres out of cement blocks and that is causing a hardship to certain builders; because these people use all the cement they can get in building these theatres and other people who are erecting buildings cannot get this cement. It is also causing a hardship to the quarry man in the country especially in the parish which I have the honour to represent. Representations have been made to my colleague and to me in this matter. Many people have been thrown out of employment because of the making of cement blocks and we are always crying about employing our own people first. In the face of our having such good

stone in the island, how can we allow the little cement that is allocated to us to be used in making these blocks? If these people want to invest their money we are glad for that; but at the same time our local people must not be put out of work by these people using the small quantity of cement available for erecting their buildings. As far as I can see, these buildings cannot last as long as those which are erected of solid stone. I think that if the Government are allowing these people to make these cement blocks in place of the use of solid stone, they should call a halt in the matter because an injustice is being done to the people who work in the quarries. It is time that the Government say something about the matter. We want to encourage industries in this colony but that must not be done to the detriment of local labour. We welcome anybody's money from abroad but at the same time we want to retain a place for our labourers in every scheme. We have a great quantity of stone in this island and if people want to erect their buildings let them use the stone which we have and let the cement be equally distributed. I know that several people have been put out of work because of the shortage of cement. In St. Philip we have work to do and we cannot get any cement with which to do it. I think that the Government should call a halt in this matter of making cement blocks because they are helping some people to the detriment of a good many others. By this motion those who have the good of the people at heart will see that something is done to stop these people from using our quotas of cement when they can use our stone; and there is a big question mark as to the strength of these cement blocks. I hope that the Government will take cognizance of what I have said in making this motion for the adjournment of the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to second the hon. member's motion. At least one phase of the remarks made by the hon. member is deserving of attention. If it is true that a few concerns are grabbing all the cement that comes into this colony, the Government will be well advised to issue a directive to the cement dealers insisting that for the future such a state of affairs be not allowed to continue. My colleague has emphasised that cement is being used not for the purpose of general construction in the sense that other materials are being used; but a large quantity of this cement is used in the construction of blocks which make it no longer necessary to utilise the soft stone which is available throughout the length and breadth of this island. I am at a loss to understand how it is that new-comers, comparatively speaking, can get the quantity of cement used in these undertakings when people in the colony find it so difficult to get this material for most essential purposes. I feel that that phase of the matter is deserving of prompt attention. Not only quarry men but masons and carpenters find it difficult to obtain work because of the general shortage of cement, and it is noteworthy that on the enterprise to which the hon. member has referred a minimum of artisans are being employed. In the case of one particular concern when it was started the people connected with it made a big splash about the attractive terms and conditions which they would offer to artisans and the comparatively high wages they would pay to the people who work with them. As far as I can see, the erection of these buildings is proceeding apace and I doubt whether as many as two dozen people are employed. If the little cement that comes to the colony is to be grabbed for this particular kind of construction at the expense of the general employment of artisans throughout the colony, so long as

this item remains in short supply, the Government should take some steps in the matter.

Mr. MOTTLEY: There is little doubt that this making of cement blocks is interfering with the industry of quarrying stones and we have not got to consider whether it is more economical to build houses, theatres or anything else with cement blocks than with local stone. What I want to draw to the Government's attention is this; we have no experience at present with regard to these concrete structures and it is within our knowledge that a place of entertainment recently erected in this colony with cement blocks has not yet been opened and it is causing much concern among builders generally as to the safety of the people going there to be entertained. I know that I am straying from the point, Mr. Speaker, but I am craving your indulgence to deal with this matter. I am dealing particularly with one of these new cinemas which have been erected. I want the Government to know this; it is common knowledge that one of these theatres has begun to sink since its erection and the feeling among people who should know is that the Government should see to the inspection of this building and get some guarantee as to whether it is suitable for the purpose for which it has been erected so that the lives of many of the inhabitants of this colony who seek pleasure in cinemas will not be endangered. Quite recently an engineer was brought to this colony to rectify some bad work on the roof of one of these theatres, the roof having begun to come in for some three or four feet. I know that some people are prevented from entering this building because the feeling is that they will see these things and make some report. I am interested in the erection of this type of building for the use of the general public and I say that responsible people are looking on and they would like some inspection to be made to these buildings by some competent Government Officer or Officers before they are opened to the public and endanger the lives of people. It is the duty of the Government to see that these buildings are properly constructed so as not to endanger the lives of those who seek pleasure in them.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this House do now adjourn for five minutes—

Mr. ADAMS: I should just like to say one thing.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is being put and if I allow you to speak now I will have to allow others to speak. The question is that this House do now adjourn for five minutes. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No." I think the "Noes" have it.

EMPLOYMENT OF WORKERS IN BRITAIN DISCUSSED ON MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I beg to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes. I desire that loyal Barbadians should assist in Britain's production drive. This island of ours has earned the name of "Little England" because of the loyalty and love of the people for the Mother Country. At the beginning of the last War—

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like the honourable member to indicate more clearly what he is speaking about.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I am speaking about the desire of Barbadians to assist in Britain's production drive. At the commencement of the last War Barbadians came from every part of the island

and volunteered to serve in the Ground Forces of the R.A.F., in the Merchant Marine and in other branches of the Armed Forces in order that the Empire could face the dangers which threatened it. To-day Britain faces a national crisis the magnitude of which is as great as that which faced her in days before. What affects Britain affects Barbados. We have been asked to accept a restriction in imports and we have cheerfully and loyally agreed to do so. Where there is a restriction of imports particularly as regards building materials, that means that many carpenters, masons, painters and all those who earn a livelihood from the building industry in this colony are faced with unemployment. Because of the most severe drought which this island has experienced for many years, we are faced with a short crop and that means that thousands of agricultural labourers and those who earn a livelihood from the sugar industry will be given only a few weeks' employment during the crop season. Those who normally have to exist in this colony upon the charity of their families or their friends favoured with seasonal jobs. We are told night after night that there is need for half a million workers in Britain to-day; we are told by the most eminent economists time and again that if they can get 100,000 workers in agriculture in Britain and a similar number of workers in the coal mines and the textile industry, the dollar crisis will pass away and the battle of production will be won. Thousands of workers who assisted in the production drive in the United States of America and served with great credit and distinction in some cases, are most anxious to be given the opportunity to serve in a similar capacity, to assist the Mother Country in this battle of production at this momentous period of her history. It appears to me that if sufficiently strong representations can be made in England of the need of the able-bodied, unemployed people of Barbados it might be possible to obtain for Barbadian workers in England a quota similar to that which was obtained for our workers in the United States of America some time ago. With the short crop with which we are now faced, I do not think that any avenue should remain unexplored for finding opportunities for employment for the people of this colony who are quite willing to work. The able-bodied people of Barbados are very anxious to serve in England where volunteers have been employed; we have been told that 30,000 volunteers have been employed in the mines in England. In this colony there are thousands of able-bodied people who love Britain as they love the game of cricket and they are anxious to work. I think that every effort should be made even if a delegation is sent to Britain, to emphasize the desire of the loyal people of this colony to help in the production drive there for the mutual benefit of both countries.

Mr. BRANCKER: I beg to second the honourable member's motion. As honourable members know, the matter of making enquiries with regard to the possibility of the emigration to Canada of workers from this colony and of finding employment in the United Kingdom for female workers from Barbados, was the subject of questions put in this House by me as long ago as October last year. I had also put questions in connection with this matter in February, 1947, because I had read that in Canada the immigration barriers had been lowered and in the United Kingdom there was a great shortage of female workers. In November last year we were told by the Government in reply to the question relative to the employment of female workers in the United Kingdom that the question of employing female workers from

Barbados in the United Kingdom is still under examination in the Colonial Office and that attention is invited to the memorandum on "the employment of labour from outside the United Kingdom" which was prepared in the Colonial Office and which has been laid on the table of the House. So far as the Canadian Government is concerned we were told that in reply to enquiries made early in the year the Government was informed that the Canadian Government did not consider it necessary to employ West Indian labour at that time. The Colonial Office has recently requested the Commonwealth Relations Office to make a further approach to the Canadian Government and the outcome of this is awaited. What I feel is of great significance with regard to the reply dealing with emigration to Canada is that the Canadian Government did not consider it necessary to employ West Indian labour at that time. That reply was given in November last year and since that time certain Canadian firms have been securing West Indian labour. There are cases where certain Barbadians who have established correspondence with certain firms in the Dominion of Canada have been invited by these firms to go to Canada where they will be provided with work and certain of these people are taking the necessary steps to travel to Canada at their own expense. That only goes to show that there is employment however great or limited in the Dominion of Canada for workers from this colony. This is a question which I feel the Government should take up again and again and see if they can get the Canadian Government to accept the responsibility of taking so many hundreds or so many thousands as can be absorbed in their country; because Barbadian workers have been told that if they can get to Canada there is work for certain of them to do with certain firms and the only question is how many workers can be employed. There is also the question of those who cannot go to Canada on their own to secure such employment as may be there. This matter of emigration has been raised from time to time and it is a matter which I submit demands unceasing vigilance on the part of the Government. It is not a matter in which the Government should say merely that their attention was drawn to it, that they looked around and there was no venue. It is a matter which demands the day to day, hour to hour and minute to minute concern of the Government because one does read every now and then in the Press that immigration barriers to Canada have been lowered, that people from the Colonies are going there and that certain workers are paying their own way in trying to get to that country. Not many workers are able to pay their own way to Canada and it is for this Government to let us know that they have contacted the Canadian Government, how many persons are likely to emigrate to Canada then legislation will be sought to provide money for emigrating the number of people for whom there is employment in the great Dominion.

Mr. DOWDING: I think that it is an unenviable position in which we find ourselves to-day. In Great Britain there is plenty of work to be done but there is nobody to do it; in Barbados it is just the reverse. As a result both the people in England and those in Barbados are suffering. I think that strong representations should be made in this matter and let some definite conclusion be arrived at in the early future and let the House be informed of it. I fail to see why in these circumstances—much work to be done in England and a surplus of people to work in Barbados—why the Mother Country cannot take some of these willing, able-bodied men from Barbados to work over there. I am sure that the people here are willing

to do most of the work that they wish them to do in England. (Cheers). We are going to hear some people say that the workers here will not be able to withstand the climate in England; but that is a fallacy which I have seen proven with my own eyes. I happened to have been with Barbadians in Italy in the coldest weather when they slept under one blanket while other regiments were sleeping under three and we did not suffer from the cold at all. I am strongly in support of this matter of emigration and I see no reason at all why some definite answer cannot be given to it at an early date.

Mr. ADAMS: Far be it from me to prevent honourable members from referring to their Mother Country in such glowing terms, but let us face realities. I have risen to my feet only because the inference has been drawn that the Government is doing nothing in this matter. I am calling a spade a spade. We have been told plainly that they do not want coloured people in England in great numbers. If we are going to declare war on England and force them to take our labour, let us do that; if we are going to use an atomic bomb on Canada and force them to take our cane-cutters, let us do that. The Colonial Office sent an official down here and told us plainly and bluntly what the position is. "I do not tell you that some of our families would not employ a cook" he mentioned. Of course there is the colour question in some places. We have been told that coloured people are not allowed to go to England in great numbers and what is the good of this debate this afternoon? The honourable junior member for St. Lucy talks about some firms in Canada who will take people but he does not say whether they are white or coloured; he speaks about emigrating hundreds and later thousands of people as if the Government know that they can get these people emigrated to Canada and we are not doing anything. What gives the Government more head-aches than the question of over-population and emigration? We do not want to maintain the old method of trying to get cheap labour in Barbados. I feel that it would pay Barbados to send Barbadians abroad and let them send back money here. It is incumbent on the Government constituted as it is with the four of us who are avowed Socialists, to see that people are emigrated. The honourable senior member for St. George says that the climate in England does not matter because in Italy Barbadians used only one blanket in the coldest weather; but we have been told plainly that coloured people are not wanted in any great numbers in England and to say that they are wanted there except in the case of War is just to ignore realities. I find it very difficult to follow honourable members who have spoken in such glowing terms of their Mother Country; I hope the Mother Country is Africa and not England. (Hear, hear). All this talk about the Mother Country is to ignore realities. I would not have spoken if it were not for the suggestions made that this Government is doing nothing about emigration. This Government knows what it has been told; an official came out from the Colonial Office to explain matters. He says that the employment of our people in England is a difficult matter; some of them make fine servants and so forth, but it would be difficult to take them in Britain. The honourable junior member for St. Lucy has been told that the Government is watching the situation; he has been told in the replies to which he has referred that with both the Canadian Government and the British Government the problem is a difficult one and they cannot give any immediate hope of any large scale employment of women or of men either

in Great Britain or in Canada. Let honourable members lay blame where blame really lies. It is the habit of a certain type of Englishman to feel himself superior to every other nation on earth whether white or black and that feeling persists even although for the past two years there has been a Labour Government in Great Britain. I repeat: let honourable members blame them but not this Government and say that we are not trying to get emigration to the United Kingdom, Canada, the United States of America or anywhere else. Everyone of us is anxious to get emigration abroad but when difficulties arise let us put the blame in the right direction. Do not suggest that the Government is not doing anything. I hope that in future when honourable members want to make accusations against the Government they will at least pay the Government the compliment of asking beforehand what is being done exactly. To get up and say glibly for people to read it in the Press that the Government is doing nothing to get people to Canada or the United Kingdom is not fair. That is pure politics or rather impure politics. I suggest that honourable members should attack the Government on facts because if the Government is not criticised it will get lazy and do nothing, but do not accuse us of not getting an emigration scheme wherever we can. Quite recently we have been accused of not getting emigration to America when we were trying to get a reply to a particular question asked. It is almost too trite to say that emigration is the day to day, hour to hour and minute to minute concern of the Government. Even in times of plenty as in times of drought people look around and ask what is going to happen. I suggest that honourable members should attack the Government and attack it strongly: but let their attacks be based on facts.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Some time last year this same question about the employment of West Indians in Great Britain was taken up by the Colonial Office. I happened to be there and I raised the question. As the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said in diplomatic language they thought more about changing the character of the various communities. I would like to say from my experience and even from that of men who worked in the various services, that the way in which people are treated is no compliment for the West Indies. The reason why we meet all this opposition and the reason why these countries will not take negroes is because in this island we have white people who tell you that they want white people. That may hurt some people but it is true. If our local people who live in a mixed community say that then the Englishmen have all the more reason for saying it. In this island they preach and practice racial discrimination; you get in certain places only if you are a porter; you have all the education but you cannot get any further. These are the difficulties which you have to face overseas. I would like to know if there is only one race of human beings; the earth is the Lord's and I do not believe that our Lord meant that only certain people should live in certain parts of the world. I can live anywhere and I think other people can live anywhere as well. If Englishmen can live in the tropics and in the cold climates, West Indians can do the same. It is very difficult for West Indians to get the treatment which they deserve. I would like to see some 50,000 people emigrate to the United Kingdom, Canada or anywhere else they can get some work to do. As the honourable junior member for St. Lucy has said, there are cases where people have gone to Canada and got work; but they are technicians. I know that a wireless operator has worked in the Canadian Army and he is back there. One of the difficulties with which

our people are faced is that of finding somewhere to live when they go overseas. I have spoken with one who I believe has a deep interest in this colony; he has a general knowledge of the West Indies and on this question of emigration he has said that even if the Government of Great Britain undertook to take emigrants in large numbers there will be difficulty in lodging them. It is a fact that in England you have people telling you plainly—even in the case of students certain householders say that they will not house coloured students. Sometimes you hear that students say they have to make out in England: but they are getting education and therefore they do not mind suffering. If students who will be coloured people in the main find it difficult to get a ready reception one can understand how difficult it will be for labourers. But at the same time I say that that is because the people are black. To speak plainly, if these people were like the Poles they would take them; but they are not taking them because they are black. No honourable member of this House should be afraid of saying that. I do not believe that a man is responsible for his colour; because people are black they cannot go certain places and that is the difficulty which we suffer in these labour troubles. The black people cannot leave here and go to England to work because they cannot measure up to the people there. We have the same difficulty here; some of us cannot get any work because we have not got the pigmentation qualification, and I feel that charity begins at home. I hear a member of this House talking about employment in certain places but I am sure that when the matter comes to be debated you will hear the same argument about the employment of certain people in the banks as you hear about the employment of coloured people in England. I say this afternoon as a plain, ordinary Barbadian, a descendant from a negro, that we must face facts; people who are negroes will not be accepted in white communities and that is the real objection to these people going to England for employment. If they were Poles or Jews they would have them. I know that there are many people who do not like it to be said that they object to you because you are black; but that is the position. They do not like people to preach race hatred. I say emphatically that the whole objection to people going to work in Britain is because of their colour. Even in some families it would be an atrocious crime to import other people to live with them in the country; the position is worse than when Judas betrayed Christ. This is a practical age and we should be able to speak freely. I speak with all the freedom I possess; people say that they stand for amalgamation but if that means that certain people are rubbing against others, it cannot work. This is 1948 and if a man cannot speak as a democrat, then he should be dead. I hope that if I have been treading on the tender spots of any honourable member or persons in the community some good will result.

Mr. GARNER: I could hardly let this debate go on without adding my quota to it because everybody knows that my soul is in emigration and the racial question. I am sorry that we cannot get a unanimous vote this afternoon to censure not the local Government, because this Government is only a set-up and it really means nothing to me, but the Imperial Government. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has told us—and I have no reason to doubt what he has said—that the British people do not want to create any colour problem. That is a very big statement and it boils down to quite a lot. They do not want us now but when they are fighting the War they sent for us. The British Government

should be censured and they should know it; there should be a unanimous vote going to the Secretary of State for the Colonies because, after all, we are subjects of Great Britain and as such we have contributed immensely to her wealth up to this day. If it is true that Britain does not want to create a colour problem what does she leave for the American people to do, people who have allowed a certain section of their country to be dominated by men of colour? It is true that the American people allow you to rise to the highest point within your group but they also put a bar. I appreciate that because it takes away that ugly stigma and brings us together in the cause of suffering. Just as it was in the days of Moses and the people so it is to-day; I am not therefore against the Americans in this matter; but when the British Government say that they do not want any colour problem that is saying quite a lot. They should do everything in their power to assist in relieving this vexed problem. You lose everything and you become degenerate when there is unemployment. If that is the attitude which Britain is going to adopt I say that Africa should be given back to us and we will not ask them to have any colour problem. They cannot keep Africa tell us they want raw materials and exploit her and we cannot get a pick. Something is wrong somewhere and this matter should be put before the Secretary of State for the Colonies because we have had it from the Government Spokesman that they do not want to create any colour problem. There are those who do not know what they are doing; they get a little book learning but when it comes to the real issues they are not very far from the man in the street, and they have to grope their way through the dark. When it is a question of bread and butter everybody will feel the pinch. There is a great crisis where work is concerned in this colony; very little money can be put in circulation and we know what an emigration scheme will mean to families who have no sense of security; so that when the Mother Country—I do not say the Mother Country from my heart of hearts—closes her doors and refuses to share this problem with us, it is time that she should be censured. Mr. Speaker, I will not prolong this matter because there is a debate coming up in connection with it and I will have all the privilege to make my remarks. At a recent meeting of British and American subjects when my colleague made a certain statement, some honourable members said that if a plebiscite were taken in Barbados and perhaps in the West Indies, 99% of the people would help Great Britain and they would not want America. (A MEMBER: Not now). I maintain that the people are not so interested in the Mother Country but the country which provides them with bread and butter. You do not want prestige when you are hungry: hungry people do not go to a church for food; they go to a shop. If Great Britain does not see that this problem is settled she will lose the affection of her people. If she does not take her people's problem seriously, their allegiance must be turned to the American people who have been giving us financial aid in the past so far as work is concerned. I say that it would be well for this House to pass a unanimous vote of censure of the British Government. This is a big question and I can speak for a week on it. Great Britain will have to share some of this burden because we have helped her in the past; we have answered her call, our boys have shed their blood on her behalf and if they have done that for Great Britain it is incumbent upon her to see that she helps the West Indies instead of other people from all over Europe. She must re-

member that the home drum beats first. This is a big question; this is a statesmanlike question and the King of England should know something about it. He should know that we are dissatisfied with the chosen policy of Great Britain not to have negroes there. They should not only want us when they want raw material; they keep us in slavery and they are afraid that we go among them and learn the arts and sciences. I could quote a lot of scripture for these things. I feel the necessity for unselfishness especially after the last War and imagine that we are now told that it is not the policy of the British Government to create any colour problem! I submit that a case has been made out against the British Government because we have a redundant population which needs bread and butter and the people who are responsible for helping us are telling us that they do not want us; and they are allowing the people who have been their enemies to come in! That is enough to make people revolt if they have any dignity. I say that with all seriousness because I am interested in this racial question. I believe that one day this now despised race will be an asset to civilisation. (Cheers). We must suffer in order to be cast in the right model so that when the time comes we will be purified and put in line for such a mission. The Israelites journeyed through the wilderness for 40 years and had to pass through certain periods; and this race of mine is suffering so that when the world is to be relieved, my race will relieve it. This is no idle dream; this is going to be a reality and I am reminded of Christ when he was on the Cross of Calvary. This is no small matter; it means a lot to this world and if there is anything to-day which gives me peace of mind it is these passages of Scripture. Even if I should die now this race of mine is going to relieve this world. I can well quote these lines:—

God moves in a mysterious way
His wonders to perform;
He plants His footsteps in the sea,
And rides upon the storm.
Ye fearful saints, fresh courage take,
The clouds ye so much dread
Are big with mercy, and shall break
In blessings on your head.

This is no political speech; this is from the soul and what I have said is going to come about. Let America have her Jim Crow people but when the floodgates should go open nobody will be able to stop this race of mine. Let England say that they do not want to have any colour problem but when the time comes every obstacle shall be removed and we shall go marching on to preach to the world that there is only one God and one creation and we are all creatures of that God and of that creation. (Cheers).

Mr. COX: I would like to say that I am in sympathy with the question which has been raised by the honourable junior member for St. George; it is a question which must be viewed very seriously. It is regrettable that at this stage of our political history, our political development, increased education and intelligence that people like the honourable senior member for St. George would have us believe that it is all well and good for this Government to take up many shiploads of people and carry them to England, Canada or anywhere else and we will be on equal terms with the Europeans. I realize that this type of cheap politics is going too far with the unfortunate people who do not know and who cannot see as well as we would like them to see. I would like to say here and now, whether anybody cares to believe it or not, that I have absolutely no dislike

whatever for any race of people in this world. As a matter of fact, I hate to discuss any colour question and I am sorry that such a question has crept into the debate; but in this colony all barriers imaginable are put in the way of the coloured people. As a matter of fact, I have found from experience that rich people who spend their vacation in this colony have tried to treat their servants better than the local people usually do.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that that question arises; this is a question of people emigrating to England, and the question of the employment of servants in Barbados has nothing to do with it.

Mr. COX: That has some bearing on the question, but if you rule it out of order I shall have to bow to your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: To be frank, this is a very delicate matter; but I do not see how the question of the employment of servants in Barbados has anything to do with the emigration of people to England.

Mr. COX: To reply to the remarks of the honourable senior member for St. George, he would make us believe that it is an easy thing for us to emigrate people to England, Canada or anywhere else and they are glad for us.

Mr. DOWDING: I object to those remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not remember the honourable member saying that. I should be glad if the honourable senior member for St. Michael would speak in such a manner as would bring back the debate where it was originally.

Mr. COX: I was making the point that there is more to this question of emigration than the colour question. It is felt that if the coloured people of the West Indies or anywhere else were to go to England they would lower the status of the Europeans. I know that people who come here and who would like to pay decent wages to their employees have been told not to pay these wages, that they can get employees to work for a few shillings. That lowers the status of employees and makes visitors look upon them more like—

Mr. SPEAKER: Again I do not think that has anything to do with the matter before us.

Mr. COX: If you rule it out of order I will have to bow to your ruling. When speeches are made from the floor of this House to the effect that people can emigrate to England, America or anywhere else, it is not as easy a matter as people would have us believe.

Mr. SPEAKER: It has been pointed out that the matter is not an easy one.

Mr. COX: It is not fair for people like the honourable senior member for St. George to suggest that the white and coloured races had anything in common although they fought together in the War. They lived in different places nevertheless and the only time when they were together was when an air raid took place. They had to get together then in order to save their lives and the honourable member knows that.

Mr. DOWDING: I would like the honourable member to explain what I know.

Mr. COX: The honourable member mentioned something about four people having to sleep under one blanket in Italy when one person had three; but the four people were coloured people.

Mr. DOWDING: I never said that four people slept under one blanket.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the honourable member said that some people had three blankets and others had only one. He did not say whether they were Englishmen or of any other nationality.

Mr. COX: I beg to withdraw those remarks; however, we can read between the lines. Every now

and then from the floor of this House some honourable member makes people believe that the Government is not doing anything in the way of trying to emigrate people. Only a few weeks ago the Government tried to pass an Address relative to an emigration scheme to Surinam and it met with opposition; even up to now that Address has not been passed so that our population could be relieved. I say that it is not fair to come to this House week after week and make people believe that the Government want to keep here those who want to emigrate. It is the big landowners, people like the honourable senior member for St. George, who want to keep the people here so that they can get cheap labour.

Mr. SPEAKER: Again that has nothing to do with the question before the House.

Mr. COX: If people like the honourable senior member for St. George are willing to have people emigrated how much more is the Government willing to bring about an emigration scheme? People should not try out of cheap politics to mislead others in the community that the Government is not working in their interest. Whether I become popular or not I am prepared as long as I have strength to stand on my feet and speak as vehemently as I can against these dishonest moves whenever I see them.

Mr. TALMA: Before the question is put, I should like to say that I am in agreement with the sentiments expressed by speakers previous to the last one in so far as this racial question is concerned. I believe that this vexed question has to be faced at some time or other and the sooner it is faced the better it will be. It would appear as if the policy of the British Government in so far as this racial question is concerned has not yet been changed; let us therefore hope that this debate this afternoon will take some root and that it will be brought to the attention of the British Government that the colonials of 1948 are thoroughly dissatisfied with certain treatment which is being meted out to them by virtue of their skin. We know that the coloured colonials are not welcomed in Canada and other places. I hear honourable members speaking about England not wanting to create a race problem; I think that England has a race problem to-day. By that I mean that when she was almost at the end of her tether she had to look to America for assistance.

Mr. SPEAKER: That has nothing to do with the emigration of Barbadians to England.

Mr. TALMA: There are coloured American soldiers in England and if they employ by way of contract 5,000 West Indians on their housing schemes that will not make the problem much worse than it is at present. To blame this Socialist Labour Government for not seeking emigration for the people is the last thing that any honest-minded member of this Assembly should attempt to do. This Government has sought every possible avenue for obtaining emigration for our people. Cables in this connection are always being sent out and to say that this Government is doing nothing about emigration is entirely unfair and without foundation. I hope that at some future time this matter will be gone into more thoroughly and the public at large will realise that the Government is doing its utmost in order to secure employment in any measure for the people. I beg to move that this debate be now postponed.

Mr. MAPP: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the matter has been debated at length and it would be better to allow the question that the House adjourn for five minutes to be put.

Mr. TALMA: I ask leave to withdraw my motion. There being no objection, the honourable member was granted leave to withdraw his motion.

Mr. LEWIS: This is a very interesting debate but I am going to be in great difficulty in voting. I would like to hear more of the discussion and I would like to take part in it. The debate started on the question of emigration and it reached a stage which I consider deplorable when there was an admission made of colour prejudice against workers from this colony emigrating to certain countries. I am not attaching any blame to anyone because I think the development of the debate necessitated some latitude being allowed. We deplore this matter of colour prejudice and the proper thing for us to do would be to pass a Resolution condemning any such thing. I do not see how any vote which we pass this afternoon would be censuring anybody for having colour prejudice or for not taking steps to find an avenue for emigration. I am making a suggestion which I think will get us out of what I regard as a dilemma. I suggest that we should now adjourn and leave the Order Paper in its present form.

Mr. SPEAKER: A motion was made for the adjournment of the House for five minutes in order to discuss the question of emigration and I agree that the discussion has degenerated and gone in a certain direction. The House can indicate its feeling by voting on the motion for the adjournment and the remainder of the debate would be covered by the particular motion before the House which deals with emigration. The remainder of the debate which I think can be brought up again has nothing to do with the motion before the House. I admit that I have allowed the debate to reach lengths which it should not have reached and I suggest that honourable members should allow the question to be put.

Mr. LEWIS: I agree with you to a great extent but there are other honourable members who would like to take part in the debate. I am asking your assistance in this matter; if I take my seat after appealing to the honourable junior member for St. George to withdraw his motion and the honourable member withdrew the motion would he be able to raise it again?

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion cannot be withdrawn without the permission of the House.

Mr. ADAMS: I suggest that the honourable member withdraw his motion and raise it again whenever he likes to do so. Of course that will mean that every honourable member can speak all over again but I do not suggest that that should be done. I cannot move the adjournment of the House until next Tuesday when there is a motion already before the House for the adjournment for five minutes.

Mr. LEWIS: Inasmuch we propose to meet on Thursday for a particular purpose, let us fix the Order Paper on Thursday for next Tuesday. I feel that the solution to this problem is that we adjourn

until Thursday. I beg to move therefore that the words "five minutes" be deleted in order to insert the words "Thursday next, the 29th instant, at twelve o'clock noon."

Mr. MAPP: I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that the words "Tuesday next the 3rd of February, 1948" be inserted in place of the words "five minutes." I have several important engagements for this week and I shall not be able to come here on Thursday.

Mr. GARNER: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable member cannot second that motion.

Dr. WILSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: A motion has been made that this House do now adjourn for five minutes. An amendment has been moved that the words "five minutes" be deleted and the words "Thursday next the 29th instant at twelve o'clock noon" be inserted. A further amendment has been moved that the words "Tuesday next the 3rd of February, 1948" be inserted in place of the words "five minutes." 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 question now is that the words "Thursday next the 29th instant, at twelve o'clock noon" be inserted in the blank created by the deletion of the words "five minutes." 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. F. L. WALCOTT, COX, LEWIS, MAPP, TALMA, ADAMS, and BLACKMAN—7.

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

The question that the words "Tuesday next the 3rd of February 1948" be inserted in the blank created was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question now is that this House do now adjourn to Tuesday next—

Mr. ADAMS rose to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that I cannot hear the honourable member; the question is being put.

Mr. ADAMS: I am just saying that I propose to deal with the Resolutions passed at the Montego Bay Conference and nothing else on that day.

The question that this House do now adjourn to Tuesday next, the 3rd of February, 1948, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.