

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1947—48

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 20th July, 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. L. E. SMITH, (*Chairman of Committees*), Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Messrs. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, F. L. WALCOTT, M. E. COX, D. A. FOSTER, R. G. MAPP, C. E. TALMA, H. D. BLACKMAN, J. A. HAYNES, B.A., H. A. DOWDING, V. C. GALE, and E. L. WARD.

Prayers are read.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT enters the House and takes his seat.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meetings which were held on the 6th, 8th, and 13th, July, 1948, respectively have been circulated. There is a correction to be made, inasmuch as a question has been tabled in the name of Dr. Wilson instead of that of Mr. Brancker. Subject to that correction and if there be no objections, the Minutes of those three meetings will be taken as read and confirmed. (*After a pause*). There being no objections, the Minutes of those three meetings are taken as read and confirmed.

NOTICE

A Government Notice is given as follows:—

Mr. BLACKMAN: Resolution to authorize the Governor-in-Executive Committee to enter into an agreement for the lease of the Kingsland Factory building for a period of five years at the rate of £1,200 a year.

Dr. CUMMINS: Of my intention to ask leave to move the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 later in the day to deal with the Resolution of which notice has just been given.

QUESTIONS

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

1. Whether dissatisfaction exists among watchmen employed by the Department of Highways and Transport in respect of their hours of employment.

2. If the answer is "yes", will Government ascertain the weekly number of such hours, with a view to a reduction thereof to forty hours per week without any corresponding reduction of wages?

Mr. WILKINSON enters the House and takes his seat.

SUSPENSION OF RULES 88 AND 89

Dr. CUMMINS: I ask leave, Mr. Speaker, to move the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 in order to deal with the Resolution of which notice was given earlier to-day.

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

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Rules 88 and 89 be now suspended.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

The question that Rules 88 and 89 be now suspended is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

LEASE OF KINGSLAND FACTORY BUILDING.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg, Sir, to move that the Resolution to authorize the Governor-in-Executive Committee to enter into an agreement for the lease of the Kingsland Factory Building for a period of five years at the rate of £1,200 a year be the first Order of the Day.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

The question that this Resolution be the first Order of the day is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. MOTTLEY and Dr. WILSON enter the House and take their seats.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker,—This building is required to meet the demand for additional accommodation for the storage of rum. The rum trade has increased very considerably during the past few months and more accommodation is required for the storage of rum. It is estimated that between 5,000 and 5,150 casks of 64 liquid gallons each can be stored in this building and the estimated revenue derivable will be between £1,500 and £1,545 a year. The expenses for watching the building and conveying the Revenue

Officer to and from it will be paid by the lessee. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second the motion for the passing of this Resolution. I should like to say, for the benefit of honourable members, that an assurance has been given this Government by the British Government that there will be a great demand for rum for a further period of five years at least and by virtue of the fact that no loss whatever will be sustained—a profit will be made in every case—and by virtue also of the fact that the basic industry of this island is sugar and its by-products, molasses and rum, it stands to reason that if this island can produce rum on a sufficiently large scale, its economy will be improved considerably and as the result, not only will the Barbados Treasury benefit by way of Excise duty and things of that nature but also the community as a whole. Some persons may be heard saying—although I can hardly believe it would be said at this stage—that the Government should not provide storage space for this additional quantity of rum but no money will be lost and a profit will be effected; so argument along that line, if adduced, cannot be convincing. The reason why this separate Resolution has been sent to this House in respect of Kingsland Factory building is that it has been discovered that the Governor-in-Executive Committee has no power under the law as it stands at present to negotiate for the lease of the building. Your Honour will appreciate that fact—I do not know whether I should say this—but Your Honour has been the person who had to guide us in this matter from the legal point of view by virtue of your position as King's Solicitor. Your Honour is thoroughly conversant with what I am saying and can better explain the matter than I can. The object of this separate Resolution is to give the Executive Committee this necessary legal right which at present does not exist and it must be done in a legally constitutional manner. Now, as far as the money is concerned, some would be heard to say that £3,000 was voted not long ago for the purpose of renting warehouses but the spending of that £3,000 has not been restricted to one class and I am happy to say that Kingsland Factory building will be utilized by small dealers as well as big dealers. There will be no grouse and no preference granted as may have obtained in the past. I am happy to second the motion for the passing of this Resolution.

Mr. WILKINSON: I am going to support this Resolution provided that I am assured on one point.

Mr. SPEAKER: At first sight, this Resolution will appear to be an abstract Resolution, but it goes on to state that this building is to be leased for a period of five years at the rate of £1,200 a year, which is tantamount to asking this House to agree to a vote of £1,200 a year. In the circumstances, therefore, I think the House should go into Committee of Supply on the Resolution and I suggest to the honourable senior member for St. Thomas to make a motion to that effect.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

The question that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

LEASE OF KINGSLAND FACTORY BUILDING

Mr. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that the following Resolution do now pass:—

Resolved that the House of Assembly authorize the Governor-in-Executive Committee to enter into an agreement for the lease of the Kingsland Factory building for a period of five years with effect from the first day of August, 1948, at the rate of £1,200 a year.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that. Before we proceed further I should like to say that the word "lessor" appears in the second paragraph of the addendum. It should be "lessee."

Mr. WARD: I am very much in favour of the last Resolution which we passed but, Sir, there has been a great deal of trouble before this Resolution reached this House. Sir, it would appear, from the information which has been given by the Government to-day, that this will be a paying proposition but I hold a contrary view. This Resolution seeks to pay £1,200 a year to the individual to whom the building belongs and then the Government has to pay the expenses of the officer travelling to and from that building as well as the wages of the watchmen who will be watching it. Now, Sir, in respect of the last Resolution, those warehouses were rented by private individuals; this building is about to be rented by the Government and that means that any individual can send rum to be stored in it, whether it be one cask or 1,000 casks. The reason why I feel that £1,200 a year is too much to pay for the lease of this building is this: It must be filled to capacity to be able to produce £1,545 per annum and if we must pay £1,200 right away every year, plus officers' travelling expenses and the watchman's wages, it can be plainly seen that the Government will be coming off to nothing at all. Formerly, the Government was approached to buy the building. It is a known fact that a certain figure was mentioned and afterwards, it was recommended to the Government to lease that building for a much less sum than £1,200 a year for a three-year period, not even for five years. Now, the period of the proposed lease has been increased to five years and the money has been increased by £200. Sir, I do not want to throw cold water on this project because I feel that it is essential to have storage space but I do not like the idea of the Government embarking on a project on which it will definitely be losing money. I feel that £1,000 would be a reasonable amount to pay for the lease of a building of that type, after hearing the figure that was asked for it and it must be borne in mind that it is not being leased for one year but for five years with a guarantee from the Government. I feel that we should reduce this amount by £200. £1,200 is, in my opinion, a little too exorbitant. The individuals who are going to store rum in this bond are not going to lose anything at all. I am looking at the matter from the point of view of the Government. It is true that the Government will profit from the transaction in the future but we do not want to have rum stored now at the expense of the Government. The Government will be paying £1,200 per year right away, plus travelling expenses of its officer and watchman's wages and in order to get the maximum revenue of £1,545 per annum, the building must be filled to capacity. Another thing to be borne in mind is this: In filling this building to its capacity, the Authorities should not allow one or two individuals to utilize all the space and not leave any available space for small dealers in rum; that is a phase

of the matter which must not be lost sight of. There may be some firms who would try to utilize all the space because they have the rum and if that is allowed, then our effort to provide storage space for small dealers in rum will be negated. As I said before, I feel that £1,200 is too great an amount to pay for the lease of this building on a five-year basis and I beg to move the deletion of the words "two hundred" in the Resolution.

Mr. COX: I feel that the whole question of renting is one which should engage the attention of the Government and that is why I am not enamoured with the policy adopted of renting these various warehouses from individuals. As you will remember, Sir, it has been explained to us that an individual has only to go and look for a building and whatever the owner of that building or the individual who is renting it asks, the Government decides to give because the Government realizes that it is covered by the payment of rent for storing rum in that building. But very often you may find that some of these buildings are rented at a figure much in excess of what they are really worth and that is why I feel the time has come when the Government should see to it that we have a system of Rent Control whereby buildings can be valued and a stipulated price placed on them in order that people on the whole, whether it is for the purpose of business or dwelling, may know exactly what they should pay, and what the buildings are really worth. Like the senior member for St. Lucy I do not feel that this building is worth a rental of £1,200 a year, when we take into consideration the fact that the Government is actually guaranteeing the people from whom it will be renting it a five-year lease. As a matter of fact, Sir, I do not believe that an old condemned factory building like that is really worth £1,000, let alone £1,200 a year. There is justification for that statement because it is being said that the factory could not pay its way and, therefore, the owners had to scrap it, so to speak. That, in itself, is proof that the machinery was not producing the income which the owners felt it should produce and they, therefore, decided to scrap it. Now we are asked to pass a Resolution for the lease of that building at the rate of £1,200 a year—\$480 a month! I am supporting the Resolution because I have already agreed to the rental of warehouses for this purpose but I do feel that the Government must change its policy in respect of the rental of these buildings. By that I mean this: Where an individual has a place to rent, whether it be for the storage of rum or for private purposes, the Government should be in a position to say "this building is worth so much and you should not charge more." When an individual can make an arrangement for the rental of a building at £1,000 a year when it is worth only £500 a year, that building, in my opinion, is nothing but a gold mine for the owner.

Mr. WILKINSON: As I was saying, I intend to vote for this Resolution because I am sure that this building is going to be a government bond. It has always been my contention that the way we have been, in the past, renting buildings for the purpose of storing rum has created more or less a monopoly for a long time because despite what the senior member for St. Joseph said on the last occasion when we were dealing with that Resolution for the rent of warehouses, namely, that the Government could order that anybody who has rum to be stored can store it in buildings which it rents from private individuals, I know that, in practice, that is not done. Only the private individual who rents a building and turns it over to the Government stores

his rum in that building; nobody else is allowed to do so. That is what happens in practice. Now the senior member for St. Thomas assures us that this is a government bond in which anybody will have the right to store his casks of rum. I think that is a much needed reform in this island and that is the main reason why I intend to support this Resolution. It is not exactly a money Resolution because the money has already been voted. This Resolution really seeks to give the Governor-in-Executive Committee permission to enter into an agreement for the lease of this building for 5 years. I am strictly not in favour of the suggestion to buy or build a building for the storage of rum because we have been warned by the senior member for St. Lucy that the boom in the rum trade to-day is due to a black market. Black markets go and do come to an end very suddenly and I think the Government would be unwise to spend a large sum of money in purchasing or building a building in the hope that the rum trade will continue as it is to-day. I think the Government has acted very wisely in leasing this building though I am not very sure that it is a wise arrangement to lease it for 5 years. I hope the Government is right. In the past, there has been the outcry that the Government has not provided sufficient facilities for storing rum and that as a result opportunities to make a lot of money are lost. Although the honourable member on my left does not consider that the Government will do more than pay expenses from the revenue obtained from the storage of rum in this building yet we all know that rum pays in many ways. When it is bonded, the Government collects the rent for storage; when it is being manufactured the money is distributed in many parts of the island and I, Sir, have much pleasure in supporting this Resolution. As I have said, its object is to enable the Government to enter into a lease with the owner of Kingsland for the building and, as the senior member for St. Thomas has explained, the word "lessor" in the addendum is a misprint; it should be "lessee." This is going to be a bond in which everybody can store rum and, naturally, the Government should pay the expenses. In this case, the small dealer will be able to store his small quantity of rum; he will have just as much or more right to do so than the big dealer because the big dealer has his own warehouse in which to store his rum.

Mr. GALE: I am in favour of this Resolution. The Government is not going to buy the building, but would be renting it and as the junior member for St. James has said, the rum trade might collapse and in that case, we would not have any white elephant in the form of a warehouse. The senior member for St. Lucy questions the amount of the rent but when we come to think of it, this building is eminently suited for the purpose. There are not many buildings of this size that the Government or anybody else would be able to rent to store rum and as far as the remark of the senior member for St. Michael about the factory having been closed down because of the inefficiency of the machinery is concerned, that has nothing at all to do with the suitability of this building for the storage of rum. The machinery has been inefficient but there can be no question as to the suitability of the building for the storage of rum. I do not think that the Government would be able to find a building of this size in Bridgetown to store rum and, further, I understand that the owner of that building has spent a considerable sum of money to put it into condition for the storage of rum. There is no doubt about it that the Government would find it very difficult to get as suitable a building in the City of

Bridgetown to rent for the storage of rum as this is and it is for that reason principally that I intend to support this Resolution.

MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman,—As you know, this is the second Resolution of this sort that we have had before us for the renting of rum bonds within the last two weeks. Now, Sir, I have already stated, in connection with the previous Resolution, that I am thoroughly against this system of renting warehouses. Unlike the junior member for St. James and the junior member for St. Michael I cannot see where the Government would be buying or building what they term a white elephant if it purchased or built its own warehouse,—a building suitable for this purpose. If this excess supply of rum diminishes in later years, we would still have to store rum. We have to remember that the Rum Industry is not going to die, even if the supply diminishes, and for all these years, as I have already said, we have had a serious blot on Bridgetown—a veritable atomic bomb in the form of a rum bond in the middle of Broad Street, so to speak. We have had the writing on the wall in respect of that rum bond in the City and yet the Government has not formulated any policy but is prepared to rent any old building that is offered to it for this purpose. As long as we support the Government in a manner like this, we will always have trouble and we will always be having Resolutions of this nature before us. This building at Kingsland is to my mind very suitable as a rum bond. It is away from everything and if fire should take place, only the rum and the building would be lost. I think I mentioned on the last occasion the example of Mount Gay distillery having gone up in smoke and nobody nor anything was destroyed—not even the manager's house—but the rum and the building in which it was distilled; therefore, we know what to expect if we have a building in an isolated place as a permanent rum bond. We are prepared by this Resolution, if we pass it, to give the owner of Kingsland the handsome sum of £6,000 in five years, money that should be going into the Treasury from the storage of rum in a building built for the purpose and which could go towards payment for the building. We have to face the fact that after five years, the owner of Kingsland will have been paid all this money and he will still have the building. If we force the Government's hands to buy this building we should have a place of our own as a permanent rum bond in the future. I personally feel very strongly on this matter and I hope honourable members will look at it impartially and deal with it in the manner in which it should be dealt with; otherwise we would be offered every two weeks an old building to rent for this purpose. I only wish I had one because it seems as if they are very profitable. I am going to make a proposition that this Resolution be postponed. It is a very strange thing that there is such a tremendous rush for it. We rented several buildings a few weeks ago for the storage of rum and all of them could not be filled already; it is obvious that there is no shortage of storage space at the present moment and we should not allow ourselves to be railroaded with these Resolutions. I received my copy of this Resolution only last night, which is absolutely absurd and it is done only to hoodwink us and not to give us sufficient time to consider the matter. I am counselling honourable members to agree with me to postpone this Resolution with the view of letting the Government understand that we are not in agreement with its policy of renting warehouses and that it should make proper arrangements in

the near future. I beg to move that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed.

MR. WILKINSON: I should just like to tell the honourable member that we are hoping to have, at the end of the next five years, a fairly good harbour. That will mean that many acres of land would be reclaimed as a result and that land would be a suitable site for a rum bond.

MR. WARD: I want to make it clear that I am not against the principle of this Resolution at all. What I feel is that the rent of this building is too high. As I said before, it was mooted a short while ago that this building could be rented for £1,000 a year on a three-year lease. I feel that it is only because the Government is in a corner that the owners of the building are trying to pull all they can out of the Government. As I have said before, it will not be a paying proposition unless the building is filled to capacity. When it is filled to capacity, the maximum amount of revenue that will be derived is £1,545 a year and when the Government will have paid £1,200 a year for rent, plus the travelling expenses of its officer and the wages if the watchmen, it can be readily seen that the Government will make practically nothing out of the transaction.

MESSRS. ADAMS and CRAWFORD enter the House and take their seats.

DR. CUMMINS: I just want to correct an error made by the senior member for St. Lucy. From the time this building was offered to the Government, it was always the understanding that the lease would be on a five-year basis. It is true that £1,000 a year was first asked for but, as he suggested, there was a lot of dilly-dallying and the Government being in a tight corner, the amount was advanced. The junior member for St. James gave the answer as regards the expenses being paid by the lessee and I want to make it abundantly clear that this building will be at the disposal of all exporters of rum, especially the small exporters. As regards the remarks of the senior member for St. Andrew are concerned I wonder if he was present in the House when, by a majority vote, it approved of the Government's policy of renting and not purchasing nor building warehouses!

MR. ADAMS: There is a further point which the senior member for St. Thomas has not made and I would like to mention it because it may appear to members that this is merely an attempt to get the Government in a corner and squeeze it. There has been some misunderstanding, apparently, on both sides as regards what was to happen when this offer was first made. The owner who asked for £1,000 was told that that was too much and the Government made a counter offer which was much less. He stuck out for £1,000 and it was considered advisable to get this building if we could. Negotiations went on on that footing and in the meantime the owner made certain structural alterations, such as the putting in of racks, at a considerable cost. Then he offered to sell the building to other people but eventually agreed to lease it to the Government at this increased figure of £1,200. Everybody who has a pint or a small cask of rum to store can store it in this building at Kingsland. Nobody has any moral claim to it and any human being, I repeat, who has rum to store can get permission to store it in this building. In the circumstances, we ought to be congratulated on getting over that difficulty which some people seem honestly to believe, that is, that only the big man can get accommodation for the storage of rum because he is able to rent warehouses and turn them over to the Government. Anybody who goes to Kingsland will be served; whoever goes first will be served first.

Mr. GARNER enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. DOWDING: I am not fully satisfied, although I have listened carefully to this debate, with this arrangement. As far as I am concerned I believe that the Government is being driven into the bargain and I am in full agreement with the senior member for St. Lucy that the amount here stated is too much. This rum trade, Sir, is liable to decrease gradually within the next two years—in fact, buyers of rum are already lowering their prices—and I fail to see why we should spend £1,200 per year for five years for the lease of this building. Why not let us make it three years at the most, at the rate of £1,000 a year? Mr. Chairman, I do not know what those notorious arrangements referred to are but I really and honestly cannot see that the Government has to be satisfied to accept this, regardless of anything and I am going to second the motion of the senior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. ADAMS: Do honourable members believe that if we reduce this amount by £200, the owner would accept £1,000? After the admirable speech of the senior member for St. Lucy on a previous occasion I would not have thought that he would drop to this low level. We will not be losing anything by this transaction and the rum dealers would be only too glad for the space to store their rum. We will be paying £1,200 a year and receiving £1,545. Why grumble about it?

Mr. WARD: It is stated that the building must be filled to capacity in order to be able to collect £1,545 a year while you will be spending £1,200 a year and have to pay the travelling expenses of the officer and the watchman's wages. It is really not an economic proposition. Whoever made the arrangement was apparently trying to help the Government but I simply feel that it is bad business. The Government is bound to lose money on this building; it is paying too high a rental for it; there is no getting away from that. While I should like to see justice done to the dealers in rum I do not want to see the Government embark on a scheme to lose money. The Government knows very well that it collects 6/- on every cask containing 64 gallons of rum that is stored and the building can hold only a certain number of casks.

Mr. TALMA: I rise simply to comment on a remark by the last Speaker about justice being done. This is one of the few instances in which justice is being meted because the object of securing Kingsland Factory building is to provide space in which the small dealers in rum, not dealers in the capacity of the honourable member who has just sat down, can store their rum. It is not a case of a building being rented by, say, Musson & Co. Ltd. and they alone being able to store rum in it. I want to make that point clear. The small man cannot find the necessary storage for his rum and this Labour Government, in order to be fair and right and reasonable and to see that justice is really meted, has got hold of this building at Kingsland and whosoever is willing, whether he be a big or a small dealer, can store his rum there. There would be injustice if that is not done.

Mr. SYMMONDS enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir.—The last speaker said that the small man cannot find accommodation for the storage of his rum and the Labour Government, in order to be fair and right, has got hold of Kingsland Factory building for the small man. Well, just a few weeks ago when we passed the Resolution for £3,000 to provide accommodation for the storage of rum, we were told by members of the Executive Committee that the places we were going to rent with that money would be available

to both big and small dealers. To-day, they are twisting their tongues in their cheeks and saying that the small man cannot find accommodation and, therefore, the Government has to go and get hold of Kingsland Factory building to provide that accommodation. Well, we know that that is not the case. We were told that all the old boiling houses and cowpens were not rented only for the bigger rum dealers: (Voices: When?) The senior member for St. Joseph rose to his feet and declared in the most emphatic terms that the Government would not discriminate in making accommodation available to any dealer in rum—

Mr. ADAMS: I would like to know when I said that. I could not have said that because the Government was under a moral obligation to give priority to a person who secured a building that was approved by the Comptroller of Customs and the Commissioner of Police. Negotiations were going on with the owner of Kingsland and they ended up in this arrangement with the understanding that the Government would not be bound to any previous decision to allow the owner of a building to have priority in the storage of rum in that building.

Mr. CRAWFORD: How could any previous decision bind the present Government, in as far as Kingsland is concerned? The honourable member must be thinking that he is talking to children. If 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 years ago, the Executive Committee decided that it was bound to pursue a certain line of action with any place it rented, does it necessarily follow that the Executive Committee in 1948 is bound by the same decision? When the senior member for St. Joseph and the junior member for St. James got on the Executive Committee and, like bad brothers, made that decision, there was no question of renting Kingsland factory building. Kingsland was then a sugar factory and there was no question of binding the Government to its decision, as far as Kingsland is concerned. The senior member for Christ Church said just now that the small man cannot find accommodation—

Mr. TALMA: I emphasized the point that this accommodation is being provided for the storage of rum by dealers whether they be big or small. It is only in reply to the senior member for St. Lucy that I may have stressed the point about justice. The senior member for St. Philip can hold on to what he likes.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am holding on to what the honourable member said. The senior member for Christ Church said that the small man cannot find accommodation and this Labour Government, in order to be fair and right, got hold of Kingsland—those were his exact words—in order to provide accommodation for the small man. I am saying that a few weeks ago we were told by the Government, when we voted the £3,000 to rent warehouses, that any dealer in rum, big or small, could get accommodation at places, such as Bush Hall, which the Government is now renting.

Mr. ADAMS: That is so reckless a misstatement that it can be characterized only by an unparliamentary expression. I said that the Government was under a moral obligation to give priority to persons who went around and secured suitable places as warehouses and anybody who has any appreciation for morals would see the Government's position. A man has rum to store; the Government cannot give him storage accommodation. He hun's around, finds a place to store his rum and comes to the Government and asks "Would you approve of this place for storing rum?" The Government approves of it and only a person without a conscience

or any appreciation of morals would feel that the Government is not under an obligation to help that man who has secured a warehouse and has rum to be stored. Since that policy has been adopted, small dealers come to me and ask "What are you fellows on the Executive Committee doing? These big fellows can find room to store their rum, why can't you find room for us?" Because that situation has arisen, because these small dealers cannot get room to store their rum, the Government has decided in this case that if it arrives at a decision to rent Kingsland at all, it is going to arrive at that decision by bargaining with the owner to allow anybody to store rum in that building; that is all that has happened.

Mr. CRAWFORD: And, naturally, the warehouses for which we voted £3,000 a few weeks ago would be for the big rum dealers only. If you compare what we hear to-day with what was said a few weeks ago you will find that they are distinctly opposite statements. As a matter of fact, the senior member for St. Joseph actually gave the House the impression that Kingsland would be included in the Resolution for £3,000. When that Resolution was before the House the junior member for St. James, I think, got up and asked "What about Kingsland?" and the senior member for St. Joseph replied that they had all these places under consideration, including Kingsland, and that they would act to suit. Now in spite of the fact that we voted £3,000, they come back to-day for a further £1,200 especially for Kingsland. After all, Sir, we all know that the Government found itself in a corner, so far as Kingsland is concerned. Legally they found themselves bound to rent or lease Kingsland but they also found themselves bound to help their friends too; so they went along and helped their friends first — we gave them £3,000 to do so — and now they come back for £1,200 to discharge their legal obligation to the owners of Kingsland. The House was distinctly given the impression, on the one hand, that Kingsland was being considered in connection with the £3,000 and, on the other hand, that both big and small rum dealers could find accommodation in the warehouses to be rented for £3,000. I think, Sir, that this is a most scandalous state of affairs and if honourable members would try to remember what the House was told on the last occasion, they certainly could not find themselves voting this sum of money to-day. I know, Sir, that at the rate at which we are going — as I hinted on the last occasion — we will soon find ourselves spending in two or three years on the rental of disused factory buildings, disused boiling houses and cowpens more than will build a new warehouse which, if in 10 or 15 years from now it was not wanted for the storage of rum, could be used for storing other things. We voted £2,000 in March; a few weeks ago we voted £3,000 and now to-day we are voting £1,200 — £6,200, so far, for the rent of warehouses. Next week or next month the Government sits down and makes some decision without knowing what it is doing and we will be asked to vote a further £2,000 for this purpose. Within a week after, somebody on the Executive Committee or some friend of somebody on the Executive Committee will offer a boiling-house to rent and we rent that too. We go on month after month spending thousands of pounds, putting money back into the hands of people who, we are told, are making all this money and in the end we have no accommodation of our own. It is nothing short of a scandal, Sir. We are going to get the facts though: either we are going to get them or the Government is going to refuse to answer questions. This week we are told one thing by the Government; next week we are told something different and we sit

here foolishly and agree to it. Why? Now the final declaration is going to be that in 1948 the Executive Committee finds itself bound by something that happened 4 or 5 years ago when, in so far as we have heard, it was only this year that negotiations with the owners of Kingsland came into the picture at all. Only this year! If the Executive Committee decided in 1928 that the franchise should be £50 a year, in 1948 we should say that it must be £50 a year and that it should not be lowered. If the Executive Committee decided in 1942 that only a certain type of dealer should have accommodation for the storage of rum because he happened to be getting certain prices, it certainly does not follow that the Executive Committee in 1948 must adhere to that decision; it does not follow at all. The £3,000 we voted two weeks ago could not be expended already on the few buildings which were mentioned by the honourable member in charge of that Resolution and, therefore, we are justified in believing that under consideration was the possibility of including Kingsland in that £3,000. Well now, if Kingsland is not included in that £3,000, if we are to vote money especially for Kingsland, it means that some other cowpens, some other boiling-houses are going to be acquired and some other friends are going to be helped with that £3,000 and it does appear to me, Sir, that we should be completely irresponsible if we sit down to-day, after having voted £5,000 already this year, and vote an additional £1,200 for this purpose.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I do not think the last honourable member who has spoken understands this Resolution. This Resolution seeks to give the Governor-in-Executive Committee permission to enter into an agreement for the lease of Kingsland factory building. This is not a Resolution asking us to vote £1,200 to-day and I think I am right in making that statement. We voted £3,000 two weeks ago but, as has been explained by the senior member for Christ Church, through some legal technicality the Government cannot enter into an agreement for the lease of this building and it has approached this House, by means of this Resolution to obtain permission to enter into this lease for a period of five years at the rate of £1,200 a year. I think that that is all this Resolution asks for. If some honourable members think that £1,200 a year is too much to pay for the lease of the building, then that is an entirely different question.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Just on a point of explanation. Is the honourable member really suggesting that we are not voting £1,200 to-day?

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: Certainly not. We voted this money two weeks ago. We are only being asked to-day to give the Governor-in-Executive Committee authority to lease this building; that is all we are doing to-day (Hear, hear) and I do not think that £1,200 is too high. I know from experience that the Comptroller of Customs goes in and tells the owner what is to be done and it costs a lot of money to do it. As I understand, the owners of Kingsland have spent a considerable sum of money to meet the requirements for the use of this building as a rum bond and do honourable members think that they would rent it for less than what is stated in the Resolution? We must exercise our common-sense in these matters. I do not generally compliment the Government but I think it should be congratulated to-day upon finding a storehouse in which to store anybody's rum. All the others it has been renting, so far, are privately owned and if the Government misses this chance, I am certain that some private individual will step in and rent the building at per-

haps a higher price. I intend to vote for this Resolution.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is—

Mr. CRAWFORD: Wait a bit, Mr. Chairman. I want a statement from the honourable member in charge of this Resolution—if he understands what he is doing—to the effect that this Resolution, despite the fact that it is worded as it is, is not to provide £1,200 but is only to authorize the Governor-in-Executive Committee to enter into an agreement for the lease of this building. I have never seen it done this way before and I want to find out if that is the case.

Voices: Question.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is wrong. I for one am going to vote for the Resolution without any amendment but surely if the senior member for St. James made a statement with which the senior member for St. Philip is not fully acquainted, it is only right that the honourable member in charge of this Resolution should explain it fully for his benefit. The question will not be put until the explanation has been given, if I have to go on speaking until two o'clock. I appeal to the members of the Government to see the decency in putting the matter in this way. Certain honourable members need not shout "Question." It is indecent to do so. It will be remembered that His Honour the Speaker ruled that this was also a money Resolution and that it should be considered in Committee of Supply.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I was in the House when the Speaker made his ruling but I would like to say that if there is a measure of indecency on the part of certain honourable members, I have sat here to-day and listened to a lot of indecent remarks, dishonest remarks, imputing dishonest motives on the part of honest people without the latter blushing or defending themselves. I should also like to say, Mr. Chairman, that I heard on the floor of this House—I do not know if it escaped your hearing—not only an indecent remark but and unparliamentary remark accusing the introducer of this Resolution of not knowing what he is introducing. When this Resolution was introduced, if the senior member for the City was paying attention, he should remember that it is a Resolution that was going to be passed in the House but it is because an amount of money is mentioned in the Resolution that the Speaker ruled that it should be dealt with in Committee of Supply. It is not a money Resolution as such. If it was not a question of entering into an agreement with the owners of Kingsland for the lease of this building, this Resolution would not have been sent to this House because the money has been already voted. Whether it is a cowpen or a boiling-house it would have been rented but in this case, the Government had to come back to the House because the law of the land does not permit it to enter into a lease. There are some people who are fundamentally dishonest and, therefore, it would be an impossibility for them to put a proper construction upon anything that an honest person does.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman,—I think the question which the senior member for St. Philip would like to be answered can best be answered by doing what I have already done, that is, to read the Resolution. I will read it again: "*Resolved* that the House of Assembly authorize the Governor-in-Executive Committee to enter into an agreement for the lease of the Kingsland Factory building for a period of five years with effect from the first day of August, 1948, at the rate of one thousand two hundred pounds a year." I thought that after the senior member for St. James pointed out that the senior member for St. Philip did not quite follow what we were talking

about,, he would have read the Resolution for himself without my having to read it again.

Voices: Question.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is that the words proposed to be deleted—

Mr. CRAWFORD: The junior member for St. John should have gone on to read the remainder of the Resolution as follows:—"and that the Legislative Council be invited to concur herein and, if concurred in,

"*Resolved* that His Excellency the Governor be asked to assent and take the necessary steps to give effect to this resolution." Now, Sir, I want to read also a Resolution in the name of the same honourable member with which we are going to deal later in the day for a certain sum of money. "*Resolved* that the sum of £378. 15. 8 be granted from the Public Treasury—

The CHAIRMAN: Is that a Resolution you are reading now?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: The same Resolution about Kingsland Factory building?

Mr. CRAWFORD: From what I said it is obvious that it is not.

THE CHAIRMAN: If it is nothing to do with the Kingsland Resolution I will not entertain it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I want to point out that there is very little difference, if any, in the wording of this Resolution and a money Resolution and, therefore, honourable members who say that they regard it as a money Resolution are justified in saying so.

The question that the words proposed to be deleted from the Resolution stand part of it is put and resolved in the affirmative, the division being as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. WILSON, Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. SYMONDS, HUSBANDS, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, TALMA, F. L. WALCOTT, BLACKMAN, MOTTLEY, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, and WILKINSON—14.

Noes: Messrs. BRANCKER, CRAWFORD, GARNER, HAYNES, DOWDING, and WARD—6.

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

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. TALMA, the CHAIRMAN reports the passing of this Resolution in Committee of Supply.

The House resumes and on the motions of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. TALMA in each case, the Resolution is read a first and a second time and is agreed to.

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. SMITH being in the Chair.

GRANT TO THE LEGAL PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE LATE ST. CLAIR GRANT.

Dr. CUMMINS: I propose that Resolution No. 2 be taken as the first Resolution in Committee of Supply.

There being no objection, Resolution No. 2 is taken first.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Resolution No. 2 is for the sum of £76. 5. 4. to be granted to the legal personal representative of the late St. Clair Grant, formerly an employee of the Department of Highways and

Transport, in consideration of his 19 years' service in that Department. St. Clair Grant was an employee of the Department of Highways and Transport. He died on the 17th April, 1948, while still in the employ of that Department. Under the provision of the Public Employees Act, 1937, his estate is not eligible for a gratuity but it is customary in such cases to grant the estate a gratuity of the equivalent of one year's pensionable emoluments and this Resolution is to provide that gratuity. I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

PURCHASE OF LAUNCHES FOR HARBOUR POLICE

Dr. CUMMINS: The next Resolution is for £5,922 to meet the cost of two motor launches, including essential spares, freight, insurance, Crown Agents' charges, etc. and to provide for running expenses to the end of the current financial year. Honourable members will recollect that this is in consonance with the recommendation of Superintendent Calver in his report. By means of these launches the Harbour Police will be able more effectively to carry out their duties. The information is set out in the addendum to the Resolution and I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman,—I have no objection, of course, to the replacing of these boats by motor launches but in considering this Resolution one does not overlook the addendum and I must say that paragraph 4 causes me some anxiety and disquiet. It states:—“By the introduction of these launches the establishment of the Harbour Police will it is hoped be reduced from forty four members to thirty-four and an annual saving of £1,830 per annum effected.” I consider that paragraph in the light of certain of the least acceptable of the recommendations of Superintendent Calver in his Report in which, you may recall, he proposed that the strength of the Police Force be reduced, as he felt that we had more policemen per head of the population than most other places in the Empire. Now, although it may be argued that if we reduce the number of these Harbour policemen to 34 the others may be transferred to the Land Police yet I want it to be understood that this must not be regarded as the insertion of the thin edge of the wedge to reduce the personnel of the whole Force. There is no getting away from it that if you reduce the number there will be less spare time for the men and less time for them to have reasonable off-duty periods. If you have ten Harbour policemen less — and these ten may or may not be transferred to the Land Police—do not let the Government get the idea into its head of coming with an appeal to amend the Police Act so that the strength of the Force will be reduced. Even apart from the general grounds of employment we would not be justified in throwing ten or any number—even one—out of work, however admirable the recommendation of Supt. Calver may be. Although this Resolution does not propose that it should be done, I want to sound the note of warning. Do not let the Government come to us and tell us “We have ten men to be transferred from the Harbour Police to the Land Police, but the Land Police is already well served. We want the personnel reduced”. When men resign or retire is sufficient time to consider whether their places should or should not be filled. As far as I am concerned the full strength of the Police Force is required by the existing law and it must be kept up to standard. We can-

not afford to increase the number of unemployed people in this island. There is plenty work for policemen to do and their duties should be so arranged that they will have a reasonable amount of spare time.

Dr. CUMMINS: I only wish to explain to the honourable member that the Government does not propose to dismiss any of these Harbour Policemen when we get these launches. The alternative mentioned by the honourable member is the one which the Government proposes to adopt in case any of the men resign or retire.

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

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. TALMA, the CHAIRMAN reports the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply and asks leave to sit again.

The House resumes and on the the motions of Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN in each case, the two Resolutions which were passed in Committee of Supply are read a first and a second time and are agreed to.

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

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (a)

On re-assembling,

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to move the suspension of Rule 61 (a) in order to resume Government Business. There are two Resolutions with which I would like to deal, namely, the Resolution relative to the payment of a living-out allowance to nurses at the General Hospital and the Resolution providing funds to enable the Education Board to continue the supply of milk and biscuits to elementary school children during the vacation period.

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

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Rule 61 (a) be now suspended.

Mr. BLACKMAN seconded the motion which was agreed to.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

The next Order of the Day was called:—To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Government.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY VOTE *re* NUTRITION FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHILDREN

Dr. CUMMINS: I ask leave to deal firstly with Resolution No. 4.

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

Dr. CUMMINS: This Resolution is one for £2,600 to supplement the provision in the Estimates for the year 1948—49 under Head XX, Education, i. Elementary, Item 23, Nutrition for Elementary School children. The object of the Resolution is to enable the supply of milk and biscuits to elementary school children to be continued during the long vacation period as well as the period of the Christmas vacation. It has been thought necessary to do this because of the short supply of food generally and especially of local provisions. The scheme has been gone into by the Director of Education and the school teachers and it is expected that in some parishes as

high as 87% of the school children will go to the schools for their milk and biscuits. It has also been suggested that the children need not go to the schools which they usually attend; some of them travel a mile or a mile and a half to their schools, but if there are schools which are nearer to them they can go to these schools for their milk and biscuits. I think that this Resolution will meet with the approval of all hon. members; I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: This is rather commendable action which has been taken by the Government but there is only one thing which I would like to know and it is this; what arrangements have been made for the distribution of this milk and biscuits during the vacation period? If arrangements have been made for the school teachers to look after the distribution, are they going to be suitably remunerated? Teaching takes a lot out of people and when they are given vacation it is a question of resting their brain while they may be engaged in some physical occupation. I am wondering if arrangements have been made for the school teachers to distribute this milk and biscuits or whether it will be done by other people. If the teachers are called upon to make this distribution then they will not really be getting any vacation. I say that this is very commendable action on the part of the Government but I am wondering if it would be correct to call upon the teachers to come out during the vacation and make this distribution.

Dr. CUMMINS: The teachers have been circularised and they have readily agreed to give their services. They will be required for about eight days of the vacation period; the work will be so rotated among the teachers that it will require about that period of their vacation. The hours of work are to be arranged by the teachers—hours which are the most convenient for both the teachers and the children. This is an experimental matter and if the scheme proves successful and the Government decides to make it a permanent feature then perhaps further arrangements will have to be considered. As the position is now, the teachers are satisfied to come out for the eight days of their vacation.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Naturally it would be expected that I have some contribution to make in this matter especially when the honourable senior member for the City has been asking for compensation for the teachers. When this scheme was first instituted the teachers were told in an official way that the Government would do something by way of providing compensation for any extra duties which they were called upon to perform. Never mind that the teacher is expected to have love for the child, any worker when he has extra duties to perform is entitled to some extra remuneration for performing those duties. I am sure that, although many of the teachers have not got the guts to tell an official this, they do feel that they deserve some compensation for his extra duty which they have been called upon to perform. And it is but right. As the hon. senior member for the City has said the teachers need rest after they have been doing their job. The teachers have many masters to please and if they have been promised at the institution of the scheme that some compensation will be theirs I think that it should be given to them. It is my duty to champion the cause of the teachers and ask that some sort of remuneration be given to them. I feel that at this stage the Government should be told the facts. I understood the hon. mover of the

passing of the Resolution to say that the teachers are ready to give their services; yes, they are ready to do so but I say "Do not take advantage of people who are ready to do work." Some compensation must be given to these teachers. I have suffered as one of them and the time has now come when the Government should be criticised for not giving remuneration for the performance of added duties.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I am supporting the remarks of the honourable senior member for the City and the honourable junior member for St. Peter in this matter. I also look upon this scheme as a commendable one; the Government is endeavouring to do something to assist the nutritional standard of school children during the period when they are not in school, because during that period they also have to live. But what strikes me and what I want to suggest is this: during the vacation period it may not be necessary to require all the teachers to attend the schools for the purpose of distributing the milk and biscuits. The Government has gone half of the way and I hope that they will eventually go the whole way by providing a substantial hot meal for these children. That is what almost every member of this House promised the people of this country at the period of the General Election. While the Government is to be commended for having gone half of the way, I hope that it will not be long before we find them going the whole way. If we agree that it is the people that matter then we should look after the younger generation who will take our places when we shall have left this scene. If we agree that sound minds can best be built on sound bodies, then I feel that the teachers should be properly compensated for any inconvenience to which they might be put in assisting in the carrying out of this scheme. I do not think that this is a matter which we can glibly pass over; when the time comes for providing a hot meal for these children I hope that adequate staff will be provided so that the meal can be given in a decent manner. It is for that reason that I am suggesting even now that the teachers who will be called upon to supervise the distribution of the milk and biscuits should be given some assistance in carrying out the scheme. I hope that the suggestion for payment for doing extra work will be seriously considered and perhaps even now it is being considered by the Government.

Mr. BRANCKER: Whether the Government promised to compensate the teachers for performing these duties or not, if we are convinced that they should be paid then it is our duty to pay them. I feel sure that if a supplementary Resolution were to be sent down to this House to provide for the payment of these teachers, that Resolution will be passed more quickly than most Resolutions are passed. These extra services must be rendered either by other persons whom we cannot conceive to be doing them for nothing, or by the teachers who, perhaps because of their contact with the children, are the best persons to render them; and these teachers should be given an honorarium if the Government do not like the use of the word "remuneration." That type of money has the same spending power and the word "honorarium" has a pleasant sound. Because it is felt that the teachers are the most capable people for rendering these services I do not think any particular category should be selected and advantage taken of their good nature. If the Department of Education sent around some of the Inspectors to these teachers in connection with this matter, what do you expect the teachers to say other than that they are willing to perform these services? If they said otherwise, that would go as a black mark against them and it would be said that they are not willing to co-operate

with the Department. The teachers will say that they do not mind performing these services but we have to look after them because we are concerned with the welfare of the people. I have no doubt that we will pass this Resolution this afternoon and we look forward at the next meeting or two of this House to a Resolution being sent down to provide for the payment of an honorarium to the teachers who are required to perform duties in the carrying out of this scheme. It is a matter of Hobson's choice with these teachers and there was no other alternative for them but to say "Yes, we will perform these services." They will be even more satisfied to perform these extra services if we do what is right and provide them compensation for depriving them of their vacation.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Paragraph 2 of the addendum states this: "The estimated cost of carrying out the scheme is £2,600, for which amount this resolution is submitted to the Legislature." I interpret that to mean that included in this amount was remuneration for the teachers. That is how the matter occurred to me when I first read the addendum; I was therefore very amazed to hear that the teachers will be performing these services free during the summer vacation, and if it is considered that the scheme should continue then the teachers will be paid. Previous speakers have, I think, made out a case for remuneration for these teachers and I suggest that the matter be considered from that point of view even now. With regard to the entire proposal itself, all of us will agree that some contribution is necessary to improve the economic condition of some of the people of this country. The people do need some assistance and anything that we can do to improve the daily diet of needy adults or children is more than justified. But what I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, is whether this proposal will really offer the assistance which, apparently, the Government considers it will offer. Under the Nutrition Scheme these children get in the majority of cases, three-eighths of a pint of milk powder and water and in some cases they get fresh milk and two biscuits when they are at school. Even although this assistance is not considerable I am sure that it means something to the majority of children. I am wondering, however, if children are going to walk for a mile and a half or two miles in some cases to schools just to get less than a half pint of milk powder and water and two biscuits and then walk back home. There are two aspects of the matter; one is that children are apt to loiter and play about the road after they leave their homes. Many a parent may feel that his child will loiter about the streets and get involved in an accident or that it will loiter in the yard of the school instead of returning home immediately after getting the milk and biscuits. The other aspect of the matter is that of providing clean clothes daily during the vacation period so that these children can attend the schools in a reasonably presentable condition for the milk and biscuits. I do not think that the observations of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas with regard to the children being allowed to attend the schools nearest to them for this nutrition need be considered because I think that it is only in the parish of St. Michael that you will find children passing a school near to them and attending another one some further distance away; but in the rural parishes I would risk to say that 90% of the children are more or less forced to attend the schools which are nearest to their homes. Therefore the arrangement under which the children may be able to attend a school nearer to their homes than that which they

usually attend will be of assistance only in the parish of St. Michael. The disadvantages which I have mentioned exist; there is the question of the children loitering about the road and so on, and the parents may feel that it is hardly worth while for the children to soil their clothes in going to the schools merely to receive this nutrition. Personally, I feel that we would be doing something of greater value if we were to utilise a little more money and provide some sort of hot meal daily not merely for children but for destitute families. If we make some contribution to the daily rations in households both the needy children and the parents will derive benefit therefrom. It has been already urged on the floor of this House in a Resolution which we passed a few weeks ago that the Government should take steps to equip mobile food vans for the purpose of carrying food daily to the country districts for needy families and I think that perhaps instead of providing this £2,600 if we were asked to provide £5,000, that would go a long way towards implementing a scheme such as that I have suggested for the period proposed in the Resolution before us. I have been making enquiries as to the support which it can be expected that the school children will give to this scheme and my information has been that in respect of the girls' schools, the girls have said that they are not going to the schools for the milk and biscuits, or their parents have said that they will not allow them to go, while in the case of the boys' schools, the response has been between 65% and 70%. It does appear to me that much benefit will not be derived from this proposal and if we are seriously inclined to assist needy people we will take more practical steps to do so than have been proposed in the present Resolution. A little more enterprise, a little more vision and a little more practical interest in the people will lead us to take action which is more calculated to improve their physical condition; and perhaps a little less obstinacy, a little less stiff-neckedness and a little less refusal on the part of the Government to take advice will lead them in the right direction. What is the point of our deluding ourselves that we are really taking steps to provide hungry children with assistance during the vacation period when we know from all the factors which exist that the scheme is not going to render as much assistance as we would like people to obtain. In a small colony like Barbados with our knowledge of conditions we have not got to experiment on a matter like this; this is a matter in which we can act after ascertaining the facts. It is a good idea to try out the scheme if the Government is incapable of adopting any more satisfactory proposal; but it does appear to me that these children should really be given something substantial daily because they cannot get it, because their parents are unable to get it for them in the majority of cases. The Government have said that in view of the present shortage of home-grown foodstuffs, it is proposed to continue the supply of milk and biscuits to these children. I am supporting the Resolution not because of the present shortage of home-grown foodstuffs at all; I am supporting it because of the economic condition of the masses of the people who, even if home-grown foodstuffs were more available, are not in a position to procure them. These people are entitled to more consideration from us. As the hon. junior member for St. George has pointed out, there is no justifiable reason against the provision of a hot meal for these school children even during the school periods. Bearing in mind the difficulties attendant upon the distribution of milk and biscuits during the vacation period, I do not see that there

is any justification for fooling ourselves that we are taking any important step forward in the provision of a better diet for the needy and destitute children in this colony.

Mr. WARD: I intended to say quite a lot of what the honourable senior member for St. Philip has said. I do not think that the inducement offered here is sufficient to cause children to walk for a mile or a mile and a half; I do not think that the children will want to walk that distance simply to receive half a pint of milk and they do not even know if the milk is of the best quality. The idea might be a good one and the scheme might have been proposed with the best of intentions, but I feel that the scheme will not produce the results which it is thought will be produced. Children do not attend the schools in order to get milk and biscuits; and I do not even think that all the children take the milk and biscuits. What the honourable senior member for St. Philip has said is quite true; when these children are going for the milk and biscuits they will not be under any school regulations, they may loiter along the road and so forth and they will not be under the teachers' care during this period. I repeat; I feel that the Government have good intentions but I do not believe that the scheme will achieve the results which they expect it to achieve. If it were possible for the Government to obtain statistics as to the number of children who would attend the schools to receive the milk and biscuits each day, then they would be able to see whether it is worth while to carry on the scheme for another vacation period or not. I feel that they should take statistics during this vacation period so that it could be discovered whether the scheme should be continued or not. I feel that the teachers should love the children just as the parents love them and I do not think that it is too much to ask them to spend two hours a day for eight days of their vacation period in attending the schools so as to carry out the scheme. I feel that a teacher who loves his school where he earns a livelihood should not think too hard to give this assistance in connection with the carrying out of the scheme, and I do not think that it is necessary to talk about any payment for this service at the present time. I feel that we should get the scheme going first and see whether it will be a success or not. As I have already said statistics should be taken to see how many children will turn out for this nutrition. I would like to ask this question; what will happen with the milk after it has been mixed and the children do not turn up for it? I feel that there should be something more to induce the children to leave their homes and go to the schools; there should be a substantial meal provided for them. As the position is now, I believe that some children would stop along the road and break canes and eat them. I am asking the Government to take all these matters into consideration and not pay a deaf ear to them. I am not opposing this Resolution now but I say that we should have some statistics in order to see how the scheme will work.

Mr. MAPP: I was hoping that this Resolution would have been passed before the end of the period allotted to Question Time. It seems to me that while most honourable members agree with this Resolution they are of the opinion that it does not go far enough. I myself have been wondering what the Government mean when they state in the addendum to the Resolution that in view of the present shortage of home-grown foodstuffs it is proposed to continue the supply of milk and biscuits to elementary school children during the summer vacation. They must

either mean that if there were no shortage of home-grown foodstuffs they would not continue with this scheme or they would supply the children with a hot meal during the vacation period. I am hoping that the future will see a scheme which will make provision for processing home-grown as well as foreign foodstuffs in order that the elementary school children and the people of this island will be able to get an adequate supply throughout the year so that their nutritional standard may be assisted. I feel that the time has come when the whole system in relation to this scheme should be changed and the Vestries allowed to take part in it. While I agree with some of the criticisms which have been made I must point out that the difficulties in carrying out some of these schemes in respect of mobile canteens and so on are really administrative. I feel that the Vestries should be allowed to assist in the supply of nutrition, playing fields, clothing and so on for school children and the Government should provide grants-in-aid in connection with the carrying out of these schemes. Complaints are made to me in the constituency which I have the honour to represent, that the school children in St. Michael get Cod Liver Oil. (MEMBERS: Quite right). Honourable members on my left are saying that that is quite right but no attempt is being made to boost them. I was saying that complaints are made to me that the school children in St. Michael get Cod Liver Oil but those in the country do not get any. I am suggesting that the Government should make it possible for the Vestries to provide these necessities; they should give grants-in-aid so that the various schemes can be carried out.

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

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (B).

Dr. CUMMINS: I ask leave to move the suspension of Rule 61 (b) so as to continue Government Business. I should like to finish the Resolution with which we were dealing and to deal with the Resolution providing for a living-out allowance for the nurses of the General Hospital.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you confining yourself to that business?

Dr. CUMMINS: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking leave to move the suspension of Rule 61 (b) in order to continue Government Business, namely, to finish the Resolution which was just being considered and to deal with the Resolution relative to the nurses at the General Hospital. If there is no objection, leave will be granted the honourable member. (After a pause). There being no objection, the honourable member may make the motion.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Rule 61 (b) be suspended.

Mr. BLACKMAN seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: When Government Business was last being considered the House was in Committee of Supply.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY VOTE *re* NUTRITION FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHILDREN

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House was last in Committee of Supply, we were considering a Resolu-

tion for £2,600 to supplement the provision in the Estimates of Expenditure for the year 1948-49 under Head XX, Education, i. Elementary, Item 23, Nutrition for Elementary School children. The honourable junior member for St. Thomas was speaking.

Mr. MAPP: I was saying that while I agree with the criticisms to the effect that this scheme does not go far enough, I quite realise the administrative difficulties which stand in the way of the extension of the scheme; and I expressed the hope that the Government will make it possible for the Vestries to assist in the carrying out of nutritional and other schemes by making grants-in-aid to them. As regards the question of the payment of the teachers, I would only like to say that if you ask a teacher now as to whether he should be paid for his services in relation to this scheme, the first thing which will come to his mind is that he is not being properly paid at all. Therefore the attraction of being paid for assisting in the scheme will be so great that he will hardly say "No, I should not be paid." I think we should keep before our minds' eyes that if the teacher is properly paid he will think of these services as needy services; he will let his love for the children come uppermost in his mind before he thinks of any material benefit to be derived from his services in this respect. I think therefore that we can very well concentrate in the future on paying the teachers as well as other Government servants properly for their services and the teachers will not cavil over the intrusion on their time in the carrying out of these schemes. I think that honourable members will agree that the continuance of this scheme is a very commendable effort on the part of the Government but they should bear in mind the criticisms which have been made and see the necessity for extending the scheme. I do not know if the milk is examined on every occasion on which it is supplied and perhaps the honourable member in charge of the Resolution will say whether milk powder is as nutritious as fresh milk or not. I think that the Government should consider making additions to this diet if they cannot provide a hot meal and help both parents and children in these days of shortage and universal suffering. Apart from administrative difficulties it may not be possible at the present time to provide a hot meal because all of us are suffering from the shortage of food to-day. As I have already said, I hope that the Government will bear these points in mind and make it possible for the Vestries to assist in carrying out the extensions which are so necessary to assist the nutritional and educational standard of the children.

Mr. GARNER: While I feel that a forward step is being made or that there is some departure from the old way of handling the school children in this island, yet I am not convinced that this is the policy which a Labour Government should pursue. I thought that this Labour Government would have evolved a sound scheme whereby by this time we would have a Family Allowance Act on the Statute Book.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not want to interrupt the honourable member but this is a scheme in relation to school children, and I am warning the honourable member to stick to the Resolution.

Mr. GARNER: I cannot stick to the Resolution; I am talking about social reform. When you talk about sticking to the Resolution, that is talking rot.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I object to the remarks that the Chairman is talking rot and I ask the honourable member to withdraw them.

Mr. GARNER: You were talking rot and we cannot countenance foolishness.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I rule the honourable member out of order.

Mr. GARNER: I cannot stick to the Resolution; this is a question of a family allowance.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Well, I will call on Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GARNER: I will call on him if you do not do so.

The CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. Speaker who resumed the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chairman has reported to me that the honourable junior member for St. Philip has addressed him in a manner which is unparliamentary and impolite, saying that the Chairman is talking rot. I ask the honourable junior member for St. Philip to withdraw that statement.

Mr. GARNER: I do not know exactly what statement Your Honour is referring to.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member has said that the Chairman is talking rot and I do not think that is a seemly manner in which he should address the Chairman.

Mr. GARNER: I withdraw the remarks that the Chairman is talking rot because I think that they are unparliamentary.

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

Mr. GARNER: As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, if we had a scheme in respect of a family allowance for the poor people of this island we should not have to come here and ask school teachers to dish out milk and biscuits to the poor children during the vacation period. Some children live far away from the schools and if they are going to receive less than half a pint of milk and two biscuits, that does not merit their leaving home. I think it is *infra dig* to ask school children to leave their homes and go to the schools for what is going to be given to them. I think that this Labour Government should have a proper scheme for the alleviation of the lot of the children whose parents are unable to feed and clothe them properly. It is time that this Labour Government evolve some scheme other than this milk and biscuit scheme. It is a farce to ask school children to leave their homes to go to the schools for a little milk and biscuits and in some cases they are not going to get cows' milk, but skimmed milk. That is not good enough; that is why I have always argued that we want practical socialism. It is the children of the poor classes in this community who will benefit by this scheme because there are certain middle-class families who would never send their children for this milk. This scheme really concerns the poor strata in our midst and it would be a good thing if this Labour Government would really study the question of a family allowance. They have refused to give the Old Age pensioners any more money and as far as my experience goes, I know that the poor relief in this island is not adequate and it is about time that we do something so as to help the poor people. Just to give the school children a little milk and biscuits is no scheme at all. Some honourable members think that that is enough but, personally, I do not think so. I repeat that it is *infra dig*. Let the Government draw up a good scheme and if people have to pay for it, let them pay for it. I do not think that school children should be asked to walk for a mile or a mile and a half so as to get two biscuits and a little milk: let the Government conceive something more tangible, something more lofty. There is a lot of money lying down in the Treasury and I do not see why we cannot spend some of it to give the children some vitamins in their bodies so that they can make better citizens. As I go through the length and

breadth of this island I come across people who have attended the schools and yet there are complete novices because while they were attending the schools they never had a proper meal to eat. Their bodies are thus deficient in certain vitamins and the development of their brains has consequently been affected. If the Government is doing something to help the children it is not a matter of giving them two biscuits and a little skimmed milk. That is likely to constipate the children and perhaps medical men can tell us more about this matter. I am sorry that this debate has had to be so heated and that I had to say certain things with which you, Mr. Chairman, did not agree; but, after all, when one has studied this question and has seen how other advanced Governments are doing real, tangible things for the children and even for the Old Age pensioners, one cannot help thinking that there is a burning question as to what we should do for our young and old. We can only get the citizens which we make and the citizens of the future will be indicative of the food which is now supplied. There are those who never had proper food to eat in their early days and so they could not inculcate the teaching which was given them in the schools. Some honourable members have spoken about the provision of mobile canteens and so forth, but I do not believe that we have the organisation for such a scheme. We would require a department so as to carry out that scheme. In the first instance we would require some experts; we would need dieticians and I do not know whether that scheme would work better than a family allowance scheme. In respect of those people who are too poor to provide their children with proper meals, the Government should have the children registered and they should give them a weekly allowance while they are at school. I do not say that the allowance should be continued after the children have reached the school-leaving age; but certainly while those children are at school and their parents are poor, the Government should subsidize them by giving them a family allowance. I have read about this and I am sure that such a scheme is workable here. I see that some honourable members are laughing, but there is nothing at which to laugh. We must have strong children so as to have proper citizens. If people are hungry they will be tempted to do anything and if they practise to steal when they are young they will continue to steal when they are old. I think that the Government should consider giving the children proper food and care so that they can receive Old Age Pensions when they can no longer contribute their useful share to the good of the community.

Mr. DOWDING: I must endorse the remarks of some hon. members as regards the greatness of the potentialities of this scheme. The future of this island depends upon the children of to-day and I do feel that it should be our primary interest to look after their welfare to the best of our ability. In saying that, I would like to make one enquiry and it is this; what is the Government's policy as regards the type of milk that is supplied? Are they giving preference to pure cows' milk as against any other type of milk? (A MEMBER: Dairyman). An hon. member says "dairyman." I admit that I am a dairyman and a member of the Stockbreeders' Association in this island. In asking that question I have in mind the fact that pure cows' milk is the nearest approach to the perfect food in the world. Apart from that, if we consider that our one and only industry in this island at the moment is the sugar industry, we will agree what benefit the production of pure cows' milk will be to that industry by way of additional fertility to the soil. I raise this question

because it has recently come to my notice that the Government has proposed or is going to propose or has thought about ceasing the Contract for the supply of pure cows' milk to the General Hospital in favour of supplying the inmates with——

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry to interrupt the honourable member, but the Contract in respect of the General Hospital is not in this Resolution.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, if you will bear with me for one minute, I am trying to point out the value of pure cows' milk.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Certainly you can do that without referring to the Contract in respect of the General Hospital.

Mr. DOWDING: If the Government is going to supply the Institutions with milk other than pure milk, what will be the result? That is what I am trying to get at. It has come to my notice recently that there is some possibility of this Contract being made null and void and the inmates are to be supplied with plain or evaporated milk. I would like to get some information as to this matter; it is a matter on which I feel very strongly. Pure cows' milk is better for human beings than any other type of milk and there is also the question of additional fertility of the soil of this island. I would object greatly to any Government Department, in spite of the fact that we are supposed to be encouraging a local industry by way of live stock production, deciding that it is going to encourage the use of products of any nature rather than pure milk at any Government Institution.

Mr. COX: Indeed I thought that this Resolution would have received the wholehearted support of each and every member of this House who is conscious of his responsibility to the people of this island, more especially the poor people whom the Resolution is intended to help; but, judging from the remarks made by some honourable members who claim to be interested in the poor people, I have got to think whether people mean what they say at times or whether they are prepared everlastingly to blindfold the poor unfortunate people of this colony. I know that the poor people do not understand many of the statements which they hear and therefore the twisters take advantage of the ignorance of the masses. The Government has sent down this Resolution asking for this money to provide some means of assistance to poor hungry children when they are not at school since they suffer more from hunger when they are not at school than when they are at school. Instead of complimenting the Government on the action which it has taken, some honourable members are offering it criticism! I remember that some years ago when the late Dr. O'Neal introduced a question similar to this, the rich people, just as those who are criticising the Government for its action today, said that the next thing for which they are going to ask is false teeth for the old people. The Government has decided to provide milk and biscuits for the school children during the vacation period; this is not all that we who claim to represent Labour desire, but it must be admitted that we have to advance by stages. With the situation as it is at present, the Government is lucky when it gets any measure passed in this House. Only today the honourable senior member for St. Andrew came down to this side of the House and tried to get the honourable junior member for St. Lucy to get hold of the honourable senior member for St. Philip so as to oppose——

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not in this Resolution.

Mr. COX: When we find these things happening, where are we? People who claim to represent Labour link with the Conservatives in order to prevent the business of the House from being done! I say that the Government is lucky when it gets anything done in this House because it has not got a majority of members. In spite of the fact that some honourable members believe that the children will not go to the schools to receive this milk, I know that the children are only too glad to go for it. Children will play wherever they go and you cannot prevent that, but we are out to help them. As regards the suggestion that some provision should be made for giving these children a hot meal, we are glad to do that, but we must start somewhere. People of a Conservative outlook have never tried to do anything for these poor children; it is only since people of a different outlook came to this House that a start was made in doing something for them. Even the hon. senior member for St. Philip when he was a member of the Governor-in-Executive Committee during 1946-47 never came to this House and asked that these children be given a hot meal when he was in a position to do that. Why did the honourable member not get on a platform and say that—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I want the honourable member to confine himself to this Resolution.

Mr. COX: I am dealing with this Resolution and the remarks which have been made whether relevant or irrelevant to it. We also heard the honourable junior member for St. Philip, who would have us believe that nobody could be interested in the poor people like himself, criticise this Resolution.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us get on with this Resolution.

Mr. COX: I was merely saying that no member of this House who has the interest of these poor people at heart would attempt to throw cold water on this movement. I would like to see the Government provide for the extractions of the teeth of school children during the vacation period as I have suggested in this House. These are really hard times through which we are passing; the honourable senior member for St. Lucy has spoken about the short crop and enquired whence we are going to get food. Nobody can say that this scheme is not a good one taking into consideration that a lot of people are out of work. Instead of asking children to go into the labour gangs we are asking them to go and get some milk which will strengthen their bodies and enable them to imbibe the teaching which is given them. I repeat that nobody who is interested in the people could stand in this House and denounce or belittle an effort of this sort which is being made by the Government.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sometimes I think that when visitors to this Chamber listen to the remarks which are made here from time to time, they can come to no other conclusion than that there are in the Chamber some veritable crack-pots, people who are mentally unable to—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not want to interrupt the honourable member, but I want to hear something relative to the Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I was saying that people who visit this Chamber from time to time must conclude that some crack-pots have found an asylum here. We are expected to come here to-day and compliment the Government on their incapacity, lack of initiative, lack of practical sympathy and lack of appreciation of the facts of the case. The last speaker, honourable members will forgive me for paying any attention to what he has said because I never do so—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member to deal with the Resolution and not refer to the speeches of other honourable members.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable member said that when I was a member of the Government I never brought forward any schemes. Apparently there was a one-man Government, I was a dictator and anything I suggested would be done. I was Hitler at the Reichstag. I have got up in this Chamber repeatedly and tabled Addresses calling on the Government to substitute a hot lunch for the present scheme of supplying milk and biscuits to these children. During this session I asked the Government to do what I know was within its power to do; I did not expect that the present set-up was capable of formulating a proper Social Security Plan so I asked them on the 21st of October 1947, to take steps provide a proper and comprehensive scheme of Social Security for the people of Barbados with special reference to the Unemployment and Sickness Pay, Family Allowance and Retirement Pensions and to request the British Government to send out to the island an expert or experts from the British Ministry of National Insurance who, along with a representative local committee, should make the necessary investigations and draw up proposals along the lines of the British National Insurance Plan. In other words, I was asking the Government to take steps to institute in Barbados a National Insurance Scheme with modifications to suit this colony along the lines of the British Plan. As regards this Nutrition Scheme, those of us who know something about the matter and who have paid attention to what is now before us and have gone to the extent of making enquiries from the teachers with regard to the reaction of parents to the proposed scheme, are in a position to state that in the majority of cases the girl's schools have reported that they do not think the children will go for the milk, while the response from the boys' schools has been between 65% and 70%. Parents have made reservations as regards getting the children ready to go for the milk and the children will run the risk of getting knocked down by motor cars and so on. We are saying that instead of spending £2,600, they should spend £5,000; instead of commending lack of enlightenment and lack of proper policy, we are pointing out a more comprehensive policy and it is not our fault if people in this Chamber are incapable of understanding any action which has been taken on the floor of the House. It is entirely a matter for the people who put them here. We know that there are those in this Chamber who, because of the lack of proper mental equipment, slavishly follow what other people tell them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is that anything to do with this Resolution?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Quite a lot.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot see that. I want the honourable member to speak on the Resolution which is before us and stop referring to other honourable members. The honourable member is only taking up valuable time when he is doing that. Let us deal with the Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Are you suggesting that I am taking up the valuable time of the House?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When you are referring to other honourable members.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I shall have to ask the House at some time to appoint as Chairman somebody who knows what he is doing.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I rule the honourable member out of order.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I say that at no time during my remarks will I be told that I am wasting valuable time. The proposal before us today does not go far enough and when it is put into action the result will be that no proper relief will be offered to the existing conditions. People in this House can work out a scheme which will cost a little more money but it will provide real assistance for destitute people in this colony. We want to see the children get something in their stomachs: when they go for the milk and biscuits by the time they return home they will have expended more energy than can be restored from what has been given them. Any mental degenerate or any idiot can understand that. Let us start a scheme even if it costs £5,000 for the two months, and get rations sent around whether they are cooked or not, to destitute people all over the island; but do not let us fool ourselves that we are doing something when we are doing nothing. Do not let us impress upon the public that we are formulating some scheme to assist the children when we know that we are not really helping them. The people who are supposed to benefit by the scheme know better than anybody else that we are not doing anything; we are not fooling them at all. If you go to any parish in this island and ask the people what they think about the scheme they will tell you "The Government could better give us the money." The children hardly have any clothes to wear at home. Personally, I think that it would be far better if the money were spent on giving the children Cod Liver Oil in the absence of something better; but I suggest that we provide rations from which whole families will benefit, and the colony can afford to do that.

Mr. COX: Any honourable member could suggest that the children be given a hot meal. In the absence of that, the Government has sent down this scheme to provide them some relief and we should not throw cold water on it. It would be difficult to provide for families with the shortage of home-grown food-stuffs. With regard to the payment of the teachers for performing these services during the vacation period, I myself will support that because I feel that so long as an individual, whether he is a Government or a private employee, is called upon to do extra work, he should be paid for it. I sincerely hope that the Government will see that these teachers are paid.

Dr. CUMMINS: I will discard the most of what we have heard this afternoon and answer one or two points. First of all, there is the point raised by the honourable senior member for St. George as regards the type of milk which will be supplied. Anybody in this House would say that fresh cows' milk is preferable to skimmed milk. When this Nutrition Scheme was first started, I think that there were about 24 schools which were supplied with fresh cows' milk from a few dairies and we know that in very many cases the children were not getting pure cows' milk and something had to be done about the matter. The result is that about eight or nine schools are being supplied with fresh cows' milk. As far as this scheme is concerned, the schools will be supplied with fresh cows' milk. With regard to the supply of milk to the General Hospital, I happen to be the Chairman of the Hospital Board and this is the first time that we have heard that the inmates are going to get skimmed milk instead of cows' milk.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is nothing to do with the Resolution and I am not entertaining it.

Dr. CUMMINS: The honourable senior member for St. George has made a statement which has

gone out to the public and I am taking the opportunity to refute the statement. Am I permitted to do so?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not in this Resolution. I stopped the honourable senior member for St. George when he was making the statement and I will also have to stop you.

Dr. CUMMINS: Very well, Mr. Chairman. As far as the teachers are concerned, they have readily consented to give this scheme a trial; and the work will be rotated so that a teacher will lose about eight days of his vacation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable senior member for the City is continuing to talk I will ask the honourable senior member for St. Thomas to take his seat and we will listen to the honourable senior member for the City.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—I notice that your eyes do not pass me but they do not see the rotten behaviour on the other side of the House. I can behave just as bad as anybody else or worse.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I rule the honourable member out of order.

Dr. CUMMINS: I was saying, Mr. Chairman, that the distribution of the milk and biscuits at the schools will only require about eight days of each teacher's vacation. As far as the figures are concerned, the honourable senior member for St. Philip has said that he has made enquiries and only a small percentage of children will go to the schools for this nutrition.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I said that in so far as the girls' schools are concerned the response has been very poor, and as regards the boys' schools it has been between 65 per cent and 70 per cent.

Dr. CUMMINS: I have the figures before me and they show that out of a total of 22,256 children, 15,333 have expressed the wish to receive the milk and biscuits during the vacation period. In one parish, the parish of St. John, the percentage of children who have expressed the wish to receive the milk and biscuits is as high as 87% and it varies to 86%, 84% and so on in the various parishes. In the parish of St. Philip the figure is 86% and in St. Michael, 59%.

Mr. CRAWFORD: We are glad for the statement with regard to the nutritional value of fresh cows' milk as compared with imported milk powder and what not. I want to support the statement of the honourable senior member for St. George that the Directors of the General Hospital have been—

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman,—You refused to allow me to answer that question.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot entertain any discussion on that question.

Mr. CRAWFORD: You refused to allow the honourable senior member for St. George to make the statement after he had made it.

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

LIVING-OUT ALLOWANCE TO NURSES AT THE GENERAL HOSPITAL

Dr. CUMMINS: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is one to place the sum of £585 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to pay a living-out allowance to nurses at the Barbados General Hospital to 31st. March, 1949. The position is that Pay Ward "A" has been completed for a few months now but the top floor has not been used because of the lack of nurses. We need more nurses in order to reduce the working hours of the present staff; and the Nurses' Home cannot accommodate any more

nurses at present. In order to accommodate an additional staff of nurses, it is proposed that 18 of the senior nurses be allowed to live out and that will make provision for a similar number of nurses to come in. This sum of money is calculated for the nurses to pay room rent and to provide themselves with a "snap" on mornings before they come to the Hospital. The other three meals of the day will be provided by the Hospital. This allowance is at the rate of \$4.00 a week for each nurse. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: My only objection in this matter is that this allowance seems to be inadequate. It seems to me that these nurses are going to find difficulty in getting two ends to meet with proposed allowance. I do not know how much of this \$4.00 a week it is expected will be spent for room rent and how much for these morning "snaps". I think that it should be a matter for congratulation if each of these nurses can succeed in getting a room for each night of the week and a meal during the morning for \$4.00.

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

The Resolution was passed.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee and that the Committee had asked for leave to sit again.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN in each case, the Resolutions passed in Committee were read a first and second time and agreed to.

REVERSION TO PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: The Government Business for which the Rules were suspended having been completed, the House will now revert to Private Members' Business.

ADDRESS *re* LOCAL SHORTAGE OF GRAIN

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. George:—To move the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor *re* subsidising the growing locally of a large crop of Indian Corn.

Mr. SYMMONDS: Mr. Speaker,—I want to ask leave to withdraw this Address and to substitute another Address for this one of which I have given notice. Ever since the outbreak of the second World War, and even up to now, the people of this island in common with people all over the world have been experiencing difficulty in obtaining food. In this island particularly we have spent several million dollars during the past years in subsidising foodstuffs in order to bring the cost of food reasonably within the pockets of the consumer. Commodities have been in short supply and because the supply of poultry in this island has been dwindling during the past years, householders have been forced to use some of the commodities such as rice, oat flakes and so on, which are needed for their consumption for the purpose of feeding a few chickens. In this island it is a very difficult problem to supply the amount of grain which we want without doing some damage to our primary product—sugar. A most laudable and commendable attempt has been made by past

Governments and by this Government to see that a certain amount of locally-grown food is provided for the people. There was a year in which such a large quantity of potatoes was produced that some of them had to be exported before they rotted. During that time no serious attempt was made, and to-day no serious attempt is being made, to bridge the gap between the amount of grain which we need in this island and the amount which we can get. I appreciate the fact that we cannot produce as much grain as we require, but there was a time when at least once a month or once a year or once every Sunday chickens could be found to adorn people's dinner table. There was a time when people with low wages used to sell their chickens in order to buy rice; but to-day with better wages many workers' wives would be glad if corn could be obtained in this island so that eggs might become the property of the workers once again. There is a short supply of meat, as a matter of fact, it is very difficult to obtain fish, pork or any form of meat. In spite of what we have been reading in the Press I know that the bulk of people in this island vainly go to the Market in trying to obtain meat. Although they have the money there is no meat to be purchased, and the result is that we are increasingly seeing in our midst not only tuberculosis but malnutrition because there is nothing for the people to eat. I should like to say that it is the duty of the Government not merely to supply a sufficient quantity of food for the people, but to see that the food is so varied as to maintain the health of the people. A very laudable attempt is being made again this year to guarantee a price for locally-grown food. To my way of thinking, unless a definite acreage is set apart for the production of corn, we will get the bulk of potatoes, which are perishable in that they last only for a few months, or yams or cassava. We want some impetus to be given to a poultry-rearing industry. Only a few months ago the Government made some attempt to supply a good breed of fowl to local householders by means of hatching chickens with the use of incubators at Government Stations. I suggest that about 50,000 eggs be imported over a certain period and chicks of a pure strain be given to the families of the working people free of cost. I commend that suggestion most seriously to honourable members, because 50,000 imported eggs at 15 cents each would only cost the Government a mere \$7,500.00 and that step would have a tremendous effect in this community if it is supported by a corn-growing campaign.

Mr. SPEAKER: This Address has nothing to do with the importation of eggs.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I was endeavouring to show why the Government should go to the trouble of promoting a corn-growing campaign in this island.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that the importation of eggs has anything to do with the Address.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I think that the local supply of poultry should be again built up. Very often you hear that balanced animal feed or feed for poultry has arrived and when you send to purchase some of it you are told that you are too late; you cannot get any unless you have a friend at court. That is a hardship from which householders are suffering day after day. For the last seven years at least sufficient attention has not been paid to the production of the quantity of corn which is necessary for this island. A short while ago this Government along with other Governments guaranteed to British Guiana a price of five cents per pint for a certain grade of rice over a five-year period—

Mr. SPEAKER: Do not let us debate that: that is an admitted fact.

Mr. SYMMONDS: It is relevant to the terms of the Address and I am asking Your Honour to bear with me.

Mr. SPEAKER: You can refer to it generally.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I am finished with that really. I think that growers should be guaranteed a price of five cents per pound for all the surplus corn produced this year. Every grower who produces that corn takes more from the fertility of the soil than if he produces other crops but he would have adequate compensation by obtaining manures which would replenish the soil. When corn is grown, the fodder is available to cattle and the supply of local labour can be increased to a very great extent. I am informed that today dairy keepers are experiencing a very hard time in getting feed for their cows and the growing of a large corn crop would fill a big gap especially when there is a shortage of rice, as is the case at present, and when there is a shortage of flour. We are living in very serious times, and although we would not like to see War clouds again threaten our existence, let us be prepared against the evil day; let us have a sufficient supply of food especially grain and poultry in this island. The peasants in this island are already pulling their weight to the utmost of their capacity where the production of food is concerned; 75% of the livestock is owned and reared and kept at great sacrifice by these peasants and they do a great service in providing us with food. In spite of that, however, before the end of this year there might be a definite famine in this Island. We have 51,255 arable acres of plantation land of which 20% is in preparation and 6% in thrown-out land; and if one-half of the total acreage of preparation and thrown-out land were diverted to the production of corn for a period of three months, by the time that the corn was ripe that land, with the use of the tractors which are now in our midst, could be quickly prepared again and used for the production of sweet potatoes at least. Corn along with sweet potatoes would go a very long way in supplying our food. It has been argued that an acre of corn as compared with an acre of potatoes would be a poor yield: but at the same time if we say that corn possesses 9% protein and potatoes possess only 2% protein, and if we say that corn is definitely a whole food lasting for an entire year when potatoes will last for only four months, the necessity for diversifying our crops and seeing that a proper acreage is planted in corn so that another secondary industry may be maintained, will become apparent to honourable members. As regards this question of the supply of corn and grain, I understand that the Order which the Agricultural Department used to enforce relative to the planting of green peas along the hedgerows of fields in this island, is no longer operative. There was a drought during last year and in speaking with many planters I was informed that because of the drought the green pea trees died. At Christmas last year green peas were sold at 15 cents a pint.

Mr. SPEAKER: I believe that you are going to substitute an Address in place of the one of which you have given notice and I think that you should refer to that Address.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I was leading up to that, Mr. Speaker. I am asking leave to withdraw the Address of which I have given notice and to substitute the one which I will read. Before doing so

I just want to make the point that up to this month with many favourable showers of rain, if you go around the countryside you will find as you look at hedgerow after hedgerow, that these green pea trees are conspicuous by their absence. Meal is at all times a scarce commodity, fish seems to be very difficult to be obtained and this island is in serious danger because of the lack of protein in the diet of the people. I suggest therefore that honourable members should give every support to the renewing of the Order by which every hedgerow in this island should be planted with green pea trees. I understand that in the case of most plantations, the green pea trees are the property of the watchmen, but I feel that if every hedgerow is planted with green pea trees it might be possible at Christmas time and during the several months of the year to obtain green peas at six or seven cents a pint at least. At this critical stage in our food supply every effort should be made to ensure that we have a sufficient supply of grain. I do not for one moment suggest that we should do anything to harm the staple industry of this colony because it has been well said that an acre of land put under sugar cane in the West Indies will buy many acres of other products; but the times are hard and there are many people who are unemployed. It is very difficult even for people who are employed to buy food and you can imagine the plight of those who are unemployed. People find it difficult to get food even when they have the money with which to buy it. For the reasons which I have given, I am asking leave to withdraw the Address of which I have given notice and to substitute therefor the following Address:—

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency the Governor

The House of Assembly are of the opinion that, because of the uncertain and inadequate supply of food available in this Island, immediate steps should be taken to remedy the acute local shortage of grain by

(a) encouraging the planting of a large crop of Indian Corn through the giving of a Government guarantee of five cents per pound for all surplus Indian Corn planted during the present year.

(b) fixing the minimum acreage to be planted in corn in various parts of the Island.

(c) Renewing the Order for planting green peas around the hedge-rows in the Island.

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

In Trinidad only last year the Government guaranteed to growers of corn a price of five cents per pound, and at a period of acute shortage corn grown in Trinidad came to our rescue. To-day we are buying some of it at seven cents per pound and cornmeal is being sold at ten cents per pound.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking leave to withdraw the Address of which he has given notice and to substitute for it the one which he has just read. If there is no objection, the honourable member will be granted leave. There being no objection, the honourable member is granted leave.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I beg to move that the Address as substituted do now pass.

Mr. BRANCKER: I beg to second that.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I have listened to the honourable mover of the passing of this Address and I do not think that he has made a single point which could be put to the Government for subsidising the

growing of corn. The first thing is that corn is yielding a better price today than that at which the honourable member is asking the Government to subsidise it and he has made a mistake there. What this island is suffering from is the lack of space; if we pass this Address this afternoon, an Address which is asking that corn be planted instead of yams and potatoes which supply the greater part of the food of this island, we would be reducing the island's food supply. If we subsidized corn at 8 cents per pint as a matter of fact if we grow more corn, potatoes, yams and sugar cane would be displaced. At present under an Order issued by the Competent Authority, 6% of the arable land has to be thrown open and the 20% preparation land has to be planted in potatoes, yams, corn, peas and eddoes. Then 46% of the preparation land has to be planted in yams, 34% in sweet potatoes and the remaining 20% in corn and peas and peas supply more protein than corn. I am arguing that if we plant more corn we will have to reduce the amount of canes or yams or potatoes that must be planted according to the law. I do not see that we can pass an Address like this, an Address which, in my opinion, would result in a decrease of the food supply of the island. This matter has been gone into very carefully and particularly by Dr. Saint and he has made the allocations in respect of the various products for supplying the needs of the island to the best of his ability. I do not think, therefore that we should try to interfere with the manner in which these divisions have been made. I cannot vote for this Address.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable senior member for St. James has said that the honourable mover of the passing of this Address has made a mistake because the price of corn is now 6 cents a pint, but I do not see how any mistake has been made. What the honourable mover is suggesting is that the Government should give a guarantee to the corn grower to purchase at 5 cents a pound any corn for which a market cannot be found; and it is obviously better for the grower of corn to be assured of 5 cents a pound for his corn than nothing at all. What the honourable senior member for St. James knows but has not said is that the planters are not particularly fussy about planting too much corn because it affects the yield of cane.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: On a point of order. It is not a question of what the planters please to do: an Order from the Competent Authority has been issued and that Order sets out what must be done.

Mr. CRAWFORD: There is a general antipathy on the part of the planters to plant too much corn because it affects the yield of sugar canes. I have not got before me the proportion of land which the Competent Authority sets out to be planted in indian corn, but it does appear to me that this colony could not go far wrong if it increases its supply of corn. Corn is an indispensable commodity for the raising of stock and the new prices fixed for poultry and eggs are so high that no stone should be left unturned to reduce the price at which these commodities will be more easily available to the masses of the population. Turkeys are sold at 84 cents a pound, eggs at 8 cents apiece and obviously the prices of these commodities can have but one effect on the community and that effect will be that only the rich can afford to buy turkeys and eggs. As I have said eggs are sold at 8 cents each—

Mr. SPEAKER: Eggs of a certain size.

Mr. CRAWFORD: In actual fact if you are buying eggs from a hawker, there is nothing by which they can be weighed, she will insist that you pay 8 cents apiece for them and you have to pay that price

for them if you want them. Some of these eggs are no larger than pigeons' eggs. If the supply of corn is increased, the first effect which that will have in the immediate future is that the price of poultry and eggs will be reduced and these commodities will be placed within the reach of the people. (Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: Are you going to plant the corn at Pelican?) The honourable senior member for St. James asks if the corn is going to be planted at Pelican, but the honourable member knows that the small landowners do plant corn in the month of September. They plant canes a month or so afterwards and when the canes reach a certain height they reap the corn. If the suggestion of the honourable junior member for St. George is implemented, if more corn is planted, even if the yield of canes is affected to some extent, that will be more than offset by the value to the community of an increased supply of corn. Apart from that, corn is essential for the raising of poultry and it is of much value as food for human consumption. As is well known, we are paying 10 cents a pound for imported cornmeal and if the colony produces more corn, the facilities for processing it can be erected and we will have the commodity available at once. As a matter of fact, I can conceive of no commodity which will be of more benefit to the community in general than corn. We already have a fairly large quantity of potatoes under cultivation and, as has been pointed out, they cannot last as well as corn. Apart from the additional point of view of supplying much-needed vitamins to the people of this colony, corn is a by-product is in a class by itself. I would like to propose an amendment to paragraph (a) of the Address so as to state more clearly what the proposal is. The Address asks that immediate steps be taken to remedy the acute local shortage of grain and then paragraph (a) says by "encouraging the planting of a large crop of Indian Corn through the giving of a Government guarantee of five cents per pound for all surplus Indian Corn planted during the present year." What the honourable mover means, according to my interpretation, is that the Government will give a guarantee that any corn planted for which a market cannot be found, they will purchase it at 5 cents per pound; therefore I propose that paragraph (a) of the Address should read as follows: "encouraging the planting of a large crop of Indian Corn by guaranteeing that any corn reaped for which a market cannot be found will be purchased by the Government at a price of not less than five cents per pound." That is merely to guarantee to the producer that in case there is a glut of corn on the market, he will be protected; but I feel fairly certain that there will not be any glut. People are finding it almost impossible to get oats for their animals or other grain for their poultry. Last year we were able to import corn from Trinidad at 7 cents per pound and I am sure that a ready market will be found for our corn at 6 cents per pound. If by any possible chance the supply exceeds the demand, the Government will not have it on their hands because the corn can be processed and a market will be found for it in that way.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable junior member for St. George accepting that amendment?

Mr. SYMMONDS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I accept the amendment.

Mr. MAPP: While this Address may be very commendable, although the amendment just moved explains better to the Government what the honourable member would like to be done, I do not feel that we should stipulate any minimum price which the Government should pay for such surplus. Prices may change at any time and after all, I do not think it is our duty as members of the Assembly to tell the

Executive Committee, who would have at its disposal expert and other advice which we do not have, what price it should pay in order to give effect to this Address. We should not name any price at all; we should say "at a Government guaranteed price."

Mr. SPEAKER: What does the honourable member mean by "a Government guaranteed price."?

Mr. MAPP: At a price to be fixed by the Government. Do not name any figure. Leave it to the Government to fix a price which would encourage the planting of Indian corn. If corn is being sold at 6 cents per lb. and we fix the price at 5 cents per lb. there will be no encouragement to plant corn.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the honourable member would read the Address he would see that it says "at a price not less than five cents per pound."

Mr. MAPP: I appeal to the wisdom of the House not to fix the price at 5 cents per lb. At present, when producers cannot find a market for potatoes the Government buys them at the same price at which they would be sold to the consumer. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the Government should not tell a peasant "you must plant so much of your land in corn and if you cannot get the corn sold, we will purchase it at 5 cents per lb." I do not think this House should lay down any minimum price. So far as the Address is concerned I think its object is very admirable. It seems as if the world is heading for another chaotic war and while I do not want to indulge in pessimistic prophecy I yet think it would be wise for the Government to take steps to provide as much locally grown food as possible. Rather than subsidize all foreign food-stuffs I think the Government should move in the way of subsidizing locally grown products.

Mr. DOWDING: Before you put the question, Sir, I would like to say that the motive behind this Address is commendable but I am afraid that subparagraph (b) of paragraph 1 may conflict with the present Defence Control Order. I am appealing to my honourable colleague to see the point which I am making. If the minimum acreage to be planted in Indian corn is to be greater than what it is under the present regulations, it may result in the production of less yams and potatoes which are the main food crops for the people of this island. I am appealing to him to see that point and not to include in this Address "fixing the minimum acreage to be planted in corn in various parts of the Island." As I see it this Address is really similar to what we have already done in this House with respect to yams and potatoes which were being produced and processed at the Government Cassava Factory. This Address can be of great help, particularly to the peasants of the island, who will be encouraged—that is the commendable part—to plant corn and if the market is flooded, they will still be able to dispose of their corn at a remunerative price. There are several peasants who, owing to the recent drought, have been unable to cultivate their land but will be able to do so now that the rains have come and to produce a crop of this sort. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that subparagraph (b) of paragraph 1 be deleted.

Mr. WARD: I really do not see the use of this Address at all. However commendable it may be I feel that it will be shelved and we will hear nothing more about it. I will tell the House why. We have a local Food Production Defence Control Regulation which at the present moment is sponsored by the Director of Agriculture and a Standing Committee who are responsible for the food supply in this island, both imported and locally

produced. Sir, we have heard from the honourable member who has just spoken that there are many peasants who have not worked their land last year and now that the rains have come will be only too glad to do so. They can plant corn or whatever they like and they do not need the Government to guarantee them a price for corn which they plant because if food is in short supply, it is impossible to have a surplus. Further, the peasants of whom the last honourable member spoke do not come under this Defence Regulation. It is only the peasant who has 10 acres of land and over whom the Government would require to plant a certain portion of his land in corn. Under the regulation, Dr. Saint has stipulated that 26 per cent of all arable acreage must be set aside for planting food for the population and in that stipulation he particularly says that 6 per cent. of that 26 per cent. must be thrown-out land. At present, all the estates and all the peasants who own 10 acres and over are supposed to have 20 per cent of their preparation land planted in provisions and if they are compelled to plant more corn, it will mean that less potatoes and yams which result in a more substantial, reliable and productive crop than corn, will be planted. Yams will last for a whole year while corn will not. There are some estates which plant more corn than fall potatoes, not through compulsion but because the fields are lying idle at the time. From the time I was a boy I have never heard of a surplus of corn in this island. If I had a surplus of corn I don't think the Government could buy it. I am sure of that, because I would utilize my corn myself instead of buying balanced animal feed. Therefore, I do not see why the Government should subsidize corn! I am not going to sell the Government my surplus of corn if I had a surplus and I am quite sure that there are very few estates that would sell their surpluses of corn. Although I appreciate the idea behind this Address yet I feel that it is not necessary. I feel that no good can be obtained from this Address and personally I do not see the sense in supporting it.

Mr. SYMMONDS: Before the question is put I should just like to make a few brief remarks in reply. If half of the arable thrown out land is used for three months in producing corn and tractors are put on immediately after, there would be no shortage of yams or potatoes. There can be no doubt about it that the food situation in this island is critical. Poor people cannot get anything to eat and it is the duty of honourable members, even if somebody loses—

Mr. SPEAKER: The question of shortage of food has not been raised and the honourable member should reply only to points that have been raised.

Mr. SYMMONDS: That is what I was trying to do. I was pointing out that we are living in extraordinary times and even if it means that somebody may lose dividends now, later on we may be able to enter into a five-year contract for the supply of corn to Trinidad or St. Vincent, let us say. We may or may not be on the brink of another war and the food situation to-day is far worse than it has ever been in the history of this island. I strongly recommend the passing of this Address; it will mean more food for the people and it is the duty of the Government to provide food for the workers of this colony.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the honourable junior member for St. George to present the Address to His Excellency the Governor.

Mr. SYMMONDS: As Your Honour pleases.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to this day three weeks, Tuesday 10th August, 1948.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

Mr. COX: Before the question is put I am moving an amendment to that motion. I beg to move that the words "this day three week's, Tuesday, 10th August" be deleted in order to insert the words "this day week, Tuesday, 27th July" therefor.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I beg to second that.

Mr. DOWDING: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to this day two weeks, Tuesday, 3rd. August, 1948.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS: As regards the amendment of the senior member for St. Michael, I would just like to remind the House that even if it does not suit certain honourable members to attend on Tuesday next, there is a great deal of work to be done and if a quorum can be had on that date, honourable members should not by their votes, adjourn the House for two weeks. Some of us will attend on Tuesday next and I appeal to those honourable members who may find it inconvenient to attend, not to stand in the way of the rest of us who are perfectly willing to come. I repeat that there is a great deal of work to be done and honourable members should not by their votes adjourn the House for periods longer than a week at a time.

Mr. WILKINSON: I ask leave, Mr. Speaker, to withdraw my motion.

There being no objection the honourable member is granted leave to withdraw his motion and he withdraws it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion before the House is that this House do now adjourn to this day two weeks, Tuesday, 3rd August, 1948. To that, an amend-

ment has been moved that the words "this day two weeks, Tuesday, 3rd August", be deleted in order to insert the words "this day week, Tuesday, 27th. July" therefor. 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 "Noes" have it.

A division is taken as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs SYMMONDS, CRAWFORD, GARNER, HAYNES, DOWDING, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON, WARD, and MOTTLEY.—11

Noes: Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. SMITH, BRANCKER, HUSBANDS, COX, MAPP, F. L. WALCOTT, ADAMS, and BLACKMAN.—9.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question that the words proposed to be deleted stand part of the motion has been resolved in the affirmative, eleven honourable members voting "Aye" and nine honourable members voting "No". The question now is that this House do adjourn to this day two weeks, Tuesday 3rd. August, 1948. Honourable members in favour will please say "Aye"; those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

A division is taken as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs SYMMONDS, CRAWFORD, GARNER, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, DOWDING, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON, and WARD.—11.

Noes: Messrs SMITH, BRANCKER, HUSBANDS, COX, MAPP, F. L. WALCOTT, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, and Dr. CUMMINS.—9.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question that this House do now adjourn to this day two weeks, Tuesday, 3rd. August, 1948, has been resolved in the affirmative, eleven honourable members voting "Aye" and nine honourable members voting "No." This House now stands adjourned to meet on Tuesday, 3rd. August, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.