

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT).

SESSION 1947—48

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 7th September, 1948.

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

Present :

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, M. E. COX, D. A. FOSTER, A. E. S. LEWIS, C. E. TALMA, H. D. BLACKMAN, V. C. GALE, E. D. MOTTLEY, S. A. WALCOTT, J. H. WILKINSON, O.B.E., and R. G. MAPP.

Prayers are read.

Mr. HAYNES enters the House and takes his seat.

MINUTES.

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 31st August, 1948, having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

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

The Bridgetown (Parking) Regulations, 1948.

The Bridgetown (One-Way Traffic) Regulations, 1948.

Message No. 24/1946 from His Excellency the Governor informing the Honourable the House of Assembly that the Secretary of State for the Colonies, with the approval of the Prime Minister of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, has selected Mr. G. H. Adams, M.C.P., to be an Alternate Delegate to the U.K. Delegation to the forthcoming General Assembly of the United Nations to be held at Paris. (Cheers).

Mr. WILKINSON : Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I ask leave of the House to make a few remarks in connection with the Message from His Excellency the Governor which has just been laid on the table of the House.

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

Mr. WILKINSON : Sir,—I think it is a great compliment to Barbados that the Secretary of State for the Colonies has seen fit to select a Barbadian to be one of the delegates to attend the forthcoming

General Assembly of the United Nations at Paris and so, we congratulate the Leader of the House on being selected. At the same time I cannot help commenting on the method which has been adopted. The senior member for St. Joseph was here last Tuesday and I should have thought that the Government would have seen fit to have sent down a Message on Tuesday last in connection with this matter and not to have allowed the information to have been obtained from a mass meeting in Queen's Park. I regret that the Government made such a serious error in not having notified the House last Tuesday of this selection when the senior member for St. Joseph was present. However, I would like to move that this House place on record its appreciation of the selection of a Barbadian to be a delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations in Paris next month.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The honourable member was granted leave to make a few remarks on His Excellency's Message but he has not yet obtained leave to make a motion in connection with it.

Messrs. DOWDING, WARD and CRAWFORD entered the House while Mr. WILKINSON was speaking and took their seats.

Mr. MOTTLEY : Sir,—I ask leave to make a motion expressing our appreciation of the selection of a Barbadian as a delegate to the forthcoming General Assembly of the United Nations in Paris.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY : I beg to move that this Honourable House place on record its appreciation of a Barbadian having been selected as an Alternate Delegate to the United Kingdom Delegation to the forthcoming General Assembly of the United Nations to be held in Paris. In doing so, I should like to say that I associate myself with the remarks of the junior member for St. James. Let me say at the outset that whatever may be our superficial differences we have fundamental similarities as colonials. We could not but express our gratitude that the Mother Country has seen fit to depart from ancient tradition and select a Colonial—more especially a Colonial of real African descent—to represent all her colonies, not only her West Indian colonies, at an Assembly of such great importance as the one to be held in Paris next month. (Cheers). I feel, Sir, that this is an outstanding tribute which will go down in history and I hope that it is only a stepping stone to higher things.

Mr. WILKINSON : I have much pleasure, Sir, in seconding that motion. I do not think I can add to what I said earlier, and I repeat that it is a great com-

pliment to us that a Barbadian has been selected for this purpose. We do appreciate the fact that a Barbadian has been selected.

Dr. CUMMINS : Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I should like to make a few remarks by way of an explanation. The junior member for St. James said that it was regrettable that this information was not given on Tuesday last, or words to that effect, when the senior member for St. Joseph was here. Those of us who knew about it were bound to secrecy until an announcement was made in the United Kingdom on Sunday night. Consequently, as the honourable member will understand, nothing could be said about the matter in this House before to-day.

Mr. COX : I want to move an amendment to that motion. I think it is but fair and fitting that the name of the person who has been selected should be inserted in the motion and for that reason I beg to move that the words "in the person of Mr. G. H. Adams" be inserted after the word "Barbadian".

Mr. MAPP : While I think we all appreciate the very open-handed and genuine tribute which has been paid by the other side of this House yet I think that the wording of the motion should be just as open-handed and genuine. We should not simply let it go on record as our appreciation of the appointment of a Barbadian but we should also be so open-handed as to say "a Barbadian in the person of Mr. So and So." For that reason I beg to second the amendment of the senior member for St. Michael.

Mr. MOTLEY : I accept the amendment.

Mr. TALMA : I do admire the magnanimous spirit which has been evinced here to-day by members of the Opposition. I must say that I feel grateful to be here to-day and to hear such sentiments as have been expressed by the Opposition. I hardly believe that ten years ago any sentiments such as have fallen from the lips of the junior member for St. James and others who have spoken would ever have been expressed in the Chamber and if that magnanimous spirit which has been evinced here to-day continues, it would be well for the future of this colony. (Cheers).

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

PETITIONS.

Mr. TALMA : Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I beg to present a petition from the Vestry of the parish of Christ Church praying the House to pass a Bill to authorize them to pay a gratuity of £25 to Geraldine Burnett, lately a nurse at the almshouse of the said parish, and to charge the same on the rates of the said parish.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I take it that the language of the petition is temperate and respectful.

Mr. TALMA : Yes, Your Honour, and I ask that the petition be taken as read.

I also beg to present a petition from the Highway Commissioners of the parish of Christ Church praying the House to pass a Bill to authorize them to borrow a sum or sums of money not exceeding £2,500 to be used in the purchase and importation of a Diesel Motor Road Roller for use of the said parish. The petition is respectfully worded and I beg to move that it be taken as read.

Both petitions are taken as read.

NOTICES.

Government Notices are given as follows :—

Mr. BLACKMAN : Resolution to approve the Regulations entitled the Bridgetown (Parking) Regulations, 1948, made by the Director of Highways and Transport on the 12th day of February, 1948, and approved and sanctioned by His Excellency the Governor on the 10th day of April, 1948, under the provisions of section 7 of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic

Act, 1937 (1937-16), as amended by sections 41 and 42 of the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945 (1945-12).

Mr. BLACKMAN : Resolution to approve the Regulations entitled the Bridgetown (One-way Traffic) Regulations, 1948, made by the Director of Highways and Transport on the 12th day of February, 1948, and approved and sanctioned by His Excellency the Governor on the 10th day of April, 1948, under the provisions of section 7 of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937 (1937-16), as amended by sections 41 and 42 of the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945 (1945-12).

Mr. TALMA : Resolution to approve the following allocation of the balance of the stabilisation fund fixed on the 2nd of September, 1948, by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the advice of the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board under the provisions of section 10 of the Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export Act, 1937.

The balance of the stabilisation fund shall be allocated among producers of fancy molasses and among producers of sugar other than muscovado sugar as follows :—

- (a) among producers of fancy molasses at the rate of 8990c. a gallon on every wine gallon produced; and
- (b) among producers of sugar other than muscovado sugar at the rate of \$3.6686 per ton of sugar made.

Other Notices are as follows :—

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT : Of the following Address :

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency The Governor

The House of Assembly respectfully request Your Excellency to take the necessary steps to enable the 550 tons of rice from Brazil to be sold at six (6) cents per pint.

Mr. HUSBANDS : Of the following Address :—

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency The Governor

The House of Assembly respectfully request Your Excellency to forward to His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies their grave expression in protesting against the recent action taken by the Government of the Union of South Africa in applying "Jim Crow" regulations to travellers on trains in Cape Town.

2. Deciding to oust from the Legislature of that Country the representatives of non-white citizens of the Union.

3. The House of Assembly respectfully hope that His Majesty's Government will take appropriate action and give a clear indication that the policy of the South African Government is not in the best interests of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

4. The House respectfully urge that a ban be placed on imports from the Union of South Africa as an indication of this colony's disapproval with this policy.

Mr. TALMA : A Bill to authorise the Vestry of the parish of Christ Church to pay a gratuity to Geraldine Burnett, recently employed as a Nurse at the Christ Church Almshouse.

Mr. TALMA : A Bill to authorise the Commissioners of Highways for the parish of Christ Church to raise a loan not exceeding two thousand five hundred pounds for the purpose of purchasing a Diesel Motor Road Roller.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT : Of my intention to move later in the day for the passing of the Address of which I gave notice a few moments ago.

Mr. CRAWFORD : Of the following Address :

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency The Governor

The House of Assembly beg to acknowledge receipt of Your Excellency's Message No. 18/1948 with regard to the prorogation of the House and the issuing of writs for a general election.

The House respectfully would inform Your Excellency that, in their considered opinion, the middle of December is unsuitable for the holding of a general election and would request Your Excellency to prorogue the Legislature, with a view to its dissolution, around the middle of October and to issue the writs for a general election on the same day.

Mr. CRAWFORD : Of my intention to move later in the day for the passing of the Address of which I have just given notice.

Mr. LEWIS : I rise, to a point of order and I should like to say that inasmuch as we have a Message from His Excellency the Governor already, in connection with the prorogation of this Legislature, I consider that the better course would be to appoint a Select Committee of this House to draft a Reply to that Message and make a suggestion or suggestions to the House. (Cheers). I respectfully submit to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that that is the better way to deal with the matter. (Hear, hear).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The senior member for St. Philip is quite in order in giving notice of this Address but if and when the matter comes up for discussion, the junior member for the City or any other member may move that the Governor's Message be referred to a Select Committee or adopt whatever course, he thinks, is appropriate.

Mr. CRAWFORD : Of the following Address :—

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency The Governor

The House of Assembly beg to draw to Your Excellency's attention the fact that considerable dissatisfaction exists amongst employees in the public service of the colony, more especially in the junior ranks of the Civil Establishment and the unestablished staff, in consequence of their present remuneration which is inadequate.

The House of Assembly would draw Your Excellency's attention to the current increase in the cost of living and, in view of the urgent necessity for assisting these people to cope with it, respectfully request Your Excellency to take the necessary steps:

(a) to make available to these employees any additional remuneration to which they are entitled as a result of the investigation conducted by Mr. G. H. Adams, C.B.E., or

(b) any other steps which would afford them some immediate relief from their present distress.

Mr. CRAWFORD : Of the following Address :—

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency the Governor

The House of Assembly is of the opinion that in order to assist in promoting British West Indian unity and solidarity, there should be an annual interchange of school children on holiday and respectfully requests that Your Excellency will endeavour to obtain the co-operation of the other West Indian colonies to make this proposal a reality.

Mr. CRAWFORD : Of the following Address :—

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency the Governor

The House begs to draw to the attention of Your Excellency the following :—

The standard of living of the people in this colony is considerably lower than it is in Great Britain, and the existing import restrictions compel the colony to purchase essential commodities at prices which are far higher than those for which they could be obtained outside United Kingdom markets.

Continuance of the present position will seriously affect the economy of the country and lower an already low standard of existence.

The House accordingly requests that Your Excellency will make representations to the United Kingdom with a view to obtaining the institution of effective price controls on goods manufactured in the United Kingdom for the export trade to the colonies.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. TALMA, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, a Bill to authorize the Commissioners of Highways for the parish of Christ Church to raise a loan not exceeding £2,500 for the purpose of purchasing a Diesel Motor Road Roller is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. TALMA, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, a Bill to authorize the Vestry of Christ Church to pay a gratuity of £25 to Geraldine Burnett, recently employed as a Nurse at the Christ Church Almshouse is read a first time.

PUBLIC HEALTH AND HOUSING BILLS POSTPONED.

Dr. CUMMINS (After having been granted leave to take charge of the Orders standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph (Mr. ADAMS) : Mr. Deputy Speaker.—Before you proceed to call the Orders, I should like to state that I am unable to proceed with the first Order to-day. The amendments to the Bill are many and I propose to have them cyclostyled and distributed among honourable members, so as to give them time to peruse them at home. We shall proceed to consider them at our next meeting. I, therefore, ask leave to postpone Orders Nos. 1 and 2.

There being no objection, the honourable member is granted the leave asked for and Orders 1 and 2 are accordingly postponed.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The first 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.

SUPPLEMENTARY VOTES FOR GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Dr. CUMMINS : Mr. Chairman,—The first Resolution is for the sum of £19,485 for the service of the Colony. The respective Departments and amounts are set out in the schedule to the Resolution,—a Resolution similar to those which have come before this House from time to time for supplementary votes for Departments. There is nothing controversial about the Resolution and I shall proceed to take the Heads in the Schedule one by one.

(1)

Dr. CUMMINS : I beg to move that Head VI Customs, item 7, Eight Watchmen—1948-49, £750 stand part of the schedule.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. COX: I want to say a few words in connection with these watchmen. The long hours for which these watchmen work and the non-provision of shelters for them have been drawn to the notice of the Government on a few occasions and once again I want to bring them to its notice in the hope of getting something done in the respective matters. It is known by members of the Government and members of this House as well as by others that there are watchmen in the Government's employ who work for as many as 105 hours a week and I think that any reasonable person would agree that those hours are definitely too long. Some of these watchmen go to work at 4 o'clock in the afternoon and leave at 7 o'clock on the following morning. To be required to watch for 15 hours a day is definitely too hard on these watchmen and something should be done to afford them relief. Then, as we go about the island we see watchmen employed by the Department of Highways and Transport without means of shelter from rain and I think that suitable huts should be constructed for these men. After all, they are human beings and they should not be left in the rain and the cold, as if they were dumb animals. As a matter of fact some dumb animals are housed and I repeat that suitable huts should be constructed and conveyed to the places where these watchmen are watching tools and materials belonging to the Department. I sincerely hope that the Government will take heed of what I am saying and remedy the situation in respect of the two matters which I have mentioned.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman,—It escaped me to draw to the attention of this Committee that since this Resolution was introduced, a memorandum was circulated among honourable members stating that it is proposed to increase the amount under this Head by £300 to meet the cost of providing four temporary clerks to enable arrangements to be made for the staffing of the rum bonds. I ask leave to increase the amount under Customs by £300.

There being no objection, leave is granted and the £750 is increased by £300.

Mr. LEWIS: Paragraph 2 of the memorandum to which the senior member for St. Thomas referred states that these are to be temporary clerks to enable arrangements to be made for the staffing of the rum bonds. I should like to throw out a hint to the honourable member and it is this: If the Government is employing additional temporary clerical assistance in the Customs Department, it should consider whether it is a right thing to take these new employees and put them to work at such a great distance from the central Customs Warehouse. I am saying, Sir, that this proposal does not necessarily mean that that will be done but I am asking the senior member for St. Thomas to give the assurance that what are virtually warehouses under Customs control at great distances from the central Customs, will be staffed by senior and responsible clerks. I throw out that suggestion so that the honourable member may know that at least one member of the House thinks that way.

The question that the sum of £1,050 be voted under this Head is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motions of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN in each case, the Committee agrees to the following standing part of the Schedule:—

(2)

Head VIII Post Office, item 12, Inland Mails—1947-48, £29; item 13, Overseas direct mails (Surface)—1947-48, £200; item 14, Overseas direct mails (Air)—1947-48, £300, total £529.

(3)

Head IX Public Market, item 13, Hot Water Supply—1948-49, £29.

(4)

Head XIII Legislature, (b) Other Charges, House of Assembly, item 13, Reporting and printing debates of Legislature—1947-48—£106.

(5)

Head XIV Legal Departments (b) Other Charges, item 47, Incidentals—1947-48, £3; item 54, Books and stationery—1947-48, £1.

(6)

Head XVI Prisons, item 18, Provisions—1947-48, £200; item 20, Cleaning, water and light—1947-48, £70; item 22, Maintenance of hospital—1947-48, £35.

(7)

Head XX Education, iv. Further Education, item 29, Grant for evening classes—1948-1949 £2,000; v. University Education, item 26, Island Scholarships at Codrington College—1947-48, £3; item 32, Students in the United Kingdom—1948-49, £315.

(8)

Head XXV Public Works Department, item 33, Harbour Police Station and Jetty—1948-49, £50.

(9)

Head XXVI Pensions, item 3, Police and Fire Brigade Pensions and Gratuities—1947-48, £2,680; item 4, Teachers Pensions and Gratuities—1947-48, £1,675; item 6, Public Pensions and Gratuities—1947-48, £4,684.

(10)

Head XXVIII Subsidies and Grants, item 32, Imperial War Graves Commission—1948-49, £21; item 33, Barbados Nurses' Association—1948-49, £75.

(11)

Head XXIX Miscellaneous Services, item 24, Books and Publications—1947-48, £35; item 25, Insurance of Government Buildings, etc.—1947-48, £38; item 25, Insurance of Government Buildings etc.—1948-49, £75.

(12)

Head XXX Income Tax and Death Duties Department, item 10, Travelling Expenses—1947-48, £3.

(13)

Head XL Waterworks, item 29, Delivery of Water by lorry—1948-49, £1,600.

(14) RESOLUTIONS.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the following stand part of the schedule:—

Resolution No. 60/1946—Water-borne Sanitary Services at Deacon's Road Tenantry, £1,491; Water-borne Sanitary Services at Belfield Tenantry, £1,742; Enclosures to house spots at Belfield, £600.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILKINSON: This total of £3,833 does seem to be a large increase of the amount of £6,852 which was provided for these purposes. I am not questioning the wisdom or otherwise of instituting the water-borne system in these tenancies but I do think that the amount has been increased enormously. I wonder whether the senior member for St. Thomas can tell me whether the water-borne system was included in the original estimate.

Dr. CUMMINS: The explanatory note says:—“Under Resolution No. 60/1946, the sum of £6,852 was provided for the purpose of supplying domestic tap, water-closet and shower bath to 66 homes in the Deacon's Road Tenantry, Black Rock, for the pur-

pose of supplying domestic tap, water closet and shower bath to 68 homes in the Belfield Tenantry, Black Rock, and for the purpose of supplying palings and fencings, and the planting and caring of hedges to each house spot and playing field in the Belfield Tenantry." That was in 1946 and everyone knows—the honourable member more than anyone else—that the cost of materials and labour has increased considerably since then.

The question that the sum of £3,833 be voted under this Head, Resolutions, is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

(15)

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, the Committee agrees to the following standing part of the schedule:—

Resolution No. 82/1947, Cost of Living Allowance to Persons in receipt of Pensions from Government—April, 1946—March, 1948—£675.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the following Resolution do now pass:—"Resolved that the sum of £19,485 be placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the service of the Colony as set out in the schedule hereto.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Before you put the question, Mr. Chairman, I should just like to make a brief observation on No. 13, Head, Waterworks, £1,600. When a sum of £500 is provided for an item and the supplementary Resolution is for three times the original estimate, it certainly seems to me that the Department concerned should have come back to this House at a much earlier date. The original amount in this case has been overspent by more than three times as much. When the House provided £500 for a service and £2,100 has to be spent on that service I think, Sir, that the House should have had a say in the matter long before now.

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

INSTALLATION OF ELECTRICITY IN THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY CHAMBER AND OFFICES.

Dr. CUMMINS: The next Resolution is for the sum of £280 to meet the cost of the installation of electricity in the House of Assembly Chamber and Offices and the charges for electric current for the remainder of the current financial year. The items are set out in the addendum and those of us who feel that this House should meet at night or late in the evening will welcome this Resolution. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: This is very necessary and it is also necessary that the Government should send down a Resolution for a sum of money to meet the cost of installing fans in this Chamber. There are days when the heat is intolerable in this Chamber. These palm leaves on the table are no longer serviceable; as a matter of fact they should be given to the Museum. I think the members of the Government should make a note of my suggestion with the view of having it carried into effect.

Dr. CUMMINS: I promise the honourable member that I shall bring forward his suggestion in the proper quarter.

Mr. WILKINSON: I notice that included in this estimate is the cost of these fluorescent lamps already installed as a temporary measure and I have been wondering for some time where the money came from to install these lamps. It was not done with the consent of this House and I thought it was

paid for out of the Governor's "two hundred". Personally I am not in favour of night sittings, but as long as we sit here sometimes until it is dark I think that these lights are necessary.

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. BLACKMAN, the CHAIRMAN reports the passing of two Resolutions, the postponement of two in Committee of Supply and asks leave to sit again.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order is 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. BLACKMAN, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY VOTE FOR MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES POSTPONED.

Dr. CUMMINS asks for and is granted leave to postpone a Resolution for £1,000 to supplement the provision in the Estimates of Expenditure for the year 1948-49 under Head XXIX, Miscellaneous Services, item 2, Cost of Exchange.

UNIFORMS AND EQUIPMENT FOR THE BARBADOS VOLUNTEER FORCE.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, — The next Resolution is for the sum of £208 to provide to the 31st March, 1949, for expenditure on uniforms and equipment at a cost of £132; uniform allowance for officers at a cost of £30; and a typewriter at a cost of £46 for the Barbados Volunteer Force. It is well known to honourable members that we are reviving the Volunteer Force and later on we shall deal with a Resolution for the appointment of certain officers. This Resolution is for the sum of £208 to equip the men and to purchase a typewriter. I beg to move that it do now pass.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SYMONDS enters the House and takes his seat.

RESOLUTION re SUBSIDIZATION OF COMMODITIES POSTPONED.

Dr. CUMMINS asks for and is granted leave to postpone a Resolution for the sum of £128,500 to supplement Resolution No. 16 of the 13th April, 1948, to provide for the subsidization of flour, salt fish, salt pork and balanced animal feed to the 31st. March, 1949, in order that the price of these commodities may be stabilized at such prices as may be fixed by the Competent Authority.

MANAGER FOR SEAWELL AIRPORT

Mr. BLACKMAN: The next Resolution is for the sum of £350 to engage the services of a Manager for Seawell Airport to the 31st. March, 1949.

The addendum states that the situation at Seawell Airport is unsatisfactory and it is hard to justify further delay in a matter which concerns the safety of the travelling public. It is proposed

to engage the services of an Airport Manager on a temporary basis for the remainder of the current financial year at a salary between £30 and £50 per month according to qualifications. The appointment will be reviewed in connection with next year's Estimates when the salary of the post will be fixed permanently. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not want to delay the passing of this Resolution but I should like to obtain a little more information about this matter. I would like to know what are the duties of this officer. The Government could hardly expect us to vote a sum of money to engage the services of this Manager at Seawall Airport without telling us what his duties are.

Mr. BLACKMAN: At the present moment I cannot give any further information in the matter. I have sent for the file and as soon as it comes I will be able to give the information which the honourable member asks for.

Dr. CUMMINS: In the circumstances I beg to move that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

The question that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

RESOLUTION re REHABILITATION OF DISCHARGED PERSONNEL POSTPONED

Dr. CUMMINS asks for and is granted leave to postpone a Resolution for £5,000 to supplement Resolution No. 8 of the 25th February, 1948, for the following purposes:—(a) to make provision for the establishment in civil life of discharged Service personnel; (b) to operate or participate in schemes for the care and maintenance of discharged service personnel; and (c) to provide a rehabilitation fund from which payments may be made.

REHABILITATION AND EXTENSION OF THE FISHING INDUSTRY

Mr. TALMA: The next Resolution, Sir, is for the sum of £3,000 for the rehabilitation and extension of the fishing industry of the Island.

The addendum sets out the details relative to this amount. An industry, such as the fishing industry, whereby the community as a whole stands to benefit should always be assisted and I feel sure, Sir, that any Resolution which has for its object the granting of assistance to fishermen would always meet with the approval of all honourable members of this Chamber. In fact, I hope that in the not too distant future, not only will fishermen be assisted in the purchasing and repairing of their boats but also in securing fishpots because fishing is done not only in the deep sea but also around the coast. The ones who also fish but are too poor to purchase boats should be assisted in securing fish-pots and I hope that the next time the Government comes to this House for money to rehabilitate and extend the fishing industry, the amount will not be £3,000 but £6,000 or even more. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Like the senior member for Christ Church I hope to see the amount increased to £6,000, possibly £12,000, to give the necessary assistance to this valuable industry. But, Sir, there

seems to be some misunderstanding about this matter which I should like to be cleared up. Even in the addendum to this Resolution, it is stated that this £3,000 is to enable the Fisheries Committee to make loans to fishermen for the building and equipping of new boats, for repairs to boats and for the provision of fishing tackle. The misunderstanding to which I refer is whether loans should also be made to owners of fishing boats who are not actual fishermen. There is a great difference between fishermen and owners of fishing boats and the feeling is that fishermen alone, the majority of whom have never been owners of fishing boats can avail themselves of this opportunity to obtain loans, but the owners of fishing boats who have never been actual fishermen but have invested all their savings in fishing boats cannot. I should like to know whether the Government's spokesman can give the assurance that these funds will be used to assist not only fishermen but also owners of fishing boats who take an active interest in the fishing industry.

Mr. WARD: If this money is to help only fishermen who are actually engaged in fishing, then I should like to say that I agree with the senior member for the City that some assistance should also be given to persons who purchase fishing boats to enable fishermen to go out to sea and fish. These boat owners provide the necessary equipment for the men who are willing to go fishing and I think that they too should be assisted in keeping their boats in repair, so as to be able to employ fishermen throughout the fishing season. Although it is a very commendable thing to help fishermen to own their own boats, yet I feel we should not lose sight of the fact that the owners of fishing boats who are not actual fishermen give the fishermen the opportunity to learn to fish and, therefore, they too should be assisted in keeping their boats in repair. I feel that the Government's spokesman should give us the information asked for, so that we may be able to pass it on to owners of fishing boats if and when they make enquiry of us in the matter.

Mr. COX: I really do not see anything wrong as far as this Resolution is concerned. As we know for some years now the Government has been lending money to fishermen who own boats to enable them to build or repair their boats, not, as I understand, to fishermen who do not own boats; therefore, I cannot see anything in the point which has been raised by the senior member for the City. I take it that the money is loaned to fishermen for the repair of boats that need repair or, in cases in which the boats are in such a bad condition that they cannot be repaired, to furnish new boats.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I am in agreement with the senior member for the City. As far as I can understand the matter, the owner of a fishing boat has to be actually a fisherman to be able to obtain a loan to repair his boat and that is an entirely wrong principle. There are many owners of fishing boats who are suffering because they cannot get any assistance to repair or replace their boats and I certainly think that the Government should do something to relieve them.

Mr. LEWIS: I really think that in the event of an emergency and wanting to get fish for the people, the Government may be excused for going outside the strict interpretation of a Resolution but I regard it as a dangerous principle for the Government to take these funds and encourage people who do not actually catch fish to own fishing boats to be hired by, or rented to, fishermen. The first duty of the Government is to the people who actually go fishing,

to assist them to be independent enough to own their own boats. That is what the Government should do. If I go to the Government to-morrow and tell its members that I would like to be given the concession on a certain bus route, are they going to lend me the money to buy eight or ten omnibuses? The proposal of the senior member for the City is tantamount to a person saying to the Government "I want to stay at home and send fishermen to die for me. I would like you to help me to build a couple of boats for the purpose." Is the Government going to help people who find themselves with sufficient money to be able to build boats and insure them against loss? I think that that is dangerous ground to tread upon because I cannot see how the Government could refuse to help other people to establish themselves in other industries. Help the fishermen to be independent enough to own their own boats but as far as helping the people who are going to put up the price of fish is concerned I think the Government would have to be careful how it proceeds along that line. I feel that it is a dangerous principle. I am not telling the Government not to embark on it, if its members find it expedient so to do, but I am telling them to beware of the procedure.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I did not think that my point would have resulted in the making of so many irrelevant statements by other honourable members. I am not going to anticipate the reply of the senior member for Christ Church but I am sure that he appreciates the recommendation which I have made. Let me reply to my colleague. What is the real position with regard to the fishing industry? Some years ago when there were 150 to 200 fishing boats in this island, what percentage of the people who exercised their calling on those boats was boat owners? Without any financial assistance people in the same walk of life built those boats but did not actually go fishing. I repeat what the addendum to the Resolution states:—"The Fisheries Committee have asked that a further sum of £3,000 be made available in order to enable them to make loans to fishermen for the building and equipping of new boats, for repairs to boats and for the provision of fishing tackle." That can only mean what it says, that is, that these loans are to be made available to fishermen and what I am saying is this: There are many people of the fisherman's type who invest their savings in boats—even long before the Government thought that the fishing industry was worth while being assisted—and provide the means for fishermen to go to sea. There seems to be some misunderstanding in the granting of these loans. A man only becomes a fisherman when he has had the opportunity to fish on somebody's boat and after he has become a fisherman he can make application for a loan to build and equip a new boat or if he is a fisherman owning a fishing boat he can make application for a loan to repair his boat but the person on whose boat he learnt to fish cannot avail himself of the opportunity to borrow some of this money to repair his boat or to provide fishing tackle, simply because he is not actually a fisherman. I challenge anyone to say that the majority of the owners of fishing boats around this coast are not small people and these boats are owned by small people because other persons who thought of investing \$700 or \$800 or \$900 in a fishing boat would not, in the absence of an insurance scheme, take the chance. This Resolution is saying that a person who is a fisherman can be assisted to build or repair boats but the actual owner of a fishing boat who took the chance when there

was no insurance scheme and built his boat so that fishermen could go to sea and catch fish cannot avail himself of such assistance, when nearly every week one reads in the newspapers about the loss of a fishing boat or fishing boats. I cannot understand the argument that if you help people in an industry such as this, you will have to help people who drive omnibuses to own buses. That is ridiculous. Some consideration must be given to the small owners of boats. No one is going to say that if A never had any interest at all in the fishing industry he should be given assistance to invest in boats. Personally, I would not agree to that but if a person who is not an actual fisherman owns a fishing boat and it is in need of repair—and there are hundreds of people in this island who are owners of fishing boats and are not fishermen—he should be given assistance from these funds. That is my sole contention. I have no desire that this Resolution should be postponed because in my earlier remarks I began by saying that I hope that the amount for this purpose would be increased to £12,000. The owner of a fishing boat gets his boat smashed in a gale but because he is not a fisherman he cannot receive assistance from this fund to replace his boat. My contention is that he should be given some assistance to replace or repair his boat because the inhabitants of this island benefit from his boat in the same way as they benefit from the boat which is built with some of this money by a fisherman.

Dr. CUMMINS: I quite appreciate the point of the senior member for the City and I promise him and those who feel like him that I will take it up in the proper quarter.

Mr. TALMA: I thoroughly agree with the sentiments expressed by the senior member for the City and many of the other honourable members who have spoken on this subject. Although the principle may be wrong, yet the fact remains that in the past the ones who owned fishing boats were not necessarily fishermen; there were there before the Fisheries Committee was established, and they are still there to-day; they provide work for fishermen. What we need to do is to assist the fishing industry as a whole and if we do that, we shall not only be providing employment but a source of food for the people of this country. I too promise that I shall go into the matter more carefully. It must be borne in mind that the Fisheries Committee is only in its infancy; we have not even built our experimental boat yet.

Mr. LEWIS: I feel that in any review of this matter the Government should consider that its first duty is to take hard-working fishermen who risk their lives at sea and make them boat owners instead of boat renters; that is my contention.

Mr. HUSBANDS: The main object of this Resolution is to rehabilitate and extend the fishing industry and as far as I know this industry has been served by many people who have never been fishing themselves. I believe that in the parish of St. Lucy the highest percentage of fishermen are to be found and I know that in many cases there has been reluctance on the part of fishermen to make any investment in fishing boats. It is, therefore, a great hardship on the majority of the people who have invested their money—many of them being people of small means—in fishing boats if they were deprived of benefiting from a Scheme of this sort. The addendum states that fishermen are the persons to benefit from this but, in my opinion, those persons who own fishing

boats but are not fishermen should be included; the latter have served the people of this island for many years in this respect; many of them are people of very moderate means and I do think that in any scheme which the Government establishes to help the fishing industry they should be included and given their fair share of help.

Mr. MAPP: I know that the sea does not touch my constituency, consequently I did not rise to say anything before; but, in my opinion, the only solution of this problem is to be found in conducting the fishing industry on a co-operative basis. Both fishermen and owners of fishing boats should be helped. I do not see how they can refuse to help a poor owner of a fishing boat who needs help neither can they afford to refuse help to a fisherman who needs a boat. The only way out of the difficulty is to conduct the industry on co-operative lines with fishermen and owners of fishing boats having shares in the concern.

Mr. SYMMONDS: We have all been suffering from a lack of fish in this country for a considerable time and now that the Government is doing something to help the industry I do not think we should debate much longer this question as to whether we should help the owners of fishing boats or the fishermen. We want so to improve the fishing industry that everybody in this island will have an abundant supply of deep sea fish to eat. That is the main thing and, therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am going to move an amendment to this Resolution by inserting after the words "Governor-in-Executive Committee" the words "for making loans to fishermen and fishing boat owners." As I see it, Sir, the fishing industry in this colony has been kept alive for many years by many small owners of fishing boats and if at this moment we were to refuse assistance to those small owners by so wording this Resolution that only fishermen should be assisted, we would be defeating the very object at which we are all striving, that is, to encourage fishermen and the small people who invest and who have invested, from generation to generation, their small savings in fishing boats along the sea-coast of this island, to improve and repair their boats so that we could have an industry in this colony employing more people and preventing us from having to import more salt fish. I do not think that this Resolution meets with any disapproval by members of this Assembly generally. From the views which have been expressed here to-day, it is plain to me that the majority of members present are willing to assist small owners of fishing boats as well as fishermen and I want formally now to move that the words "for making loans to fishermen and fishing boat owners" be inserted after the words "Governor-in-Executive Committee" in paragraph 1 of the Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to second the motion of the honourable junior member for St. George and I want to say, in passing, that I really cannot appreciate the necessity for the long-winded debate we have heard on this issue. What some people seem to forget is this: If you are going to lend money only to fishermen who possess their own fishing boats then you are going to render very little assistance to the fishing industry, for the simple reason that over 90 per cent. of the boats in the colony are owned by people who are not fishermen in the first instance and in the second instance, the majority of these owners are very poor people. I do not know a single wealthy boat owner in St. Philip or Christ Church or St. John or St. Joseph; they

are all poor people who own boats in those parishes. If you are going to say that the only persons who can borrow this money must be fishermen who have their own boats then you may as well say that you are not going to advance money to peasants from the Peasants' Loan Bank unless they are going to work their lands themselves. The moment this Committee was told that people in need of assistance have gone to the Fisheries Officer to obtain loans and have been told that the Fisheries Committee has no authority to advance loans because they were not actual fishermen, that in itself was sufficient information to make this Committee come to the conclusion that it is necessary to extend the scope of the credit facilities for people in the fishing industry in the same way as we have found it necessary to liberalize the systems under which similar institutions operate. I see no reason why we should not on this occasion take the necessary steps to assist the fishing industry as a whole.

Dr. CUMMINS: I just want to say this: As I have said, the senior member for the City made a point which I appreciate and which did not occur to me before. I appeal to honourable members to pass this Resolution and I am prepared to discuss the point with the Governor and the Fisheries Officer.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman—If you are going to permit a debate on the amendment I should like to say that I think we have to be very careful about what we are doing. I have heard the analogy made between helping the fishing industry—

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

MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL RE SELECTION OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE STANDING CLOSER ASSOCIATION COMMITTEE

On re-assembling,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that since the adjournment for lunch I received the following communication from the Honourable the Legislative Council.

*The Honourable Legislative Council
To
The Honourable House of Assembly*

The Legislative Council have the honour to refer to the Message from the Honourable House of Assembly dated the 17th of August on the subject of the Closer Association of the British West Indian Colonies and the selection of representatives from Barbados on the Standing Closer Association Committee and to inform the Honourable House in reply that the Council consider that the matter could be more suitably dealt with at an informal meeting of members of the House and Council.

2. They therefore suggest that the members of the House should meet members of the Council in the Lobby of the House of Assembly at 11 a.m. on Tuesday the 14th of September.

DUDLEY G. LEACOCK,
President.

Legislative Council Chamber,
7th September, 1948.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (A).

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I ask leave to move the suspension of Rule 61 (a) in order to continue Government Business.

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.

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

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

REHABILITATION AND EXTENSION OF THE FISHING INDUSTRY

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House was last in Committee of Supply, we were considering a Resolution to place the sum of £3,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the rehabilitation and extension of the fishing industry of the Island. The honourable junior member for the City was speaking.

Mr. LEWIS: I was speaking on the proposed amendment to the wording of this Resolution. I quite appreciate the fact that it is this branch of the Legislature alone which can attach conditions to money coming out of the Treasury, and I think we are in order in making this amendment; but I think that if the Resolution is amended as has been suggested, it is likely to have the very opposite effect to that which we intend it to have. I have heard the analogy made between the granting of this assistance to the fishing industry and the assistance given to peasants by the Peasants Loan Bank; I do not know that the Peasants' Loan Bank lends money to peasants for the purpose of buying land and therefore the analogy is lost. The way in which I see the matter is that if we extend the terms of this Resolution we are saying that the boat owners should be assisted. It would be very easy, in my opinion, for a boat owner who has six or eight boats to sell two of them to some rich person and that person would go to the Fisheries Committee as a boat owner and get a loan to increase his fishing fleet. I think that the effect of that would eventually be to keep the actual fishermen in a state of slavery. I am not saying that the fishermen would not be assisted but the tendency would be that those who are able to maintain themselves can present the Fisheries Committee with a certain amount of working capital and they would remain in this business. Even fishermen who own boats may find themselves having to rely on somebody giving them a boat to work, as I believe it is called. If we say that we should lend money to boat owners I take it that only the original boat owners would get this relief. The addendum to this Resolution says this: "The Fisheries Committee have asked that a further sum of £3,000 be made available in order to enable them to make loans to fishermen for the building and equipping of new boats, for repairs to boats and for the provision of fishing tackle." I think that we should preserve the people who actually go out to fish. My opinion is that rich investors can easily acquire a boat or two and come in this scheme to the detriment of the actual fishermen. (A MEMBER: The Fisheries Committee can use their discretion). They cannot use their discretion; people who have fishing boats, no matter who they are, should be assisted from these funds if the wording of the Resolution is amended, otherwise the Fisheries Committee would be doing wrong. There is nothing

defining who is rich and who is poor; my point is that we should leave the Resolution as it is. The Fisheries Committee is doing a good job and I would leave it to them. My opinion is that if we extend the terms of this Resolution, we are cutting the ground from under the fishermen's feet so to speak and we will make them perpetual slaves to investors.

Dr. WILSON and Mr. GARNER came into the Committee and took their seats while Mr. LEWIS was speaking.

Mr. MOTTLEY: My colleague should appreciate the fact that we are lending people money; and the same argument which the honourable member used in connection with the Fisheries Committee not using discretionary powers must also apply to the fishermen. Before a fisherman can get a loan there must be some terms attached to getting that loan; you must have a certain amount of the money. The honourable member would have this Committee to believe that if this amendment is inserted that would give the right to capitalists to come in; but there are no capitalists where fishing boats are concerned. This is a question of lending people money. The majority of these people—98%—are small people with small investments in boats. If we have any experience about fishermen we are bound to agree that we have never seen a man who invests money in fishing boats get rich. All this amendment asks is that rather than turn back a man because he is not a fisherman to-day, let him have the right to borrow some money and not maintain that he must be a fisherman. Because people are not actually fishermen are we saying that they cannot obtain a loan? The boats must be efficient and if loans are made to these fishing boat owners to repair their boats, that would enable employment to be found for the fishermen who would have nothing to do otherwise. If people have fishing boats which are in a state of disrepair, let us help them to repair these boats and provide employment for others; do not let us talk about capitalists. If a fisherman acquires enough money as to be able to own a boat and ceases to do the actual work of going out to sea, do you call him a capitalist? Let us assume that somebody wanted \$5,000 or \$6,000; do you think that the Government would not have some Regulations in that respect? I have discussed the matter with the honourable member in charge of the Resolution; the Fisheries Committee would have some Regulations in this respect. Fishing boat owners have actually been told that this assistance is for fishermen, but fishing boat owners who must employ people should be assisted in repairing their boats. The matter is similar to loans being obtained from the Peasants Loan Bank. Would you lend money to a man on the condition that he is going to work his land himself? How could we sit here and say that money should not be loaned to a small number of people who own fishing boats? I am supporting the amendment of the honourable junior member for St. George.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Before the question is put, I want to be charitable and say that the honourable junior member for the City has adopted the position which he has adopted because he is misinformed on the matter. To begin with, as the honourable member on my left has emphasized, this money is not a gift; it is a loan on which interest is paid. To say that the comparison between loans made in respect of the fishing industry and those made in respect of the Peasants' Loan Bank is lost because we do not lend peasants money to buy land is not correct. The honourable junior member for the City agreed to extend the scope of the Peasants' Loan Bank and under that extension the peasants are allowed to

obtain loans in respect of the remainder of the purchase price of their land. The honourable member also knows that millionaires go to the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank and borrow money. Similarly, the Peasants' Loan Bank is for the benefit of people who own up to ten acres of land; a man who owns ten acres of land is by no means a pauper and he is assisted. In this particular instance, I am sure that 98%—if that is not correct it is nearly so—of the people who own fishing boats are poor people. I do not know one fisherman in St. Philip who could be called a capitalist. There are people in Christ Church who allow fishermen to work their boats for a consideration, but in every instance it is correct to say that the boats are owned by poor people and they work on a co-operative basis. The fishermen work for a share in the catch—not for a salary—and in the same way we extend help to the sugar factories through the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank, and to the peasant proprietors through the Peasants' Loan Bank, it is suggested that we should do the same thing to people who participate in the fishing industry of the colony.

Mr. TALMA: I regret that the debate on this Resolution has been so long. I appreciate the sentiments which have been expressed by the last speaker and the honourable senior member for the City has opened the eyes of the Committee. We are anxious to help the fishermen and I do feel that the matter has been debated for too lengthy a period. I accept the amendment and I shall be very happy if it goes through so that we can get on with some other business.

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

ENGAGEMENT OF THE SERVICES OF AN AIRPORT MANAGER

Dr. CUMMINS: Earlier today when we were dealing with a Resolution with respect to engaging the services of a Manager for Seawell Airport, some information was asked for and the honourable member in charge of the Resolution did not have the file. Since then the file has been obtained and the honourable member is prepared to give the information required. I ask leave therefore to revert to Resolution No. 4.

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

Mr. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman,—I think the information asked for can best be given by quoting from letters in the file. A letter dated the 21st of April from the Assistant Manager of the British International Air Lines Ltd. says this:—

"In order to increase the utilisation of our aircraft, it has become essential to schedule certain flights into and out of Barbados during the hours of darkness, and my Company would be very grateful if the Government of Barbados would take the necessary steps to equip its aerodrome with facilities suitable for schedule night operations.

The Director General of Civil Aviation is aware of the facilities which he considers necessary, and appreciates that, with our relatively small fleet of aircraft, it is absolutely essential that we obtain the highest possible utilisation to offset the present high costs of operation."

The Director General of Civil Aviation in a letter dated the 18th of August says this:

"It is, in my opinion, of the utmost importance that the appointment of an Airport Manager is pressed forward. Until this happens the Government is running a very serious risk in the event of an accident taking place, in view of the absence of any

proper control or organisation of rescue facilities. I have brought this to the notice of the Government of Barbados before and I reiterate that the importance of this factor cannot be over-emphasised.

Until this appointment materialises, I consider it imperative that some Officer be deputed to take an active interest in the Airport operations, and to take the responsibility for them. I shall personally be delighted to advise and help in any way possible."

On that correspondence the Government have decided to appoint an Airport Manager, and this Resolution is for the purpose of providing the salary for that Manager up to the 31st of March, 1949.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank the honourable member for the information he has given. Although in my opinion it is absolutely necessary to demand further information in connection with a Resolution like this, I do not think it is possible at this moment to obtain it because this is a matter of embarking upon a new venture. I think that honourable members ought to be satisfied with the recommendation of the Director General of Civil Aviation. I suppose that when the Estimates come before us we will be told more about the salary.

Mr. LEWIS: I do not suppose that the salary is so attractive that we will have to think of getting somebody from outside. But I am merely asking if I can be told now what is contemplated, whether, if it is not beyond his capacity, someone who is already in the service of the Government or somebody else, some Barbadian, will be able to undertake these duties. I have seen airport managers at work and I think that the qualification for the job is largely one of intelligence to conduct the business so that no accident will occur and to see that the persons using the airport are granted facilities and made comfortable. I should merely like to know whether or not it is the intention of the Government to bring in somebody from outside, whether there is somebody who is technically trained for this job and we will keep that person on that comparatively small salary and then when the Estimates come before us, say that it is a big job, one which is worth £1,000 to £1,500 a year. I certainly hope that it is not the intention of the Government to get it in like this.

Mr. MAPP: I must confess that I am at a loss to understand what is meant by paragraph 2 of the addendum to this Resolution. It says this: "It is proposed to engage the services of an Airport Manager on a temporary basis for the remainder of the current financial year. Applications will be invited for the post at a salary between £30 and £50 per month according to qualifications. Quarters will be provided on payment of rent." This word "qualifications" can be deliberately taken to mean many things in many quarters. Quite recently a post was advertised calling for qualifications and somebody with no qualifications at all was appointed to the post. In this case you must either have some definite qualifications for this post or you must not have any. You are either advertising for a man with certain qualifications for this job or you are not. I cannot understand the position. It seems to me that if a man who has not got the qualifications for the post is appointed you will pay him £30 per month and if another man who has the qualifications which are not necessary for the post is appointed you will pay him £50. That is the only explanation which any reasonable person can apply to paragraph 2 of the addendum to this Resolution. I hope that the honourable member in charge of the Resolution will explain whether or not the position is that if the person appointed has qualifications he will be paid £50 per month and if he has not got the qualifications

he will be paid £30. I do not see that anybody will come from abroad for this post at a salary of £50 per month if he is getting more abroad. The honourable member who has just sat down has said that all that is needed to do this job is intelligence and I say that we should state definitely what qualifications we want the appointee to have; otherwise we will find that a person from abroad who has no more qualifications than a local person will be given £50 per month while a local person will be given £30 per month.

Mr. WILKINSON: Like the last speaker I do not know what is meant by these qualifications. I was at Seawell one evening when a plane was late; it got dark and the plane had to come in under its own lights because the man who switches on the engine up there was out riding a bicycle. I agree with the honourable junior member for the City; I do not think that any special qualification is required for doing this job. I would like to know what the qualifications are; what are the duties of this post, to see that the passengers sit in the right place, to see after the planes coming in or what? What is this job? Unless I can get more information I feel that the consideration of this Resolution should be postponed.

Dr. CUMMINS: This is a new job and we are entirely dependent upon the Director General of Civil Aviation. I do not know if anybody in Barbados knows anything about running an Airport. We have never had one before and consequently nobody has the necessary experience. It is quite possible that we will find somebody in the West Indies, possibly in Trinidad, who will have the experience and the qualifications and so be a suitable man for this job. The Director General of Civil Aviation says he thinks that we can get a manager locally for about £600 a year. He will look after the staff, runway, radio, firefighting apparatus, night flying and so forth. It is difficult at this stage to lay down any hard and fast rules as to the type of man we want; however, it is expected that aviation will increase. I do not think that we can give any further information on this matter now; this Resolution is to pay the salary of the Officer who is appointed up to the 31st of March, 1949. If by that time honourable members think that this expenditure is not necessary or the man who is appointed is not the right type of person, they will have a chance of reviewing the position and probably they will reduce the amount.

Mr. DOWDING: Although we are not very clear as to what this job is to be, I want to draw this fact to the attention of the Government. This job is in connection with the Airport, a new venture, and we have among us some Ex-R.A.F. personnel both Officers and men of other ranks. I feel that if it is at all possible the appointment should be made from among these men who went to England and who would be very capable of doing this job.

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

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

Mr. DEPUTY 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.

PETROLEUM (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is to resume Committee on the Bill to amend the Petroleum Act, 1882 (1882—2).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Mr. TALMA: This matter has more or less received the sanction of this Committee but there were one or two little discrepancies which needed to be explained by me. Owing to the fact that the file was not in my possession on the last occasion, I found it impossible to explain matters to the satisfaction of the Committee. The honourable junior member for St. James raised the question relative to the storage of petroleum products above ground; he asked if the object of this Bill is to ensure the safety of the products and the community why should any of these products be allowed to be stored above ground? I refer to Clause 2 of the Bill which reads as follows:—

2. Paragraph (a) of section nine of the Principal Act is hereby repealed and the following new paragraph substituted therefor:—

“(a) that it shall be lawful for any dealer in petroleum products of a flash point between 73° F and 150° F to keep in a place to be approved by the Petroleum Inspector any quantity of such petroleum products not exceeding one thousand gallons in metal containers installed not less than three feet underground or to keep in any shop, store or warehouse any quantity of such petroleum products not exceeding two hundred gallons if in metal cases and fifty gallons if in wooden packages.”

The answer to the honourable member's question is that it has been agreed to allow a small quantity of petroleum products to be stored above ground for the purpose of retailing instead of having to resort to the big containers at all times. The point raised was a very good one and I shall accept an amendment which I hope the honourable member will make whereby no petroleum products can be stored in wooden containers. Before I sit down I must say that this Bill has been pending for some time, since October, 1947, and consequently, there is an amendment which should be made. I ask leave to delete the word “three” occurring in line 6 of this Clause, and to insert the word “two” in place thereof; and to delete all the words occurring after the word “cases” in line 9.

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

Mr. WILKINSON: I thank the honourable member for the explanation.

At this stage, it now being 3.30 p.m., Mr. DEPUTY 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 am sure that honourable members will give us a few minutes so as to finish this Bill. I therefore ask leave to move the suspension of Rule 61 (b) so as to finish the Bill.

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

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Rule 61 (b) be now suspended so as to continue Government Business, namely, to finish the Petroleum Bill.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When Government Business was last being considered, the House was in Committee on the Bill to amend the Petroleum Act, 1882 (1882—2).

PETROLEUM (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House resumed Committee on the Bill, Mr. Smith being in the Chair.

Mr. TALMA: I also ask leave, Mr. CHAIRMAN, to delete the word "if" occurring in line 9 of Clause 2 of the Bill.

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

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

On the motion of Mr. TALMA, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee with amendments.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

REVERSION TO PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Government Business for which the Rule was suspended having been completed, the House will now revert to Private Members' Business. The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business is to move the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor requesting that immediate steps be taken with a view to the establishment of a Government-owned printery in this island.

ADDRESS *RE* SALE OF RICE FROM BRAZIL AT SIX CENTS PER PINT

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—In pursuance of the notice which I gave earlier to-day, I beg to move that the Address of which I gave notice be taken as the first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business.

Mr. GALE: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I would appreciate getting a copy of the Address so that I can realise exactly what it is about. It is very difficult for one to agree to the consideration of an Address without a copy of it being handed to him.

The question that the Address be taken as the first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. SYMONDS, LEWIS, TALMA, BLACKMAN, CRAWFORD, GARNER, HAYNES, DOWDING, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WARD, WILKINSON, MOTTLEY and Dr. CUMMINS—15.

Noes: Messrs. SMITH, HUSBANDS, COX, FOSTER and MAPP—5.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business now stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. James—To move the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor *re* the sale of the 550 tons of rice from Brazil at six cents per pint. If the honourable member has any copies of this Address perhaps he will be good enough to circulate them.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—On the 17th of August a Resolution was placed before this House for a sum of money—it was £10,000—for the purpose of subsidising rice from Brazil so that it could be sold at nine cents per pint. This House postponed the consideration of that Resolution for only one reason, namely, that the Government should send down a Resolution for subsidising this rice so that it could be sold at six cents per pint. That was three weeks ago and no Resolution has been sent down by the Government yet. It looks very much as if the decision of the majority of this House is being flouted. (Hear, hear). I cannot put it in any other terms. We have passed several Addresses to the Governor and no notice has been taken of them at all. I think it is high time that this House do something about the matter. The original Resolution is still on the Order Paper and I consider that we are going to be told that if we do not pass this Resolution, the people will have to pay 14 cents a pint for their rice. That is the move which I consider the Government is going to make. I am hoping that this Address will be passed and that the Government will take cognisance of what we are saying. We were told by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph that this rice can be sold to the big merchants and they would sell it to their customers. I think the honourable member went even further and said that the big merchants would buy this rice and sell it to their customers and leave the Demerara rice for the small man to buy. The quantity of 550 tons of rice is not even a month's supply: if it is kept for the well-to-do they cannot use that quantity in a month and the small man who has no rice at present will be unable to buy any at all. That will be the result if the suggestion of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph is carried out. The honourable senior member for St. George said at the meeting when the Resolution was being considered that we would be subsidising rice for the rich.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to be careful not to infringe Rule 120. It says "No member is to allude to any debate of the same session, upon a question or Bill not being then under discussion, except by indulgence of the House, for personal explanations."

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT. My argument is that if this rice is put on the market at 9 cents or 14 cents a pint, which might happen, the small man will have to purchase it at that price and this is not time for increasing the price of the small man's rice by 50%. When this Government took office they forthwith increased the price of the small man's rice by 50% and today they are increasing the price of this 550 tons of rice by another 50%. I think that this House will be well advised to let the Governor know that we are not satisfied to postpone a Resolution with one object and then no notice is taken of it. I beg to move that this Address do now pass and I am hoping that it will be unanimously passed this afternoon. It reads as follows:—

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency The Governor

The House of Assembly respectfully request Your Excellency to take the necessary steps to enable the 550 tons of rice from Brazil to be sold at six (6) cents per pint.

Mr. GALE: I beg to second that. I will not recapitulate the arguments which were used on the last occasion. The position was clearly put on that oc-

casion and I do not think the arguments need to be repeated on this occasion.

Dr. CUMMINS: A few Tuesdays ago we had a full-dress debate on this rice question. I want to speak now because I agree with the principle which has been adopted here that when the passing of an Address to the Government is being put to the vote, members of the Government should vacate their seats. I mean to do that this afternoon. Since the debate on the rice question the matter was re-considered in Executive Committee and certain conclusions were arrived at. I will not mention them here. Since that debate I have spoken with shopkeepers and with other people. A few shopkeepers have told me that if the rice were sold at 9 cents a pint provided that there is also rice at 6 cents a pint, they think the public would buy it because the rice at 6 cents a pint has a lot of pickings, while this other rice is represented to be of a better quality and they would lose less in pickings. Speaking for myself, what I fail to see is this: when this rice arrives here and there is a fair quantity of British Guiana rice on the market, how are you going to sell both qualities at the same price? I spent my early days in a shop; I was brought up in a shop, I got my education through a shop and in those days there were always two or three qualities of rice and you could buy what you liked. (Mr. GARNER: The price was different too). The price was different; there were always two or three prices. I do not see that there will be a lot of mixing; the whitish rice cannot be mixed with the lower grade rice. There is one thing which I want to correct; the honourable senior member for St. James said that when this Government took office they forthwith increased the price of the poor man's rice by 50%. I am ashamed to hear those remarks fall from the lips of the honourable member; that is a deliberate misstatement which is calculated to do harm. What was the position? The price of the rice was increased as a result of British Guiana not being able to keep to their Contract. British Guiana agreed to supply us with a certain amount of rice, at a certain price. It was not a question of any deliberate wangling on the part of the Government. The statement made by the honourable member is one which particularly brought me to my feet. The British Guiana people demanded a certain price for their rice and it was a question of either taking it or leaving it. Since then it is known to every member of this House that they have adopted other subterfuges so as to get a further increase in the price of the rice. Therefore when the honourable senior member for St. James says what he says, that is a misstatement.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT entered the House and took his seat while Dr. Cummins was speaking.

Mr. WARD: From the argument of the last speaker I am a little doubtful because he said that the poor man would be willing to pay 9 cents a pint for his rice.

Dr. CUMMINS: On a point of explanation I said I was told that by shopkeepers one of whom I may say is a member of this House.

Mr. WARD: The honourable member was told that the poor people would be quite willing to pay 9 cents a pint for their rice.

Dr. CUMMINS: On another point of explanation; I added if you have the two qualities of rice side by side. I want to be quoted correctly.

Mr. WARD: The honourable member said that he was told by a shopkeeper, a member of this House—

Dr. CUMMINS: I said that I was told so by shopkeepers one of whom is a member of this House.

Mr. WARD: The honourable member said he was told that individuals would buy this rice at 9 cents a pint. There would be no alternative but for the individuals to buy it at that price because there would not be sufficient rice at 6 cents a pint. There is no argument in that; we are only asking that this Address be passed so as to try and ameliorate the position when this rice comes to the Island. It is a well-known fact that the cost of living is fairly high, that work is not so plentiful as people would like it to be and there are many people who are unemployed. I, personally, feel that if the Government is willing to help people, they should be willing to subsidise this rice at 6 cents a pint so that everybody can get his quota. Why should it be left to the merchants to say that this rice is for a select number of people? In my opinion, rice should be sold at one price. The honourable senior member for St. Thomas spoke about the price of rice in his early days; but there was no hardship then because an individual could have his full supply of the cheap rice and he would buy the more expensive quality for a hobby. When this rice arrives and it is sold at 9 cents a pint, an individual who has 9 cents will have nothing left when he buys a pint of rice; whereas if this rice is sold at 6 cents a pint when the individual buys a pint he will still have 3 cents over. I am sure that there are a good many people who will not get that rice at all. Honourable members who represent the people know that the people are not fully employed and the higher we make the price of their food the greater hardship must be created on these people. I feel that every member of this House should be willing to subsidise this rice at 6 cents a pint as has been requested in this Address; and I do not see that there is any need for any lengthy debate because we had a full-dress debate on the question a few weeks ago. People will buy this rice at 9 cents a pint but they would buy it more easily at 6 cents a pint.

Mr. SMITH: It has been urged that the Government should help the consumers by subsidising this rice at 6 cents a pint. If we are out to spend £8,000 or £16,000 more on subsidising rice, I feel that it would be much better or cheaper for the Government and the consuming public if the Government could see their way to spend this money in subsidising salt fish which is being sold at 18 cents a pound—and a poor quality at that—and pig's head which is also being sold at 18 cents a pound and which is 90% bone. This salt fish and pig's head used by the poor people should be reduced to 10 cents a pound. We could reduce the poor man's meal from 10 cents a pound to 6 cents a pound and we know that by next month we will have a full supply of ground provisions which need to be cooked with salt meat. We should subsidise those commodities which are too expensive. The well-to-do have no use for pig's head or neck bones; as a matter of fact, they do not know them and they would not even give them to their dogs. (Cheers). I feel that if this rice is left at 9 cents a pint and we reduce the prices of other commodities which are used only by the poorer classes, we would be doing the consuming public a great favour. (Cheers). As I have said, ground provisions must be cooked with salt meat and you must have salt fish along with them. A pint of rice at 9 cents should go much further than a pound of meal for 10 cents. The poor people can get a pint of rice which they can cook and eat with salt fish, and they cannot use ground provisions without anything with which to eat them. I am in favour

of the Government sending down a Resolution for £16,000 to subsidise those commodities which are used only by the poorer classes and leave the rice at 9 cents a pint. I repeat that that will be doing the consumer public a great favour because I know what the poor people want and what they have to eat. I know more about that than the honourable senior member for St. James. He can only talk about the poor man's rice at 6 cents a pint but I do not think he knows anything about the pig's head or neck bones. The small people cannot buy proper meat; they have to live on the cheap stuff which should not be brought to this island at all but they cannot do any better. I repeat that I am in favour of a Resolution for £16,000 to subsidise other commodities and leave the rice at 9 cents a pint. I am sure that the people will benefit by that. We should not stand here and try to spend another £8,000 in subsidising rice; by next month we are going to have a lot of potatoes in the island and we know that these provisions have to be cooked along with something else. I say therefore; let us subsidise salt fish and pig's head as I have already mentioned and do the consuming public a great favour.

Mr. HAYNES: I did not intend to speak on this matter because it is something which should be passed unanimously by this House; but the remarks of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas have brought me to my feet. He says that shopkeepers have said that they can sell these two different kinds of rice. I, too, have talked with some shopkeepers—some reliable ones too—and their feeling in the matter is that if it were not for the Food Control Inspectors which are naturally very useful, the two brands of rice would be sold one for the other. It would always be the bone of contention among the people as to whether they were getting the rice at six cents a pint or that at 9 cents a pint, and there might be some lawsuit taking place when a disgruntled customer says: "You gave me 6 cents a pint rice at 9 cents a pint." For that reason a lot of shopkeepers in this island feel that there should not be any discrimination in the price of rice or they will not stock it at all. They are afraid of some malicious prosecution. The honourable senior member for St. Thomas has told us that there used to be several varieties of rice, but there was no question of any price control then. At that time a man could sell rice as he liked and the quantity altogether. I am supporting the passing of this Address.

Mr. GARNER: I have listened to this debate very carefully so far and I am still of the same opinion as when I spoke on the last occasion. I am surprised to think that the Executive has not dealt with the Resolution as was required by this honourable House. It appears to me that the Executive or somebody in the Executive is flouting the wishes of this House on every occasion; and I think it is high time that a stop be put to it. I do not know if a march from the House or something else would alter the position, but it does seem to me that somebody will have to do something if the situation is to be remedied. I heard my colleague fraternally say that rice should be sold at 9 cents a pint because meal is being sold at 10 cents a pound, but the honourable member knows very well that if you put the price of rice at 30 cents a pint it will be sold, but it will be reflected on the credit sheets of his books and on his account at the merchants. If you put the price of rice at 2/- a pint it will be sold because the people are hungry; they want rice and

they will buy it at any price. However, that is not what we are here to tell people; we are here to see that the Government give them cheap food. If you put the price of rice at 30 cents a pint the people will credit it because they want food; but that will be reflected on my book eventually it will get on the merchant's book and somebody will go bankrupt. If a person comes to my shop for any item and she has not got the money to pay for it, she will tell me: "Put it in the book for some future day" and God knows when that day will come. It was all well and good when people were getting money from America, but now they are spending Barbadian money and everybody knows what that means. I think that the honourable junior member for St. Joseph should have thought twice before he spoke; no matter how much in the way of ground provisions the average man gets, he still looks for his rice. We do not want to feed people on potatoes; that is not becoming of this House. We want to give them rice and we on this side of the Table maintain that the Government is not in such a poverty-stricken way that they cannot subsidise this rice to the tune of how the Demerara rice is being sold to-day. There are many factors which contribute to this argument; we have a short crop and nobody is spending any money this year. The average man gets two or three days' work and that means that he has only a limited amount of money on which to live. When we push up the cost of living so that people cannot purchase the very necessities of life, how can we say that we are representing these people? Recently we voted £5,000 for St. Lucia, we may give away more before we are through, and I do not see that £8,000 could not be spent in subsidizing this rice so as to keep down the cost of living. With regard to the other point, this is not a matter of politics. Far from that it is a matter of knowing something about economics. I think that we would be well advised to let His Excellency or the Executive or both know that it is the feeling of this House that this matter should not be ignored. If the majority of this House pass any Address or Resolution, I do not see why it should be flouted when it goes up there. If that is so then we will have to protest in a vigorous way. Another point is this: we cannot say that only certain people will buy this rice; that is a farce. Under the prevailing circumstances if a shopkeeper goes to town for rice and only one brand can be obtained during that particular week, if there is no Demerara rice about the place, he must take the Brazil rice; so that you cannot say the poor man will not have to buy that rice. As it is now, we have not got the rice; but there might be the time when both grades of rice will be here or only one brand will be here and if you do not try and get some of that brand, somebody will be faced with starvation. While my colleague fraternally says that potatoes will be here in another month, a lot of harm can be done between now and then. A lot of people go to sleep with just a little bit of food to keep them alive in these days. I think that whoever is in charge of this matter should move quickly so that this rice will come in and they should make sure that all the necessary arrangements are made so that when it comes we will not have to go all over again. We must have food for the people and it is our bounden duty to keep this rice at a level where everybody can have his fair share. When money was coming from America, people could get anything; we have no American money coming in now and we are living on Barbadian shillings. The cost of living is already high for the inhabitants

and I think it would be as well to keep everything on a certain level so that the cost of living will not be too high.

Mr. COX: This is one of the questions which have been engaging the minds of members of this House and those of the community for some weeks now. At the outset, I want to make it clear that I am voting against this Address. I do so with a full sense of duty and responsibility and I am ready to take the consequences. We hear quite a lot in this House Tuesday after Tuesday about the poor man, and one wonders why his condition has not been further improved since the capitalists, the Conservatives, the Labourites and everybody is on his side. Why, the poor man should have Heaven overnight if that is the case; but instead of that we find that his position has become worse. Let us deal with the principle on which commodities are subsidised. The Government's principle is to subsidise commodities which are more or less used by the poorer classes, items such as those which have been mentioned by the honourable junior member for St. Joseph, because the Government is conscious of the fact that the majority of workers in this colony are being deprived to a large extent by their masters of a decent wage which will cause them to live in decent surroundings. The Government has come to the conclusion that the only thing it can do as a means of extending the slender earnings of the workers is to subsidise the items which are extensively used by these poor people. Let us examine the position. We get a certain amount of rice from British Guiana and some weeks ago we could not get any through no fault of the Government. Now we expect to get a better quality of rice from Brazil than that which we are getting from British Guiana at present and that rice is supposed to be sold at 13 cents a pint. The Government says that instead of allowing this rice to be sold at 13 cents a pint, it will subsidise the rice so that it can be sold at 9 cents a pint. I have not heard it said that the two qualities of rice are the same. As we know, before the War and even during the early part of the War, there were two different grades of rice on the market and they were sold at two different prices. Why I say that I am not prepared to agree to subsidise this rice to be sold lower than 9 cents a pint is because of the fact that the people whom we are attempting to help by subsidising the rice at 6 cents a pint are not going to get it. That rice will be pushed into every corner by the big merchants of this colony and the poor people will still have to buy the other grade of rice. I am in a position to say that an item like condensed milk, which is subsidised as soon as it is landed in this colony, cases of this milk have been pushed into various houses in Belleville and Strathelyde when women of the labouring class with their babies could not get a spoonful of this milk, in spite of the fact that the milk was subsidised so that the poor people could buy it cheaply. That is what has happened; I could mention items which are subsidised by the Government and which, when they arrive in this colony, are sent for the greater part to places like Belleville for the rich people. Only a few weeks ago a lady in Belmont Road reported that she had lost \$22 worth of tinned meat. That was when we were supposed to have a hurricane and it was said that as much tinned meat as possible should be kept.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: To whom did the lady report?

Mr. COX: I understand that she reported to the Police. We are only wasting the time of the

House when we are fooling and cajoling the poor unfortunate people when we should be doing something for them. The poor people do not understand the position because if they understood it some of us would have been hanged already. Rice is 6 cents per pint and I know that an old lady wanted two pints and she had to pay a shopkeeper in the south-eastern part of the island 16 cents for it last week; and she had to buy cauliflower leaves with worm holes in them before she could get that rice for 16 cents. That is the position; but you hear people talking about the poor man and I say that we should see ourselves as others see us. During the debate on the Resolution for the subsidisation of this rice, an honourable member mentioned on the floor of this House that six cases of English potatoes rotted on him—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member must be careful, as I warned an honourable member earlier, not to allude to any debate for this session.

Mr. COX: I thought this would be a continuation of that debate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: We are now dealing with an Address.

Mr. COX: I bow to Your Honour's ruling. If we really have the interest of the people at heart how can any of us allow food to be thrown away when there are so many starving people around us? We cannot allow people to get on the floor of this House and say that the poor man and the common man is dying in their area and they are so composed having whisky and soda, chicken and a lot of vegetables! I am prepared to speak what is in my mind on any question that comes before the House. I am convinced that the truth will be made known even although it takes a longer time to be made known and to fructify than a lie. I am sure when the truth is known, the agony of those who are responsible for the lies will be great. Tuesday after Tuesday we hear about the poor man's cause; I have never heard so much about the poor man before. Something is wrong if so many people are interested in the poor man and yet he is going down. People who could not spell "poor man" before are now talking about the poor man (Loud Cheers). Nothing like that can disturb me in the least, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because I know that good begets good. I say that if people do not see things for themselves and fight against the evil forces, if they do not see that there are those who come under the guise of sheep when in truth and in fact they are wolves, then I say that the people will go back to the darkness whence they came. I am surprised at the attitude of some honourable members today as against what it was in 1946 when the rice question was before the House. We know that the people prefer rice at 9 cents a pint because the quality is better than that at 6 cents a pint. I, too, have had a conversation with a prominent shopkeeper and he said that it is impossible for these two qualities of rice to be mixed without the mixture being observed. I feel therefore that if we have the two qualities, one at 6 cents and the other at 9 cents, people who are in a position to purchase the quality at 9 cents will do so and leave the other quality to be purchased by other people. My sole reason for not agreeing to have these two grades of rice at the same price is because I know that the better grade will find its way at J. N. Goddards' and similar stores. The poor people will be told: "We have not got any of this rice", but the 20-pound and the 50-pound paper bags of rice will be sent into Belleville and Strathelyde. Hence we will be sub-

dising this rice in the interest of the rich people who refuse to pay taxes whereby the Government can get money to subsidise the same rice; we will be subsidising this rice for those people so that they will not have to spend the money which they have kept back from the poor man for the last 300 years. I am taking a positive stand in this matter, as long as I know a thing is wrong I will vote against it; but if it is right, I will support it. As I said before, I am ready and willing to take the consequences. This is a cheap political stunt being played by some people; I could quote a million and one cases in which the poor man, of whom we have been hearing so much today, has been ill-treated by those who say that they have him at heart. The Government would be a sort of jelly-fish to take notice of political moves by a few members of this House who have prevented good work from being done and at the last moment talk about the poor man and his rice only to fool the electorate. I say that the Government would be a sort of jelly-fish—and we know the unholy alliance between the Congress Party and the Conservatives—to take any notice of this Address if it is passed. (MEMBERS: Oh yes?)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the honourable member should be very careful about his remarks.

Mr. COX: I am suggesting that members of this House should take their responsibility seriously and be not afraid of the people. If honourable members are working in the interests of the people they will be elected to this House, and they will not need any cunning devices or plans. Let us do things which will help the people but do not let us pass Addresses about this and about that when in truth and in fact they do not amount to a row of pins to the people.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I could not sit here this afternoon and allow this Address to be passed without again emphasising an aspect of this matter which I emphasised on a former occasion. It seems to me that the Government is definitely playing hide and seek when it comes to the question on which the majority of the elected members of this House have expressed their desire. To-day there is starvation in this colony second only to what was experienced immediately after the 1914–18 War. It is alright for a few people who may be able to get full supplies for themselves but there are the masses in this island who are unemployed or seasonally employed and who go to sleep hungry many a night. I come in contact from day to day with cases in which I find grown men with tears in their eyes because they cannot get any food for their children and I ask: is this a time for any Government to be trying to impose its will on the majority of this or any other House while the people are starving? This is a time when people cannot get any meal, flour or rice and if a paltry £8,000 or £16,000 will bring to this island an additional supply of rice at a time when it is most needed to save people from dying from starvation, then I say that this is no time—I do not like to use the term “playing politics”—but this is no time for one section of the House to work its will against another section. Let us put an end to that: let us show by an overwhelming vote that we are not prepared to allow this condition of affairs to continue. As far as the rice being sold at 6 cents and 9 cents a pint is concerned, I cite this instance, recently the Government fixed the price of eggs at 6 cents and 8 cents apiece and can you buy an egg for less than 8 cents? I hope that honourable members will pass this Address without any delay and that the overwhelming desire of this House will be implemented.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I did not intend to speak on this matter because on the last occasion I expressed my views which I think are well known and therefore I am voting for the passing of this Address. I should like to say that in a matter of this sort, it is most unfortunate that people should assume, when honourable members suggest that this rice should be subsidised at 6 cents a pint, that there is some ulterior motive or dishonesty about the matter. We sit here Tuesday after Tuesday and hear all sorts of arguments but I am amazed this afternoon at the suggestion of the honourable senior member for St. Michael that the Government would be a sort of jelly-fish to accede to the request of the majority of the members of this House. I am serious about this matter because upon that statement you can see what is happening and what the honourable member said might decide the fate of a lot of things. Honourable members who realise that they are not elected to this House on the whims and fancies of the honourable senior member for St. Michael can appreciate that there is only one alternative. When the elected members of this House pass an Address dealing with the subsidization of rice and, Mr. Deputy Speaker an honourable member says that the Government would be a sort of a jelly-fish to accede to the wishes of the majority of this House and nothing is done in connection with the wishes of the House, that is tantamount to a Cabinet dictatorship.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I hope that the honourable member will proceed with his argument in favour of the Address.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I was replying to the statement of the honourable senior member for St. Michael, a statement which honourable members seem to think should be ignored. (A MEMBER: You are doing wrong to notice it). Surely there must be some balanced persons in the Government. I am voting for the passing of this Address and I think it is time that honourable members should take courage and face the facts. If it is suggested that this rice should be subsidised and sold at 6 cents a pint I cannot imagine that honourable members in agreeing to that, have any but the purest of motives relative to the inhabitants of this colony. Behind the question of subsidisation the arguments used hinge on the question of the cost of living. That is the whole point. If rice is sold at 12 cents or 30 cents a pint it will be credited and so it will be shown on the books. Some people would rather die before they rob you but the whole question is that of the cost of living. If ever there was an argument which would convince anyone as to whether or not they should vote for the subsidisation of this rice at 6 cents a pint it is the argument that the rice will find its way into the big stores. Surely if honourable members understand the method of allocation—I see that the Government has not mentioned it to-day—they will appreciate the fact that as night follows day, the small man will be forced to buy the majority of this rice. When say, 1,500 bags of rice are landed in this colony from British Guiana, according to the method of allocation—and even the honourable junior member for St. Joseph will have to admit this—those persons who were selling a certain quantity of rice before 1940 will be allocated their quantity pro ratio. Two or three merchants in Roebuck Street with branch shops all over the place will get two-thirds of the rice. I have spoken with shopkeepers too. With both these grades of rice in stock, those who patronise the large retail shops will find themselves getting the greater

proportion of the rice at 6 cents a pint and when the small shopkeeper comes to Bridgetown there will only be the rice at 9 cents a pint. When "X" gets 12 bags of rice—8 bags at 6 cents a pint and 4 bags at 9 cents a pint—will he not send to his shop the grade of rice which will be sold the more quickly? Is he going to hold back any of this rice to be sold to the honourable junior member for St. Joseph or anybody else? I repeat that this question bears on the question of the cost of living. That is what we have to bear in mind and I make no apology for saying that the type of people who will buy the grade of rice at 6 cents a pint will surprise honourable members. The difference between honourable members and myself is that they are not decent enough to say they will buy this rice. I repeat that I am voting for this Address. We are only fooling people to say that those who can afford to buy rice at 9 cents a pint will do so and leave the other rice at 6 cents a pint for the poor man. This is a question of economics I say nothing about what the Government has done or what it has not done. In view of the existing conditions and taking all the circumstances into consideration, it should be obvious that if 550 tons of rice are expected to be landed in this colony, the Government should take the necessary steps to subsidise it so that it will be sold at 6 cents a pint. The Government will be asking for trouble if they fail to carry out the wishes of the majority of this House in a most reasonable thing; and this is a matter which the Head of the Administration will not take it upon himself to turn down unless he is so advised by members of this House.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I came to the House late to-day and I have had lectures in economics. From a Parliamentary point of view I should like honourable members to consider this Address and ask themselves whether they are really and truly serious in their Parliamentary conduct. I do not want to use any superlative language which is so popular nowadays, because we hear that the people are starving and therefore you must do this and that so as to avoid greater starvation. Now on the last occasion a Resolution was brought before this House for the sum of £10,000 for the purpose of subsidising rice from Brazil and the majority of this House voted for the postponement of that Resolution. This is not the place for using any stunts; this is an Assembly where there are 24 members who are supposed to be cautious in what they do. I want to say that when a matter is postponed by the House you do not bring forward an Address asking the Government to implement something the consideration of which has been postponed. The Resolution has not been removed from the Order Paper and it must be assumed that the Government proposes to act on the Resolution. If the honourable member in charge of the Resolution had taken it off the Order Paper then I say that it would be appropriate to pass this Address. But that is not the case; the Resolution is postponed and before it reaches the House again you introduce an Address about it! I am not playing politics but this does not seem to me to be Parliamentary. I made my speech in relation to the postponement of the Resolution on the last occasion and I feel that the Government must review the situation. To pass this Address when the Resolution is still under consideration would be equivalent to having two judgements on one matter. When the Resolution was before the House—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member must be careful not to allude to the previous debate.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am only recalling my speech.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member can state what his views are without referring to the previous debate.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: My contention is that you should subsidise an article if the price of it is beyond the normal means of the people and if you realise that there is going to be a serious shortage of that article then you must subsidize and ration it. I am asking honourable members to be tolerant this afternoon because I am not one of those who sit back and try to lead others astray. I thought at first that this Address was introduced by the honourable junior member for St. James because I expected a different attitude from him; but his colleague is old in years but not where Parliamentary procedure and behaviour are concerned. On reflection honourable members will see that there can be no point in passing this Address at this stage when they have already voted for the postponement of the Resolution; and we cannot spend the money before we pass the Resolution. Of course, there is nothing in the Rules to prevent this Address from being passed and I do not think I am here to tell honourable members what they should do. I am not accusing anybody of playing politics or of being dishonest but my contention is that there is no point in passing this Address; I do not see the necessity for it. If we pass an Address like this, we may as well pass an Address in connection with the Public Health Bill the consideration of which has also been postponed. It will mean that as soon as a matter is postponed we can pass an Address in connection with it and say that the Government must do so and so. There is an Address on the Order Paper asking the Government to import rice from Brazil or other countries but no mention has been made of the price; therefore we have to analyse the speeches which have been made and then come to a conclusion. I regard this Address as just a gallery exhibition the Elections being just around the corner. As long as honourable members have voted for the postponement of a matter which has not been withdrawn from the Order Paper, the matter must come before us for consideration again; and as regards this particular matter, there has not been any undue delay. I feel that the introduction of an Address such as this does not in any way speak well for the House of Assembly in 1948 if honourable members are seriously conducting their affairs. What surprises me is that some honourable members who are apparently in favour of this Address know that this is not the way in which things are done; there is no precedent for the introduction of an Address in similar circumstances. We have postponed Resolutions involving more money than the one in question and we did not have to pass any Address so as to get something done. The voting for the postponement of the Resolution is in order to show that the Resolution has been postponed on such and such a ground. I repeat that if the Resolution had been removed from the Order Paper then this Address would have been appropriate; but to introduce this Address when the Resolution has not yet been brought up for further consideration has the appearance as if somebody is trying to play politics.

Mr. BLACKMAN: If this 550 tons of Brazil rice is subsidised to the amount of £17,500, it will mean that we will be spending \$3,000 a day on the subsidisation of this rice for 28 days. I may mention this: the Governor-in-Executive Committee in what I would call true democratic fashion, has already decided to send down a Resolution to sub-

sidise this rice at 6 cents a pint. (Hear, hear). In true democratic fashion the Governor-in-Executive Committee has also agreed to allow me to put my point of view before the House. I happen to be one of those who are not in favour of reducing the price of this rice to 6 cents a pint. I do not consider that we are justified in subsidising this rice at 6 cents a pint on account of the high cost which it will entail. I feel that that amount of money could be used to greater advantage for the benefit of the people. This Brazil rice is a polished rice and it has not got as much vitamin in it as brown rice. Therefore I do not see why we should make the price of an article which is of lower nutritional value the same as that which is of a higher nutritional value. However, the Government has already decided to send down a Resolution for the purpose of subsidising this rice at 6 cents a pint.

Mr. LEWIS: I warned this Government a long time ago that this subsidisation would get them into trouble. I was the only member of this House who wanted to know whether the Agreement with British Guiana would prohibit any merchant in Bridgetown from importing rice from any other source from which it could be obtained and sold more cheaply. I have never got that question answered. It does not matter what the merits or demerits of the subsidisation of this rice are. I think that the way in which the matter has been dealt with will force the Government to subsidise this rice at 6 cents a pint. The question of economics has been removed from this subject ever since and this Address will have the effect of making some honourable member or members look to the public that they have been instrumental in getting this rice for the people at 6 cents a pint. I am not saying whether it is unparliamentary or anything else to bring in this Address at this particular time; but the very people who have brought in this Address are responsible for the fact that they do not know what the Government is doing. The honourable able senior member for St. Peter went fairly near to the kernel of the matter. He said that honourable members had voted for the postponement of the Resolution in the first instance, but I would like to point out to honourable members that we have come here on several days since the 17th of August when the Resolution was considered and we have voted for the suspension of Rule 60 so as to bring other matters higher up on the Order Paper. We have allowed the Leader of the House to bring up other Resolutions in Committee of Supply above this particular Resolution when it was our right, if we wanted to know what was going on, to refuse to allow any other Resolution to be dealt with and appeal to the Government to tell us what they had done about this Resolution. Many motions have been made that we have passed so many Resolutions in Committee, we have postponed so many, one of which is this Resolution for subsidising the rice, and we have asked for leave for the Committee to sit again but we do not ask what progress has been made in connection with this Resolution! If this is not playing politics with the people's food I do not know what is. We were at liberty to prevent the Resolutions which we passed today from being brought up before this Resolution and to ask the Government what was happening about it; but we know how we would play politics with this Address today. I can only say that this is reprehensible conduct, whether it is Parliamentary or otherwise, on the part of a person who is representing the people. The subsidisation of this rice at 6 cents a pint is

inevitable under the circumstances, and if the Government had done otherwise they might have been able to allow this rice to be sold at the first cost to the people who are most able to buy it and the Demerara rice could be sold to the poor people at 6 cents a pint. I submit that when the people in British Guiana tell us that the position is improving the Government could not tell definitely that good supplies of Demerara and Brazil rice will be here at the same time, and it would take a member like the honourable junior member for St. Philip to tell us what the position will be. I am saying that the two grades of rice will be mixed from tomorrow morning and the Brazil rice will remain in the island until after the Elections. From tomorrow morning the Brazil rice will be in the island and you will hear that it would have been sold at 9 cents a pint but for the Address of the senior member for St. James. As the people do not know the colour or the quality of this rice all will be Brazil rice. I am saying that is a further stage in the playing of politics with the people's food, and as regards the starving people that is nothing to do with whether the rice is 6 cents a pint or 9 cents a pint. That is something to give this matter a twist which cannot be justified at all. If people are out of work and are starving, the Government will have to give them food. They will not be able to buy rice at 6 cents a pint because they have not got any money. I merely got up to state the position as I see it; I repeat that honourable members have sat here for one or two Tuesdays and allowed the Government to postpone the consideration of this Resolution, they have been parties to the postponement and now they introduce an Address the opening remarks in support of which are that they have not heard anything about the Resolution! I say that for a statesman or politician this is not playing the game.

Mr. TALMA: This matter has been occupying the attention of honourable members for a very lengthy period when, in reality, it has been discussed and amended in keeping with the wishes of this House, and in keeping with the desires and suggestions made in the Address the passing of which has been moved here today. Speaking on my own behalf, I have always been in favour of subsidising this rice at 6 cents a pint (Cheers) because I know that some shopkeepers in this island are very unscrupulous and I know that the rice which is to be sold at 6 cents a pint will be sold at 9 cents a pint. I know that taxes are collected from all sources and that people must eat in order to live. I know that rice is regarded as the staple food in this colony and no matter what quality of yams or potatoes we have, rich or poor people look for their rice. I regard this debate this afternoon as being untimely since the matter has already been agreed to. On account of British Guiana not being able to keep to their Contract we have had to get this 550 tons of rice from Brazil, and this might be the only occasion on which we will find ourselves in this position. We have wasted time, not only this afternoon but previously, when more business could have been done in this Chamber. We cannot blame the people in British Guiana to the full extent for what has happened because they had bad labour conditions and if conditions improve, the British Guiana Marketing Board will be able to keep to their Contract. I have heard that the Brazil rice is inferior in quality and it does not cook well, but I cannot swear to that. However I think that the Government has a good and just reason for bringing down the price of this rice to 6 cents a pint so that everybody can buy it at the same price.

Mr. MAPP: I am going to make my position clear. On the previous occasion when the Resolution came up for debate—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot allude to the previous debate.

Mr. MAPP: When we were considering the Resolution to subsidise this Brazil rice, we were told that the rice was of a better quality—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the honourable member means that he was told that in the House, he would be referring to the previous debate.

Mr. MAPP: It is very difficult to avoid mentioning certain facts which came out during the first debate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member can refer to what has been said without saying that it was said during the course of that debate.

Mr. MAPP: I must thank Your Honour for guiding me along that line. The information came out at first that this rice was of a better quality than the British Guiana rice and any reasonable member of this community knows that you cannot go in Broad Street, for instance, and get an inferior article at the same price at which you can get a superior one. We were assured that the Brazil rice and the British Guiana rice would be here at the same time and the plan was to distribute the rice so that the poorer sections of the community would be able to get the British Guiana rice at 6 cents a pint and leave the Brazil rice at 9 cents a pint to be purchased by those who are able to purchase it. In the circumstances, one grade of rice being better than the other, that was a reasonable proposition to be put to this House. But today I hear a different story; a propaganda move has been made and therefore I am explaining my position. Whatever has been said today in favour of this Address was said on the postponement of the Resolution for subsidising this rice; so that we are bringing up the same arguments and wasting the time of the House. I have got up to speak on this matter simply because the Government is changing its position. (A MEMBER: They had to do so.) This is a matter of not finding out facts before coming to the House. We are told today that the Brazil rice is not as good in quality as the British Guiana rice. (A MEMBER: And you still want it to be sold at 9 cents a pint.) If honourable members will listen they will hear a worthy contribution to this debate. It was said that we would get the Brazil rice at the same time as the British Guiana rice and the rice would be distributed in such a way that the poorer classes would be able to buy the cheaper rice. My view is that the Brazil rice should be subsidised and also rationed. Rice is the basic food of the masses and if you ration it, the people will get their fair share. I am not in favour of spending money in one way and not in the other. As long as you do not ration this rice you will be helping one section of the community to the detriment of the other. I am not in favour of spending this money to reduce the price of this rice unless it is going to be rationed. Trinidadians have told me that people can get rice in Trinidad because it is rationed. I say that rationing does not cost us too much if by doing so we ensure that the people get some of the things which we are subsidising. We have been given some information now and we find ourselves in difficulty; we have now been told by a Government member that the information which they have given us is wrong, that this rice is of an inferior quality and that it will be subsidised at 6 cents a pint. That member is a

responsible member of the community and I think that serious reasons should be given—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like the honourable member to say exactly what he is referring to. Is the honourable member referring to something which the honourable senior member for Christ Church said?

Mr. MAPP: He was in favour of this proposal.

Mr. TALMA: I was always in favour of this rice being subsidised at 6 cents a pint. I said so in Executive Committee and I said so again today. (Cheers.)

Mr. MAPP: I am very glad that the honourable member adopts a certain course and sticks to it. If he has the facts at his disposal and adduces his reasons for supporting this measure.—

Mr. TALMA: If the honourable member reads any constitutional law and practice he will realise that if it is a question of one against three whether they are right or wrong you have to go along with them.

Mr. MAPP: I am a young member of this House and I only hope that we will be presented with all the facts in so far as this matter is concerned. If this rice comes to this island and we can also get British Guiana rice, I am not in favour of bringing down the price of the Brazil rice to 6 cents a pint so that a certain section of the community will get the bulk of it. It must be distributed so that the poorer sections of the community can get some of it. When I have been told that this rice is of a better quality than the British Guiana rice and now I am told that it is of an inferior quality, I must make my position clear and with some force. When I say anything in this House I say it seriously and for some good reason. I am not bearing anybody's blame on my shoulders because my shoulders are too small for that. I repeat: I hope that the Government will bring their facts clearly and that they will spend some money in rationing this rice because in that way you will ensure that everybody gets some of it. (A MEMBER: That is too expensive.) Trinidad is rationing rice. I think that we have got to the stage where we can do away with this manoeuvring and act like grown-up people and not like little children. The Resolution dealing with the subsidisation of this rice was postponed because of the wishes of the House and now you bring up this Address asking that something be done before the Resolution is further considered! That is definitely playing politics.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I would just like to reply to the junior member for the City. He accused me, Sir, of playing politics by moving this Address. Well, I can assure him that if getting food for the people of this island as cheaply as possible is playing politics I shall continue to play politics as long as I am returned to this House (Cheers). If he has the interest of the people so much at heart, why didn't he play politics too? He also asked why I did not object to any other Order being taken before the Resolution which relates to the subsidization of this Brazilian rice, inasmuch as it has been postponed for three weeks. The honourable member has been a member of this House long enough to know that we could not increase the amount from £10,000 to £18,000, so I would have been only wasting the time of the House if I had taken steps to have the Resolution dealt with in the circumstances.

Mr. LEWIS: I rise to a point of explanation. I said that the honourable member could have enquired what was happening in connection with the

Resolution. I never said anything about his being able to increase the amount. Why is he bringing that in? It was with the honourable member's consent that the Resolution was postponed and I said that he could have enquired from the Government's spokesman what was happening in connection with it.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I understood the honourable member to have said that I should have refused to have allowed any other Resolution to be considered before the Resolution dealing with subsidization of this rice imported from Brazil. The Resolution was for only £10,000; it was postponed with the view of enabling the Government to send down a Resolution for the full subsidy of £18,000. The Government has had three weeks to reconsider the matter—not a day as the junior member for the City wants to insinuate—and it has done nothing. In the meantime the rice will be landing here and sold at a price which would create a hardship on the people. Further I understand that the quality is not as good as that of the B.G. rice and this Government will have it brought here and sold at 9c. instead of 6c. per pint.

Mr. TALMA: I rise, Mr. Deputy Speaker, merely to say, with your permission, that further investigation has taken place by the Government in the matter and the Government is willing to accept the suggestion that this rice be subsidized in such a manner as to enable it to be sold at 6c. per pt. That is the reason why this House has not heard anything further as yet.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I understand the junior member for St. John to say that the quality of this Brazilian rice is not as good as the quality of the B.G. rice. I hope that members will pass this Address unanimously.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—On a point of explanation. I never said anything about quality. I said that polished rice has not the same nutritious value as brown rice. Brown sugar is more nutritious than white sugar but white sugar is sold at a greater price than muscovado sugar. I did not say anything about the quality of the rice from Brazil because I am not a merchant.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: If nutritious value is not quality I do not know what is.

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

Ayes: DR. WILSON, MESSRS. SYMMONDS, HUSBANDS, F. L. WALCOTT, LEWIS, TALMA, CRAWFORD, GARNER, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, DOWDING, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON and WARD—15.

Noes: MESSRS. COX, MAPP, BLACKMAN, and DR. CUMMINS—4.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will ask the honourable senior member for St. James and the honourable junior member for St. Michael to be so good as to present the Address to His Excellency the Governor.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: As Your Honour pleases.

Mr. GALE: As Your Honour pleases.

MESSAGE TO THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I ask leave to move an Address to the Honourable the Legislative Council in reply to their Message relating to the selection of Representatives on the Standing Closer Association Committee of the British West Indian Colonies.

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

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the following Address do now pass.

The House of Assembly

To

The Honourable The Legislative Council.

The House of Assembly acknowledge the receipt of a Message from the Honourable The Legislative Council of even date relating to the selection of Representatives of the Standing Closer Association Committee of the British West Indian Colonies and beg to inform the Legislative Council of their agreement to the suggestions contained therein.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

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

FIXING THE ORDER PAPER.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I propose to fix the Order Paper now.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: To what point has the honourable member risen?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Before the Order Paper is fixed at all—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable member making a motion that the Order Paper be not now fixed? If so, I will hear him.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am going to do that. I am appealing to the senior member for St. Thomas to see that there is an Address which should be passed this evening. We have always given the necessary co-operation by staying here until a fairly how to get certain things done and I am appealing to the senior member for St. Thomas to see the wisdom in allowing this Address to be dealt with this evening.

Dr. CUMMINS: I am fixing the Order Paper now.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that the fixing of the Order Paper be postponed at this stage.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that and I do so for the simple reason that the Address which the honourable senior member for St. Philip would like to deal with relates to the fixing of the dates for holding the forthcoming General Election. That is the only reason why I am seconding the motion.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—it would appear that some honourable members want this House to sit until a late hour of the evening to discuss an Address of which I do not even have a copy. We have received a Message from His Excellency the Governor stating that he proposes to prorogue the Legislature on the 23rd of November—

Mr. GARNER: On a point of order. The Address of the senior member for St. Philip is not before the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am waiting for the senior member for St. Peter to complete his sentence.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I was saying that we received a Message from His Excellency the Governor stating that the Legislature will be prorogued on the 23rd November, that writs will be issued on the same day and will be made returnable on the 13th December. We received that Message, Mr. Deputy Speaker, two Tuesdays ago—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member must speak on the motion that the Order Paper be not now fixed.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker.—I am sure that you will grant me that same indulgence which you granted the senior member for the City who stated his reason why the Order Paper should not be now fixed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The time for that indulgence which I granted the honourable senior member for the City did not exceed one minute.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I would like to have Your Honour's ruling as to what line my argument must take on the motion that the Order Paper be not now fixed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member is entitled to state, as briefly as possible, the reason why he is against the motion that the Order Paper be not now fixed.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am quite prepared to give Your Honour the opportunity to go home early but it seems as if some honourable members are not in favour of that being done because if they were in favour of it when the senior member for St. Thomas was about to fix the Order Paper they would not have objected. I feel that at some time or other you must give certain people a dose of their medicine and I intend to do that now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable member still speaking on the motion before the House?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Otherwise I will put the question.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I cannot see the wisdom in objecting to the fixing of the Order Paper now. The senior member for St. Thomas does not propose to go on with any more Government Business and when we look at the Orders under Private Members' Business—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable member still speaking to the motion before the House?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Yes, Sir. There are 85 Orders under Private Members' Business on the Order Paper and, personally, I have a lot of matters on this Order Paper which I would like to discuss but I cannot get an opportunity yet to discuss any of them. What is annoying me—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable member addressing the Chair or is he not?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am being interrupted. We are asked to discuss an Address in the form of a Reply to a Message from the Governor and that Address is not before the House in the usual form in which Replies to Messages from the Governor come before this House. I am not convinced that we should consider that Address at this late hour rather than fix the Order Paper. Members on the other side of the House have asked on previous occasions that business should be completed at five o'clock and we on this side of the House have acceded to their request because in these days of steamy weather if you have a comfortable home you do wish to get to it and have a little relaxation. For that reason I am quite prepared to have the Order Paper fixed now and let this proposed Address be dealt with next Tuesday. The discussion on this proposed Address cannot possibly be finished this evening because other members of my Party and I will be expressing our views on it before it is put to the vote. Let us have a look at Private Members' Business on the Order Paper. No. 1 is an Address in Your Honour's name—

Mr. WARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I move that, in accordance with Rule 79, the question be now put.

Mr. WILKINSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: A motion has been moved and seconded that the question be now put and it has been ruled on previous occasions in this

House that when a member makes a motion in accordance with Rule 79, the question is to be put without further debate. In accordance with that ruling I shall put the question.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I would like Your Honour's ruling, in view of your legal training and knowledge of Constitutional Law, as to whether I have the right to speak on the motion before the House. I was speaking on a substantive motion and had not yet resumed my seat when the senior member for St. Lucy jumped up and made a motion that the question be now put.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Naturally, as soon as another honourable member gets up to speak, the honourable member who was on his feet should sit and listen to the other honourable member without losing his right to continue to speak, unless the honourable member who has risen from his seat makes a motion that the question be now put.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The senior member for St. Lucy did not rise on a point of order or on a point of explanation; he simply moved that the question be now put.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I rise to a point of order in the hope that my remarks will be of some assistance. I know that Rule 79 has been used but it has never been used while an honourable member was on his feet. A motion that the question be now put would necessarily indicate that the House does not want any further debate on the particular subject but I would appeal to the senior member for St. Lucy, in the circumstances, to withdraw his motion so that this matter may be regularised. My recollection is that a motion of that nature is not put while a honourable member is speaking. Rule 79 should only be exercised after several honourable members have been heard and there is no new argument to be brought forward. Your Honour has sat in the Chair before but you are sitting there to-day as the result of the Speaker being absent from the island and I think that we should render you every assistance in your presiding over the deliberations and in upholding the dignity of this House and I again appeal to the senior member for St. Lucy, in the circumstances, to withdraw his motion.

Dr. CUMMINS: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I have been informed that the senior member for St. Philip is willing to have the Address, of which he gave notice to-day, placed as the first Order under Private Members' Business at the next meeting. In view of that, I will proceed to fix the Order Paper.

Mr. WARD: asks for and is granted leave to withdraw his motion.

Mr. SYMMONDS: On a point of order. I would like to have your ruling, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on this question. If a member of this House is speaking on a subject and has not sat down can his speech be superseded by a motion that the question be put? Your Honour has not given any ruling on that point and the same thing may happen on some future occasion.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper being fixed,

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to this day week, Tuesday, 14th September, at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I should just like to say, before we adjourn, that the senior member for St. Lucy was given permission to withdraw his motion; therefore, the point of order to

which the junior member for St. George rose is purely academic.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second the motion for the adjournment of the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Before you put the question, Sir, I ask leave to have the Address relating to the prorogation of the House, of which I gave notice to-day, placed as the first Order under Private Members' Business at the next meeting.

The leave is granted.

Mr. COX: I ask that Order No. 7 in my name—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is a motion for the adjournment before the House. The question is that this House do now adjourn until this day week, Tuesday, 14th September, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon. Honourable members in favour will please say "Aye"; those against will please say "No." I think the "Ayes" have it. This House now stands adjourned.