

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT).

SESSION 1946—1948

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 18th March, 1947.

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. G. B. EVELYN (*Speaker*), His Honour Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER (*Deputy Speaker*), Mr. J. T. C. RAMSAY (*Chairman of Committees*), Dr. J. A. LeV. WILSON, Messrs. A. E. S. LEWIS, M. E. COX, D. A. FOSTER, R. G. MAPP, H. W. SPRINGER, M.A., H. D. BLACKMAN, E. D. MOTTLEY, and V. C. GALE.

PRAYERS AND MINUTES

Prayers are read and the Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 11th March, 1947, having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

Messrs. ADAMS, S. A. WALCOTT, GARNER, WILKINSON, and HAYNES enter the House and take their seats.

NOTICES.

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Mr. ADAMS (On behalf of Mr. Crawford): Resolution to grant the sum of £57. 5. 10. to Edgar Edwards as an *ex gratia* grant representing one month's salary for each completed year of service, within the pensionable age limit, as a casual employee in the Public Works Department.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY gives notice of the following Address:—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor*

The House of Assembly are of the opinion that in view of the complex nature of Government business and the desirability of keeping the Public fully informed of the policy and decisions of the Administration and the progress of affairs concerning the welfare of the people of this island, Your Excellency should take the necessary steps to establish the post of Public Relations Officer.

The House would welcome such an appointment following the lines adopted in many of the other West Indian Colonies and that preference be given to a person with practical experience in the collection of information and its presentation.

QUESTIONS

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

Is it a fact that the Department of Highways and Transport has instructed Omnibus Concessionaires that all of their spare units must be kept in the bus stand at all times?

2. If the answer to the above query is "yes", will the Government state precisely the reason for the issuing for such instruction and whether accommodation is available for all such units as aforesaid?

SELECT COMMITTEE'S REPORT

Mr. BRANCKER hands in the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on Head XXXII, Department of Highways and Transport, of the Estimates of Expenditure for the year 1947-48.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair; the House resumes Committee of Supply and continues its consideration of the Estimates for 1947-48, Mr. Ramsay being in the Chair.

HEAD XXVIII—SUBSIDIES AND GRANTS.

The items and the respective amounts to be voted are read.

Mr. TALMA enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. ADAMS: In moving that the sum of £35,588 be voted under this Head, I would like to say that I thank immensely—this is not mere rhetoric but I speak from the bottom of my heart—the junior member for St. James for having given me intimation that he wanted information on item 3. Upkeep of Highways, £26,267 and item 22, Publicity

Committee, £3,000. I make that statement for the reason that later on when we are dealing with Head XXXII, Department of Highways and Transport, I have very many pages of typewritten matter in connection with it and unless honourable members tell me beforehand the particular item or items about which they want information, we should just be wasting time to wait until we are in Committee to seek it. I shall deal firstly with item 3. The information which the junior member for St. James sought was: on what basis are the grants made to the Highways Commissioners of the several parishes? Well, the basis up to the present moment has been £140 per mile. As honourable members will see in the explanatory note, there is a certain amount of money which is granted to the Highways Commissioners of each parish under the Act—£500 to St. George, £400 to St. Thomas, £400 to St. James, £400 to St. Joseph, £400 to Christ Church, £250 to St. Peter, £250 to St. Philip, and £200 to St. John. Now, these amounts are obviously insufficient; the Highways Commissioners were asked to state how many miles of parochial roads they are going to do and they submitted figures ranging from 20 miles in St. John to 43 miles in Christ Church. Honourable members will remember that when the junior member for St. George brought up the question of tenantry roads earlier in this session I pointed out that the Colonial Secretary had circularized all the Highways Commissioners asking them to come in and let him know how many miles of parochial roads they were contemplating to construct or repair during the next financial year, with the view of making some arrangement whereby they may take over the tenantry roads and the Government take over parochial roads other than tenantry roads. The Colonial Secretary went into the matter very carefully with them and, in effect, agreed to all their suggestions. For instance, they pointed out that £140 per mile might have been good enough in 1939 but with the increased cost of materials and labour it was not sufficient in these days; they suggested that the amount should be £200 per mile and they satisfied the Colonial Secretary—and the Governor-in-Executive Committee agreed to it later—that the grant should be fixed on the basis of £200 per mile, with the result that every one of these parishes is being voted to-day the sum fixed by law plus the amount calculated at the rate of £200 for every mile of road to be done by them.

As regards item 2, Publicity Committee, honourable members will see that there is an increase of £2,500. The Publicity Committee asked for £500 in the year 1946-47 and they have asked for £3,000 this year. That is due to the fact that without waiting on any arrangements we may make for tourist development, the Committee is doing quite a great deal of advertising in the U.S.A., the United Kingdom, and Canada; this increase is due to its proposed expenditure for not only advertisements in magazines and newspapers in England, the U.S.A., and Canada but for representation in New York, London, and Montreal and for the printing of advertising booklets, postcards and so on. As far as I remember, honourable members have had circulated among them, a few weeks ago, a very useful booklet which was issued by the Publicity Committee advertising Barbados. There is also included in this £3,000 an amount for the maintenance of the Information Bureau on the Pier Head. I should add that consideration is being given to the propriety of opening a branch office at Seawall Airport so that people arriving by air would have the same facilities which people arriving by sea are given at the Pier Head. The Committee further states that

the present arrangement of a joint office which is run in New York in partnership with Trinidad and Tobago and British Guiana will be terminated at the end of this month; that new representation has to be arranged and it is expected that the cost of this will exceed the cost of the former arrangement which was approximately £4,000. If there is any further information that honourable members desire to have I shall be only too willing to give it. I beg to move that the sum of £35,588 be voted under this Head.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. DOWDING enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. WILKINSON: I beg to thank the senior member for St. Joseph for the information which he has supplied and I agree that it does save a great deal of time if we ask for information beforehand. Now, Sir, as regards the upkeep of highways I think the Government has been very generous in increasing the grant from £140 to £200 per mile but what we really want in the parishes is to be able to take over if it is only half a mile of tenantry road every year and be allowed to use some of this extra money in putting it in order. The honourable member said that the Colonial Secretary circularized all the Highways Commissioners to find out what they want to be done but I do not agree that all the parochial roads should be taken over by the Central Road Board. I agree that some of these roads are used by everybody and should be handed over but not all the parochial roads of the parishes. I do think that the Highways Commissioners who live in the respective parishes should know—and do know—more about the requirements of the people, as far as the roads are concerned, than persons sitting in an office in Bridgetown but I shall not press that point to-day. As regards the Publicity Committee, an increase from £500 to £3,000 seems to me rather large, when you take into consideration the fact that the Companies in Bridgetown and the Hotels in Christ Church and St. Philip have increased their subscriptions—and rightly so because they will be the first to benefit—to the funds of this Committee. I do not know if the honourable member can tell me the amount of money that was collected by this Committee from hotels and boarding houses in the year 1946; if he cannot give me that information now, but will do so later on I shall be grateful to him. Now with regard to item 34, Barbados Nurses Association, £380, I notice the explanatory note says: "To assist the maintenance of a District Nursing Service. Previous grant made from Colonial Development and Welfare Funds." Well, Sir, we all like to think we shall have a proper Nurses Association. Rumour who is very often a wicked jade has been very persistent during the last year that this Nurses Association has not been running as smoothly as it should. I do hope that when we grant this amount, things, as far as this Association is concerned, will be put on a better footing. There is one other item on which I want to speak before I sit down, that is, item 16, Steamship Subsidy, £5,000. Every year we give £5,000 towards this subsidy and I must say that during the war "Canadian National" gave us a very good service and are continuing to give us a good service. I was in Canada towards the end of last year and I was rather perturbed when I heard in the steamship office in Montreal that stewards from the West Indies who are employed on the Canadian National boats—at least some of them—will no longer be employed. I understand that the Trade Union in Canada objects to stewards

from the West Indies being given appointments on Canadian National Steamships because they do not belong to the Trade Union of Canada. I made a few enquiries, Sir, and I was told that it was very difficult indeed for West Indians to join the Seamen's Trade Union in Canada. Now, Sir, I think that is wrong. After all, we in Barbados and the other islands subscribe towards the Canadian Steamship Service and I do think that West Indians should be employed on these boats. I have travelled on boats with them and can vouch that they are the best stewards in the world (Cheers); they are most polite and most thorough and even the officers testify to that. I spoke to one of the officers a few days ago and he told me that he was very sorry to have lost the services of a certain man whose name, I think, is Dickson and who was paid off after having been in the Service for 15 years. That is not right and I am afraid that there are many others that are going to be paid off or have been paid off. Many of these men have been on those boats throughout the War—some of them for 10 or 15 years—and have faced the perils of the War and yet at short notice they have been paid off. I do not know if the Government can do anything in the matter but I would suggest that it takes the question up with the Government of Canada. (Cheers).

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I have been in this House for 13 years and I do not think I have heard a speech on which I would like to congratulate the maker more than I do in respect of the one I have just heard. If we can bear in mind that, after all, the efforts which we make should be for the good of the community we will get more speeches like the one which the honourable member has just made (Cheers). None of us who are professed trade unionists could have put the case better than the honourable member has put it. We would like to point out to the Canadian Government and the Canadian National Steamships Company that we are thankful for all they did; but it is not the fault of the "Canadian National" if West Indian seamen are no longer employed on their boats; it is the fault of the Canadian Seamen's Union. When Mr. Mitchell, the Minister of Labour, was out here the other day, we discussed the matter with him and honourable members who are as careful in their newspaper reading as they should be, will remember that in the first issue of "The Beacon" there appeared on its front page an article dealing with this very matter, that is, how the Canadian Seamen's Union had protested against the employment of West Indian seamen and they even put it on the racial basis that they did not want these coloured seamen. I put the matter before Mr. Mitchell and he promised that he would take it up when he went back to Canada. It has, I repeat, nothing to do with the Canadian Government or the Canadian National Steamship Co.; it is really the Canadian Seamen's Union which does not want these West Indians. But however much we might thank the Canadian Government, it is only fair to our people to let the Canadian Government know that we do not propose to give them the subsidy we have been giving them in the past if West Indian seamen are going to be denied the opportunity of serving on these steamships (Cheers), and I am very glad that the junior member for St. James, the leader of the Opposition, is at one with the members of the Government in that determination. We are willing to give credit where credit is due. We are willing to thank the Canadian Government for what they have done for us but we should say to them, in our own interest, that if we provide money by way of a

subsidy to help them, they must give our people work on these ships. It would be churlish of me not to get up and acknowledge my gratitude for the help which, I see, the Government will get from the Opposition in this House in this matter; that is as far as that point goes. As regards the information which the honourable member seeks in respect of the funds collected by the Publicity Committee from hotels and boarding houses I shall have to go more carefully into the file than I have gone so far before I answer him but I assure him that I will get the information and give it to him.

The CHAIRMAN: I want to draw to the attention of this Committee that this sum of £5,000 is fixed by law and the Chairman does not intend to allow any further debate on it along the lines taken by the honourable junior member for St. James and the honourable senior member for St. Joseph because it will serve no useful purpose.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman,—Naturally, the parish of St. Andrew is not included in item 3 of this Head but we shall hear of it later on. I am referring now to St. Joseph. I see that £2,740 of this additional grant, plus the £400 fixed by law, a total of £3,140, will be given to this parish and inasmuch as the junior member for St. Joseph is not in his seat I want the senior member for St. Joseph or the member of the Government who is in charge of Roads to notify the Highways Commissioners of St. Joseph that some of this money should be spent on tenantry roads. The senior member for St. Joseph will realize that the main roads in the parish of St. Joseph are in first-class order and it seems to me a pity that some of this money should not be spent on roads which have been abandoned—public roads not tenantry roads—and the Highways Commissioners of St. Joseph should be made to take them over and put them in order. I am asking the Government to bring this to the notice of the Highways Commissioners of St. Joseph with the view of their taking the necessary action.

Mr. FOSTER: I take it, from the remarks of the senior member for St. Joseph that provision is made for the Highways Commissioners of the parishes which are mentioned in the explanatory note to item 3, to take over tenantry roads. I would like to ask if anything has been done along that line in respect of the roads in St. Andrew which are being done by the Central Road Board. Has any provision been made for putting the tenantry roads in St. Andrew in order?

Mr. CRAWFORD enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—The position is this. In 1944, after a lengthy correspondence between the Engineer of the Central Road Board, the Government and Sir Frank Stockdale, it was agreed that we should ask Colonial Development and Welfare for £60,000 to put roads in order. A very elaborate programme was prepared by the Engineer of the Central Road Board in respect of roads in each parish, including the Bathsheba—Belleplaine coastal road. It was submitted to Sir Frank Stockdale and he approved of it, recommending a free loan of £60,000 and a further loan to do minor things like rounding off corners. All that was done in 1944. Well, we needed new rollers and Mr. Lambie, the Canadian Trade Commissioner, did his best to try and get rollers for us but we did not succeed. Subsequently, the Highways Commissioners of every parish were circularized and asked to state the mileage of their roads as well as the roads which they expected to take over and the proposed expenditure; they were also asked to bear in mind the possibility of having

an Assistant Engineer of the Central Road Board who would be able to advise them as to the roads taken over by them and would supervise the construction or reconstruction of those roads. As honourable members will know, the new arrangement with Colonial Development and Welfare is this: As to the money you spent before the recent allocation, well and good; you spent it and good luck to you but from now on we will allocate to all the different colonies or groups of colonies such and such amounts; in that allocation you have to tell us how much you are spending on this, that or the other and as far as Barbados is concerned, the tenantry roads are included in our allocation. But the Government has gone further than that. Since the Address of the junior member for St. George was passed in this House the Government has as was done before—called on the highways Commissioners to state what tenantry roads they want done first and as far as I am aware most, if not all of them, have sent in their lists, the idea being that they should take over some tenantry roads while the Government will take over some of the parish roads. That is the position at present. I do not think that the Government is trying to take any particular credit to itself when I say that it has kept abreast of its opportunities as far as it is possible to do. There is one of these files before me which is devoted purely to the question of trying to get materials and rollers during 1944, 1945 and this year and it is very likely that the Government will make provision for an additional staff to undertake its normal commitments for road repairs plus the extra Bathsheba—Belleplaine coastal road and these tenantry roads. If we get the materials and the rollers and the House agrees to the additional staff, we can undertake to do not only our usual commitments but everything that this House and the public through this House is asking the Government to do—coastal road, tenantry roads, rounding off corners, and widening roads throughout the island.

Mr. FOSTER: I thank the honourable member for his reply but I would like to say that the construction of the East Coast road is long overdue. From the time of the abandonment of the Railway the people who live in that neighbourhood were promised this road and they are suffering badly for the want of it. I hope the Government will do something to help these people who have been suffering all these years.

Mr. GARNER: I have listened to the senior member for St. Joseph and I am not at all convinced that it needs all these requirements to do tenantry roads. In St. Philip where I live there is a roller doing nothing now. We are not short of rollers or stone; the thing of which we are short is money to do these roads. The labour is there; everything is there. I hear a great deal about the 10-year plan but I do not believe in a 10-year plan. Divide it in half and let us do something in five years. It is farcical to put off until to-morrow what you can do to-day. While they are telling me about a 10-year plan, there are people who cannot get in or out of their houses without their shoes getting dirty and wet. We have the money in the Treasury; let us use it. A 10-year plan is useless in Barbados. Let us draw it up to five years or two years, if you like, because the life of the House is only for two years; perhaps you can make it coincide with that but this promising can get nobody nowhere. Let us have something done to-day. I do not want to hear about what Colonial Development and Welfare proposes to do. People are paying taxes now—I pay for my motor car—and they should be given proper roads now. Everybody knows that the tenantry roads are in bad order. Year after year honourable members come to this House and ask questions about them and all we get is a very nice,

flowery apology, putting us off until some future date when perhaps somebody will have broken his foot or a number of motor car springs will have been broken or people will have died for want of medical attention owing to the impassable condition of these tenantry roads. I come now to the Steamship Subsidy.

The CHAIRMAN: That is fixed by law and the Chair does not intend to allow any further debate on it.

Mr. GARNER: I appreciate the impartiality of the Chair. (Laughter). Inasmuch as other honourable members have spoken on it I should be allowed to speak on it too.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair has ruled that no further discussion will be allowed on it.

Mr. GARNER: All right, Sir. I am not going to have any quarrel to-day about that. With regard to item 23, Relief of distressed Barbadians abroad £30, I would like to get some facts concerning that. I want to pause here for a moment to get some facts about that item.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member may go on.

Mr. GARNER: I want to get some facts about that item before I go further.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: It is not often, since I have been in this House, that I support the Government but I do not think that the last honourable member who spoke is correct in what he said. Last year St. Philip got £794 in addition to their usual grant and this year they will be getting £4,415 additional; so that I think the Government has treated them very generously. On behalf of the parish which I represent and with which I am concerned, I should like to thank the Government very much for the increase which it has given us so that we can put our roads in order. What we are suffering from is not rollers or labour but money and now we are given the money we will do more roads. (Cheers.)

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman,—It has been somewhat pleasing to hear that some attention is being paid to the question of roads, more especially tenantry roads, but, Sir, when I compare the sizes of the various parishes and the numbers of the tenantry roads I must say at this juncture that it does not appear to me as though fairplay and equity have been meted to all the parishes. Christ Church is undoubtedly the second largest parish, as we all know, and the sum allocated to Christ Church is far from being proportionate to those of the other parishes. Take St. Philip, for instance, not that I am attempting to ridicule the grant as far as St. Philip is concerned, but I am merely speaking on the proportionate basis, I would be the last person to suggest the reduction of the grant to St. Philip, but it is about 75 per cent. more than the grant to Christ Church. Christ Church happens to be the second largest parish in size and population, so I cannot say that I am satisfied with the grant that is being given to that parish. I feel that Christ Church should be put on the same basis as St. Philip. There are many more roads in Christ Church than in St. Philip and the population of Christ Church is 25,000 people whereas St. Philip has about only 5,000 or 6,000 people. When we consider those points, Christ Church should be given a grant of £5,000 instead of £2,000. I think that the Executive Committee has acted very unfairly in the allocation of these grants. As regards the Nurses Association, this is the first time that they are getting any assistance from the Government and it is good to see that it is actually thinking of helping this Association, although the grant of £380 is very trifling when you think of the number of people who are assisted by these nurses. I think the amount should be at least £1,000. Another item to which I should like to refer is No. 32, Salvation Army £150,—the Salvation Army who of all people

perform the most Christian work not only in Barbados but probably in all the other parts of the world where the organization can be found; they are the only Christian minded people of whom I happen to know; they practise Christianity and I would like to see the grant to them increased or a Resolution come down to this House to give them greater assistance. The Salvation Army is supposed to be doing social work and this grant of £150 is too trifling an amount for the performance of this work; they provide shelter for destitute soldiers, the ones who risked their lives that we might live, and I fail to understand what the Government was thinking of when it fixed this grant to the Salvation Army at £150. Now, Sir, as regards the Steamship Subsidy I do not care to add anything to what has been said but I hope that West Indian seamen will be granted the opportunity to secure jobs on these Canadian boats. I hope the Government will see to that, otherwise there should be no subsidy at all.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to draw the attention of the honourable member to item 10 of Head XIX; that will perhaps bring more peace to his soul as far as the Salvation Army is concerned.

Mr. TALMA: With regard to the roads I would like to say that there are several pieces of machinery for road building which Colonial Development and Welfare have in stock but which they claim as being too modern to be used for the purpose. Is it that the Director of Highways and Transport happens to know nothing about this type of machinery?

Mr. WILKINSON: I find myself in the peculiar position to-day of defending the Government but I do not think that the honourable member who has just sat down realizes how this grant to the parishes is given. He said that it was most unfair that the parish of Christ Church should get only £2,000. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph gave me a statement last Tuesday showing how the grant is arrived at and I think it is done on a very fair basis. They take the mileage of road to be done and multiply it by £200 per mile; then they deduct the estimated revenue from highway taxes and give the balance as the grant to the particular parish. The honourable member spoke about the parish of Christ Church being the second largest parish and having a large population. I agree that it also has very many more lorries and motor cars than other parishes and, therefore, its revenue from this source is greater. The Commissioners get the difference between their revenue and the amount calculated at £200 per mile and I cannot imagine a fairer method of dealing with the matter than that. The greater the revenue collected by way of highway taxes, the less is the assistance to the particular parish. I remember that a few years ago Christ Church never got any assistance because their revenue worked out at more than £120 per mile. I do not think the honourable member understands the basis on which it is done.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman.—There are only two items about which I should like to get a little information. The first is item 17, Young Men's Christian Association £300. I notice that the amount is the same as last year's and I just want to find out if any application has been made to the Government for an increase. I understand that such has not been the case and, naturally, the Government did not feel like doing anything in the matter. Now, as regards item 25, Barbados Museum and Historical Society £100, I wonder if any honourable member, apart from a member of the Government, can tell us how often this Museum is opened free of charge to the public. If we are helping it to the extent of £100 it should, in my view, be opened certainly more than once a week free of charge to members of the public.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman.—So far as the grant for the upkeep of highways is concerned I

can remember something having been stated in an Address which was passed in this House about the appointment of a Parish Engineer to be attached to the Department of Highways and Transport. While I do not think it is practical to have a purely Parish Engineer I do think that in view of the fact that this large sum of money is being spent by the parishes in this way, there should be some supervision to see whether they are building roads, perhaps not in the most modern way but in the way which meets with the approval of somebody who knows more about it than the usual type of Highway Inspector, — somebody who will give them some advice if they will take it; so that they will not come here every year saying that the roads are in a deplorable condition and that they want more money to put them in order. This grant has reached such proportions that I am going to ask the Government whether it does not think it necessary to have some expert supervision, no matter how casual it may be and that some advice, if it is taken, should be given to these Highways Commissioners because I am not prepared to come here every year and vote this sum of money to people who hold on most tenaciously to their parochial authority and make appointments, sometimes for political reasons, when the appointees really and truly know nothing about the jobs to which they are appointed. I think that if the Government is going to grant this sum of money to be spent for this purpose it should provide some help so that we can know that the money is being spent in a reasonable way and be assured that it will last a sufficiently long period. I do not think that the Government should just hand over this money to a number of laymen to do this work in their own way; it may be the best way but I still think that there should be some collaboration between the experts of the Department of Highways and Transport and the Highways Commissioners in the expenditure of this large sum of money. When it comes to the Publicity Committee, we have not yet heard the figures as to the people who benefit more particularly from the visits of tourists to this colony but I have said on more than one occasion in this House that the Barbados Government has not collected one cent by way of an Excess Profits Tax from the people who do business in this island. The hotel proprietors are making money; the people who bottle and export rum are making a lot of money; the merchants are making a lot of money and this Government has not taken one cent of their excess profits from them. The merchants are now owning all the hotels—merchants who, you hear, cannot pay taxes—and I am not prepared to spend the taxpayers' money in inviting people to come here and put money in the pockets of these businessmen. It is true that some of the money which the tourists spend will find its way in other directions but I think it is time that these business people should realize that they should go forward and do this advertising for themselves and pay for it out of their own pockets because they had a privilege which business people in no other place were allowed to have during the War, that is, they have been allowed to make all the money they could without paying one cent of their excess profits by way of an Excess Profits Tax. I am not prepared to continue to allow myself to be ruined by the payment of income tax to enable these people to make more money. It is a shame! In the other colonies where they have taken surplus money from the merchants they have given them assistance to build

hotels and everything else; that is right. But in this island every merchant has made money out of the War and every clerk who has worked for them is dissatisfied because he has not been given a square deal; he is unable to pay his taxes—income or otherwise; he is unable to pay for the food and clothing he has credited from them. I am taking an entirely different view of this matter. Let these people go forward and help themselves. I am not going on to increase grants and thus increase my taxes when I am not able to pay them at present. Mr. Chairman, I am going to move the reduction of this amount because I feel it is incumbent upon me to do so. Now, there is item 30, Subsistence allowance for Benjamin Skeete in Spanish Honduras, £54. I think this is the particular case that came up for consideration in 1943 when it was stated that Benjamin Skeete had spent 20 or 25 years in Spanish Honduras; that he had worked for the people there and become blind and that now he was old and decrepit they wanted to send him back to Barbados; now that they have no more use for him they want to get rid of him. He cannot come back because they would have to send someone with him and even if they could find someone it would be difficult to obtain passages. I believe that the amount voted in that Resolution was exhausted and another sum was voted subsequently by way of what is called an abstract Resolution. However, the fact remains that the House is entitled in a matter of this sort to some sort of progress report and I think every effort should be made to get this man back home, if not to his people to his country. Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that item 22, Publicity Committee, be reduced by £1,000.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Chairman,—I do not want to defend the Government because the senior member for St. Joseph is quite capable of doing that but the attitude of the last honourable member who has spoken amazes me. By all means criticize the Government for not imposing an Excess Profits Tax but do not tell me that we should adopt the method in other colonies of giving it back in a direct manner by relieving these merchants or hotel proprietors of certain duties on goods imported into this island. Do not on one hand say that they should be given back some of the profits taken from them in that fashion and on the other hand say that the Government should reject the only method by which it should encourage the tourist industry, that is, by advertisement. That is the method adopted in all other countries where the tourist industry brings in so much national income. All Governments in the world assist to a large extent in advertising but when they do that, they by a proper method of taxation take some of the profits made by the merchants and hotel proprietors. I cannot understand the attitude of the honourable member. We should assist the businessman in bringing in the tourists and then by a system of taxation take away some of the profits.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—From the time that the honourable member has been in this House he has been misunderstanding all I have said. He says that other countries have an equitable system of taxation as far as this matter is concerned. I agree with him but if you did not follow them in one way how are you going to follow them in the other way? I hope that he will sit for a moment and think over what he has said. You cannot now impose an excess profits tax on people in respect of profits which they made during the war; it would not be fair to them. How are you going to get at those profits? Are you going to rob them by some sleight-of-hand system? Let them use the money they have instead of inflating

prices to make more money. Does the honourable member think that if this building was in the market he could buy it first even if he had money? There are many people who do not pay an excess profits tax and who would be able to pay ten times the value of it and he could not buy it. However, I will not keep back the consideration of the Estimates but I hope that the senior member for St. Joseph will be able to tell me something about Benjamin Skeete.

Mr. ADAMS: As far as Benjamin Skeete is concerned, the file in connection with his case discloses that the latest pronouncement about him is a cable to the Acting Governor from His Britannic Majesty's Minister and Consul General in Spanish Honduras acknowledging the receipt of a letter of the 16th January, 1947, concerning the allowance and asking that provision be made for the continuance of the allowance. The allowance is paid to Skeete from time to time and he, in the presence of witnesses, have acknowledged the receipt of the money. As soon as we have been notified that there is an opportunity to send him back home I am sure that this House will vote the necessary amount and stop the sending of this allowance.

The question that the sum of £35,588 be voted under this Head is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XXIX—MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES.

The items and the respective amounts to be voted are read.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of £115,282 be voted under this Head.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I would like a little information about item 25, Insurance of Government Buildings, etc., £2,661. The explanatory note says *inter alia* that the estimated value of Government buildings included is £467,225—I hope that those are new values—and goes on to state that the estimated value of the furniture at Government House is £500. Well, Sir, if we are asked to vote every year between £170 and £300—next year it will be £365—for furniture at Government House I would like to know how it is that Government House has only £500 worth of furniture. I would like some information about that.

Mr. ADAMS: It is conceivable that at to-day's prices, the furniture at Government House would be worth more than £500 but the fact that £170 may be voted for its upkeep does not mean that this sum bears any relationship to the value of the furniture. There is a lot of mahogany furniture, including banisters, at Government House and a great deal of that expenditure is due to the cleaning and polishing of it. I agree that the values look, probably, small and we shall have to go into them because this furniture would certainly be worth more than £500.

Mr. HAYNES: I notice that the amount for item 43, Cost of operating Mobile Cinema Van, has been reduced from £850 to £625. I remember that when this van was given to us we were promised two or three more and I am wondering if the Government has taken any steps to see that we get more of these vans. As far as I know, a great deal of good results from this van, especially in the country districts where life is so dull in the evenings. I should have thought that the Government would have seen to it that we get, if not two, at least one more of these vans. I am continually told by people in my district that they see this van so seldom. Sometimes I estimate the number of people who are entertained by it in St. Andrew at about 1,000 and I am hoping that the present Government will try to get a promise from

the British Government that it will supply us with two more of these vans. I am told that they are quite easily obtainable because during the War a number of them was used in entertaining the troops. It seems to me that we should be able to obtain at least one or two more to supplement the service which is being given by the one which we have at present. It is a good cause and I am appealing to the Government—it is very hard to know who looks after the various Departments under the present Constitution and therefore, one has to appeal to the Government as a whole—to try and see what it can do by way of increasing the number of these vans.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman,—I certainly do not regard the explanation which the senior member for St. Joseph has given in respect of the value of the furniture at Government House as any explanation of the matter. I think that the replacements bear a great relationship to the value of the furniture and I sincerely hope that he will look into the matter. Instead of the value of the furniture at Government House being placed at £500, it should be £2,000.

Mr. WILKINSON: I would like to support the argument of my colleague. Perhaps this matter has been overlooked and I would suggest to the senior member for St. Joseph to have a revaluation of the furniture at Government House. We all know the dining table in the dining Hall at Government House and that cannot be replaced for £500.

Mr. ADAMS: I thank the honourable members for their suggestions. I thoroughly agree with them that the furniture at Government House is under insured and I shall bring it to the notice of the Secretariat.

Mr. MAPP: I do not think that the observations made by the senior member for St. Andrew should go unsupported in this House and I rise to support him wholeheartedly. This Mobile Cinema Van may not be so attractive around the City because there are cinemas and other forms of entertainment in this area, but I can assure the House that if more vans are acquired and this service were extended in the country districts, it would serve a very useful purpose. We are having too many of these cheap, commercial films in our midst at present and I am amazed at seeing it stated in the explanatory note to this item that no new apparatus would be required this year. I think the Government should broaden and not curtail this service and, like the senior member for St. Andrew, I would like them to obtain at least another of these vans.

Mr. SPRINGER: The explanatory note, on that score is quite misleading. The amount put in for maintenance last year included the extra portion for apparatus which has been bought and the rest of it is recurrent.

I agree that there should be more mobile cinema vans.

Mr. COX: I would like to know whether the senior member for St. Joseph can give me some information in respect of item 26, Maintenance of Garrison Savannah £128. I notice that the explanatory note states:—"Labour for cutting grass, filling holes and levelling." I was under the impression that the Garrison is more or less rented to the owners of racehorses.

Mr. GALE: I can answer that question. The Garrison Savannah is controlled by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. Only a portion of it—the race track—is kept in order by the Barbados Turf Club and whenever there is a Race Meeting the Governor-in-Executive Committee allows the Turf Club to take control of the Savannah from the time the Races start until they end.

Mr. COX: I thank the honourable member for his explanation. There is one thing I would like to say, as far as this Savannah is concerned. Everybody knows that it is a money-making affair and that the Government gets a lot of revenue from the sweep-stake tickets which are sold by the Turf Club. I feel that the Government, in the interest of the health of the community, should erect some shelter with latrine accommodation for the many people who attend Race Meetings and are not in a financial position to pay \$2 or \$3 for admission to the Grand Stand or 3/- for admission to the Field Stand but yet have to answer Nature's call. I hope that the Government, realizing the revenue which they get from this source, will provide some sort of accommodation for the people to whom I have referred.

Mr. BRANCKER: So far as item 45, Revision of Laws of Barbados, £450 is concerned I observe that the explanatory notes states:—"To meet the cost incurred in the publication of the Index to the Revised Laws and to provide postage and minor incidental expenditure." I wonder who is actually looking after this Index. Is it already in the hands of the Printers and it is just a matter of getting it printed or is this Index not yet completed? All honourable members have copies of the Revised Laws and I take it that we would read them better if we had the Index. I would like to know if the delay is caused by the Printers and if the manuscript has not yet been put in their hands by those who are responsible for the preparation of the Index. Speaking on this item I am reminded of item 5, Government Binding and Printing, £6,000. That item has always been a sore spot; so long as we have not got, as other advanced communities have, a Government Printery we always have to make complaints when we are dealing with this Head. It is not possible for us to find a bound volume of the debates of this House for any year subsequent to 1942. Well, Sir, that is a real disgrace. I do not know who is responsible but it seems to me that the lack of a Government Printery and having to ask a commercial house to do our printing have caused this state of affairs to be in existence. It is high time that something should be done about it and the House should express its opinion on the dilatoriness of those responsible for the publication of the bound volumes of the debates of the Legislature. Before I sit down I should like to refer to item 13, Telephone rentals, transfers and installations £1,990. I think the attention of the Government should be drawn to the very unsatisfactory telephonic communication between the various police stations in this island. It is a difficult and unpleasant experience to try to get a telephone message from District "F", for instance, to District "C"; nearly every day the telephone at one or the other end is not in proper working order and it is difficult to make out what is being said at the other end of the line. I find it a much more pleasant experience to talk to someone in Trinidad than to a person at District "C" and I feel that the Telephone Co., should be admonished in connection with the amount which we are spending with them for Government telephones. We are spending as much as £600. 17s. 0d. with that Company in respect of the Police Department and the Government is not getting value for that amount of money. Lastly, Sir, any information which the Government can give me about item 37, Expenses under the supervision of the weighing of Sugar Canes Act 1939, £265, will be welcome. The expense last year in connection with this item was the same £265 and I wonder if the senior member for St. Joseph can tell me how many visits were paid to the various sugar factories by the various

authorized persons, in how many instances was anything found to be not entirely above board and whether the practice is discontinued of notifying the factory owners when periodic visits are about to be made.

Mr. ADAMS: The answer to the honourable member's last question is that that practice has been discontinued. As regards the answer to his question before that, the honourable member could hardly expect anybody to answer that off-hand unless he will accept the reply that as many visits were paid as were found to be expedient. I assure him that the Labour officials were notified to request the inspectors to find out how much of the criticism that was levelled by all of us in the past, in respect of the weighing of canes, is justified and the report is to the effect that the cane weighers are doing a good job and that there is no danger, as far as could be seen, of there being dishonest cane weighers or dishonest factory owners. I should like to remind the honourable member that a super criminal would commit a crime even under the eyes of the Police but normally speaking, with a proper check you do not expect that to happen. I do assure the honourable member that the Government made it its business and the Labour Officer made it his business to ask the Inspectors to check up on this matter and to our surprise the report was that much of the alleged grievance does not exist; that many of the complaints were due to suspicion through not knowing the principle rather than to actual wrong weights. As regards the Index to the Revised Laws I have been informed, only recently, that the Advocate Co., Ltd., has completed the printing of it and that the delay is due to the fact that both Mr. Archer and Mr. Fergusson were in Trinidad. If they had been here, the Index would have been published earlier. This is one of the few occasions on which it is not necessary to put the blame on the Advocate Co.

Mr. LEWIS: While I welcome the suggestion of the senior member for St. Michael to provide facilities at the Savannah for the public on Race Days I wonder whether the Government will consider the provision of certain facilities and amenities on the Savannah for people to be able to enjoy a breath of fresh air or some other form of relaxation on afternoons or early evenings. I suggest that some seats be placed on the Savannah as is done in some other colonies. I would go a little further and put the minds of some honourable members at rest by suggesting that a few lights be also placed around the Savannah, so as to make it a more attractive place that it is now.

Mr. GALE: In reply to the honourable senior member for St. Michael I can tell him that the Turf Club is contemplating erecting latrines on some part of the savannah; the only difficulty which they have is to find a suitable site for the purpose. The Turf Club is only too willing to provide this accommodation and I hope that the Government will give it the necessary assistance in the matter.

The question that the sum of £115,282 be voted under this Head is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XXX—INCOME TAX AND DEATH DUTIES DEPARTMENT.

The items and the respective amounts to be voted are read.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of £35,851 be voted under this Head.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—With regard to item 9, Office rent, £175, I have told the Government

on a previous occasion that it was renting only a part of that building as an office for the Income Tax Commissioner. Since then, I believe that it has taken over the other part of the building and I ask it whether it does not think it advisable to negotiate for a reduction of the rent.

Mr. ADAMS: I will bring the matter to the notice of the Government.

The question that the sum of £35,851 be voted under this Head is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XXXI—LABOUR DEPARTMENT.

The items and the respective amounts to be voted are read.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. Cox, the sum of £780 is voted under this Head.

HEAD XXXII — DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT

The items and the respective amounts to be voted are read.

Mr. LEWIS: I rise to a point of order. I would like to know if we appointed a Select Committee to consider and report on this Head whether it is right that we should deal with it without at the same time taking the Committee's Report into consideration. That Committee has reported and if it is felt that the Report is too long I would suggest that it be printed and circulated among honourable members.

The CHAIRMAN: That is a matter for this Committee. The Report was handed in only to-day.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of £163,426 be voted under this Head.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman,—As you are aware, a Select Committee was appointed to consider the various items under this Head and make a report as a result of its investigation. Well, Sir, I think it would be correct to say that the particular feature of that investigation was the fact that the Committee find that in a number of cases the remuneration, salaries and wages which are paid are inadequate. This House, as you, Sir, know, cannot increase the remuneration; we can only regard it as inadequate, comment upon it and draw to the attention of the proper quarter that if they do not take early steps to remedy the state of affairs we are going to protect ourselves by passing an Address to the Governor in the matter. That is what the members of the Select Committee are contemplating, namely, to introduce an Address at the next meeting of this House to give effect to certain proposed salaries and wage increases to various officers and employees in this Department and particularly—

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman,—We have not yet read the Report of the Select Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair is trying to find out what the junior member for St. Lucy is driving at. I am just giving him a little latitude.

Mr. BRANCKER: The only thing, Sir, is that if you find out—as I am sure you will—other honourable members will not be so acute. Take, for instance, item 2, Executive Engineer, £650. As you are aware, we have been endeavouring for a considerable length of time to get an Executive Engineer, that is, a fully qualified engineer, at that salary but we have been unable to do so in spite of the wide advertising we have done.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to take action at this stage. The Report of the Select Committee was put in earlier to-day but that Report is not before this

Committee because the House has not asked that it be considered in Committee of Supply. This Committee, therefore, has no power to deal with the Report and is quite out of order to do so.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair is just trying to find out what the honourable member is driving at, lest it be accused of stifling debate. The honourable member may proceed.

Mr. BRANCKER: I was saying that nobody has applied for the post of Executive Engineer and there is a strong feeling that if the salary is increased, we shall be able to get a man to fill the post. From what I understand, until this Executive Engineer is appointed, it will be impossible for this Department to carry out the big programme which we in this House want to be carried out; so we have to take steps to ensure that we are getting the maximum amount of efficiency out of this Department. We cannot increase the amount to be voted under this Head but we can certainly point out the inadequacy of the salaries of certain officers of this Department such as the foreman mechanic. As a matter of fact an attempt was made to fill this post but the required qualifications are so very high for the salary of \$100 per month that is not surprising that no one has as yet been found to take the post. Then the salary of the Store Clerk — £75 by £7. 10 to £120 per annum—must appear to honourable members to be inadequate and to be deserving of further consideration. The biggest and most important item under this Head is No. 24, Unestablished Staff, £32,500. It is clear that the wages which are paid to the unestablished staff and to casual employees is insufficient; \$1.12 per day is quite inadequate. Perhaps you, Sir, will agree with me that less than \$2.00 per day is not a fair wage to pay in these days and if a supplementary Resolution came to this House for this purpose it is bound to receive a favourable reception, with the view of giving a fair day's pay for the fair day's work which employees of this Department give.

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

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (A)

On re-assembling,

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (a) in order to resume Government Business.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Rule 61 (a) be now suspended in order to resume Government Business.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the adjournment took place, the House was in Committee of Supply.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House was in Committee of Supply before the adjournment, we were considering Head XXXII of the Estimates.

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman,—I think that we have a very ambitious programme under this Head. In my experience, I say that this programme cannot be completed by the 31st of March, 1948. I

have communicated with the Director of Highways and Transport by telephone, and he has told me that he made up his programme on the assumption that he would complete his present programme within the present financial year, and that he will get a full staff. As we all know, up to the present time no Executive Engineer has been appointed. As far as I know, perhaps the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has some more information on the subject, but there is no likelihood of this appointment being made for several months. What does that mean? It means that this programme cannot be completed by the 31st of March, 1948, so what is the good of voting a lot of money knowing that the work cannot be completed? The Committee probably knows that the programme for 1946-47 will not be completed by the 31st of March, 1947, and I prophesy that within a few weeks we shall have before us a Resolution asking us to vote probably £10,000 to complete the work which should have been finished in the year 1946-47. The work has to be completed. Honourable members who live up Bishop's Court way will see that the Collymore Rock road is nothing like being completed. It cannot be completed by the 31st of March, and the same thing applies to Bank Hall. Under those conditions, I do not see the sense in voting all this money when we know that it cannot be used. In case that the work is speeded up, they can come back to us and we will be willing to grant the money, but I do not think that they should put forward a programme knowing that it cannot be completed by the 31st of March, 1948. Of course, when the Director drew up these Estimates in December, he had hoped to complete the programme. Again I would like to point out that if it takes six weeks of this new financial year to complete work which should have been completed in the previous financial year, that means that six week's work has been taken out of this new year's programme. In my opinion, this Assistant Engineer should be appointed; nothing can be done without an Assistant Engineer. The work is in arrears now and the present Director is spending a very large proportion of his time doing office work instead of being outside. The work is not being supervised as it should be. I hope that the Government will urge upon the Secretary of State for the Colonies that it is necessary to appoint this Assistant or Executive Engineer as quickly as possible. Sometime ago we advertised for an Engineer and pointed out the terms and conditions under which we wanted him. I do not know whether any replies have been received or not, but I suggest that the Secretary of State for the colonies and the Colonial Office are not getting anything done. They are somewhat constipated. I would gladly vote this entire amount of money, but I cannot conscientiously do that, knowing that the present year's programme will not be completed by the 31st of March. I therefore beg to move that the item "Total Extraordinary Works" be reduced by £10,000 for the reasons which I have given.

Mr. ADAMS: While I appreciate the point of approach made by the honourable member who has just spoken, I would like to point out that this is not now war time. I am asking honourable members to see what is the attitude of the Government in adopting the Estimates made by the Department. I am not now endeavouring to reply to everything but wish to point out that this is not now war-time. We waited for a long time before we could get a Labour Commissioner and a Director of Education; we had to pay more money, but we got them. These

Estimates would have been ambitious three or four years ago when it was impossible to get rollers. We were once trying to get a roller from Trinidad and the British Government commandeered it and had it sent back to England. Difficulties like that arose in war time. I think that the hon. member will agree with me that if we do not have certain things that we need to-day we may assume that we shall get them inasmuch as the export trade of Great Britain is being built up. The Committee must bear in mind that the hon. member's point is not that the programme will not be done, but he fears that it cannot be done simply because we may not finish within the next two weeks all that was budgeted for last year. Hon. members must realise how much is being put forward in respect of the various roads in order to carry out some of the 1946-47 programme. If the hon. member feels that we shall have to re-vote £10,000 in respect of last year's programme, why should he suggest that this amount be reduced by £10,000? What we have not done in this year's programme we can carry on in the coming year's programme and the money will be there. If we carry out the programme for last year, we can get some money re-voted, but our present estimate is in respect of a different lot of roads. Before the debate is closed I will give hon. members a list of all the roads on which we propose to work during the year 1947-48. If we carry on with this programme there is no reason to cut off anything from what the Committee is now being asked to vote. Some of last year's programme may be called ambitious. Personally, I as a layman, an ignorant layman if you like, think that less money should be spent in building concrete gutters and things of that sort and more spent on the tenantry roads. (Cheers). I do not agree with putting all that cement in the gutters as we are now doing. I repeat that that is purely personal. As far as the Government is concerned, there is a full scheme contemplated for St. Michael, St. Lucy and St. Andrew, and as I have said, if hon. members want the details, I will give them exactly the many roads on which it is contemplated to do work.

Mr. MOTTLEY rose to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is the second time that the hon. senior member for the City rose to speak and I stopped him so as to allow the hon. senior member for St. Joseph to speak. I would like to explain that I am giving opportunities to speak to the hon. Leader of the House, the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. Leader of the Congress Party. Whenever any of those hon. members rise to speak, I will give them the opportunity to do so. It is not a question of any partiality.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am speaking on this Head generally. As there is no Report of the Committee which investigated this Head of the Estimates before the House and I happened to be a member of that Committee, I will crave your indulgence to speak on this Head generally. As regards item 2, "Executive Engineer", it must strike hon. members that after a period of many years—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I ask hon. members to curb their feelings and let the debate go on in order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I was saying, Mr. Chairman, that in respect of this Executive Engineer, a salary of £650 a year is proposed. It must strike hon. members as very strange that in spite of the fact that the Government realise that it is impossible to get a qualified man at that salary, they insist in coming back year after year and asking for this amount to pay an Executive Engineer. That leads to the conclusion that there is no intention on the part of the Government to carry out any proper rebuilding scheme because you do not want this Engineer. If you insist

on putting down the same money every year, especially now that there is reconstruction taking place in Europe and skilled engineers are so much in demand, how can you hope to get an Engineer for that amount? I cannot agree with the hon. junior member for St. James that this amount should be reduced; the programme may seem to be an ambitious one but having good roads is one of the surest ways to civilization. If you went to Australia to-morrow and you saw good roads, you would come to the conclusion that civilized people live there, but if you were to go into some districts of Barbados you would say that they are like the jungle of Africa. I have gone very carefully into this matter, and although there is no Report before the Committee, I do not think that the salary of the Executive Engineer should remain at £650 per annum. As regards the item dealing with Extraordinary Works, I see that the details as to the work which is contemplated to be done are given in the Appendix. I am mindful of the fact that since the establishment of this Department, whenever the Estimates are being dealt with, we hear something about the tenantry roads. I understand from the Director of Highways and Transport that among the reasons why none of these roads in the tenancies have been reconstructed particularly, is that there is no staff or equipment. However, he has agreed that some of the roads as set out in this programme should be postponed as they are still in a passable condition, and he has promised that work on some of these roads as have been set out here will be postponed and that certain tenantry roads will be taken over in this programme. For those reasons I am voting for the whole amount which has been asked for. I am anxious—as a matter of fact all of us are anxious—to see that some start is made where the tenantry roads are concerned. The re-surfacing of the roads as set out in this programme might be very desirable from the engineering point of view, but it will be agreed that many of these roads, particularly in the parish of St. Michael, can be left over for some time and attention paid to the tenantry roads. As regards item 30, "Upkeep of paved road drains", it will be observed that the sum of £1,000 is asked for annually. As far as the condition of the gutters and drains within the immediate City limits is concerned, I am sure that a little more supervision could be paid by the Director to this work and a little less administrative work done. Honourable members will appreciate that instead of £1,000 being spent in this connection, it seems necessary to spend £5,000. It is impossible to walk along the streets of Bridgetown properly with the drains and gutters in such a terrible condition. I repeat that I feel that if the Government will see fit to offer a decent salary for this office of Executive Engineer, they will have taken the right step. We will then be able to put our gutters and side-walks in a proper state of repair. I regret that I cannot support the motion of the hon. junior member for St. James for the reduction of this vote. Although the programme does seem to be an ambitious one, I am supporting it on the undertaking given me by the Director that every opportunity will be taken to make a start where the tenantry roads are concerned during this year.

Mr. HAYNES: The attitude of the honourable junior member for St. James amazes me. (Cheers). Instead of the honourable member trying to urge the Government and the Department of Highways and Transport to do something, he is turning around and saying: "Don't do so much, we are taking away money from you." I should have thought that the honourable member, as an ex-member of the Government, would know that if money is voted for some

purpose and it has not been spent, it goes back into the Treasury. If we reduce this amount of money which is estimated to be spent, that is tantamount to saying that we have too many roads, and that is contrary, absolutely contrary to the feeling of the members of this Committee. The trouble with this Department is not the money which is given to them, but because we foolishly allowed the two Departments—Highways and Transport—to be combined. I should have known better and should have voted against the proposal at the time. I blame myself for that. Here we have a Director of Highways and Transport who spends three parts of his time in settling disputes in matters relating to Transport! In the neighbouring colonies Transport matters are dealt with by the Police Department. Matters relating to Transport concern the Police, not a trained Engineer. I quite agree with the honourable junior member for St. James with respect to this Executive Engineer. The hon. member will tell you that I was a fellow-member of the former Highways and Transport Board when he was Chairman, and I used to make a special point of the appointment of this Engineer and if it had not been for the war-time restrictions, we would have had a man doing the work. The hon. member will remember that three persons applied for this job and one of them was appointed, but the Colonial Office would not allow his wife to come out with him. You cannot expect a man to take a job and not be able to get his family with him. We were in a somewhat urgent spirit, and I had hoped that with the change of Government, that spirit would have been maintained. (A MEMBER: It is too early). An hon. member says that it is too early, but, Mr. CHAIRMAN, I have never heard that it was too early to do a good thing. As regards the question of an ambitious programme to which the hon. junior member for St. James has referred I see that £2,899 has been allocated to St. Michael, and they have 56 miles of roads to repair and reconstruct; St. Lucy has the sum of £15,753—I am not complaining about that—but when you come to the parish of St. Andrew, which is suffering most of all, we are given £9,858! We have it on record that there are 13 miles of roads which are absolutely essential for the benefit, peace and happiness of the people. Where is the ambition in that? I cannot see it. I may be biased on this matter of roads, but I think that I am pretty rational when I say that it is not an ambitious scheme. I call it an unambitious scheme. To me, this question of roads has always been an important one. I am very glad to hear from the hon. senior member for St. Joseph that the Government are opening their eyes to the importance of it. We cannot expect people to be happy and comfortable unless we give them the means of getting to their homes. How can we expect them to be happy otherwise? We are paying for past sins in many cases in this country; certain roads should have been done years ago, and we have to face the question now of spending money and putting those roads in order. That is the only position which a reasonable man should take in the circumstances. As long as we get people supporting the Government in this lack of energy in dealing with these matters, we will always have this situation. The Government now have a glorious opportunity: they can call the Director of Highways and Transport and say to him: "We have the money, we have stones and we have rollers; get ahead and do your work." As the position is now, year by year money is voted but nothing is done. With reference to the Executive Engineer, we passed a Resolution providing for the payment of a Cost of Living Allowance for Government employees the other day, and when I hear

hon. members talking about £650 a year as the salary for this Officer, I would remind them that he would now be entitled to £790 a year—close on £800 a year—according to the present scale of paying Cost of Living Allowances. I have never seen any advertisement showing to the world that we are willing to pay this money for this post. You have to advertise these things in order to let people know about them, and unless that is done, everybody is ignorant as to the position. As far as roads which are in a state of abandonment are concerned, these Estimates are so ambitious that I do not see one of them mentioned in the Appendix. We have only the reconstruction of the roads which are in actual existence now, and yet we hear that this is an ambitious scheme! I cannot see that. My idea is this: that unless we force this point tooth and nail, year by year we will come back to this House and accomplish what we have accomplished in the last seven years—nothing as regards roads. That is simply because nobody will take the initiative to force the issue. I quite agree with the honourable senior member for St. Joseph when he says that the work on all these concrete drains and so forth are not essential at this time. To my mind, they should be done, but I think that they can be postponed until a more opportune time arises and let us get ahead with the remainder of the roads in the districts where they are so badly needed. I think that the time, money, labour and supervision should be used to force the repair of the roads in the various districts. This is a most serious matter, and I am hoping that other honourable members will take the opportunity of expressing their views in connection with it. Apparently, unless something is done, there will be no change in our policy. Every year the money will be voted and it will go back into the Treasury because nobody will do the work. There cannot be any excuse now; we have the money and if it is taken away, we will deserve anything we get because we will be encouraging the Head of this Department in not working on the roads. We will really be giving a stick with which to beat ourselves. I am trying to get the members of the Government to see how serious the situation is and to put things in order. Let the Highways Department be separated from the Transport Department, and let us get behind the various authorities in respect of the appointment of an Assistant or Executive Engineer. Do not let us take away the money from this Department; I would like to increase the amount by £1,000 rather than take away any of it.

Mr. MAPPE: The honourable member who has just spoken said that he was amazed at the attitude of the honourable junior member for St. James. I would like to say that I am disappointed at the attitude of the honourable junior member for St. James; he seems to have entirely deserted his post as chief member of the Opposition. Far from this amount being too much, I think that it is too little. The criticisms that have often been levelled against the Director of Highways and Transport in the past, especially by the honourable senior member for St. Michael, concern the administrative duties of this Department. Among the things which the Committee which enquired into this Department discovered were wrong was that the Director is burdened with too many administrative details. Here it is, in an important Department like this, there are about four or five offices vacant. I quite agree with the honourable senior member for the City that every year a certain amount of money is put down for the salary of an Executive Engineer and the Government knows that you cannot get an engineer for that amount of money.

I repeat that the Director has too much administrative work to do and if he is to be assisted in his special duties an **Executive Engineer** will have to be appointed. It is impossible to find a man for £650 per annum. The office of Foreman Mechanic is vacant as well as that of Senior Clerk; and with all these vacancies an excessive burden is thrown on the the Director. It is really amazing to hear anyone allege that the estimate under this Head is too much. I feel that it is too small and if the recommendations of the Committee which investigated this Head of expenditure are put into effect, the amount would be increased by one-half as much. I am glad to see that item 24 "Unestablished staff" has been increased on account of a number of casual employees being put on the permanent establishment. I congratulate the Director on having made an arrangement whereby more employees have been put on the permanent list. This question of casual employment seems to be a "casualty" where planning is concerned. Honourable members have criticized the ten-year plan, but we may even have a fifteen-year plan because it is better to plan for a long time than for a short time. I think that there should be as much security in the ranks of labour as possible. I think that the amount allocated under this Head is too small and I am sorry that this amount is not greater.

Mr. FOSTER: I heartily agree with the honourable senior member for St. Andrew. The honourable junior member for St. James has moved that this vote be reduced by £10,000 but how can we expect the Highway Commissioners to make bricks without straw? **The amount allocated to the parish of St. Andrew is £9,858, and I would like to see that amount doubled.** If you compare the roads in St. Andrew with those in other parishes, you will see that the roads in St. Andrew are most difficult. We have many bridges to deal with and the greater portion of the money has to be spent on them. I would like to say that I had the opportunity of meeting the honourable junior member for St. James when he was Chairman of the former Highways and Transport Board and the honourable member knows that you will put down a road in St. Andrew to-day and tomorrow you will find it somewhere else. Like the honourable junior member for St. Thomas, I am surprised to see that a reduction of this vote has been asked for. As I have already said, I would like to see the amount allocated to St. Andrew increased to twice that amount. I think that the days have passed when those in authority should be called upon to make bricks without straw.

Mr. COX: From the remarks of the honourable junior member for St. James one is constrained to feel that this Department is sadly lacking in administration. Honourable members will remember that some time last year we spoke on the question of laying off people. Not long ago the honourable junior member for St. James said that he had got in touch with the Director and the Director had told him that he would not be able to carry out this programme. Well, the Director did not tell that to the Committee which investigated this Head of the Estimates; he said that he was in a position to do only as much as he had laid out to do in the Estimates, when the question of tenantry roads came up. What strikes me more than forcibly is the fact that while there was money at the disposal of the Department during November and February there were still many of the present employees laid off and many of the rollers, as has already been explained, were laid aside. It seems to me that we want some more administrative Officers in this Department or somebody at the head to run the

Department as it should be run. As regards the watchmen, they are employed to work for a period of 105 hours a week and, peculiarly enough, they are paid for a period. That means as far as I can see, that if a man watches for an hour he will be paid \$1.00 and if he watches for one hundred hours he will be paid the same \$1.00. I find that the night watchman goes on at four o'clock in the afternoon and comes off at seven o'clock in the morning. If he is employed during the day, he goes on at seven o'clock and comes off at four o'clock. I feel that the Department should look into this matter and if the night watchman has to work for longer hours, he should be suitably remunerated for it. The question of the repair of the tenantry roads is the most burning one of all; it has been emphasized on many occasions. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has told us about the ten-year plan in which the repair of the tenantry roads is included. While I appreciate that you can plan for one hundred years, I still feel that if the Government realize how serious the situation is, especially in the districts where water is so scarce, they should start to repair these roads and they can be reimbursed from the funds which are allocated to them by the Colonial Development and Welfare Department as soon as the allocations have been made. I want to see something done where these tenantry roads are concerned; we have been hammering at this question for too long now and nothing has been done. From the year 1944 Addresses have been brought up in this House and questions have been asked about these tenantry roads and, judging from the discussions, as far back as 1926 an honourable member at that time tried his best to get these roads repaired. Up to now nothing has been done in districts such as Haggatt Hall. I have already drawn to the attention of the House the fact that in one of these districts a poor man died and the sum of \$100 dollars was asked for in order to get out that dead person.

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

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (B).

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (b) in order to continue Government Business.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I object.

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

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. RAMSAY, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, SPRINGER, ADAMS, BLACKMAN and GALE—9.

Noes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. LEWIS, CRAWFORD, MOTTLEY, DOWDING, S. A. WALCOTT, and WILKINSON—7.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Rule 61 (b) be now suspended in order to continue Government Business.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

The question that Rule 61(b) be now suspended in order to continue Government Business was put and resolved in the affirmative.

The following division was taken:—

Ayes: Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. RAMSAY, LEWIS, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, SPRINGER, ADAMS, BLACKMAN and GALE.—10.

Noes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. BRANCKER, CRAWFORD, GARNER, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, DOWDING, WALCOTT, and WILKINSON.—9.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been resolved in the affirmative, ten hon. members voting "Aye" and nine honourable members voting "No." However, the vote is of no avail since twelve honourable members must vote for the suspension of a Rule. The House will now proceed with the consideration of Private Member's Business.

ADDRESS *RE* DELEGATION TO NEGOTIATE THE SENDING OF WORKERS TO U.S.A.

The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business was called to move the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor requesting that a delegation should depart for Washington in order to conduct negotiations *re* sending of workers to the United States of America.

Dr. WILSON: Mr. Speaker,—The Address reads as follows:—

The House of Assembly To His Excellency The Governor

1. The House views with deep anxiety the statement made on the floor of the Assembly at its meeting on March 4th by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, Mr. G. H. Adams, to the effect that "the outlook for emigration at present is not rosy."

2. The House is of opinion that every possible action should be taken to procure a quota for our workers to enter the United States this year and with this end in view requests that a delegation comprising Your Excellency, the senior member for St. Philip, Mr. W. A. Crawford, and the Labour Commissioner Mr. Guy Perrin, should depart for Washington at the very earliest possible date in order to conduct negotiations with the appropriate authorities.

In making the motion for the passing of this Address, I do so with a full sense of responsibility not only in respect of the parish of St. John which I have the honour to represent, but the island as a whole. It is good to know the true facts in every matter; the outlook for emigration at present is not rosy—hence this Address. I would like to say that the circumstances enumerated in this Address are apparent that every statement made explains it. What is more, there is absolutely nothing in the Address which criticizes or accuses Government of negligence. The personnel of the delegation which should depart for Washington in order to negotiate with the authorities is a matter for this House to decide. I have made my suggestion and I leave it in the hands of honourable members. I want honourable members to know that I feel very strongly in this matter and I hope that honourable members who, like myself, have committed themselves to their respective constituencies on this question of emigration, will be good enough to accept this motion with the same spirit which actuated me in moving it. I would like to emphasize that this House should not leave any stone unturned in relation to emigration until a quota of workers from this island is procured to proceed to the United States of America during this year so that unemployment and its attendant evils may be far removed from our island especially in view of the short reaping season this year. I beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Mr. BRANCKER: It is not often when one rises to second a motion such as this which I now beg to second, that one is in the happy position of having heard the honourable Mover say everything that is required to be said in favour of the motion which is before the House. The honourable member who has just sat down has put the matter of this Address very clearly and succinctly before the House. It is not that we feel that nothing has been done by the Government in the matter of finding or trying to find a quota of Barbados workers for employment in the United States of America; it is that we feel that everything possible should be done, that no stone should be left unturned and that the maximum of united effort should be put forward in regard to this matter. I am happy to associate myself with this Address because of that. Of course, one perfectly appreciates the necessity for having as members of a delegation such as this, officials such as the Chief Executive himself and the Labour Commissioner. It is essential and very desirable that they should be there. I think that it is equally essential that a representative of the people of this colony—one who is interested in the people, a native of the colony and one in whom they have confidence not merely as an official—should be a member of such a delegation. I take it that that is why the honourable member on my right (Dr. Wilson) in framing this Address has suggested that the delegation should comprise three members—the Head of the Administration, the Labour Commissioner and the honourable senior member for St. Philip. I do not think that there is any of us who would attempt to deny the value or the extent of the contribution which has been made to this colony towards the cause of emigration by the honourable senior member for St. Philip, and I think that it is perfectly safe to say that the appointment of the honourable member as a member of a delegation such as this, will meet with widespread, if not the complete, unanimous desire of the people of this colony, and, in particular, the would-be emigrants. In commending this Address to the House, I would like to point out that it is not because it has been suggested that nothing has been done by the Government in this matter of emigration that the Address has been brought forward, but because in a matter such as this, we cannot possibly do too much. That is why I formally beg to second the motion for the passing of this Address in which it is suggested that a delegation comprising three persons—two officials and an unofficial member in the person of the honourable senior member for St. Philip, whom, I venture to suggest, the great majority regard as the pioneer of emigration in Barbados—be sent to the United States of America with a view to expediting and furthering negotiations in connection with the sending of Barbadian workers to that country.

Mr. GALE: Before this Address is passed, I would like to make a few observations. Not many weeks ago this House unanimously passed an Address in connection with emigration. The passing of that Address was moved by the honourable junior member for St. James. We had a full-dress debate on this question of emigration and every honourable member of every shade of opinion in this House agreed that emigration was necessary for Barbados and that it was one of the only things to which we could look forward for getting our people in other lands where they will be able to make a better living than they are able to do at present. I heartily agree with that and I think that every member of this House is in favour, absolutely in favour, of emigration to America or any other part of the globe; therefore, Mr. Speaker, I do not see that this Address this afternoon serves any useful purpose. I agree that the Executive Com-

mittee have done all that it is possible to do as far as getting people to go to America is concerned. Everything has been done, and a statement has been published in this morning's paper showing what the Government has done and what they intend to do. I think that we would be absolutely redundant in passing this Address this afternoon when we know full well that the members of the Executive Committee have tried their best to get people to go to America. Not only His Excellency the Governor but everybody connected with the Government is doing his utmost to get people to go to America, and I think that this Address is quite unnecessary. (Cheers).

Mr. COX: I, too, would like to make a few remarks in connection with this Address before it is passed. First of all, I admire the stand taken and the remarks made by the honourable junior member for St. Michael. I think that it is high time that we allow the public to know the true position, and whether they appreciate it or not, as time rolls on they will appreciate that it is right to put things in their true perspective. The honourable junior member for St. Michael has said that not very long ago we passed an Address asking the Government to do their best to send out people from this colony, whether it be an emigration scheme, a colonization scheme or any other scheme. That has been done and when the attempt was made last Tuesday to have this Address passed, we had the information from the Government that they had done everything possible in this matter of emigration. As this Address is worded we thought that nothing was done in the matter, but when we heard the reply from the Government, we found out that the Government had done everything possible it could have done to secure emigration for the people of this colony. The passages were even booked I understand, for the delegation to go to America to try and get a quota of workers from this colony. We found out that the terms of the Address had already been carried out by the Government. I feel that if such an Address must be passed there should be some amendment made to it. If we are sending the honourable senior member for St. Philip to America, well, let us pass an Address to that effect; but if we are passing an Address to send the Governor and the Labour Commissioner when that has already been arranged, I think that that is unnecessary and we should not play upon the delicacy of the intelligence of the people who have not got the information which is necessary to guide them. I do not know where we are heading for; we who have been selected as representatives and leaders of the people should not be prepared in any sort of surreptitious manner to try to deceive people, because that cannot be done any longer. The people realised that that used to be done and that is why such a change has been made in the constitution of this House. We will also be changed if we persist in doing this sort of thing. I say that we need to be conscientious, sincere and honest in everything we do otherwise something will happen very soon. I cannot subscribe to anything like this. I remember when members of the Parliamentary Association paid a visit here, a delegation from the organization which I belong, went to the Legislative Council Chamber, and we stressed the question of emigration to British Guiana and British Honduras. The Governor did his best in 1944 to send out people. He and the Labour Commissioner went to the United States and got a quota of workers from this colony. Is it necessary to send people up there now just to throw away the taxpayers' money because we can spend it? I am not in

favour of this Address because I know that something is being done for the people whether they appreciate my remarks or not. Let us do things honestly and uprightly; let us do things above board and do not subscribe to cheap politics! To-day we have a Labour Government, and we have confidence in the people whom we have selected as members of the Executive Committee of this colony. They have done or are doing their best for the people and yet we are asked to pass this Address to make people believe that nothing has been done! We saw from this morning's paper that the United States Authorities are ready to receive a delegation now. I repeat that unless we want to send the hon. senior member for St. Philip, I have nothing against that; but His Excellency the Governor and the Labour Commissioner have already been selected to go and I do not know what we are doing at all. I have discovered that some cheap methods are being adopted to fool the people of this colony and I know that somebody will pay for it very soon. I think that it would be out of order to pass this Address since we have already passed an Address of a similar nature. In any case, as this Address stands, I am prepared to say that I cannot see that any useful purpose will be served by passing it because it is clearly understood and everybody feels that the Government has already taken all possible steps with regard to this question of emigration and the United States Authorities are now ready to receive the delegation. Before I sit down, I would like to say that I know the type of mentality that exists in the outside world and I feel that in the interests of the people, it is far better to allow the two gentlemen who have been selected to go, than to make any mistake in selecting other members. If we want to be successful in this scheme, let us allow the Governor and the Labour Commissioner to go and obtain a quota of our workers. I repeat again that it is unnecessary for us to pass this Address. I hope that the time will come when we will stand up and do our duty to the people honestly, wholeheartedly and sincerely and not try to play upon their intelligence because we know that they are not in a position to gather the facts and see everything as we see it.

Mr. FOSTER: I rise to support the remarks of the hon. member who has just sat down. When this Address was introduced last Tuesday, I was in favour of it; but I am now satisfied that the Government is doing everything in connection with the matter and I am prepared to vote against the Address.

Mr. WILKINSON: As the hon. junior member for St. Michael has said, everybody must be in favour of emigration, and we are all very pleased to learn that a delegation from this colony is soon going up to the United States of America. As regards the composition of the delegation, this is a matter on which we should speak plainly, and I think that a member of colour should be included in that delegation. After all, the hon. senior member for St. George said a few weeks ago that he considered that a member of the people should go to represent the people. I think that this Address should be amended by deleting all the words after the word "and" occurring in line 3 of paragraph 2 and inserting the following words: "learn with pleasure that it is proposed to send a delegation to Washington and respectfully suggest that Mr. W. A. Crawford be included as a member." I beg to make that motion.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I beg to second that amendment: I do not know if the hon. Mover will accept it or not. The whole island knows that the hon. senior member for St. Philip has always been very interested and persistent in securing emigration

from Barbados. I consider that this House should send him there to represent the labouring classes. (Hear, hear). It is all very well to send the Governor and the Labour Commissioner; I would not say that the Government has not done its best in the matter, and we are not putting any obstruction in the Government's road if we ask that another member should also go up. We wish the Government to do more: we want them to send up an extra man with the two who have been selected. I would like to know from the hon. senior member for St. Joseph if they have ever heard anything from the Brazilian Government with regard to emigration. I would like to know what is happening.

Dr. WILSON: I accept the amendment proposed by the hon. junior member for St. James.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has accepted the amendment.

Mr. TALMA: I have got to my feet simply to say that an amendment such as this should meet with public support and sympathy. I feel that the hon. senior member for St. Philip, who has identified himself with emigration from the outset, should necessarily be included as a member of the delegation. I humbly submit that at this stage, His Excellency's presence is not strictly essential. This is not a new undertaking: this is a question of continuing what has already been done. I am not suggesting that His Excellency should not be sent, but I feel that the presence of the hon. senior member for St. Philip is more essential than that of His Excellency. The Labour Commissioner and the hon. senior member for St. Philip can handle this matter. His Excellency has a lot to learn. I cannot be convinced by anyone, especially of a Labour group, that there can be any dissentient voice relative to the presence of the hon. senior member for St. Philip on this delegation. If the Progressive League are opposed to this, it simply means that they are opposed to securing results. They are trying to claim emigration as their own cause, but emigration belongs to the hon. senior member for St. Philip. If they are not supporting this Address, it means that they are against emigration and everything that is fair and reasonable.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Before the question is put, I think that I should say a few words. I want to preface my remarks by saying this: About two hours ago I got an Air Mail letter from New York and in that letter were some clippings from newspapers published in New York last Saturday. One of them reads as follows:—

Mr. SPEAKER: You need not read the whole extract—

Mr. CRAWFORD: I will quote from memory.

Mr. SPEAKER: All right.

Mr. CRAWFORD: One of the clippings says that Jamaican farm labourers are expected to go to Canada this year and the Jamaican House of Representatives are appointing a three-man delegation to go to Canada to negotiate with the Canadian Government. The delegation will be composed of Mr. Bustamante, Rev. Black, a public Minister in the House of Representatives, a coloured man whom I know, and the Labour Officer. The Canadian Government has apparently decided to lower the racial barriers against immigration, and as the elected Representatives of the people in Jamaica, the Bustamante Government is sending a delegation to Canada comprising two members of the House and the Labour Officer to negotiate with the Canadian Government. Having said that, I want to say that the people who can understand the English language when it is read are apparently very limited in number in this House. In the course of his remarks the hon.

senior member for St. Michael claimed that the way in which this Address is worded accuses the Government of having done nothing in this matter of emigration. I ask any little child who understands elementary English—I ask any little child who has begun to go to school to show me two words of this Address which accuse the Government of not having done anything in this matter. All this Address says in paragraph 1 is that "The House views with deep anxiety the statement made on the floor of the Assembly at its meeting on March 4 by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, Mr. G. H. Adams, to the effect that the outlook for emigration at present is not rosy." Then in the second paragraph, it is suggested that every possible action should be taken to procure a quota of workers from this colony and mention is made of the personnel of the delegation which should go to Washington to conduct negotiations with the appropriate Authorities. When the passing of this Address was first moved, my reaction was that it would be passed. When I saw the wording of it, naturally I know that the Government has decided to send the Governor and the Labour Commissioner to the United States of America, my conclusion was that when His Excellency receives the Address, he would reply that it had already been decided that the Labour Commissioner and himself should go to America, but if the House decided that they would add to the personnel of the delegation, he would conform to their wishes. What has happened is this: because of personal animosities, because of selfish prejudice—

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know that the hon. member can bring in any question of prejudice.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have not finished yet. I was saying that because of personal animosities and selfish prejudice, we have objection from the floor of the House to this Address, purely because it includes in the personnel a member to whom certain members in this Chamber are uncompromisingly opposed. This does not worry me. Those people are my opponents: I have been fighting them all my life, and I intend to fight them all my life. Let us look at the background of events. A few weeks ago I was approached by a local Committee on this question of emigration, and asked whether I would be willing to go abroad, if they collected money locally to send me abroad, to investigate emigration possibilities. My reply was that the Government was acting in the matter. I have learned only four days ago, that the same delegation which came to me, telephoned Government House and asked for an interview with His Excellency to discuss the matter, and was told that the matter could be taken up with the Colonial Secretary. The delegation came back to me and I told them that we were moving in the matter. I told them that. It was only after the hon. senior member for St. Joseph rose from his seat and said that the prospects for emigration did not appear to be rosy that the delegation came back to me and suggested that if we moved in this matter, the people would be satisfied even if we accomplished nothing, as long as there was on the delegation somebody in whom they had confidence. In view of the apprehension which was engendered by the remarks of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, they felt that whether I liked it or not, whether I thought it necessary or not, I should be included in the delegation. This Address was the result. I should like to find out what real objections could be raised other than personal and carrying hatred and prejudice too far, other than allowing—

Mr. SPEAKER: I would suggest to the hon. member that he should not impute to other hon. mem-

bers motives less worthy than he would impute to himself.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It would be impossible to discover any justifiable reasons—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is insinuating that the reasons are based on not very nice motives.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not pressing the point. I remember that when Sir Grattan Bushe returned from Washington on the first occasion, he told us at a Press Conference that he had arranged during the negotiations for something and he hoped that he had not done anything wrong. He had arranged for the workers to go south during the winter after they had finished work in the midwest—

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not see that that has anything to do with this Address.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I just want to point out that the Jamaican Government refused to allow their workers to go south during the winter after they had asked if he had done right in suggesting that our workers should go south. The point is, that although we sent him there to represent the colony, he himself was not quite satisfied in his own mind in connection with certain matters which arose that he was actually expressing the desires of the people of this colony: If he had there with him a man in whom he knew the people had some confidence, one whom he regarded as being capable of expressing the desires of the people had some confidence, one whom he a line of action in which he wanted confirmation when he returned here. When I was in the United States of America in 1945, the Leader of the Jamaica Government sent a coloured delegation from the House of Representatives to America, and they made a complete tour of the Jamaican camps; and Barbadian workers who were in America then will affirm that the interest displayed by the Bustamante Government, and the results gained by that tour were of inestimable benefit to the Jamaica workers. Later on in the year when a hurricane almost demolished the greater part of a county in Florida, when we had over 1,600 Barbadians there awaiting transport—

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you arguing because a member of the House of Representatives of Jamaica was sent on that delegation that that is an argument why a member from this House should be sent in the shape of yourself?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am making a statement of fact and the House can draw their own conclusion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Except you are making that point, there is nothing in the argument.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am merely stating the facts as they appear to me. I feel that I know what conclusion they should draw and if they did not draw that conclusion, there is something lacking either in their honesty of purpose or intelligence. I was saying that these Representatives from Jamaica were of extreme value to the workers in America, and in one instance I know that they secured an extension of contract for two or three months when our workers had to remain in camp awaiting transport home. Thanks to the intervention of the representatives of the people of Jamaica who were interested in their workers! I am not suggesting that the Governor or the Labour Commissioner is not extremely sympathetic in this matter; but everybody will admit that His Excellency has arrived here just a few weeks ago, and only the most obstinate will want to claim that in a few weeks—

Mr. SPEAKER: The Address does not bring in anyone else but yourself.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I feel that in view of the misstatements which have been allowed to becloud this issue, and in view of the misapprehension which suggestion of my addition to the delegation may rise, I think that those who support the proposal should make the position as clear as possible. When the honourable senior member for St. Michael says that it is a waste of money to include an elected Representative of the people in a delegation such as this—when that is said by an honourable member who claims that he has been elected by the people because they have confidence in him, certainly it devolves upon people who think like us to make the position as clear as possible. During last year the British Government spent two hundred thousand dollars in defraying the expenses of delegations from India to Britain and *vice versa* in an endeavour to settle the Indian question. It is known that last year West Indians in America remitted forty million dollars back home. The expense of sending a Representative of the people to America would not amount to more than two hundred pounds.

Mr. SPEAKER: The whole question is in the second paragraph of the Address where it is suggested that you should be a member of that delegation.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I submit that the honourable member made the point to which I am now referring.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the honourable member made that point, the Address did not read as it reads now.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not clear as to what Your Honour is ruling on that point.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are pointing out the value of emigration with which the House agree. Therefore, the whole point now is whether you should be a member of the delegation or not.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I was trying to reply to the point made that the expense of sending a Representative of the people is unjustified. An honourable member said last week that it was putting money into my pocket. When we degenerate into such unfair and undignified accusations, certainly in a matter of this sort, it devolves upon those who are supporting the proposal to make our position quite clear to the public and substantiate it from every angle from which we can do so. I repeat that, looking at the matter from the point of view of expense, at a rough calculation it would cost less than £200 to send a Representative of the people to America. Can anybody suggest that that expenditure is unjustified bearing in mind all the particular circumstances involved? I would like to suggest at this stage that when people come on the floor of this House, irrespective of how they come here, whether they come as a result of their own initiative and ability or whether somebody else brings them. In 1940 I suggested on the floor of this House that we should send a delegation to British Guiana and British Honduras to investigate emigration possibilities. I also suggested that we should include on that delegation people drawn from the type of Barbadians who would be most likely to benefit from the emigration. I pointed out that we wanted two agricultural labourers on the delegation. Here again this year a similar Address was passed by this House and it was suggested that agricultural workers should be included on the delegation. To-day, however, we are being told that an elected Representative of the people would not be of any use at all on a delegation of this sort, and the matter must be left in the hands of Officials. That is the idea of people who talk about self-government day in and day out, people who proclaim that we are

capable of running our own affairs, people who say day and night that we should be masters of our own country, but who, even in a matter of arranging for a delegation, they are not capable of doing that. They have to depend entirely on officials. If we were self-government today and were making arrangements for emigration would we ask Europeans or British officials to see about it for us? When the Abyssinians want things done, do they ask the Europeans to see about it for them? Do they not send their own people to see about it for them? It is difficult to reconcile these two things. We say that we can run this island; we want Dominion status. They are just parrot cries and we hardly recognize what that means. On the other hand we must defend implicitly on officialdom. Any mistakes which may be made, they will correct them when they come back. I am merely making these points so as to show how unjustified the position is and how it all revolves not upon the question of principle but of personality. None of the opponents to this Address is capable of making a reasoned statement in support of the allegation that an elected member of this House should not be included on a delegation of this sort. Instead of that we hear a lot of cheap gibes from those who profess to represent the people; we hear that it is a question of putting money in somebody's pocket. That is not good enough. When we hear all this talk about everybody in the House supporting emigration, there are those of us who know at what rate to assess it; there are those of us who know how people pay lip service to this question of emigration when they have to do so and then make subtle attempts through other channels to sabotage it. It is an open secret that people are being told by supposedly responsible people in this community that there cannot be any emigration this year no matter what anybody does. It is amazing to see that certain sections of the Press instead of attempting to obtain it and to bolster up endeavours to obtain it, they make attacks and insinuations. I remember when it was suggested in this House two weeks ago—

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member is going outside the scope of the Address altogether. The whole point of the Address is that the House should take every possible action to obtain a quota of workers to go to the United States and that you should be appointed as a member of the delegation to negotiate with the authorities.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am sorry if I have transgressed, but I think that I may be pardoned for expressing my views very strongly in this matter. Finally, I would like to say that the insinuation was made last week and again this week that we tried to get this Address through and failed. Nothing of the kind took place; no motion was made for the passing of the Address. To-day is the first time that a motion was made for the passing of the Address. Again it was insinuated in this House that on the ground of colour, the addition to the delegation of the third member proposed would not be of any assistance.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was present in the House on each occasion and I do not think I can uphold you in that. I hope that you will keep any question like that out of the debate because there is no reason for it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It came from a responsible member of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot remember anything like that being said.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I think I have said enough to support the suggestion made by the honourable senior member for St. John that it cannot do any harm and possibly it will do a lot of good, if a

Representative of the people is included in this delegation. In dealing with the Dominion of Canada, admittedly one of the countries in this world which was very strong in respect of colour barriers and is now lowering them allegedly—

Mr. SPEAKER: The Dominion of Canada is not in this Address.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am only referring to it for the purpose of making a comparison. The Dominion of Canada is a country which admittedly has a well-justified reputation for erecting colour barriers and now a West Indian colony is sending a delegation there. The Jamaica Government is not sending any high officials; they have selected elected Representatives of the people, two coloured men—Bustamante and Black—and the Labour Officer to represent the interest of the workers. I hear somebody ask what will be the outcome? I reply: Wait and see.

Mr. ADAMS: Before the question is put, I should like to say that even with the best case people will make a mess of it by imputing evil motives to others. Nobody has suggested that there is anything inherently wrong in a member of this House being chosen as a Representative of the people to go to America. Speaking for myself, I said two weeks ago that the honourable senior member for St. Philip knew that the Government was doing all it could as regards sending the delegation to Washington. I have never suggested that this person or that person should not go. I entirely agree with the honourable member—I may be wrong—but I entirely agree with the honourable senior member for St. Michael that, from the American angle, there is nothing that any of us can do that cannot be done by the Governor of this colony. Whether we be Ministers of State or not, they will not take any notice of us, from the honourable junior member for St. James to the Chairman of Committees when the Head of the State is there himself. It is the easiest thing in Barbados—and Barbados is not unique in this case—to make an electioneering speech and impute something against somebody else and get cheers from outside. Anybody can get a cheer from the unthinking. From a political point of view, if the people of this country feel that their elected representatives would be serviceable or useful on a delegation, by all means they have a right to say so through the mouths of their representatives here. The only point I raise now is that it is purely a matter of good taste; how many of us would get up and ask for money for ourselves? In a matter of pecuniary interest members cannot vote. It is unusual—

Mr. CRAWFORD: I must apologise for interrupting the honourable member, but I think he must explain how I am benefiting in a pecuniary way from this suggestion.

Mr. ADAMS: If the honourable member will take the trouble to read May's Parliamentary Practice, he will see what the representatives in the House of Commons are allowed to do and what they are not allowed to do. Let him take up a "May" and read it. This is a matter of personal taste. That is all I have said: there is no rule to prevent the honourable member from getting up and talking about himself, only I do not know if anybody else would do it. That is all I was saying. None of us has ever said that a Representative of the people should not represent the people, but this is not the best method of doing it. The honourable member has put it plainly that because a person may move or suggest to you that such a time is not the proper time to do such and such a thing, therefore you should impute hatred and prejudice to that person. That is the speaker's view rather than a reality; that is a subjective feeling,

not a reality. From a political point of view, the Government has got to do some things which they know in their heart of hearts to be unnecessary, but it is expedient to do those things. In Jamaica, it is expedient to do some things so as to make people realise that you are doing your utmost for them even if you think that they are superfluous. My position is, and will always be, that the Head of the Executive will be listened to when no other human being will be listened to; but if the people of this colony feel that they would like their own Representatives to go to America, then it is a matter of policy for the Government to say "Well, we will send your Representatives". Now from that stage, Mr. Speaker, what is our position? We have got to face realities: we are not children. There are not all of us who will say what I am going to say now, but they will know it. The public of this colony have sent to this House nine members of the Labour Party, eight members of the Electors' Association and seven members of the Congress Party, and if the people have elected their representatives in this manner, I would imagine that the honourable junior member for St. James in his amendment would have suggested "Members of the Legislature", if the honourable member is speaking for the people of Barbados; otherwise he is only speaking for a few voters. I have not the slightest objection to the honourable senior member for St. Philip going to America if the people of this colony feel that a Representative whom they have sent to this House should be on the spot; but even if the people who sent the honourable senior member for St. Philip to the House felt that he should go, it must be remembered that there were those who voted for the Labour members and there were those who voted for the Conservatives, and they should also feel that one of their members should be sent. No matter how much we differ, we, as a House of Assembly, have to remember that we are being looked upon by the eyes of the outside world. Let us try and keep the conduct of business in this Assembly on a high plane; there are those who are watching every action we take. I appeal to the House that if as a matter of political judgment or political expediency they feel that the people of this colony will be more pleased to know that, in addition to the Governor and the Labour Commissioner, their elected Representatives will go to America, let us look at the composition of the House and do not pick out one, but two or three persons. Let us remember that we have been sent here as three Parties by the votes of the people of Barbados; they voted Labour, Conservative and Congress and they were split votes. How can anyone assert that we would be doing our duty to the people, to the rank and file of the inhabitants of this colony who feel that they should have a voice in this delegation if we pass this Address with a specific reference to a single individual? I know that there are other honourable members who feel like me in this matter, and I do not wish to anticipate anything which anybody might do. I know that at least two honourable members have drafted amendments, and I shall do no more than apologise to them if I have taken the wind out of their sails; but I think that it is time that we should be men and not little children. It is time to remember the dignity of the House of Assembly; it is time to stop suggesting that because somebody differs from you he is opposed to you. Some unfortunate remarks have been made today; apparently, the honourable senior member for St. Philip was "poohpoohing" what the honourable senior member for St. Michael said on a previous occasion, but who could be so brutal and criminal as not to do his best for emigration? Foul lies and propaganda go out whether it be at election

time or not; because such and such an honourable member said such and such a thing, therefore he is opposed to emigration. I said in making my Budget Speech that the prospects for emigration were not rosy lest people would have too high hopes; let us read the communication from the Government as published in the Press today. I agree that the Government should have a proper Publicity Bureau and let the people know these things as they take place, so that a lot of misunderstanding would never arise. If the Government had done what was done this morning and let people know that everything had been done and that we were merely awaiting the telegram which came the other day stating that the delegation could go, probably this would never have arisen. Merely because we possess different views, because we have different political labels, do not let us assume that a man who differs from you politically is a villain. I appeal to honourable members to see that we owe a duty to the people; if they are clamouring for their own representatives, they must remember the proportion in which their representatives were sent to this House. They made it clear from the division of their votes, that they are supporting persons of every Party in whom they have confidence, that they believe that those persons will do their best for them. I appeal to honourable members to look at everything we do in this light, and when we have done that we will stop this casting about of firebrands which cannot do any good to the community of Barbados as a whole.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am very glad that my politics are such that I can be independent of this Party strife. We have debated at length this matter of including a Representative elected to this Chamber to accompany the delegation which will proceed to the United States to seek a quota of workers for this colony. I have listened very carefully to the remarks of honourable members, and my position is similar to what it was on the last occasion. There is no member of this House who, after the last Election could be mentally dishonest enough or courageous enough to offer any sort of opposition to emigration. I am bound to take cognizance of the official communique which appeared in the Press today, in which it is pointed out that the present Government has done something in this matter. Since the last debate which took place in this House on this subject, I have been at pains to move more closely among the populace and I have discovered beyond the shadow of a doubt that it is the feeling among the people that some representative or representatives of the people should accompany this delegation. I am saying this—I am not a member of any of the Parties and I have no apologies to make—that although it may be a matter of bad taste, in reconnoitring on Sunday morning last in order to get the true state of affairs, I discovered that quite a majority of people would like to see the honourable senior member for St. Philip accompany this delegation. (Cheers). I am not moved by cheers; the next statement may not be cheered. There is also the feeling that other honourable members of this House should also accompany the delegation. The Address as it was introduced by the honourable senior member for St. John on Tuesday last, would seem to be perfect; because the honourable member like myself, not being a member of the Government, knew absolutely nothing of the facts. The honourable member was in ignorance of the position of the Government, hence any amendment which is proposed today cannot be taken as an attempt to minimise, belittle or ridicule the honourable member's attempt. I will repeat what I said last Tuesday, that every honourable member of this House is in favour of emigration to the United States, and on this subject I am so mindful of events, that I am going to quote the honourable

senior member for St. Joseph, the Leader of the House. The honourable member made it quite clear just now, and I wonder if his words on that subject will be really read by the Head of the Administration, because the honourable member distinctly pointed out that there is no majority Party in this House. Now, Mr. Speaker, if there is no majority Party in the House, it is definitely the wish of the people that the country should be run by all three of the Parties which have been elected to this popular Chamber. That is an admission from the floor of this House today.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that anything to do with the debate?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Only in the sense that that utterance by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph will hinge upon the amendment which I will make. Mr. Speaker, I feel that this House will be upholding its tradition, as a matter of fact, I do not see that there is anything wrong in this House feeling and expressing in an Address the view that representatives of Labour should accompany the members of the delegation to Washington. I quite agree with the last speaker that the presence of the Head of the Administration on the delegation is bound to carry weight in the United States with the peculiar mentality as we know it, but, Sir, there is still the feeling in this colony that the Governor has been with us for only a short time. There is still lack of confidence among the masses in the Labour Commissioner as Labour Commissioner, and if we think in terms of democracy that the Government must be for the people and of the people, then it is our duty, if we are satisfied that it is the desire of the people, to send a representative or representatives from this popular Chamber on that delegation despite whatever the ancient traditions may be. I do not see that there is anything wrong in this House agreeing with that. I see that there is one thing wrong with the amendment as proposed by the honourable junior member for St. James. I will exercise my prerogative in letting His Excellency know that it is the wish of the great majority of the people that the honourable senior member for St. Philip should accompany this delegation. I am going to be as strong as this: I do not think that the honourable member's name should be mentioned in the Address. That is pinning down the Administration and if the honourable member should be taken ill or anything else should happen, what would be the position? I am going to make another strong statement and it is this: I have never felt, due to my present contact and association, that any one member or section is any more interested in emigration than any other section. Due to the activities of the honourable senior member for St. Philip and to his contact in the United States of America, it must be appreciated that, at one time or another, he has displayed a great deal more interest in emigration than a lot of us have displayed. That is an undisputed fact, but that in itself does not necessarily mean that my colleagues at this end of the Table do not have a similar interest in emigration. I will make this amendment: it may not be as popular as some people would like, but I have given it serious thought. I am fully conscious of what my constituents expect of me: I feel that I can live above the level of the Party strife and Party conflict and the various malicious accusations which some members of this House try to make at times. It is very easy for some of us to appreciate what we have actually said. I find that in order to attain success in any democratic Assembly, you must have the spirit of compromise. After studying the matter carefully, I am offering this amendment for the consideration of honourable mem-

bers. I am offering it because I am conscious of my responsibility and whether I like the utterances of members of this House or not, I am bound to acknowledge the official communique. I beg to move that the following Address be substituted for that which has been moved and amended:

The House of Assembly are of the opinion that representatives of the people should be included in the delegation which it is proposed to send to the United States of America to make arrangements for a quota of Barbadian Workers to be sent to the United States this year, and respectfully request Your Excellency to include Members of the House of Assembly in the proposed delegation.

I feel that this is a compromise however you feel about honourable members no matter to what Party they belong. I feel that Party feeling should cease as soon as you reach the top stairs of this House. It is the feeling that some representatives of the people should go to America, and that is my considered opinion whether the amendment is seconded or not. I feel that this debate will go on unless something of this nature is done. I make no apologies for having offered this amendment. I say that I will exercise every right that is mine if I feel or if I am given to believe that anything is being done to minimise the interest of the honourable senior member for St. Philip in this matter. If I thought that there was anything conceived by any Party or Parties to belittle the honourable member's interest in emigration, I would approach His Excellency in the matter.

Mr. SPRINGER: I have much pleasure in seconding the amendment which has been so ably moved by the hon. senior member for the City. I do not think that any one in this House will accuse me of harbouring any spite or prejudice against any one either during this debate or at any other time. I made the position clear last Tuesday on behalf of the Government, because whatever was the intention of the hon. senior member for St. John and the honourable senior member for St. Philip in introducing the Address in the form in which it was introduced, there was no doubt in my mind that the inevitable result of such an Address which was moved without any statement of fact either to the members of the House or the public, would be that everyone would conclude that, until the Address was moved, the Government was not doing anything in the matter. I have never accused the hon. senior member for St. John of having that as his reason. This is a matter which each one of us should consider for himself and infer or not, as he pleases according to the evidence. There is no doubt that whenever you are dealing with a democratic Government, you not only have to consider the result of any action which is taken, but the appearance which the action will have in the minds of the masses who inevitably will not have the sources of information which are available to us. We are in a position of responsibility. Therefore, I realise that it is necessary sometimes to give an impression so as to satisfy the feelings of the masses that you are doing everything that you can possibly do. I realise that in the minds of some people, it is bound to be felt that the presence of elected Representatives of the people on a delegation will, in some way, ensure a more adequate statement of their case than the presence merely of officials. In this particular case, I have no doubt whatever that a delegation of Officials would be all that is necessary, and that the delegation will not be strengthened or made more effective by the addition of a popular Representative. But I do realise that once the question has been raised, the average person outside the Government will always feel, and

perhaps it is right that he should feel so, that it is better to have a Representative of the people going along with the delegation, a man who belongs to the colony. That is why I am seconding the motion of the hon. senior member for the City. I certainly could not vote for an Address which picked out the honourable senior member for St. Philip or any other honourable member in those terms. As has been well said, it is not true to say that the honourable senior member for St. Philip is the only person who is interested in this matter. No one could assert with any certainty that the honourable member is the most interested person in the matter. What is true is that he is the person with whom emigration has been associated in the public mind, and that is the point which must be recognized when you come to decide as to the position of any other person. I would not, for example, agree to send a delegation including popular Representatives which did not include the hon. senior member for St. Philip if I believed that his presence would add anything to the delegation; if you are sending members of the House, obviously you would be very foolish to exclude the man with whom emigration is associated in the minds of the people. Everybody remembers that in 1943-44 the honourable senior member for St. Philip held a public meeting in Queen's Park; it was the first meeting which was held in connection with the subject, and from then onwards his name has been associated with emigration. In 1945 he went to the United States of America, and took great care to see that his visit was associated with emigration. As a wise politician, he was right. I am not saying that the honourable member has not spent his money in sending cables and so on; my point is that his name has been inextricably associated with emigration in the minds of the Barbadian public. Apart from that on general grounds—I know that I differ from the honourable junior member for the City—I believe that appointments are best made by the Executive. I do not think that it would be right, having regard to the composition of the House and the intensely local political nature of this emigration question, to insist that representation of the popular Chamber should be restricted to any member of one Party. I am comforted to hear from the mouth of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy, as well as from that of the honourable senior member for St. Philip, arguments in favour of that view, because they have pointed out that the question of sending a Representative or Representatives from this Chamber not only has a precedent in the case of Jamaica, but, as the honourable junior member for St. Lucy says, the actual matter is so important, that we should not leave any stone unturned; we should send a delegation as strong as possible. If the presence of M.C.P.'s will be useful, obviously more than one will be more useful than one. Therefore a delegation consisting of one member of this House will not be as strong and impressive as one consisting of more than one member of the House. This is not a question of sending a delegation to a conference; it is obviously more than that. I am supporting the motion of the honourable senior member for the City because he does not specify any one person; he has suggested that members of the House should be included in the delegation. Why should such a delegation not include the honourable junior member for St. James who was the first person in this Session to raise the question of emigration, and move an Address which was passed and sent to His Excellency? I would not be so mean-spirited as to suggest that the Party to which he belongs should not be represented on any delegation which is proposed. I feel that the only proper course

to be followed is to state that the House is willing or wants the delegation to include members of the Legislature or members of the House of Assembly, the representatives of the people, and leave it to the good sense of the Governor exercising his prerogative with the assistance of the four members of the Executive Committee so as to guide the counsels right. It does not take a genius to see that under the present set-up the House should ask the Governor to appoint the members of the delegation. The Governor will see the source from which he should draw the members. If he does not see it, then it follows that his advisers will be there to see it. I think that it will be most improper in the circumstances to pass an Address and send up the names of people, and it would be wrong to send up the name of any one person for the reasons which I have given.

Mr. LEWIS: I think that the debate which has taken place in this Chamber both when the Address was introduced and in connection with the present amendment which appears to be gaining the acceptance of honourable members, has done a great deal of good. I think that on Tuesday last when the Address was introduced most people in this colony felt that as in the case of the Department of Highways and Transport where there was no Executive Engineer as yet, it would be recommended that some steam be let off before the Government's boiler burst. (Laughter). In that respect, the debate has done a great deal of good. The first Address was one with which I did not agree, and I still cannot agree with it. I think it is unfortunate that one of the members of the House should have been included in the Address, especially the honourable member who was mentioned. The honourable member whose name was mentioned, is a member of the Government and he would be expected to know something of the facts that were revealed in the debate. He would undoubtedly have found it very difficult to convince any member of the community that, as a member of the Government and the Leader of a Party, he did not know the substance of the Address at the same time he knew that two of the names mentioned in the Address formed part of the delegation proposed by the Government. I think that the honourable member has allowed his undoubted zeal for emigration to outrun his discretion on this occasion. The Address which has been moved as an amendment will have my support if my colleague is willing to accept an amendment. I have always held that this House should select the persons who are to be selected on these particular occasions. I think that the House should have a say in the selection of any delegation which leaves this colony in the interest of the people. I cannot too strongly condemn the Government for not giving any information as to the developments in their efforts to secure a quota of our workers for the United States and also their action in regard to emigration generally. I take it that a mistake was made on this occasion because at least the Head of the Administration felt that the Cabinet, so to speak, was more representative of the Assembly and the people, and if it were necessary he would have been advised to disclose what was being done. I take it that the Head of the Administration was not advised to take that step and if that is so the blame must rest equally on the shoulders of the four members of the House of Assembly. (Cheers). I know that when a person like the Head of the Administration even of this small colony is included in a delegation for many reasons, for reasons of prestige especially, the negotiations will perhaps have an 80% chance of

success. I do not think that you would have to go to Government House to know that that is so. Therefore, I do not think that the Government can be too cautious in their actions. We have to be very careful about the things we say and in expressing our feelings otherwise we cannot represent any section of the community much more the entire community. We are sending a delegation to negotiate with people to whom we cannot issue any threats no matter how mild; we have to be extremely diplomatic in negotiating with them for the purpose of securing a quota of workers. I have no doubt that the Head of the Administration and the Labour Commissioner will do that. (Cheers). They are quite capable of doing that with the Americans. I do not think that there is any shadow of a doubt about that at all. I think it is incumbent on the Head of the Administration to include perhaps not only an elected Representative of the people, but definitely a Representative of the people. (Cheers). If a delegation comprised of white men went to the United States of America and failed to get a quota of workers, could you convince the rank and file of the workers in this colony that the delegation did not go with the intention of failing? (Cheers).

The visitors to the House cheered.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to draw to the attention of the people who are sitting in the gallery that they are not allowed to take any part in the debate either by applause or otherwise.

Mr. LEWIS: I feel that the suggestion which I have made is one that should come from perhaps higher than the House of Assembly. It is a good suggestion; it is a method of assurance against possible failure—a definite explanation to the people that everything was done for them and the delegation had failed. If my colleague will accept an amendment, I will give my wholehearted support to the amended Address as has been proposed by him. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that you will allow me to say a word further about the lack of information from the Government. The suggestion has been made in this House that a Public Relations Officer is necessary for this colony. I think that such an Officer is absolutely necessary.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that we should have any debate on that matter.

Mr. LEWIS: I just want to make this point and allow the Government to draw its conclusion. We have a Labour form of representative Government at present, and we have given the people to believe that they are more adequately represented in the councils of Government. We have had instituted during the regime of the last Head of the Administration such things as Press Conferences, and I would like to know what information the people of this island have ever got out of them. I think that the Government should have used some of the means at their disposal for putting the people's mind at rest by keeping them informed of what was happening and making them feel that they are mindful of the interest of the people. I may be one of the persons to whom the honourable senior member for St. Philip referred in his remarks, but I should like to say that it is my considered opinion that when the Address as it was introduced by the honourable senior member for St. John, and everything is taken into consideration, it does look as if the Government was being accused of doing nothing. It is difficult to prove otherwise. I should like to say that the Government has incurred that upon themselves, because the charge can be laid at their door that they have failed to inform the public of what they were doing when what they were doing could not have been described as a State secret the disclosure of which would be inimical to the success of the scheme. I would like to offer this information to be taken to the

Head of the Government; that it is in his own interest—and he may realise it too late—to allow the people's Representatives to select the persons who are to accompany him. If he attempts to do it himself or by some information he might get, no matter how good that information might be, he has to be very careful otherwise the scheme will not be successful. I would offer this amendment to the Address as moved by my colleague, that all the words after the word "respectfully" in line 3 be deleted and the following words substituted therefor; "suggest to Your Excellency that Members of the House of Assembly selected by the House be included in the proposed delegation." For the benefit of my colleague I would like to say that His Excellency may not feel that he should undertake to choose those who should go with him, and from the very nature of the honourable member's Address there is a lurking suggestion that more complete representation of the people is necessary. I think that the amendment which I have proposed will absolve everybody from blame and give some measure of security to the people. If His Excellency is forming part of the delegation, and you are asking that some other people be included, what is the sense of placing upon His Excellency the responsibility of choosing the other people? I say: let the House see that some of its members are included in the delegation and let us be willing to absolve His Excellency from any blame by selecting the members who should accompany him.

Mr. GARNER: I will begin by quoting from Shakespeare: there is much ado about nothing. I am supporting this Address with a grieved heart; I am surprised that I belong to a Coalition and that what has happened to-day can happen. There is still a lot of propaganda. I voted for the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to attend a Conference in St. Thomas when a member of his own Party nominated him, and now that a member of my Party is asking that the Leader of the Party be included in this delegation to the United States of America, I do not see anything wrong in that.

"Why all this fret and worry,
Why all this anxious care;
There is no lack where God is,
And God is everywhere."

You hear everybody talking about the dignity of the House, and it all boils down to the question of personality. The name of the honourable senior member for St. Philip being included in the Address means nothing sinister; everybody knows that the honourable member was the first citizen of Barbados to get this emigration spirit moving. The whole island is greased on that. If a plebiscite were taken as to this matter, there would be so great a majority in favour of the honourable senior member for St. Philip, that you could hardly tell who was the next man in the running. I repeat, I see nothing wrong in an Address being introduced in good grace from the floor of this House asking that the honourable senior member for St. Philip be included in this delegation. There is no question of the taxpayers' money being wasted; in fact the efforts of the honourable member where emigration is concerned have given the island thousands and thousands of pounds, and even if £200 were spent so as to enable him to go to the United States in the people's interest, there is nothing that would be wasted. When we talk of bad taste, every right-thinking person who is not prejudiced will know that each of us as human beings has his pet thoughts and subjects; and if emigration happens to be the pet theme of the honourable senior member for St. Philip, we should try to refrain from interfering with that. This is all a matter of prejudice. The honourable senior member for St. George has had the courage to admit that the honourable senior member for St. Philip has shown great interest where emigration is concerned, and I go

so far as to say that there would have been nothing wrong even if the honourable member had brought the Address himself. The honourable member has been associated with emigration in this island for a number of years; he has made efforts on its behalf in the Press, on the public platform and from his own pocket. I know that the honourable member has spent his own money in connection with emigration before it came about and even recently, so that he has nothing of which he has to be ashamed. This is only a question of rivalry, and how can you expect to talk about a Coalition Government? That is a farce. Not long ago we had the same thing here; when we were appointing a Deputy Speaker, everybody saw what happened—

Mr. SPEAKER: We are debating this Address at the present moment.

Mr. GARNER: I was only making an analogy. Mr. Speaker. The same spirit has motivated these speeches this afternoon, and yet we talk about Coalition. This shows that, for me, this Government has fallen down; there is no more Coalition after this afternoon. I cannot see it. Nobody in this Assembly can expect me to coalesce with him after this. This is foolishness; I repeat that there is much ado about nothing. The honourable senior member for St. Philip is entitled to go to the United States if the masses want him to go, and therefore why all this ado? It is only on the question of prejudice that some of us would want to prevent him from going. I regard this as a very niggardly act; because after we got on the battlefield and fought tooth and nail against each other and certain people got together and said: "We will sink our differences", what do we find? The whole thing has broken down; when the name "Coalition" is put up, you find that there is a division; you find that there are people who are pulling against each other. You can only deduce that the Coalition has broken down, the Government has been defeated and we should get in our cars, go to Government House and tell the Governor that a fresh set-up has to be made because this one has broken down—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is going out of the scope of this Address.

Mr. GARNER: Very well, Mr. Speaker. I do not think that there is anything wrong in the House choosing the persons who should go on this delegation, because I am one of those persons who believe that we should not put too much power in the hands of the Governor. I do not see the necessity for sending the Governor, but if he is included in this Address, I will vote for that. Here we have Labourites standing on the floor of this House in opposition to the honourable senior member for St. Philip on this question of emigration and allowing members of the community to hear them say that the honourable member should not be a member of the delegation; and they are trying to pick facts as to why he should not go! I say that this is ridiculous. I am saying that the honourable senior member for St. Philip should go, not only because he is my friend and colleague, but because on another occasion I voted for the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to go to St. Thomas. If the Progressive League had a "break" on that occasion, I think that the Congress should have a "break" now. I think that we should be magnanimous enough to rise to the occasion. If the honourable senior member for St. Joseph went to St. Thomas, he should allow the honourable senior member for St. Philip to go to the United States in the interest of his pet subject. I think that the honourable member is the right person to go there. I remember that the honourable member came to my house, awoke me out of my bed and asked me to go to Queen's Park to attend a meeting in connection with emigration, and now we hear a lot of excuses, a lot of talk about bad grace and bad taste;

and when the honourable senior member for St. George nominated the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to go to the Conference in St. Thomas I did not say that it was bad grace or bad taste. Mr. Speaker, I have generated a lot of heat, but I do not think that I could have spoken otherwise. I have nothing to gain by it; but what I want to see is that a certain number of labourers go out of this island so that the standard of wages can be maintained at a high level. If we keep this redundant population all the time, we cannot make the employers pay the standard wages—

Mr. SPEAKER: We are not going into that question this afternoon.

Mr. GARNER: That is a part of it.

Mr. SPEAKER: That has nothing to do with this Address.

Mr. GARNER: I am not labouring that point, but I am saying that emigration is necessary, and it is well that we decide to send on that delegation a man like the honourable senior member for St. Philip along with those who are in charge. Jamaica has benefited by sending their own representatives and we would do well to send ours. There should not be any petty strife in this matter. I am surprised to hear the arguments which have been adduced this afternoon.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not wish to interrupt the honourable member, but that point has already been made.

Mr. GARNER: I am supporting this amendment for many reasons. This is not a political issue with which we can play the ball; this is a statesman-like issue. I get a "break" to-day, to-morrow you get one and things will even up. I hope that the Opposition have made up their minds; their opposition must cease if the people of this island are to get the best out of this Legislature. It is a fact that all of us have become socialistic; I see all Socialists around this Table. It will be remembered that an Address in connection with emigration was moved by the honourable junior member for St. James—it is true he brought it after we had thought about it—but he brought it nevertheless, and let us not forget that it was amended. Somebody has said:

"God give us men,

The time demands strong men,

Men whom the lust of office cannot buy."

When you want position, you will get what you deserve, if you come about it in the right way. I say that no chain is stronger than its weakest link; I do not see how people who had sunk all their petty animosities could be so childish in an issue such as this. I hope that some of us will regret our opposition to the honourable senior member for St. Philip being sent on this delegation.

Mr. RAMSAY: I am sorry that I have to rise at this time, but honourable members must bear with me. There is such a thing as filibustering, but that is not my idea. I must make my contribution lest I be misunderstood. I am appealing to the intelligentsia of this House, and those who come under that category can listen. We have had a display of what can be called ignorance or anything else; we have let ourselves go. Honourable members have spoken as if emigration is the cardinal point; but that is not the point. We all agree with emigration, but the point is sending somebody along with the delegation. Well, the first contribution to this debate has moved me, I refer to the contribution of the honourable junior member for St. Michael. Lest I go too deeply down, I must not call out names. The honourable senior member for St. George was one of those who also contributed to the debate. I am asking honourable members to read, mark, learn and inwardly digest what has happened this afternoon, and we will see just where we are. I am proud of the amendment as has been introduced by the honourable senior member for

the City. I have not much to say except this: we have got on like a lot of little children, and I am sorry that our schoolmaster was not here to put us in our places. I intend to vote for the amendment anyhow. I also had an amendment to make, and it is this: that the words "comprising Your Excellency, the senior member for St. Philip, Mr. W. A. Crawford, and the labour Commissioner, Mr. Guy Perrin" occurring in paragraph 2 of the original Address be deleted, and the following words be added at the end of the Address: "and that Members of the House of Assembly should be included." I have always been told as a little fellow that I should take my meat last. Whenever you have people at your home, you let them eat first; you are always the last person to eat. I am voting for the amendment.

The question that the Address as moved by the honourable senior member for St. John and amended do now pass was put and resolved in the negative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. BRANCKER, CRAWFORD,

GARNER, TALMA, DOWDING, S. A. WALCOTT and WILKINSON—8.

Noes: Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. RAMSAY, LEWIS, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, SPRINGER, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, MOTTLEY, HAYNES and GALE—12.

The question that the Address as moved by the honourable senior member for the City do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, Mr. SPEAKER declaring "I think the 'Ayes' have it."

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the honourable senior member for St. John and the honourable senior member for the City to present this Address.

Dr. WILSON: As Your Honour pleases.

Mr. MOTTLEY: As Your Honour pleases.

THE ADJOURNMENT

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the House was adjourned to meet on Thursday next, the 20th day of March, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon.