

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1947—48

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 17th February, 1948.

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. G. B. EVELYN, (*Speaker*), His Honour Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, (*Deputy Speaker*), Mr. J. T. C. RAMSAY, (*Chairman of Committees*), Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Messrs. L. E. SMITH, F. I. WALCOTT, M. E. COX, R. G. MAPP, C. E. TALMA, H. D. BLACKMAN, E. D. MOTTLEY, J. A. HAYNES, B. A. H. A. DOWDING, V. C. GALE, S. A. WALCOTT and E. L. WARD.

Prayers are read.

Messrs. LEWIS and ADAMS enter the House and take their seats.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 10th February, 1948, having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID.

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

Report of the Acting Port Health Officer for the year 1946.

Progress Report No. 33 on the Further Improvement of the Water Supply Scheme for period October to December, 1947.

Statement showing the appropriation of the Legislative Grant to the Barbados General Agricultural Society for year 1947-48.

Statement showing the amounts advanced by the Government of Barbados and the amounts received from His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom under the provisions of the Colonial Development and Welfare Act for the period ended 31st December, 1947, in respect of the several schemes sanctioned by the Legislature.

PETITION.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to present a petition from Una Mill Archer and Leonard Charles Mill Archer, Trustees of the Will of the late

James Mill Archer, praying the House that the Bill entitled the Petroleum (Production and Control) Act, 1947, be not passed into law and that they may be heard against the Clauses and Provisions of the said Bill. The petition is respectfully worded and I ask that it be taken as read.

The petition is taken as read.

NOTICES.

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution for £560 to supplement Resolution No. 101 of the 29th October, 1947, for carrying on the organisation for banking the compulsory savings of Barbadian workers in the U.S.A., for payment to their nominees of the allotments authorised to be paid under the terms of the workers' contracts, for the payment of any Court order for the maintenance of any person dependent on the workers, for the reimbursement of any monies paid by the Government of Barbados in respect of duties incurred by the workers in the U.S.A., and in respect of advances by way of loan in order to effect insurance.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of £7,428 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the service of the Colony as set out in the Schedule to the resolution.

Dr. CUMMINS: Bill to consolidate and amend the Acts of this Island relating to Public Health.

Dr. CUMMINS: Bill to provide for the division and sale and the division and letting of land in lots and for the regulation of tenancies.

Dr. CUMMINS: Bill to amend the Poor Relief Act, 1892 (1892-2).

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

Other Notices are as follows:—

Mr. MOTTLEY: A Bill intituled an Act to amend the Vestries (Cost of Living Bonus to Employees) Act, 1947 (1947-6).

Mr. MOTTLEY: Of the following Address:—

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency the Governor.

1. The House are of the opinion that, in view of the increasing number of cases of Pulmonary Tuberculosis with its very contagious effects, the

Government should take immediate steps to provide for the erection and maintenance of a proper sanatorium, separate and apart from any Almshouse, where persons suffering from this disease can be isolated and given curative treatment.

2. The House respectfully request Your Excellency to send down, without delay, the necessary legislation to give effect to this proposal.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Of the following Address:—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor*

1. The House are of the opinion that, in keeping with the recommendation of sub-paragraph "(A) Re-organisation" under Head "V. Elementary Education" as set out on page 16 of "A Policy for Education" prepared by the Department of Education and approved by the Legislature, the government should send down, without delay, the necessary legislation to provide for the erection and equipping, within the parish of Saint Michael, of, at least, two of the new Senior Schools recommended in the said paragraph so as to relieve the congestion in the existing elementary schools in the City of Bridgetown as well as to provide much needed employment for (a) the many unemployed artisans in the Island and (b) many of the young persons leaving the secondary schools with the necessary qualifications for teaching but without the prospect of suitable employment.

2. The House respectfully request Your Excellency to send down, without delay, the necessary legislation to give effect to this proposal.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, a Bill to consolidate the Acts of this Island relating to Public Health is read a first time.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, a Bill to provide for the division and sale and the division and letting of land in lots and for the regulation of tenancies is read a first time.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, a Bill to amend the Poor Relief Act 1892 (1892-2) is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. RAMSAY, a Bill to amend the Vestries (Cost of Living Bonus to Employees) Act, 1947 (1947-6) is read a first time.

Dr. WILSON enters the House and takes his seat.

THE JUSTICES OF THE PEACE (EX-OFFICIO) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for Christ Church,—Second reading of a Bill to provide for the holders of certain offices to be *ex officio* Justices of the Peace.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker,—This Bill, as is set forth in the Objects and Reasons, seeks to attach the powers and duties of a Justice of the Peace to persons holding certain offices specified in the schedule to the Bill. The holders of such offices will be Justices of the Peace so long as they hold such offices and no longer, and are required to take the requisite oaths before entering upon the duties of a Justice of the Peace. The Objects and Reasons further state that the Governor is given power—power

which he always possessed—to amend the schedule by adding to or removing therefrom the name of any office. This Bill is somewhat of a departure from the regular manner in which Justices of the Peace are appointed. Legislation has to be sought for this purpose, whereas the power to appoint Justices of the Peace are already vested in the Crown's representative—the Governor—so he can, if he thinks fit, if he thinks it is in the interest of the community and not merely politicians, increase the number of Justices of the Peace. I want to assure honourable members that this is not a political gesture nor does it have anything to do with any political movement—nothing political whatever; it is merely in the interest of the community as a whole, who to-day suffer great hardships for the want of the services of Justices of the Peace. Some of the former Justices of the Peace are dead and those who are not dead have retired and are unable to function any longer. In fairness to the community these latter should resign their Commissions as Justices of the Peace. If they cannot function as J. P's, why hold on to their Commissions and to the dignity of the office? I can tell you, Sir,—and I know that you and other honourable members are aware of the fact that it is extremely difficult to find Justices of the Peace who are able and willing to perform their duties, with the result that the few who are able and willing are hard pressed and have to do more than they should normally do. Justices of the Peace are not paid officers. If you go back to the history of the appointment of Justices of the Peace in England—Halsbury explains it very thoroughly and I shall refer to it, if necessary, later on—you will discover that they are appointed to perform certain duties, such as the issuing of warrants, the initiating of certain legal and criminal proceedings and assisting the Administration in carrying out its work. In England, Justices of the Peace sit as Lay Magistrates and have the assistance of trained Solicitors of not less than five years' standing who guide them on points of law; so one can well and easily understand that the office of Justice of the Peace carries a certain amount of responsibility and although in the past only the gentry were chosen for such an office, yet in recent years, regardless of class, creed, political outlook or even sex, you find people being appointed Justices of the Peace by the Crown. I am always more or less accused of not giving the information, so I shall give every iota of information in this respect before I sit down. In Barbados, Justices of the Peace are appointed on lines similar to those prevailing in England. They are called upon to swear persons to vaccination certificates, to swear persons to warrants in criminal proceedings, to swear persons to affidavits, to swear persons applying for passports and what is foremost in the minds of honourable members, to swear persons to registration forms in respect of election to the General Assembly and the Vestries. Now, Sir, the last mentioned is probably the least function which a Justice of the Peace should normally have to perform because, in my opinion, a £20 a year franchise is tantamount to adult suffrage; so that asking anybody to swear another person to the statement that he earns \$8 a month only causes a certain amount of inconvenience and hardship to both parties and is an absolute waste of time and energy because everybody more or less has that qualification—a person either works and has the qualification or he does not work and does not have the qualification. The swearing of persons to statements in registration

forms is, therefore, not the main object of this Bill. The main object of the Bill is to assist in the very needy services of the Administration,—assistance without which the Administration could not be successful. In 1943, the number of Justices of the Peace in St. Michael was 32 and of those 32, only 18 functioned in reality as such; only 18 were willing to be approached at any time. I have had the sad experience — I am sorry to say — of having been almost chased away by a Justice of the Peace when I went to him to get certain documents sworn to. In the parish of Christ Church, they were ten Justices of the Peace in 1943, and only seven of them functioned as such. In each of the other nine parishes there are between 4 and 7 Justices of the Peace and they function fairly effectively. In 1944, owing to the lowering of the franchise and owing to the paucity of Justices of the Peace who are ready and willing to serve, the Head of the Administration saw fit to appoint new Justices of the Peace in order to facilitate the registration of voters. In St. Michael eight were appointed; in Christ Church 4—one whose name I shall not call refused to serve; in St. Philip 3, in St. John 3, in St. Joseph 2, in St. Andrew 3, in St. Peter 4, in St. Lucy 2 and in St. James 3. What I want to draw to the attention of honourable members is that since 1944, many Justices of the Peace have died or retired from business and are unable to serve, with the result that the island is put to a disadvantage by not having a sufficient number of Justices of the Peace to assist in essential duties which are to be performed. I would say that the schedule to the Bill could probably be more elastic because I feel — and I think many of my colleagues feel likewise — that persons holding offices like those of the President of the Legislative Council, the Speaker of the House of Assembly, probably the Deputy Speaker of the House of Assembly, the Chairman of Committees of the House of Assembly and maybe the Provost Marshal and one or two others should be included but the Governor is the person to add to or remove any office from the schedule. I, however, will certainly do anything in my power to see that certain offices such as I have outlined are included because I know as a fact that the Provost Marshal is definitely *ex officio* the type of officer who should be a Justice of the Peace and, for the same reason, the Chief Clerk of the Assistant Court of Appeal should also be a Justice of the Peace. The idea is to facilitate the judicial work that is to be done, so that the community as a whole may benefit. As I said, no remuneration is attached to the office of Justice of the Peace, so that we can well understand the reason why there is a certain amount of reluctance on the part of certain persons to serve. The average person who may be appointed may feel that too much of his time will be wasted for nothing.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question of remuneration does not arise. I take it that the whole object of the Bill is to increase the number of Justices of the Peace for the convenience of the public.

Mr. TALMA: I was only pointing out that certain persons might not have been willing to serve for that reason. I would be quite willing, Mr. Speaker, to explain any point that has not been explained. I am quite willing to give all the information from Halsbury's in respect of the history of the appointment of Justices of the Peace and the duties which they have to perform. With those few introductory remarks, Sir, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Bill be now read a second time—

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker!

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member must take time by the forelock.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The honourable introducer of this Bill started off by excusing the Government on this occasion and by telling us that there is nothing political about it but those of us on this side of the table must view it as something political. Now, Sir, he told us all about the duties of Justices of the Peace and how they are appointed, both in Great Britain and locally, to assist in the administration of justice, but let me say that up to now, the honourable member has not justified this Bill. How can it be justifiably said that to appoint the four members of this House who are members of the Executive Committee as Justices of the Peace because they happen to be members of the Executive Committee is only to assist in the administration of justice? Mr. Speaker, the members of this House who are members of the Executive Committee, with the present set-up—and I am going to be frank about it—with the present Party set-up, with the Bushe experiment which is at present being tried out, are all taken from one particular Party and despite what the honourable introducer has said about there being nothing political in the objects and reasons for this Bill, apart from those persons connected with that Party no other member can say that he does not really feel there is something political about it. I hate even to cast any reflection on the Head of the Administration, as having associated himself with the sending down of a Bill of this sort.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot make any reference to the Head of the Administration which will influence the debate.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is why I used the words "I hate", lest any remarks I make may appear as if I am accusing him. I do not want to associate him with anything political in the sending down of a Bill of this sort. As the law stands in this country it is purely the right of the Head of the Administration to make these appointments. I am dealing particularly with the members of the Executive Committee. While it may be argued that the appointment of the members of the Executive Committee as Justices of the Peace under this Bill will be only temporary, if His Excellency chooses to exercise his prerogative, they can be appointed permanently, although it is not without precedent that persons have been appointed to hold this Commission and it has been subsequently withdrawn. I, therefore, cannot see any justifiable reason—absolutely none—for the members of the Executive Committee being Justices of the Peace merely because they are members of that Body. Now, Sir, I agree with the honourable introducer of this Bill that it is necessary that more people in this island should hold this Commission and I further agree that it is also necessary that persons drawn, so to speak, from among people who can be easily approached should also be appointed. I agree entirely with that. For instance, as is set out in the schedule, besides members of the Executive Committee, the Chairmen of Vestries should be appointed as Justices of the Peace; that follows as night follows day. They, Sir, would be accessible and I definitely agree to that. I also agree to Churchwardens being appointed because by virtue of their office, they come in contact with most of the people, especially in the outlying parishes, who desire to swear that they have a conscientious objection to the vaccination of their babies. I go further. I wonder whether it would not be an act of wisdom on the part of the Government to include the Clerks of the several Vestries whose duties again bring them in con-

tact with many people in the parishes; the people especially in the outlying parishes must know the Vestry Clerk of their particular parish, whether they want to know him or not, because they have to go to him to pay their taxes and I do not think that anyone would deny that the Commissioner of Income Tax and Death Duties should be included. But, Sir, if this is not a political gesture, well one has never been put forward in this island. Why, Mr. Speaker, should the members of this House who are members of the Executive Committee be singled out from this House and sent down in a Bill asking this Assembly to say that they should, by virtue of their office, be Justices of the Peace? I cannot understand it, Sir. How can it be safely argued that merely because they are members of the Executive Committee — persons selected from this House, from the Other Place or otherwise — they would be in a position to really serve the people, as is set out in this Bill? No one would attempt to waste time by repeating what the duties of a Justice of the Peace are. The swearing of persons to affidavits, to applications for scholarships, to vaccination forms and to registration forms constitutes about 98 per cent of the duties of a Justice of the Peace and of that 98 per cent, Mr. Speaker, the swearing to applications for registration as voters — I want this to be noted carefully — comprises about 90 per cent of his duties. I want honourable members to view this Bill in that light. If, with the present set-up in this country, it is agreed that the bulk of the work which a Justice of the Peace has to do is really not the swearing to vaccination forms, or to applications for scholarships but particularly the swearing to registration forms, how else can we view this Bill but politically? What would be the position — I am putting it as strongly as this — of those of us who happen not to be members of the Party from which the members of the House are selected to the Executive Committee? What would really be the position? There is absolutely no Party Government at present, I agree, but you will find that the four members of this House who are members of the Executive Committee are all members of a particular Party.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable introducer of the Bill did use the word "political." I do not know exactly what it means in respect of the principle of this Bill but when the honourable senior member for the City raises the point as to who should be appointed Justices of the Peace, I should like to point out that that is dealt with in the schedule to the Bill. I do not think that the persons who are to be named for this appointment have anything to do with the principle of the Bill. What I am suggesting to the honourable member is that the remarks he is making now could better be made in Committee when the schedule to the Bill is being discussed.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not know, Sir, that the Bill should be allowed to go to the Committee. It is too dangerous a Bill—

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like the honourable member to confine himself to the merits of the Bill.

Mr. MOTTLEY: This is the second reading of the Bill, Sir, and I would not have been raising this point if the honourable introducer of the Bill had not intimated that there was nothing political about it. The moment he makes that statement, I crave your indulgence to allow me to show that it is nothing else but political, without inferring any improper motive on the part of those who sent it down.

Mr. SPEAKER: How do you arrive at the conclusion that "political" is applicable to this Bill?

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is what I am trying to explain, Sir. The honourable introducer says that it is not political but with the present set-up as regards what is known as the Bushe experiment, the Head of the Administration can call upon the member of this House who can control a majority to nominate the members from this House to be appointed members of the Executive Committee and I am trying to show that if that policy is pursued, it is nothing but political to appoint only those members Justices of the Peace when that selection can be made from a particular Party, even though there is nothing to show that that Party has the entire support of the people of this island. That surely is the implication and honourable members are bound to see it that way. Let us assume that the present experiment is continued. Obviously the members of this House who are to be members of the Executive Committee will be selected from the Party holding the majority of seats and only members of that Party will be Justices of the Peace; that, in itself, must show that it has the tendency to be political.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the grounds of your objection is based on the principle that members of the Government, whoever they may be, should not necessarily be Justices of the Peace.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is my ground. I am quoting the words of the honourable introducer of the Bill.

Mr. TALMA: On a point of explanation, I want to let the honourable member know positively that I said that the main duties of a Justice of the Peace are not strictly political.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know that you said that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The honourable member said in his preliminary remarks that he wanted to impress upon honourable members that there is nothing political about this Bill. I would hardly like to misquote the honourable member. But whether he said that or not I shall attempt to show the seriousness of this Bill and that it is political. If there had been no change in this community as to the set-up, if it were still left to the Head of the Administration to select the members of the Executive Committee from this House, one could clearly view the situation as non-political. I think I have said enough on that point to convince honourable members why this Bill and the schedule as it stands should not be passed. Now, Sir, the custom which, I understand, was observed in appointing Justices of the Peace in this Island was this. Whenever representation was made to the Head of the Government, or whoever is responsible, by the Police for assistance in the administration of justice in various parts of the island, it was necessary to appoint Justices of the Peace. Recommendations were usually made—and here, let me digress to say! that it is a good thing that that habit has been stopped, the habit of making recommendations from among only one class of persons—and these recommendations were perused by the Attorney General and then the Commission was given.

Mr. SPEAKER: That custom is really still in force and that is not for discussion at all under this Bill.

Mr. MOTTLEY: No, Mr. Speaker. The point I was making is that that custom is still in force and I see no reason why it should be changed. If it is really felt that the members of the Executive Committee should be Justices of the Peace, then let them be appointed Justices of the Peace but do not let them come here—I would nearly use the American expression "Pass the buck"—for us to legalize it in this way.

Mr. SPEAKER: What I am pointing out to the honourable member is this. The honourable introducer of the Bill stated what is the existing law and that it is proposed, for the convenience of the public, to confer these powers on these people who were appointed to these offices in the schedule to the Bill. That is the whole principle of this Bill.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I agree, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Then do not let us go into anything that has nothing to do with the Bill before us. The whole question is: Are the members of the House going to agree to the principle that certain people, during the time they hold certain offices, shall *ex officio* be Justices of the Peace? That is the whole point.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I quite see that. But why come to this Assembly and ask us to pass an Act which should say so, when the Head of the Administration has the right to-day to appoint them?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think so. The existing Act does not give him the power to appoint as Justices of the Peace persons who hold certain offices. The whole point is whether the Head of the Administration should be given that power under this Bill.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I see that. But while that may be argued, there is also this to be argued. There is nothing wrong in the Head of the Administration appointing persons temporarily as Justices of the Peace if he wanted to do so; he can appoint and withdraw the Commission afterwards. I opened my remarks by stating that there is precedent for it; he can appoint and he can withdraw the Commission subsequently. It may be argued that it would not be in good taste to do so but it can be done.

Mr. SPEAKER: Apparently they do not seem to think so.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I recall where that has been done in these parts. However, Sir, I cannot agree to "members of the Executive Committee" being included in the Schedule to this Bill and I urge upon other honourable members not to agree to it. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be rejected. I make that motion because I am not convinced that there is nothing political about it. I am convinced that there is everything political about it. If this Bill were passed and members of the Executive Committee were appointed Justices of the Peace, can you imagine my going to the senior member for St. Joseph and saying to him: "Come and swear some people to registration forms for me?"—a rank impossibility! How then can it be said that this Bill is in the interests of the people? Or imagine the senior member for Christ Church and the senior member for St. Joseph coming to me and asking me to go with them in Christ Church and register people as voters! I move that this Bill be rejected.

Mr. GALE: I have listened very carefully to the argument of the senior member for Christ Church in introducing this Bill and I really cannot see that this Bill will serve any useful purpose. The Head of the Administration has the power to appoint as many Justices of the Peace as he wishes to appoint under the present Act. Under this Bill, the Government is attempting to make members of the Executive Committee, Chairmen of Vestries, Churchwardens, and the Commissioner of Income Tax and Death Duties *ex officio* Justices of the Peace during the time they hold their respective offices. Well, if we go back to the history of the appointment of Justices of the Peace in England, we will see how and for

what purposes they are appointed. They act as Lay Magistrates—

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not want to interrupt the honourable member but I think we have heard enough about the history of the appointment of Justices of the Peace already.

Mr. GALE: We in Barbados have legally trained Magistrates, so Justices of the Peace in this island are not called upon to perform the duties assigned to Magistrates. I think it would be a wrong thing in any country for the administration of justice to be mixed up with politics and for that reason I beg to second the motion of the senior member for the City.

Mr. RAMSAY: Mr. Speaker.—I think we are having a storm in a tea-cup. I view this Bill which has been sent to this House as being ultra vires; it is none of our business. It is the prerogative of His Majesty the King vested in the Governor as Head of the Administration and when the Head of the Administration sends down this Bill he is asking us to associate ourselves with something that can be easily classified as folly. He has the power to appoint whom he likes as Justices of the Peace and if he is so desirous, he can include certain members of this Chamber or all or none. Honourable members have been at pains to point out that this is nothing political but I would like any honest member of this House to tell me what is done in this island to-day that does not have something to do with politics. The side of the street on which one drives is regulated by politics. The Minister who receives money from the Treasury for preaching does so through politics—all is politics. I am asking honourable members not to pass this Bill because the Head of the Administration is making pooh-bahs of us. He has the power; let him exercise it. I think it is time that he appoints a few more persons as Justices of the Peace. The franchise has been broadened and if the Head of the Administration—I am not speaking disrespectfully—was paying attention he would have appointed three or four more already. All over the country people make applications for passports, scholarships and so on and they need the services of Justices of the Peace. I think the proper thing to do is not to allow this Bill to pass the second reading. We should send it back whence it came—straight to the Head of the Administration and let him exercise or not exercise his duty. (Cheers).

Mr. ADAMS: This is one of those instances which make me sometimes shudder for the future of Representative Government in this country. We pride ourselves as having risen above mere Party issues in matters which concern the community as a whole, forgetting that we are Socialist or Conservative or Liberal. But when one listened to the remarks of the senior member for the City who started off by saying that he is not a Party man at all and whose whole speech is a complete first-class argument which can be used against him by anybody who would oppose his speech, when one hears remarks like those uttered by otherwise seemingly responsible members of the community, let alone members of this House, one shudders, I repeat, at the sort of gray matter that is going to run this island and the West Indies if that is a sample. We pride ourselves as being superior to what is called the "down along" countries and yet we display the inability to rise above pettiness, let alone the gutter. I reminded the senior member for the City that he was personal when he used the argument that I would not go with him and register people and I am going to be equally personal by asking whether either of the two

honourable members for St. James would go with me and register people. As soon as he says that he brands them too as being persons who would put politics before their duty to the community. To use an argument like that to convince the House of Assembly is the most barefaced thing I have heard during the 14 years that I have been in this House. This is what he is telling you. "Look at the present set-up". It is an admission that he and the group for whom he speaks have no hope of being members of the Executive Committee. It can only be that because that is what he is saying. He says "If we had a different set-up." What does that mean? It means that if we had a different political Party in power, if we went back to the old days when the rich people ruled this island and the Governor chose only those to be members of the Executive Committee, then he would support a Bill of this sort. "If we had a different set-up!" A Conservative Government in power is still a set-up! Why are he and his friends who are so confident of turning this Government out so afraid of this Bill? When the honourable introducer of the Bill gave the impression to the senior member for the City that this was not a political matter he was speaking the truth as regards its origin. I know as a fact that Police Magistrates were trying to get two senior Barristers made Justices of the Peace to help in the work of the Police Courts because it was difficult to get Justices of the Peace to perform duties which are assigned to them. I know that a recommendation was made to the Governor about six years ago to make Consuls Justices of the Peace by virtue of their offices and the very good reason for not including them in this schedule is that a Consul like the American Consul who holds no allegiance to the Crown could not be a Justice of the Peace. His other argument, if I can dignify it with the word "argument", is in favour of this Bill. "Why come to this Assembly", he asks, "with this Bill when the Head of the Administration can appoint as many Justices of the Peace as he likes?" Well, that is just the point. You may easily cause the Head of the Administration to choose four members of the Labour Party to be Justices of the Peace for life. Instead of that, is it not non-political to say that anybody who attains the dignity of the office of a member of the Executive Committee, anybody who has attained the dignity of the office of a Cabinet member, anybody who is a Churchwarden and who has the confidence of the people and is elected by them to a Vestry can carry out the duties of a Justice of the Peace? Can anything be less political? Let the honourable member add to the schedule if he likes. Even in his own soul he could not believe that this Bill is not necessary. The junior member for St. Michael has stated that it can serve no useful purpose. This matter started—and if the honourable junior member for St. Michael wants confirmation of it I will get permission to show him the file—in Sir Grattan Bushe's time when representations were made by different persons that there was not a sufficient number of Justices of the Peace. I myself have been to him about appointing persons as such and it was decided then that there were enough Justices of the Peace on the roll if they would only perform their duties. It was also decided to circularize them and find out if there were any who would like to resign. Does the senior member for the City seriously suggest that a man who has been appointed a Justice of the Peace should be removed from the roll? Could anybody think of anything being more execrable—to give a man an honour and then take it away from him? Could anything be more ludicrous than that? To avoid the

very taint of politics, the Bill has been worded in this way, that is say, whoever may be appointed to these respective offices shall be Justices of the Peace during the period in which they hold the offices. Does the honourable senior member for the City seriously suggest that a person who is a Churchwarden—he says that Vestry Clerks should be included—or a Vestry Clerk is not worthy of the dignity of being a Justice of the Peace and will not be expected to perform his duty to the community irrespective of politics? The next thing the honourable member will tell us is that a person who is associated with the Labour Party should not be appointed a Justice of the Peace. Does the honourable member seriously suggest that a man who has attained the dignity of a Vestry Clerk could by virtue of his office be a Justice of the Peace and not a man who has attained a seat in the Government of this country? At this time, the Government happens to be anathema to the honourable member. If we are going to be men, this is an occasion when we should be. If we had too many Justices of the Peace and if there were not so many complaints I would agree with the junior member for St. Michael that this Bill is unnecessary. As regards the junior member for St. Peter he is like a Daniel who has come to judgement! He has stated that the people all over the country run around seeking Justices of the Peace to swear them to applications for passports and things of that sort and he himself has suggested that there should be more Justices of the Peace. What strange bedfellows! The junior member for St. Michael says that the Bill is not necessary and the junior member for St. Peter says that we have not enough Justices of the Peace and that we want a few more. We all know that politics make strange alliances. I appeal to honourable members to see that far from this Bill being political it is to avoid it being said that the Governor is appointing only members of the House who are members of the Executive Committee as Justices of the Peace; it is saying "take the matter out of the realm of politics. Let anybody who happens to be occupying any of the offices mentioned in the Schedule to the Bill be a Justice of the Peace." Does the honourable senior member for the City suggest that only the four members from this House are the members of the Executive Committee? Does he not know what every schoolboy ought to know, that is, that the members of the Executive Committee include the members of the Executive Council and a member of the Other Place? Does he suggest that members of the Executive Council are members of the Labour Party? Can he picture the Hon. H. A. Cuke being a member of the Labour Party? The members of the Executive Committee are: four members of this House, a member of the Other Place and the Executive Council. Does the honourable member suggest that an Executive Councillor has not attained the dignity to be an *ex officio* Justice of the Peace but that a Vestry Clerk has? That is deplorable. The necessity for appointing more Justices of the Peace has been pressing for some time. Nothing was done in the previous Governor's regime when it was first broached, simply because it was considered that a reasonable time should be given to see whether the complaints about those Justices of the Peace who were not doing their duty would stop and those complaints have not stopped. I have no desire whatever to use the same argument that the senior member for the City used because if one wanted to talk politics one could easily point to the fact that in the past, Justices of the Peace were appointed

in Barbados as in England. In the past, as the senior member for Christ Church has pointed out, Justices of the Peace in England were specifically drawn from one class of persons; to-day a howl would be created in England if that were done. I remember that 25 years ago when Lord Haldane removed from the roll of Justices of the Peace a person who on conscientious grounds did not believe in swearing, a howl went up because it was thought that he had done it because the person was a member of the Conservative Party while Lord Haldane was a Liberal. Any suggestion about this Bill savouring of politics is to be deplored but if I were to use the honourable member's argument, I would say that still in Barbados — I should not use the word "still" because in recent times conditions have improved — but up to a comparatively short time ago in Barbados persons were appointed Justices of the Peace who belong to the gentry of Barbados or who think that only the gentry can do things or who were given recommendations from their friends, the planters, or their friends, the merchants. I hope myself to see women appointed Justices of the Peace and I see no reason why that should not come under this Bill. I definitely agree that a woman should be on the Bench and I should like to see Justices of the Peace put on the Bench and made to do some work as such, in addition to any Police Magistrates we may have.

Mr. SPEAKER: Strictly speaking, that is not in the Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: I was merely suggesting that while I would like to see it, women have not been put in the schedule because they should come under the Police Magistrates Act or be appointed Justices of the Peace for life. If honourable members want to be paltry, they will be paltry and if they want to rise to the opportunity and be men they will be men. Nothing I say can possibly induce honourable members to vote one way or the other. If they are persuaded that this is political or non-political, they have it in their power to put in "members of the House of Assembly" in the schedule but it was for the reason that the Government did not want it to be considered political that it did not put "members of the House of Assembly" in the schedule. If the Government had put "members of the House of Assembly" in the schedule it would have benefited the Labour Party. That would be politics and that would have been hurled at me. But the very thing the Government has tried to avoid, it is being accused of. Honourable members who want certain officers removed from the schedule and others added to it would not, in spite of Your Honour constantly putting it to them, go into Committee on the Bill but they make and support a motion for its rejection. Instead of providing that Mr. H. A. Vaughan, for instance, shall be a Justice of the Peace the Bill provides that Mr. H. A. Vaughan, for instance, shall be a Justice of the Peace while he holds the office of Police Magistrate; that is all this Bill is providing for. If honourable members reject this Bill, they will be forcing the Head of the Administration to do the very thing no Head of the Administration should do, that is, to be appearing to be carrying out his duties as Head of the Administration by political persuasion. The Head of the Administration already, I am happy to say, has shown to us, by the measures which come before this House, that he wants to be taken out of the realm of politics and put where he should be, as is the case in Great Britain to-day,

that is, in the position of a constitutional monarch who must run his country irrespective of what political party may be in power. Do not let us make a mistake now that we are progressing along the lines where the Colonial Office and a Colonial Governor no longer have the power to influence governmental considerations as they did in the past. Do not let us push Barbados back in the position of being governed by a class that is not necessarily associated with the people of the country. I appeal to honourable members. There was a time — I need hardly remind honourable members — when members of the House of Assembly were appointed Justices of the Peace for political reasons. The Governor of that day was advised that that was bringing the question of the Commission of Justice of the Peace, which should be out of political consideration, into the realm of politics and he no longer appointed members of the House of Assembly Justices of the Peace. In those days, as now, members who were appointed Justices of the Peace remained as such for life, whether they lost their seats or not and to-day, with so many shiftings and changes of the personnel of the House of Assembly one could easily see that we might quite unintentionally be adding unnecessarily to the number of Justices of the Peace if we went back to the old practice of appointing every member of the House of Assembly a Justice of the Peace for life. If honourable members prefer that, I suggest to them that the proper course is to let the Bill go to a Select Committee on the clear understanding that they are voting for the principle of adding people by virtue of their offices to the list of Justices of the Peace. It is perfectly open to honourable members to add to or remove from the schedule, but do not use the argument that it is not necessary to have more Justices of the Peace. It is more than necessary, as the junior member for St. Peter has reminded us, that we should have more of them. I repeat that honourable members can add to or remove from the schedule but to say that they are not voting for the Bill because it is unnecessary is to play the part of children and not of men. Before I sit I will repeat again that this proposal was put forward in Sir Grattan Bushe's time—1943 or thereabouts. It was felt then that it should be brought up later on, that some more time should be given to see whether there would be any further complaints. Some people did not know, until they made enquiries, that Mr. So and So was a Justice of the Peace. I myself knew only last week of one who is a Justice of the Peace and he was appointed years and years ago. Only to-day an honourable member on my left knows of another. As I said, it would be ludicrous to give a man a Commission as a Justice of the Peace and then withdraw it from him. One cannot imagine a more despotic act. You may just as well say "withdraw a man's O. B. E." It is too preposterous for words! I again appeal to honourable members, in spite of any expressions of opinion they may have given by their cheers or otherwise, to accept the principle that more Justices of the Peace are needed; that it is better, instead of having a whole string of persons appointed as such for life, to let certain people who hold certain offices be appointed Justices of the Peace and in that way honourable members can do what they like with the schedule to the Bill. I wonder if honourable members know that the law provides that a Justice of the Peace can arrest a person in the street if he commits a breach of the Locomotives on Highways Act but I would like to see

the junior member for St. Michael going up to a chauffeur to arrest him for committing a breach of that Act. My last argument expands a bit what the senior member for Christ Church said. Some of the members who are talking about this being a political matter—I do not want to use a strong word. I will use the mildest word I can think of—criticized members of the Government for bringing down this Bill. They have said that they believe in universal suffrage. If they believe in universal suffrage, what difference would this Bill make? What member of the Executive Committee would be registering people if there was universal suffrage? How long would any member of the Executive Committee be having to do anything politically as a Justice of the Peace if there was adult suffrage? But when adult suffrage comes, persons will still have to be sworn to vaccination forms and a Justice of the Peace will still have to perform other duties which the law compels him to perform. I cannot help the House any more. I end as I began. I regret that honourable members by the very nature of the argument they used—at least one honourable member—cannot see that whatever the composition of the Government may be, a Bill of this sort has nothing to do with Party politics; that the schedule is prepared not with the idea of having too long a list but of selecting offices that are sufficiently dignified in themselves as to merit the holders having Commissions as Justices of the Peace. That is the simple principle on which this Bill has been drafted by the then Acting Attorney General and sent down to this House. I deplore the necessity for any references to the Head of the Administration, as Your Honour pointed out at the time they were being made, more especially as we have already gone far on the stage of keeping the Head of the Administration completely out of politics and putting him in the position where he can act purely as a constitutional ruler on the advice of his advisers, against which, whether he likes it or not, no constitutional ruler would act except only in exceptional cases.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I think, Sir, that it is very deplorable that with so many matters of pressing urgency facing this country (Cheers), so many matters of importance with which this House can concern itself, so much time has been wasted and will be wasted to-day—and perhaps on another day—in the discussion of this matter. Now, I want to begin by saying that I endorse the principle of having more Justices of the Peace; they are needed in this country. We all know that they are needed but it does not necessarily follow that because one endorses the principle of having more Justices of the Peace, one must endorse the principle of this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, what is the principle of this Bill?

Mr. CRAWFORD: The principle of this Bill is that we should concur in Commissions as Justices of the Peace being granted to members of the Executive Committee, Chairmen of Vestries, Churchwardens, and the Commissioner of Income Tax and Death Duties.

Mr. SPEAKER: The principle of the Bill is that the holders of those respective offices shall be temporarily *ex officio* Justices of the Peace; that is the only principle.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What I am saying is that we were asked by previous speakers to endorse the principle of having more Justices of the Peace in the island and I began by saying that I endorse that principle. The senior member for St. Joseph, Sir, at the end of his remarks declared that he deplored the

references which had been made to the Head of the Administration in connection with this matter. If there is any reference to be deplored, it is the reference made by himself—

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that has anything to do with the principle of the Bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Well, Sir, I think it is important.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think so. I ruled one honourable member out of order in using the name of the Head of the Administration in connection with this Bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The senior member for St. Joseph said that if we object to this Bill, we shall be forcing the Head of the Administration to appear to be apparently carrying out his duties by political persuasion.

Mr. SPEAKER: He was only pointing out that if this Bill was not passed, the Head of the Administration would be called on to appoint persons permanently as Justices of the Peace.

Mr. CRAWFORD: And inferentially the holders of the offices mentioned in the schedule to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think so; not necessarily.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The position is this. If we object to this Bill we shall be forcing the Head of the Administration.—

Mr. SPEAKER: If you object to the schedule.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If we object to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thought the honourable member said that he agreed to the principle of the Bill!

Mr. CRAWFORD: I did not say so. I said that I endorse the principle of having more Justices of the Peace. I do not endorse the principle of this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: What I cannot get certain honourable members to appreciate is that the principle of the Bill is only the increasing of the number of Justices of the Peace by the appointment of holders of the offices mentioned in the schedule. Is the schedule the part to which the honourable member is objecting?

Mr. CRAWFORD: And that is the schedule.

Mr. SPEAKER: The schedule then is the part to which the honourable member is objecting.

Mr. CRAWFORD: In the carrying out of the principle, the only people who would be appointed Justices of the Peace would be the persons holding the offices mentioned in the schedule. You cannot dissociate one from the other, the moment you begin to put into effect the principle of the Bill. Do not mind, Sir, the nonsense you hear on my right. I repeat that the only people who can be appointed Justices of the Peace under this Bill are the persons holding the offices mentioned in the schedule to the Bill. You cannot appoint anybody else. What I am saying is that I take strenuous objection to the senior member for St. Joseph trying to suggest to the House that if we object to a Bill that is before us we shall be forcing the Head of the Administration into doing something in opposition to the action of this House. No Head of the Administration would dare do such a thing. No Head of the Administration in this country, if he appreciates his position and is not walking about looking for trouble, would dare to sit in Government House and take steps which are obviously opposed to the fundamental wishes of the House; therefore, Sir, that is a threat which makes absolutely no impression on me at all and if the members of the House

really want to hear something—let everyone of the members of the Executive Committee in this House deny it—the Head of the Administration was opposed to this Bill as it is.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot let you say that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: He was opposed to it as it is.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the honourable member is in order when he says that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The position is this. If the senior member for St. Joseph says that if we object to the Bill we shall be forcing the Head of the Administration to take steps contrary to what we do here today—in other words, implying that the Head of the Administration supported the Bill—am I not justified in saying that the Governor himself was not in favour of the Bill?

Mr. SPEAKER: You are trying to draw an inference and I do not think you have any right to draw the inference you are drawing in respect of the Head of the Administration. You cannot do it under the Rules of the House. According to my notes what the honourable senior member for St. Joseph said was that it was in the power of the Head of the Administration to appoint further persons as Justices of the Peace.

Mr. CRAWFORD: With all due deference, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: If your notes are more correct than mine, read them.

Mr. CRAWFORD: His exact words were: "if we object to the principle of the Bill we shall be forcing the Head of the Executive to appear as if he is carrying out his duties through political persuasion" and the honourable member on my left also has the same words in his notes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Anyhow I cannot allow you to use the name of the Head of the Administration to influence the debate.

Mr. CRAWFORD: He was opposed to the Bill and if we reject it we shall not be forcing him to appear as if he is carrying out his duties through political persuasion. Now, to continue. The senior member for the City said that a case could be made out for appointing Vestry Clerks, members of the House and other people occupying important positions Justices of the Peace and the senior member for St. Joseph attempted to draw an analogy based on that particular remark. "If", said he, "you are willing to grant the Commission of Justice of the Peace to a Vestry Clerk, why not grant it to a member of the Executive Committee, a man who has attained the dignity of a member of the Executive Committee, a man who has the honour to be a member of the Executive Committee, the greatest Body in the administration of this island?" Well now, what are the facts? Under the new dispensation—in fact I should preface my remarks by saying this: In this particular matter the Head of the Administration would be well advised to adopt the old maxim "Festina lente"; he would be well advised to make haste slowly (Hear, hear, and Cheers). Under the old dispensation the members of the Executive Committee were selected by the Head of the Administration and even although one disagreed with their political complexion one would, at least, have reasonable grounds for assuming that they were men of responsibility and ability. Under the new dispensation, the Leader of the majority Party in the Assembly, whoever he may be, hand-picks the members from this Chamber to serve on the Executive Committee and it is conceivable that the

Leader of the Majority Party, insane with the lust for power, may put on the Executive Committee, not men of responsibility, not men of ability but any spineless nit-wit that would do what he wants, any drunkard, any moron, any man who has not the guts to stand up and say "I am a man"; any man whom he can mould like clay to do what he wants he may get on the Executive Committee and with this new constitutional set-up, they are asking responsible members in this Chamber to appoint, even *ex officio* as Justices of the Peace, people selected by the Leader of the Majority Party in this Chamber, who may be serving no other purpose but his own and whose ambition, whose insatiable lust for power must lead to the wreck of the entire country so long as he achieves his own ends. After all, a Justice of the Peace should be a man with some responsibility in the community and I again assert that under the new dispensation, the new constitutional dispensation, it is conceivable that you may find on the Executive Committee a member of this House who is not even able to speak grammatically a few dozen sentences of the King's English, far less to be able to understand the import of some of the serious documents which come before a Justice of the Peace. If, Sir, any member of this Chamber is going to say that it is not playing with politics to bring this suggestion before the House I do not know, Sir, what is. It is conceivable that with the lowering of the franchise in this country, people may come to this Chamber who, through mere demagogic ability, will be able temporarily to impress the people in this country that they can really do something for them, and it is conceivable that they, in consequence of irresponsible leadership, may find themselves on the Executive Committee. While they are there, they are there but it does not necessarily follow that we should entrust into their hands the power that is involved in a Commission of Justice of the Peace. The senior member for St. Joseph said on two different occasions that this whole thing started in Sir Grattan Bushe's time. What whole thing? What does he mean? Does he mean that in Sir Grattan Bushe's time the suggestion was made that members of the Executive Committee, Chairmen of Vestries, Churchwardens and the Commissioner of Income Tax and Death Duties should be Justices of the Peace? Does he mean that? Or does he mean what I believe to be the case, that is, that in Sir Grattan Bushe's time the question of adding to the number of Justices of the Peace was mooted? Sir Grattan Bushe did take steps to add to the number and while I am not suggesting that the number is sufficient, yet these half-truths can cover a multitude of evils and may be able to give the impression that because in Sir Grattan Bushe's time it was suggested that we should add to the number of Justices of the Peace, it was also suggested that the people holding the offices mentioned in the schedule to this Bill should be accorded Commissions. Is that correct or is it not? I should like to hear some spokesman for the Government assert that during the regime of Sir Grattan Bushe it was suggested that members of the Executive Committee, Chairmen of Vestries, Churchwardens and the Commissioner of Income Tax and Death Duties should be given Commissions as Justices of the Peace. And I want to remind the senior member for St. Joseph that it is not as fantastic as he seems to think for a Justice of the Peace to be deprived of his Commission. I was in Grenada some years ago when the Hon. T. A. Marryshow who is the Leader of the Caribbean Labour Congress, an

organization to which the senior member for St. Joseph belongs, was deprived of his Commission as a Justice of the Peace purely because he happened to have opposed the Governor in power, Sir Seton James,—a fact not unknown to the present Head of the Administration in this island because, I am almost sure, he was in Grenada at the time when Mr. Marryshow was deprived of his Commission and, therefore, it is not as ludicrous—that is the word used by the senior member for St. Joseph in reply to the senior member for the City—as the honourable member thinks. He said that it was deplorable to suggest that a man once awarded a Commission could be easily deprived of it. There is a further point, Sir, which occurred to me during the remarks of the senior member for St. Joseph and to which I want to take exception. He said, in reply to the senior member for the City, that after all, “members of the Executive Committee” means the whole Executive Committee and not only the four members from this House. We all know that. He said that the Executive Committee was comprised of Mr. Cuke and members of the Executive Council and so on. We all know that. But does he mean to imply, by that, that this particular suggestion in this Bill originated with the entire membership of the Executive Committee? We have been told and reminded by Sir Hilary Blood in his latest broadcast that the members from this House on the Executive Committee are the main instrument of policy, in so far as the formulation of Government policy is concerned; so, therefore, honourable members are justified in coming to the conclusion that this particular proposal did not originate with the entire Executive Committee or that the other members of the Executive Committee were necessarily in accord with it. So long as the members who comprise the main instrument of policy agree to it, it can come to this House, whether or not the other members of the Executive Committee wanted it; so long as the four members of this Chamber on the Executive Committee wanted a Bill like this to be sent down to this House, it would have come down even against the objection of all the other members of the Executive Committee. I want honourable members, therefore, to disabuse their minds of any idea, any possibility that because this Bill has come down from the Executive Committee, of necessity it follows that every single member of the Executive Committee endorses the principle of it. Now, Sir, it is all well and good to talk about England and compare Cabinet rank with membership of the local Executive Committee but if there is one thing, Sir—

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member likely to speak beyond ten minutes past two o'clock?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I shall be longer than that, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, we had better adjourn. It is now after 2 o'clock and this House stands adjourned until 2.45 p.m. in accordance with Rule 40 (a).

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (A)

On re-assembling,

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (a) in order to resume Government Business. There are two matters in Committee of Supply with which we should like to get through as quickly as possible; there is the Supplementary Resolution to provide additional accommodation at the Lunatic Asylum and the Resolution to make provision for the establishment in civil life

of discharged personnel. If the House do not wish to proceed with any further Government Business after that, I am entirely in their hands.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF RULE 60

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to move that Rule 60 be now suspended in order to deal with Order No. 3, Committee of Supply, as the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. BLACKMAN seconded the motion which was agreed to.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Order No. 3 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. BLACKMAN seconded the motion which was agreed to.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY VOTE FOR ADDITIONAL ACCOMMODATION AT THE LUNATIC ASYLUM.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman,—I propose to deal firstly with Resolution No. 2, a Resolution for £7,600 to supplement Resolution No. 105 of the 4th November, 1947 to provide additional accommodation at the Lunatic Asylum and to erect a boundary wall.

Honourable members will remember that as recently as November last year the sum of £32,000 was voted for the purpose of doing certain work at the Mental Hospital. That work was to build a dormitory, dining hall, isolation ward and quarters for the Medical Officer. The work is proceeding quite satisfactorily but it has been discovered by the Acting Medical Superintendent that when this additional accommodation is provided there will still be a certain amount of overcrowding. Consequently he has recommended on the advice of the Colonial Engineer that second storeys placed on top of the male and female dormitories will provide more accommodation so that there will be less overcrowding. At the same time this will be economical from the point of view that it will save us from coming at a later date with a Resolution for funds to build additional dormitories and boundary walls. There will also be a saving in connection with roof and floor space. As the figures show, when this work is completed with the additions which we are now seeking, there will still be a small amount of overcrowding, but as I have said, the erection of these storeys will relieve the situation. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. HAYNES: I really deplore the Government's action with regard to this Resolution. We are told in the Addendum to the Resolution that there is at present accommodation for 311 females and they are making accommodations for 351. With

respect to males the present accommodation is for 246 and provision is being made for 286. This is a piecemeal business. The honourable senior member for St. Thomas has told us that there is still going to be congestion and I consider that they should erect three storeys instead of two. We are going to spend a lot of money in pulling down and putting up again and that is not at all in the interest of the future.

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

The Resolution was passed.

REHABILITATION OF DISCHARGED SERVICE PERSONNEL.

Dr. CUMMINS: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is one to place the sum of £2,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the following purposes:—

(a) to make provision for the establishment in civil life of discharged service personnel;

(b) to operate or participate in schemes for the training and for the care and maintenance of discharged service personnel; and

(c) to provide a rehabilitation fund from which payments may be made.

The Addendum sets out the matter fully. It will be remembered that between 1945 and 1947 the sum of £10,000 was provided for the rehabilitation of discharged service personnel, and that amount was administered by the Rehabilitation Committee. The amount was expended, the Committee reported and has since been dissolved. Recently a few applications from men who have returned to the island, as well as from one or two persons who have not been out of the island, have been received by the Government for assistance in setting up certain business concerns which will help them to maintain themselves and their families. The Government thought that instead of dealing with these applications as they come in, they would come to the Legislature and ask for a further grant of £2,000 to be placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee and that a Committee similar to the Rehabilitation Committee should be set up to administer this sum of money after the applications of these men have been investigated. It has been the policy of Governments in the past to give favourable and sympathetic consideration to men who have served in the War and to do everything possible to help them to return to civil life on their retirement. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: I could not make out if the honourable member in charge of the Resolution disclosed the number of ex-servicemen who were out of the colony at the time of the dissolution of the Rehabilitation Committee and whom it is now proposed help.

Dr. CUMMINS: As far as I can remember now, four applications have been received and the Government felt that instead of dealing with these applications individually they would come to the Legislature for a certain sum. The amount is not to be expended in respect of these four applicants; one application is for £150 and the Government felt that instead of coming to the Legislature for sums of money in a piece-meal way they would ask for one amount to be administered by a Committee similar to the Rehabilitation Committee.

Mr. BRANCKER: Far from censuring the Government for dealing generously with these men,

I would implore them to be more liberal than they appeared to be in the past. I consider that a more sympathetic Committee than that in the past should be set up to assist these men. I remember that in the reply which the Government gave to my question relative to unemployed Barbadian ex-servicemen they said that it is not known how many are unemployed but only 114 have so registered at the Employment Agency of the Labour Department. I would commend to the Government that they appoint to administer this fund a Committee comprised of persons who are likely to be sympathetic and magnanimous in dealing with these men. It is not good enough to have a Committee who, when a person who has been employed comes back and asks for further assistance, will say to him; "We have helped you already and we cannot do anything more." I am not suggesting that they should take that person and walk with him to the end of his days, so to speak; but I feel that where the employment given is of a temporary nature and a person has not thrown it away, he is entitled to go back to the Committee and say "The employment was only temporary and I would be glad to obtain the services of the Committee in securing further employment." I notice that the Government said in reply to my question that 64 persons were known to have left the island; 423 were known to be in employment; 23 persons refused employment and 831 letters of introduction were given to potential employees. I am commending to the attention of the Government that they should endeavour to appoint on this Committee people who would be at least more generous than the majority of the previous Committee seemed to be. I know of some of the grants which they have made, I regard them as inadequate and many persons have agreed with me. I think that a more liberal policy should be followed in trying to rehabilitate these ex-servicemen. I think we are far behind other West Indian Colonies in the generosity of our assistance to these men while we should be leading the way.

Mr. WILKINSON: This is a very difficult question. We all want to see these people rehabilitated, at least we want to see them in the same position in which they were before they joined the Forces. The Rehabilitation Committee has been criticised but I am assure honourable members that there is no joy in being a member of that Committee. We have had schemes for the employment of drivers, carpenters, tailors, mechanics and so forth; but when they had completed their training there were no jobs to be offered them. I do not know how we are going to get over that. We have had a certain number of men trained and they made good workmen but they could not get any work. I really do not know what the answer to this question is. We cannot have these people stranded but, on the other hand, no country can afford to dole them for life. I see from the Addendum to the Resolution that another Committee is going to be appointed to assist in this matter and I really wish the best for them. The honourable junior member for St. Michael and the former senior member for St. George, Mr. Springer, were members of the Committee along with me and we all came up against the problem of finding employment for these men. Today the position is worse. Several of these men were assisted in repairing or building their houses and one or two of them got assistance in starting shops but there is much less money in circulation this year than previously. I sincerely sympathise with the Social Welfare Officer or whatever Committee is going to administer this fund. Every member of this House agrees that we should try and do something for these

men, but what are we to do? I should be glad to hear any constructive ideas.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Let me begin by saying that I commend the action of the Government in this matter. I am sorry that this Resolution is not for a greater sum of money. When the honourable junior member for St. James sat down I started to wonder what could be done in the circumstances. We are so prone to forget and to forget so quickly. During the War days our sympathies, our generosity, our everything went out to the men of the Colours.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Did the honourable member say men of colour?

Mr. MOTTLEY: No, Mr. Chairman; I said men of the Colours. We offered them everything. Things are really bad in this country and let me say that no observation of mine was intended to be any criticism of any Government. I said at the beginning that I commend the Government's action in the matter and that I was sorry that the amount of the Resolution was not greater. I will deal with the question of colour when the time comes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are dealing with ex-servicemen.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Imagine our asking on the floor of this House what is to be done in the case of several hundred ex-servicemen having nothing to do? It is a fact that they have nothing to do, but you hear over the B.B.C. that 100,000 people are wanted in England to do work and it is only the question of pigment that prevents people from going there!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member to be very careful on that question. There is nothing in the Resolution about it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: However nicely we put it on the floor of the House, however calmly and dispassionately we may try to argue it, we only need to go into the slums to hear how people feel about the utterances of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph that it is not the policy of Great Britain to have any colour problem.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Before the honourable member goes any further, I should like to say that if any question of colour is imported into this debate I shall rule against it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Like you, Mr. Chairman, I have tried to drown it but when I am faced with what has been said in this House—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: As soon as you carry on with it other honourable members will do the same.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I think that we should let it be seen that we object to our soldiers being debarred from being employed in Great Britain because of their pigment. I feel that anything should be held up as a mark of protest against that. You have people walking about the street with nothing to do; they come into my office and they go into the offices of other people too, asking for work and for something to eat, and yet you hear over the radio that they want so many people to work in great Britain!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member has also heard that thousands of people are leaving Great Britain and going somewhere else.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have my views in this matter and they are very strong. I regret these things very much. I have tried to get the number of men who have been disbanded from the Local Forces, of those who went overseas of those who have returned. It would be difficult to get accurate figures now, but I say to those of us who stood at home (A MEMBER: And made money) and had our safety and to those who were too ill or too old to go overseas along with these men, let us not forget so

quickly. I am in easy access to people and they come to me. I have been informed that despite the difficulties in obtaining work, certain ex-servicemen were offered work and they were debarred because they were not members of the Union. I believe in Unions but I also understand that these men were refused admittance to the Union on the ground that it is a closed thing. (Mr. ADAMS: Do you know the meaning of the word "closed"?) I am only saying what has been represented to me. I understand that certain ex-servicemen have been offered work in this City and they were refused or others would not work with them because they were not members of the Union and rightly so. I understand further that they were refused membership of the particular Union. I hope that I have made myself clear. These men were offered work and they were refused because they were not members of the Union. Mr. Chairman, I would ask honourable members to have some manners.

Mr. ADAMS: I am yet to know that honourable members cannot talk when an honourable member is speaking except there is too much noise. There is no Assembly in the world where members do not talk or walk about when another member is speaking. If honourable members can secure interest others will listen to them.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That is not true.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Honourable members must address the Chair.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Everybody will appreciate what I am saying. I have just said what I have understood and I would like the honourable member in charge of the Resolution to say whether there is any information on the point. The point I was making is that I am not only offering criticism against these men not being given an opportunity to go abroad, but I am appealing to local employers to give some consideration to these men. If what I have just mentioned is a fact, if such a state of affairs exists, I feel that it is most regrettable; because those of us who sat at home when these men went out and gave of their best, should today give these men of our best. I feel that whatever Committee the Government might set up there will not be much benefit resulting unless we do not remain with our tongue in our cheek but make some really strong representations on behalf of these ex-servicemen hinging upon the question which was raised by the honourable junior member for St. George and discussed in this House some weeks ago. If there is anything to be done so as to help rehabilitate these men it would be to try and get them to some industrial country where they can secure employment. I do not think that, as has been represented to me, these men should have been turned back by any union; I think they should have been given more consideration than that. I again commend the action of the Government in this matter but I hope that they will take steps to see that these men secure employment.

Mr. SYMMONDS: Mr. Chairman,—I want to commend the Government for having sent down this Resolution and I feel that it is a token of the sympathy which the Government has for those who offered to risk their lives for the service of the Empire. I want to stress that these men are typical of all Barbadians who are so truly English that their language is English, and so are their habits, customs and even their worship. It is fitting therefore that men who have been imbued with such loyalty and who have risked their lives in the service of the Empire should be shown some practical appreciation of their services by this Government. But I want to again make an appeal that something further

be done for these men who risked their lives for the Empire. The honourable junior member for St. James has informed this Committee that many of these men have been trained, some of them have become expert electricians and others have qualified in other callings. I suggest that any Committee whose function it is to rehabilitate these men have it in their power to work along with other people who desire to see opportunities created for these men in Great Britain where we are told not only that 100,000 men are needed but at least 300,000. No less distinguished a person than Sir Stafford Cripps has just told the world in an interview given to special correspondents that Britain hopes to solve her employment problems with the assistance of European volunteers, many of whom a short while ago were her enemies in an effort to destroy the British Empire and the democratic set-up throughout the world. If to-day Britain has been reduced to such straits that she has been forced to accept her enemies as volunteers in order to extricate herself from the desperate shortage of manpower with which she is faced, then it is fitting that every member of this Assembly, every Barbadian should show his sympathy for these men who served the Empire in the hour of peril and for those who now stand under the ever-green tree outside. It is all right if you expect to get a job next month or month after next or even the next six months because you have something to which you can look forward; but it is very desperate, discouraging and demoralising to find yourself in a position where there is no prospect of getting any employment after you have risked your life for the safety of the Empire and of democracy. I can assure honourable members that this is no laughing matter, this is a serious matter; and it will be an eternal reflection and reproach upon this Government or any other Government which stands by without proper representation, without proper protest and allows Great Britain to refuse work to loyal citizens in this part of the Empire. In a debate which took place in the House of Commons in August several speakers stressed the fact that Great Britain's need was the opportunity of these Colonies, and it was pointed out that it was not Africa or some other parts of the British Empire but only Malta and the British West Indies which were faced with this special problem of over-population. It was further pointed out that in the West Indies there was an abundant supply of manpower representing trainable personnel which could be used to the advantage of Great Britain and the British Empire; because, owing to the difficulties through which we are passing, if Britain sinks then all of us will sink. If therefore Europeans are now being accepted as volunteers in the service of Great Britain rather than loyal Barbadians, it is the duty of the representatives of Barbadians to see that the voice of the people is heard not only at Downing Street but in any industrial part of England where labour is required. We find that manufacturing firms in England want to sell goods in Barbados even although their cost is high. Even if we do not want to purchase these goods we find that representatives of these firms are sent to this island to impress upon distributors and salesmen the quality of the goods so that we should give to British goods the opportunity of being sold in this market. Therefore it strikes me that if we are to do these ex-servicemen and their unemployed loyal relatives in this island any service, it is our bounden duty to take a leaf out of the book of those who are experienced in the Mother Country—and to-day I see the Mother Country most advisedly and most seriously

because for everything we have ever enjoyed we owe a debt of gratitude to Great Britain. We are grateful for her colonizing policy and her defence throughout the years and during the last 100 years she has been marked by such a democratic spirit that she has been the champion of human freedom.

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

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (B).

Mr. ADAMS: I had no intention of asking leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (b) but I am sure that honourable members whose sentiments are being expressed, feel the necessity of getting this money into the hands of the Executive Committee so that an early start can be made in connection with this matter. I hope that honourable members will agree to the suspension of the Rule for the purpose of completing this Resolution alone. I ask leave therefore to move the suspension of Rule 61 (b).

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

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

Mr. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the time for Private Members' Business arrived, 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.

REHABILITATION OF DISCHARGED SERVICE PERSONNEL.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House was in Committee of Supply just now, we were considering a Resolution in connection with the rehabilitation of discharged service personnel. The honourable junior member for St. George was speaking.

Mr. SYMMONDS: Mr. Chairman,—Every Barbadian is deeply conscious of the fact that during the past 100 years Great Britain has been the champion of human liberty and when the history of the world will have been written, the policy of the British Government throughout the past century, as far as human rights and liberties go, will be one of the most illustrious. It is because of this that the vast majority of Barbadians will be found to be as deeply loyal to England as the British people who have been born in Great Britain. Even if it is said that Great Britain needs 100,000 workers, she needs 70,000 for the coal-mining industry and while it has been advanced that Barbadians are not strong enough to undergo the hard work of mining, I want to remind honourable members that during the 1914-18 War many Barbadians some of them from the parish of St. George—the Goodings, Talmas, Eastmonds and several others—I am just enlightening honourable members on this matter lest they be misled—several Barbadians were recruited for service in the mines in Canada; they served in Great Britain and in Nova Scotia for a year or longer and gave every satisfaction. It has been said by persons in very exalted positions in this island that a Barbadian who can labour for long hours in the hot sun digging up the soil would find it very difficult to work in a coal mine; and that the cutting of soft

stone in our quarries is child's play as compared with the work of a miner in England. However, from the facts which I have gathered and from talking with Barbadians who have worked in coal mines, that is not the case. The fact that Barbadians have served satisfactorily in the coal mines should be an encouragement to us to present a united front in trying to get employment if not for every unemployed Barbadian, at least for the discharged personnel who risked their lives in the service of the Empire. We are interested in the building of a West Indian nation; we are interested in cementing and maintaining those ties of goodwill which bind us to England as the Mother Country and this is a moment in our history when we hear over the radio that England needs help. We hear that she wants volunteers and that she is taking European volunteers; and there are Englishmen in the British House of Commons who have plainly said that in the West Indies there is an abundant supply of trainable personnel who can be of help in Britain's industrial drive. If we in this island are aware that Britain has never at any time offered a single Barbadian the opportunity to work for one cent in England we should see that the hour has now come when Britain should demonstrate that feeling of reciprocity, that feeling resulting from an understanding of our needs, the understanding which we have been taught and trained from our youth in all our schools to expect of England. We have been taught to worship heroes like Sir Philip Sydney who, in dying gave water to a wounded soldier saying, "His need is greater than mine." The needs of Barbados today are greater than those of Great Britain even in austerity. It is our duty to make one united effort now to help our suffering people. Let us not allow this opportunity to slip lest thousands of suffering and loyal people of this island miss the chance for industrial training and education. This is the opportunity which Providence has now placed within our grasp if we will only take it. (Cheers).

Mr. DOWDING: I regret very much that I did not get my Order Paper until yesterday afternoon and when I saw that this important matter was to be considered, it surprised me that we did not deal with it in the first place this morning. We have wasted the greater part of the day and have now come down to one of the most important matters on the Order Paper. I speak as one of the Barbadians who went abroad willingly to serve King and country: I have been in contact with privates, sergeants and officers throughout my Army career and throughout my civilian career and the situation with them is a serious one. There are lads who are well-qualified, lads who have risen to the rank of captain in the Army and to-day they are unable to secure work in this island. There are also those who were privates, corporals and sergeants and they are all unable to obtain any employment here. Sometimes ten of them come to me in one day; sometimes two, sometimes fifteen. I know what I am talking about. These men are finding it very hard to live. At the beginning of the present crop there were at least 100 ex-soldiers in the yard of one sugar factory! I am not saying that every individual is a good man but the majority of these men are good material, material that can be trained and used. But what is happening? The sum of £10,000 has already been spent in the rehabilitation of discharged service personnel. That was a certain amount of assistance given but on the whole it was very little. Here we are asked to provide the sum of £2,000 in the same connection. We have been told that four applications for assistance have been received, but I have had so many people coming

to me—I am quite certain that there are at least 400 of these people who are in a very serious position not being able to obtain any work. The situation with these men who offered voluntarily to serve King and country is a bad one and it needs the greatest consideration. When War was declared years ago we heard a lot about the common effort, that every man must do his bit regardless of class, colour or creed. To-day we have a different type of War; things are worse than they were at the height of the war especially as regards food which is our greatest support. And we hear from the United Kingdom that they are in need of workers. Mr. Chairman, there is just as great a need today for a common effort to supply these men who are capable of doing this work and those who are not capable of doing it can be trained and made capable of doing it. As great as 99% of these men can be trained and made capable. If they were willing to risk their lives for the Empire then they would be willing to go and get some work. These men are suffering and there is work in England to be done if they could only get there to do it. There is no common effort being made: I speak very strongly in this matter. I have discussed this problem with others on several occasions and we could not see exactly what the solution is; but the only solution I can think of is that we should provide work not only for the ex-soldiers but for most of the unemployed in this island, and let it be a real common effort between us and the United Kingdom. (Cheers)

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I would like to say in connection with this Resolution that I do not believe in palliatives. The amount asked for in the Resolution is £2,000 to give some relief to these men but, to my mind, that cannot really solve the problem. Sometimes in order to relieve a problem and you approach it in this manner, you will find that you have good intentions but you build up for yourself a danger which is very hard to remove. From the time of the formation of the Rehabilitation Committee I had my doubts about it. Even if you lend people money for desirable purposes and the policy is not a long-term one or adequate provision cannot be made for it, sooner or later the money goes and the people are in the same position as when they borrowed the money. The sum of £2,000 is a lot of money for an individual, but it is not much money for a group of people such as this. I do not know the number of people but I would rather see the Government embark upon a project, even if it costs more money, to employ these people profitably. As regards the statement of the honourable senior member for the City about people applying to the Union for work and being refused I do not intend to explain the matter to the Committee because I believe that a delicate matter of industrial negotiations must be discussed in proper quarters. It is not within the province of this House to discuss a matter like this because it is a matter which affects employers and workmen. Where you have industrial machinery set up, where the employers have their own Union and the workers have their own Union, it may be good meat for politicians to make some political statement out of it, but from an industrial point of view it cannot do any good for the country. With the amount of casual work there is in Barbados you will create a greater problem if you try to make work more casual; and if you bring in more people into any branch of work that will make the position very difficult where wages are concerned. If you make the work more casual, the few people who get there will always be a demand for more money. With regard to ex-servicemen being refused membership of the Union I should like to point out that you do not

join a Union so as to get work. The Union would find itself in a peculiar plight if people joined it so as to get work because it would not have work for them and therefore there would be a very difficult position created. I repeat that the House is not the place for any discussion of these matters. To go back to this Resolution, I am of the opinion that whether you find work for these people outside the island or you start a project within the island where not only ex-servicemen but other people can be employed, that would be better than these half measures to provide relief for these people. I do not mind giving these men relief but I am wondering now if the benefit derived from the £10,000 that was previously provided—I know that the members who served on the Rehabilitation Committee tried their best—could be appreciated in the sense in which it was intended to be. The sum of £100,000 might be provided but it is better to devise ways and means of spending that money on some project where it will be of benefit not only to these people but the community as a whole. I am voting for the Resolution but I feel that some project should be embarked upon whereby profitable employment can be provided for the people of the colony.

Mr. BRANCKER: I am wondering if the Government has given any consideration to the purchase of a small plantation for the benefit of those ex-servicemen who are agriculturally minded. I think the Government would be well advised to consider the attitude of these people towards running an estate for themselves. That would not be a case of spending a certain amount of money which in a few month's time will be all gone, but the idea would be to have the estate running on the principle of a collective farm. Many of these people might be agriculturally minded and they might be willing to try their hands at farming. As a matter of fact, if the Government were favourably disposed towards that suggestion and they wanted to start such an experiment, I think that there is now in the market a place which would benefit the people in the Leeward district particularly. The Government might well submit a Resolution for the purchase of Springers and Butchers containing about 50 acres in the parish of St. Lucy. The operation of a collective farm is worth while considering, and as I have already said, many of these ex-servicemen might care to try their hands at farming. If the ex-servicemen did not take kindly to collective farming, there are many other people who would be willing to take over any farm and run it successfully.

Mr. WARD: We have had the experience of one of our sons who have been out to fight for their King and country. It is all very well for us to stand around this Table and make certain remarks but from what I have been made to understand I really do not know if England is in such a desperate plight for workers. We read that Englishmen are leaving England and going to the Dominions so as to obtain work. I have been told by very authoritative sources that the trouble in England is that the people have been concentrating on one part of the country and there is the need for a redistribution of the population. I understand that people have collected in certain districts and there are others where work can be obtained but there is nobody to do it. I do not believe that the situation in England is what we think it is. If we had to send our people to England the first difficulty with which Englishmen would be confronted would be the finding of homes for our people; and it is a well-known fact that England herself has no where to house her own people. While I feel that it is a good point to make that the British Government should give some consideration to our people by giving them employment after they have faced the disasters of War so as to protect Britain and also this country, I also feel that if the British Government cannot

find any employment for these people we ourselves will have to start some industry so as to employ them. I do not believe that the majority of these people are labourers so that it would be out of the question to ask them to work on the land or in collective farming. I feel that they would prefer an industrial set-up and I do not think it is too much for us to try and find some scheme or create some new industry which will be of some help to our people who have served us so faithfully. As the honourable senior member for St. George has reminded us, it must be borne in mind, that these people volunteered to go and fight in order to protect us and some consideration should be given to them since they so willingly risked their lives for our safety. I repeat: it is not too much for this Government, if they really have these ex-servicemen at heart, to experiment in some industry whereby we will be able to provide employment for a good many of them and for others too if not for all. The question is: Can we at this moment think of or undertake any industry which will be profitable so as to provide employment for our people? Mr. Chairman, it must be borne in mind that we will have to start an industry to employ our people continually even if we do not make any profit. If these people are hungry and are willing and prepared to do some kind of work then it is the Government's duty to find work for them even if it is work in building new roads which will benefit the community. Even if we lose money in a project we are losing even now because we are doling out money. Until we can receive a grant we must try and go on our own oars. No matter how sympathetic we may be towards these people in giving them a dole we have to be careful not to do any injustice to others. It is not too much for the Government to spend a few thousand pounds in embarking on something which will be for the benefit of the island.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I cannot allow the remarks of the honourable senior member for St. Lucy to pass unchallenged because if I did so, that would be doing a great disservice to thousands of people in this island. The honourable member wonders where they will find housing facilities in England for Barbadians; my answer to that is that Barbadians can have the same housing facilities which are extended to European Volunteers which no less distinguished and responsible a person than Sir Stafford Cripps informs us they are now recruiting or about to recruit from Europe. Captain Gammans, a Conservative, and other members of the British House of Commons, responsible men in company with numerous economic experts who are selected to give talks over the BBC, tell us that there is a definite shortage of labour in very essential industries in Great Britain—agriculture, coal mining and textile—and I am saying that it is not our duty to make excuses for England; it is our duty to try and obtain employment for our people there.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do not want to emphasize any points which have already been made but I feel that due attention should be given to the remarks of the various speakers who have emphasized the necessity for expending money on some sort of productive work. With the passing of this Resolution we will have voted £12,000 for the purpose of rehabilitating discharged service personnel; and as has been pointed out by other speakers, while this money might have alleviated the economic position of the recipients, yet in the majority of cases it was not of any permanent benefit to them and very likely the position of these people is now even worse than it was before. The suggestion of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy relative to the purchase of a farm on which to settle the agriculturally-minded

people who could produce vegetables and short crops is not unworthy of consideration and attention might also be paid to the possibility of establishing a furniture shop with proper equipment. Those who have the necessary training could engage in work of this sort and others might also be trained in it so that the money invested in this manner would provide continuous and profitable employment for those whom this Resolution seeks to benefit. I think the British Guiana Government when they voted the first large sum of money for the rehabilitation of discharged service personnel, set up an engineering shop and equipped it with the necessary machinery so as to employ those who were trained in engineering in England and elsewhere during the War and apprentice others who desired to be apprenticed. You can readily appreciate that a provision of this sort would mean more to the community and the ex-servicemen than the mere doling out of a few dollars or a few pounds as the case may be. This money might be badly invested, in a small shop perhaps, and the property which the people might own might be involved and in a few months' time both the money and the property will be taken away by some wholesale merchant of Roebuck Street. In my opinion, it is advisable for the new Committee which is to be set up to approach the matter from this angle and I am sure that the members of the Legislature in this colony would be willing to increase this vote to £4,000, £5,000 or £6,000 if they could be assured that the money will be invested in some productive project which will in consequence provide some work of a permanent nature, work which will yield returns and be of permanent benefit to the community.

Mr. ADAMS: Before the question is put I should like to say that we who are so far away from England and hear and read speeches do not know what the true position is, because, like honourable members, I have read both things which have been mentioned by honourable members. There are actually more people who have left England or who are on the waiting list to leave, than what Sir Stafford Cripps says were necessary for employment in England. I want to congratulate the honourable senior member for St. Lucy for being so courageous because when it is so easy to arouse cheers and let it be thought that you are doing all you can for the unemployed by saying that there is employment in England, it takes a lot of courage for the honourable member or any other honourable member to remind the Committee that the position may not be as easy as they think. This Government has never ceased in trying to get an outlet for people in other countries where employment can be obtained; this Government has never ceased to make enquiries in this direction before anything was published in the newspapers, even before the honourable junior member for St. Lucy could ask any question. I say that as a compliment to the honourable member because he is always very anxious to see what he can bring to the notice of the Government for the benefit of the community. That compliment is deserving and it is meant. Sometimes the honourable member does not know that we are working on a matter and he shows his anxiety for something to be done about it. I say as a simple statement of fact that unemployment is obviously our most pressing problem; it has been so for decades and as far as human foresight can tell us, it will be so for years and years to come. The trouble is that this island is over-populated and therefore any sort of Government would naturally try at all times to see what can be done by way of securing employment for its people. When honour-

able members say "Let us have a common front and let us pull together" they should remember other things and they should know the implications of what they are saying. I am very glad that in a debate of this sort, coming on the heels of the speech of the honourable senior member for St. George, the honourable junior member for St. Lucy should suggest to the Government that they should buy land for the purpose of collective farming. But, unfortunately, people do not sell their land cheaply and while it is quite easy to ask why does the Government not buy land, the Government always have to pay exorbitant prices for land. The Government has several plans in view to be presented to the House within a short time for the relief of unemployment. The Government is doing its utmost, in spite of the obstacles which are put in its way, to relieve unemployment in this island. Despite allegations to the contrary, the Government has constantly kept in touch with the Authorities in the United States of America with a view to securing further emigration schemes there. I make no reply to those allegations other than to say that it is a crude type of man who when he telephones a friend asking for an interview and is told to call the next day, still gets a taxi and lands at the other man's door-step. I know that certain allegations have been made with regard to emigration to the United States of America. I am glad for this debate during which we have had the words of the honourable junior member for St. James, who is said to be one of the best business brains in Bridgetown, that he wishes well of any Committee which undertakes this matter because the Rehabilitation Committee tried their best and found no solution and they had been subjected to criticism. What are we to do, we who have no business brains, when those who are the best business brains have failed? I should like to remind honourable members in connection with agricultural work that if you take an agricultural labourer and give him a different outlook in life he is not going back to farming. Many people have refused work which has been offered them; that is human nature. Every boy who is employed to work in a garden looks forward to the time when he will drive a car; he has the ambition to improve his position in life. If a man who has never worn shoes or clothes in his life gets several pairs of shoes and several suits, can you expect him to go back to St. Andrew, for instance, and farm the land? Honourable members have just heard an appeal to pull together and I hope that when the Land Acquisition Bill and the Housing and Town Planning Bill come before the House we will not get any unseemly obstruction. I hope that the big land-owners will sell the Government land at £20 per acre instead of £80 per acre. Let us be united in our efforts; let us put away all obstacles which are put in our way by Englishmen or others. I am no imperialist as the honourable junior member for St. George seems to be; I am mindful of the fact that we owe such development schemes as we have been able to obtain to the British taxpayer. We are still being given money by the British taxpayer and we should give him back his coppers before we curse him. I repeat; I am no imperialist and some of the words that have fallen from the lips of the honourable junior member for St. George would have fallen from my lips when I was a schoolboy, but never again. England has her faults just as any other country, but it comes with very bad grace from us considering that we have been given a certain standard of comfort—and I do not exaggerate when I say that we as a community, were best supplied with commodities

during the last War, we never knew what it was to stand in a queue for food when our neighbours had to do that. When we are asking for help it ill-becomes us to curse the people from whom we are asking help; it ill-becomes a beggar to curse the person from whom he begs. You cannot be a beggar and a curser at the same time. The best way to borrow money from any person is to flatter him, not tell him how thin-skinned he is. The words which have been used by the honourable senior member for St. George appeal to all of us; let us pull together, let us see what we can do to help one another. The Government has in one case been offered land at a reasonable price—the owner of the land is a lady. Let a few more people who own hundreds of acres do the same (Cheers) and then the unemployed will no longer be unemployed.

Sometimes it is said of this Government that we are not willing to increase the wealth of the colony, that we are not willing to industrialize; but people do not know what we are up against. No normal capitalist whom I have come across in this country will put one half cent in anything unless he sees that he is getting money out of it. Such attempts as I have seen made to do anything to create work for a substantial number of people in this country or to benefit the country by the sale of products cheaply, have come from Englishmen in the country and from Englishmen outside who are willing to come in. In short, they are local capitalists; they do not start anything unless they feel more than reasonably sure that profits are coming and that those profits are just around the corner. Let us have these copy-book maximums, but let us live up to them. I hope that when the Land Acquisition Bill and the Housing and Town Planning Bill come before the Legislature, the honourable junior member for St. Lucy will influence his newly-found political friends to lend their support in trying to keep the price of land at a reasonable figure so that the Government can acquire it for the benefit of the people. I have to make these points because I wish to assure honourable members that if any honourable member makes a suggestion which is clearly useful to the community, the Government does not turn it down. Perhaps the honourable member did not think of the suggestion first; but any suggestion which is made is considered in order to see whether it can be put into effect or not. We would not be human beings if that were not so. This Government, in spite of the difficulties which the previous Rehabilitation Committee encountered, is perfectly prepared to ask for this sum of money so that these men might be relieved whilst schemes are being worked out. It is a perpetual headache to anticipate the trend of the labour market. I appeal in all seriousness to the capitalists of this country; they have the money and the business experience and they have sympathy for the unemployed who went abroad in order to protect them and their wealth. Why can't some of them try to start some project or put aside some corner of their estate so as to afford an allotment for the benefit of the people whom they want to assist? We are now about to ask the House to nationalise petroleum in order to have money in the Treasury to assist in carrying out schemes for the benefit of the people and there is the cry being made that we are stealing people's property and so on.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are not discussing that now.

Mr. ADAMS: There are so many statements appearing in the Press and objections made by ill-

advised persons that the Government is doing this, that and the other, that I must remind the Committee that the Government in company with other Colonial Governments including Trinidad, is attempting to make necessary legislation whereby the mineral resources of the colony are to be kept in the colony for the benefit of all the inhabitants of the colony; and when you see these statements and objections it makes you wonder how much attention some people pay to their writings and speeches before they write and speak. There are those whose hearts bleed with sympathy, they have sympathy in their writings and speeches, but they do not say: "I will give you a free living on a quarter of an acre of land where you can plant vegetables for your help." Instead of doing that, they will curse the Government. As far as the honourable senior member for the City is concerned, I am sorry that I have to end on a note where I will have to accept his challenge and in this connection I congratulate the honourable senior member for St. Peter on being much quieter than I thought he would have been. As the honourable member has said, in view of what is happening now, this is not the time for saying things which might possibly make people lose their tempers or make them feel that you are not being fair. But I ask honourable members a simple question; do you solve an unemployment problem by removing a man who is already in work and putting a demobilized man in his place? I find that solution a very difficult one. The same people who are aware of the necessity for helping the unemployed have, by reason of their position in the labour world, to safeguard those who are already in work. A merchant might tell an unemployed person: "I employ twenty persons, I cannot remove one of them and bring another"; or he might say: "I will try and make work for you although I can do without your service, but inasmuch as you are unemployed I will find something for you to do". Surely that merchant would be blameable if he knocked off one of his employees and put that unemployed person in his place. That is the answer to the suggestion that the Union is not doing this or that. The honourable senior member for the City has not got the matter right and therefore there is no need to reply to an accusation which has not been made. It is not true to say that the Union has prevented people from working because they are not members of the Union or otherwise. If you have a certain number of men employed already, how can you, in the middle of a dispute make use of ex-servicemen? And you cannot set workman against workmen. Where negotiations are still pending and people are locked out—and I should like to explain that there was a lock-out the other day and not a strike—to put demobilized personnel in place of these men would not be doing justice either to the original workers or the demobilized men. I must thank honourable members who have made suggestions and who have not blamed the Government to-day. They are only saying that we should collaborate; but I ask them to consider seriously that what they have said to-day is the most serious indictment against the capitalist system; namely that even the cleverest brains in the colony cannot solve the unemployment problem; the capitalist system is rampant in this island and it was present in a modified form in Great Britain before the Labour Government came into power. The House will see next Tuesday that we are not a bankrupt colony. For our size we are as wealthy if not the wealthiest colony in the Caribbean area, Trinidad and Jamaica not excluded. Our revenue has exceeded even our

most sanguine expectations and I know that Mr. Herbert Staly and others will reply and say that the Government taxes people too much. It is not the actual resources of the colony which cause this vast amount of unemployment; it is the bad distribution of money in the colony. Therefore those whose business in life fits them to help to spread employment more thoroughly in this colony ought not merely to say in pleasant words that something must be done for the employed; they will be doing the colony and their conscience good if they would join private enterprise with public enterprise in doing something to relieve the unemployment situation. I have said that purposely because the Secretary of State for the Colonies has reminded us that there is room for both private and public industry. When private interests ask this Labour Government what it is doing we say: The Government is doing its best but we are hoping that you too will do your best.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I hope that I will be permitted to make a few observations. Apropos to the remarks made by the honourable junior member for St. George, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph said that he would make those remarks when he was a school-boy but not now that he has grown up. I think it is really a pity that some of us ever grow up (Laughter) because if we remained as school-boys the personal considerations and the ulterior motives which becloud our perspective and interfere with our better judgment would never operate. I never thought that I would sit in a Chamber of elected representatives in this colony and hear it said that we find ourselves in the position of beggars at the hands of Great Britain; and therefore if we attempt in any way to speak out plainly or criticize British Imperial policy in any phase we are being ungrateful. Those of us who know the facts will readily admit that the money which is being spent in these Colonies to-day under the Colonial Development and Welfare Organization is the result of the pricking of the conscience of Great Britain. The British people felt that they have exploited these Colonies for so long and the position in which the Colonies find themselves to-day is so deplorable and disgraceful that if they are to hold up their heads with pride among the nations of the world, the time has come when the British people should attempt to make some reparation for the evils of the past. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph would have us to believe that this is a wonderful, generous gesture, that Great Britain out of her heart is generously giving us money and we must take it quietly because it is sheer charity. These Colonies have been producing raw materials for centuries and sending them to the British market for nothing, sending them at a price which could not give a fair return to the producers and allow a living wage for the people employed in the production of the materials; and then they re-ship the same materials of these Colonies at exorbitant prices. Now that some attempt at reparation is being made we are told that we are ungrateful because we speak plainly! I do not believe that at all. Some of us after we have left the school-boy and the adolescent stage, allow our personal considerations to weigh with us. We have been told that we must be quiet in trying to get British Imperial loans and when people who are fully conscious of the situation and who have a deep knowledge of the true position begin to speak, you weigh one statement against the other. You get one person saying this and another person saying that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But every honourable member is entitled to his opinion.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The opinion should be based on fact. Therefore when those who know the facts see that a wrong inference is drawn, they feel obligated at least to let the true position be known. As regards the question of unemployment in this colony, when you hear the remarks made that unemployment will be our greatest problem for years to come, let us face the facts. What sense does it make to say, as the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said, that no capitalist would put money in any concern unless he sees a profit in it? That is child's talk. If you put money in a business whether you are a capitalist or not, you expect to get returns. Did the honourable member not study his profession because he thought he would make money out of it? Anybody who invests money in a business or lives on his wife's earnings or however he gets along, he is doing it because he thinks he can get a profit on his investment. What the Government wants is a programme. It is futile to talk about land costing the Government so much and when you try to buy it, it costs more. We sat down in this Assembly and bought the Bay Estate—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is a general hubbub in the Visitors' gallery and I am asking visitors to the House to remain quiet.

Mr. CRAWFORD: We paid £65,000 for the Bay Estate because it suited certain people. We will again, perhaps in the near future, pay exorbitant sums for properties and you will not hear that they asked too much money for them then. If certain people want them to be bought they will be bought.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable member casting aspersions on the purchasers of the Bay Estate?

Mr. CRAWFORD: No, Sir. The Committee has been told that when it is a question of the acquisition of land the Government has to pay an exorbitant price. When it was the desire to purchase properties in the past, they were purchased whether the price was exorbitant or not because it suited certain people to purchase them. Therefore there is no excuse for indifference or negligence or sins of omission because we have had the example before; and in connection with the acquisition by the Government of properties which the Government felt would be useful and be of good advantage to them, the Government as we know, have the power to acquire these properties at the best possible price. I am amazed to hear the argument that because the honourable junior member for St. James claims that his Committee had difficulty in providing a constructive programme to rehabilitate these ex-servicemen, and as he is one of the best business brains in Bridgetown, therefore no other Committee will be able to provide such a programme. The honourable junior member for St. James is a good businessman and the honourable senior member for St. Joseph can only appreciate his extraordinary business ability in so far as this matter is concerned! If the honourable member is a businessman *par excellence* in the community why not have him in the Government?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Surely the honourable member remembers the resignation of the honourable junior member for St. James from the Government.

Mr. CRAWFORD: We should have in the Government people with the ability to plan constructively for the country, to present schemes to the Legislature instead of passing the buck and trying to pick up all sorts of excuses for doing

nothing. When the people of this colony will have been satisfied that every attempt is being made permanently to eradicate this evil of unemployment by constructive planning, by starting a scheme of industrialization—when that is done then we can afford to sit back and say that we are really doing something. Less than a month ago we had the spectacle of a debate in the Other Place in which we learnt that the Government refused to assist in the industrialization of Barbados. We read that an application was made by a local company for permission to bring in machinery duty free for the establishment of a canning industry. We were told that the Government refused the application and had refused to declare any settled policy in the matter; and it was implied in the speech of an honourable member that the Government preferred to treat every case on its own merits. Are we going to be told by the same Government that they are doing everything to assist in the industrialization of the colony? Every other colony is doing everything in order to attract new industries in the colony. Nobody is suggesting that you are not going to have capitalists trying to get the best out of their investments, but the Government can regulate the profits in any industry. In British Guiana, the Governor said at the opening of the Legislature that the Government had already agreed to the granting of concessions in connection with the development of industries. In Puerto Rico millions of dollars have been made because of the concessions granted by the Government. Throughout the West Indies to-day it is a recognised principle that the only way in which you can develop the country industrially is by offering concessions to people to come in and when business is started you can regulate the profits and see that people receive a fair share of them. This is not the time to develop this point; the time will come when it will be developed as extensively and as emphatically as the circumstances warrant. I merely make these observations in passing just to emphasize that you cannot always pull the wool over the eyes of the people in the community. It is not possible for people to fool all the people all the time. (Cheers) If there are those who are not capable of thinking for themselves and who are not capable of estimating and appreciating the full import of these matters, one can easily forgive them for the following blindly without question the path set by the people whom they have to follow; but in the final analysis it is the people of this country who will eventually decide these issues. Fully conscious of this fact as I am, I can afford to face their verdict with equanimity.

Mr. ADAMS: I had no intention of speaking again; but I have completely come to the end of sitting down quietly and listening to strings of untruths which I sometimes feel that the House will discover for themselves, and let it go abroad that the Government is not doing this, that or the other. The Government has just been accused of paying an exorbitant price for land because it suited certain people. If there are any doubting Thomases I will get the necessary permission to produce the Report by the honourable senior member for St. Philip which says this: "I consider this price a reasonable price. Signed W. A. Crawford." What is the value of the honourable member's utterances?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us be calm; do not call the honourable member by name.

Mr. ADAMS: I am quoting a Report: I repeat: the honourable member makes this rash accusation against the Government that in order to please certain people they gave that exorbitant price for the

Bay Estate, and we are setting an example for things to come. I will get the necessary permission to put into the hands of honourable members the Report which has been signed by the honourable member. He says: "I consider it a good scheme and the price a reasonable price", and then accuses the Government of what he has just accused them. Mr. Chairman, the honourable member used to publish in his newspaper extracts from "Mein Kampf" from week to week and I suggest that he learnt well that if you are telling a lie you should tell a thundering one. I have given the honourable member the lie to what he has said in black and white.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member not to continue in that strain for the sake of peace.

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable member has accused the Government of not doing anything where industrialisation is concerned. The first project to come before the House in recent years was the result of a request by the owners of Spring Hall. The Government sent down a Resolution for a refund of the money which the Company paid on machinery for making fuel from megasse. The Resolution came before the House and it was strongly attacked by the Congress Party. The honourable senior member for St. Philip prompted his colleague to oppose the Resolution. I grant you that his colleague says what he actually believes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Again I hear a voice from the Visitors' gallery and I shall ask Mr. Speaker to have the gallery cleared unless visitors can keep still.

Mr. ADAMS: That was a beginning so as to get an expression of opinion from the House. I am not afraid to face the position whether I get fewer votes or not. What happened? I had no intention of voting for the Resolution, but rather than attack the Government by voting against it I used to walk out whenever the Resolution was brought up for consideration. The Resolution was returned to the Government and as a result they did not proceed with it. The principle was established that the House will oppose any such request on the part of a private company for an unqualified concession and an opinion was expressed that the worker and the consumer were to be protected. There are certain things which can be taken over by the Government. Let me remind the Committee at this stage of the Address to the Government asking that public utilities be nationalised. The Government has both a positive and a negative duty. We have the House telling the Government to nationalise public utilities and what is the Government to do when matters of a similar nature come before it but try each of them on its merits? I do not shrink from this language; to get the words of the honourable senior member for St. Philip to square with his actions presents a thorny, knotty, insoluble problem. Let us take the Hotel Bill which was sent down to the House. It was put into the hands of the honourable member who was all for it because everybody says and many people believe that the most important secondary industry in this colony is the tourist industry. I am not prepared to vote for a Bill of the type which that was, allowing hotels of a certain size to get all their mattresses and so on free. The honourable senior member for St. Philip who is the only man, the Leader of the only Party and who was anxious to help people, walked out Tuesday after Tuesday when the Order dealing with that Bill was to be called! If he means what he says he would have shown the public that he was anxious to help the unemployed and we were not; but the honourable member was afraid of the Hotel Bill. He wanted to help the capitalists and also the workers; but he was

caught between two stools, the workers whom he did not want to offend after he had let them down in the strike, and the owners, and he who sits between two stools eventually falls.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not think it is necessary for the honourable member to carry on in that strain.

Mr. ADAMS: I am speaking for the Government. The honourable senior member for St. Philip says that we are the only Government that do nothing at all. It is against the Rules to refer to any matter that takes place in the Other Place but when the Government is accused of incompetence and the facts are not put before the public, the public are bound to get a wrong impression. What this Government is going to insist upon is to try and get carried into legislation what it believes is for the good of the country; and it is going to see that certain things do not get into the hands of any private business which is running for profit.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member refers to that in glowing terms he can carry on.

Mr. ADAMS: When the Government does not carry out certain things it is because of the hills of opposition which it has to surmount. This Government has certain views and the Labour Party for the last ten years has been preaching the same views and sticking to them. There are three categories in which you can place Government interference: there is outright nationalisation, the control of profits and wages; and participation either merely by a seat on the directorate or by loans, subsidisation or having some of the shares or most of the shares in a corporation. I am happy to be able to say that one or two persons in some quarters who objected at first have arrived at the point of seeing that Government can participate by taking shares. Lord Trefgarne is also of that opinion. We have been accused of not doing what every other country has done. All this has happened since the honourable senior member for St. Philip fled from the Hotel Bill Tuesday after Tuesday. If the honourable member is so anxious to see that he is doing all he can for the causes of unemployment and emigration, why did he not put forward the Bill and call for a division so that he could say: "I did my utmost to get employment for the people but Mr. So and So voted against me?"

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I understand that material could not be obtained for the building of the Blue Waters Hotel.

Mr. ADAMS: It was felt that the House would not pass the Bill; they could get all the material they wanted. I repeat that the House has expressed its feeling about the Spring Hall affair and the honourable senior member for St. Philip was afraid of the Hotel Bill and did not bring it forward. The Government has to examine every scheme and see that it comes within one of three categories which I have mentioned. What the Government will never do is to take up money without any sort of control or Government participation and put it into any private firm under the name of industrialization or anything else; we are not going to build up any more profiteers. The only people who I know have asked for income tax exemption are these hotel people. I ask why did the honourable senior member for St. Philip not show his willingness for this industry to be carried on? No, but he accuses the Government of doing nothing. I took it upon myself to negotiate or see how far an applicant from abroad would go towards meeting us in connection with an industry and there was not one

single thing I put to him that he did not accept; he did not ask for any income tax exemption. He agreed to lease land from the Government, allow the Government to take shares in the business, allow them to fix prices and to see that his products were not sold beyond the normal price. There are those who are anxious that local businessmen should get exemptions but do not want the Government to come in at all. I have to be very careful not to touch anything which may be a disclosure of Executive secrets. For the sake of harmony I have sat down sometimes and heard extraordinary fabrications being trotted out to the public and I have said nothing; but there comes a time when you must reply, and when accusations are made by a person whose very handwriting can prove that his accusations are untrue, then it would be stupid for one to remain silent. I repeat that the Government has done nothing whatever to stop industrialization coming into this country but the Labour members of the Executive Committee have made it plain that we are not starting or perpetuating any new industrial revolution in Barbados where the employers wax rich and the workers wax poor. We are not prepared to allow anybody to go in for industrialization in this country unless we control the profits and prices and unless in certain instances we participate in it. The whole blame for the capitalist system of this country lies in the perpetual, 300-year-old feeling that a select few should grab all they can and wax as rich as possible out of the toil of the cheapest labour they can get. As long as I have a seat in this House whether on the Executive Committee or not, I shall not be a party to any such schemes even if plastered in gold letters where you proclaim that you are helping the poor or anything like that. That blessed word "Industrialization" can cover a lot of things. Mr. Chairman, this debate has drifted and drifted; it has shown the many accusations which have been levelled against the Government without foundation. You will find that these accusations are made simply because those of us who can reply and should reply at the appropriate time kept silent for the sake of peace and appeasement; but as far as I am concerned that policy is as dead as Munich and as Chamberlain himself. Whenever the honourable senior member for St. Philip comes in here with what I know to be a fabrication I shall nail his lie immediately because it is time that the people of this island are stopped from being fooled. I end as the honourable member ended; you can fool some of the people some of the time, you cannot fool all the people all the time.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do not think it necessary to reply to all the ludicrous remarks made by the last speaker.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member must not refer to the remarks as being ludicrous.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I was asked to accept and I accepted the Chairmanship of the Committee appointed to investigate the matter of the purchase of the Bay Estate because the honourable senior member for St. Joseph was leaving the island for St. Kitts and Antigua. Before he left the island he said that the Bay Estate could be purchased for £56,000. We kept Minutes of the meeting; we had a Clerk from the Colonial Secretary's Office as Secretary. Three days after I was appointed on the Committee the price of the estate went up to £70,000 after certain people realised that the Government were willing to buy it. This matter agitated the minds of my Committee for over a week. The House passed an Address relative to the purchase of the

Estate and if I had opposed it people would have said that the Government could have acquired the land and I opposed it because I did not want them to get house and land. Therefore my Committee and I eventually decided to offer £65,000 for the Estate, but that does not say that if it were not for the machinations of certain people, the Estate would not have been acquired for £65,000. I repeat that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph told me that the estate could be bought for £56,000. I knew that too, and when I said today that we paid an exorbitant price for it I make no apology for saying so because it is my firm conviction that—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House having decided to purchase the Estate, they cannot now be criticised; and the honourable member knows that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Are you suggesting that I cannot defend myself?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Not at all.

Mr. CRAWFORD: With reference to the Hotel Bill, I was asked by the Government if I accepted the principle of assisting hotels in this country along the lines obtaining in Jamaica. I read the Jamaica Act and I replied; by all means, it is the best thing for this country. As the honourable senior member for St. Joseph told the Committee, both he and his colleagues refused to support the Bill. I was asked and I said that I would bring the Bill before the House. I also said that in Jamaica they had gone further than we proposed to go here. All hotels with ten rooms and over should be allowed to bring in their equipment duty free. In Jamaica they are allowed that and they are also allowed exemptions from income tax for the first ten or fifteen years. The Hotel Bill only asked for exemption from customs duty. I was prepared to come on the floor of this House and support the Bill because I thought the erection of a million dollar hotel in this colony would afford a tremendous amount of work for carpenters, masons, labourers and later on, barmen, waiters and so forth. I argued that this was a right step to take and I would support it. In the meantime we were not sure of getting the Bill passed in the House because only my Party and I were in support of it. The former senior member for St. George, Mr. Springer, and his Party opposed it and what was the point of my bringing it to the House? Meanwhile the hotel strike occurred and I told Mr. Taylor that he was asking us to assist him with concessions and yet he was refusing to pay people a living wage when he turned down the demands of the waiters; because we were told by one of the satellites of the honourable member's Party that men had been sent from the Union to do the work. My colleagues and I then decided that, after all, if these people are so inhuman to those whom they employ, then, although this Bill might mean something to the country, we will have nothing to do with it. There are members of the House who can bear me out. We were responsible for the conditions under which the people worked in this place and I told the hotel proprietor this on two or three occasions; "If you want the Government to assist you, you must make it clear that you employ people on a living wage and under the best possible conditions." They were not prepared to do that and they brought in people who had just dropped their hoes and forks, people who had never been into a hotel before. — They brought in agricultural workers to do the work. The strike was broken as a result and a lot of the men remained unemployed. In consequence of that could you reasonably expect me to ask for legislation to promote this industry? The honourable senior member for St. Joseph knows the facts well and yet he says that I refused to bring in the Hotel Bill.

At this stage Mr. ADAMS objected to certain remarks used by the honourable member and asked that he withdraw them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I did not hear the remarks which were used. Can the honourable member say what the remarks were?

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable member said something about my helping to break the customs laws. I object to those words and I ask that they be withdrawn. If the Committee agree that the honourable member said something which is innocuous, I will withdraw my objection; if on the other hand they agree that he said something which was far from being innocuous, I will not withdraw my objection.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member can say what are the words to which he is objecting I will put the question.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I want to say that it is sheer absurdity to talk about the Government having shares in industries.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There are honourable members who have certain obligations. Most of us are interested in getting this Resolution passed; I have something to do for the benefit of myself and if we are going on much longer the House will have to appoint a new Chairman.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I want to crave your indulgence for a few minutes. With regard to the Resolution for £850 referred to by the senior member for St. Joseph, the honourable member said that I prompted my colleague to attack the Resolution. The honourable member thinks that the non-honourable junior member for St. Philip is one of those members of this Chamber—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Do not let us carry on like that because we will not get any further. Are we not interested in these ex-servicemen?

Mr. CRAWFORD: It is easy to get before people who do not know the facts and claim that the Government wants to do this, that and the other. What is the reason for having Trade Unions? Do they not exist for regulating conditions of work and so on? I conclude by saying that the facts as have been set forth in this debate relative to the Government's policy are indisputable and no amount of double talk will be allowed to influence the people of the country.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I would not be doing my duty to the ex-servicemen in this island and to the unemployed if I did not take some exception to the words of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph on this question of unemployment. At the beginning of his remarks the honourable member said that he would be a crude type of man who, after telephoning a friend asking for an interview and was told to call the next day, still calls a taxi and lands at the other man's door. The honourable member happened to be speaking on the question of rehabilitating discharged service personnel and I can only take his remarks to mean that since he has informed this House—I do not intend to bring in anything personal—

Mr. ADAMS: In order to prevent the honourable member from making a mistake I should just like to explain that I was referring to the accusation that the Government is doing nothing as regards emigration to the United States. I made it clear that if we are told not to come to a man's house we should not go to it.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I was about to say that I have been at pains to point out that people have agents and representatives to make impressions upon would-be purchasers when they do not want to buy their goods. We have a commodity in Barbados—

available manpower in connection with which the question of colour has been raised; but from a debate in the House of Commons as late as August last year, members of the House of Commons were at pains to point out that there is trainable personnel in the West Indies and there was no question of colour raised. If honourable members who are concerned about doing something for the ex-servicemen know the facts and do nothing—I am not charging the Government or anybody else of doing nothing—but no serious attempt has been made to send personal representatives to Britain. The work of the revivalist preachers was so great and the conscience of the British nation was so awakened that slavery in the British Dominions and throughout the world was abolished. If a thing like that happened because of the agitation of two people who were convinced on such a question, if by proper representation commodities can be sold to people who did not want them at times, then we stand indicted before the unemployed in this island if we sit here in this Assembly and make excuses for Englishmen and accuse one another of cursing the British taxpayers which none of us has done. We have, I repeat, available manpower in this country and it would be to the eternal disgrace of the people if when they cry for manna we give them a stone, or if when they cry for work we make an excuse for Englishmen. I am supporting this Resolution and I say, let us make a united effort and present our case to the people in Britain in such a manner that we will get some relief.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chairman is forced to leave the Chair at least for five minutes, and if honourable members intend to carry on for longer than five minutes he will have to leave perpetually. (Laughter). I suggest that we report progress with leave to sit again.

Mr. WILKINSON: It is now late and we have laboured all day and have done nothing. I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to know what sort of a motion that is.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not want any debate on it.

Mr. LEWIS: I beg to move that you do now report progress with leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion.

Mr. ADAMS: I take it that when Mr. Speaker takes the Chair we will resume Committee of Supply again.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair is more interested in the discharged service personnel than many honourable members.

The question that the Chairman do now report progress with leave for the Committee to sit again was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LEWIS: I beg to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes in order to discuss this matter. I know that Your Honour has asked that such motions be brought to your notice beforehand but I would like to take this opportunity to draw to the attention of honourable members that the people who look after the blocking of the street when the Legislature is sitting—

Mr. SPEAKER: I have asked that notice of these motions be given beforehand and I do not think I can allow you to discuss the matter.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is—

Mr. BRANCKER: I would just like to know if the Committee which will administer this fund is going to demand security from these people in respect of loans because I would not advise any insistence on that. If these people are destitute I do not see that they should be asked for security before money is loaned to them. There are instances on record in which persons who attempted to obtain a loan were asked for security. That is necessary where business enterprise is concerned but in this case where we are assisting these men, the matter cannot be treated as a normal business matter. I commend that to the Government as an instruction to the Committee which they may appoint. The amount asked for in this Resolution is £2,000 and that is more than is actually needed for the four people who have made requests to the Government. However, I suggest that the Government should go through the list of persons who have already been helped and see whether they are not deserving of some further assistance.

Mr. LEWIS: I am interested in this Resolution as I would be interested in the relief of suffering; but I do not come into this House to fool anybody. I do not intend to fool anybody while I am in this House. I have some regret in voting for this Resolution because I am sure that it will not rehabilitate these ex-servicemen nor will it relieve unemployment. I see in it, as I have heard, nothing more than a glorification of War; my idea is that these men should be taken as a whole. We have heard that these ex-servicemen gave voluntary service and now we find that obligations are attached to the people whom they served. We should see that the unemployed people get work and obtain food and clothing out of the labour of their hands or brains. No ex-serviceman can be more hungry than anybody else, and I deplore the idea of picking them out for special treatment. We have heard things today that make us feel and I am wondering if we are really interested in the unemployed and the ex-servicemen. Those who remained behind, as we have heard, made millions out of the War and I do not see them coming forward to give anything out of the properties which these ex-servicemen pledged their lives to protect and maintain. What are the plantation and factory owners doing today? They are installing labour-saving devices in a country that is riddled with unemployment and then come in here to make what sort of speeches? I am issuing a warning to everybody in connection with directing attacks against the Government of Barbados and that of England. These attacks are being directed against these Governments because they are the people's Governments. Import restrictions would not have objected to by the merchants of Bridgetown if a Tory Government were in power; but certain things are being forced upon the Government of Great Britain because it is the people's Government. I am going to support the suggestion of the honourable junior member for St. George that a delegation be sent to England if the people there say that they want workers but they do not want them of a certain colour. I have not got in mind that ex-servicemen particularly should be employed in England if there is employment there but anybody who can be any use. I would not tell the people out there that during the War these men offered their

services voluntarily and now they are not wanted; I would tell them that we are in this Empire together and if they have work to be done we have people who can do it. I do not think that we should set out to embarrass them in this matter of employment. Let us be genuinely interested in the employment of the people of this colony. Why do we not urge a Land Settlement Scheme? We have sufficient land that we can put our people to work on it and industrialize the area. It is said that if they open up the mines in England people will be sent from Europe to work in them. I say: let us make an effort in the interests of our people to see whether they want them or not. We are willing to embarrass certain Governments because they are labour Governments and I say: let us find out whether there are any areas out there which can be secured for our people. If they do not want us out there, we do not want them out here either; but let us be absolutely sure about that. With those remarks I am supporting the suggestion that we send a delegation out there and let them see that we are interested in this matter. Let us send a delegation there even if it costs us £2,000 to do so and let us discover what the position is. I sincerely hope that something will be done to help the unemployed in this country particularly the ex-servicemen whom I hope we will find it possible to rehabilitate.

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

The Resolution was passed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

SELECT COMMITTEES DISCHARGED.

Mr. ADAMS: There are some Select Committees which have reported and might be discharged.

Mr. SPEAKER: I discharge the following Select Committees; the Select Committee appointed to prepare a draft Reply to His Excellency's Message No. 30/1947 relating to an error in Resolution No. 30/1947 for £5,063 *re* New Pay Ward 'A' at General Hospital; the Select Committee appointed to prepare a draft reply to His Excellency's Message No. 35/1947 relating to an error in Resolution No. 45 of 1947 in connection with the Cotton Spinning Plant; and the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Address *re* Emigration to Surinam.

THE ORDER PAPER.

The Order Paper under Government Business having been fixed,

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to move that Order No. 75 standing in my name on the Order Paper under Private Members' Business be made Order No. 3 for the next meeting.

Mr. WILKINSON: I object; I have tried to bring up Orders standing in my name and the honourable member has always objected.

Mr. ADAMS: I suggest that Order No. 22 standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. James be made Order No. 3 and that Order No. 75 be made Order No. 4; because after the debate we have had this afternoon Order No. 75 dealing with the re-establishment of the British West India Regiment might well be brought up.

The question that Order No. 75 be made Order No. 3 was put and resolved in a "tie", the division being as follows:—

Ayes: MESSRS. SMITH, COX, F. L. WALCOTT, MAPP, LEWIS, TALMA, ADAMS, BLACKMAN and DR. CUMMINS.—9.

Noes: DR. WILSON, MESSRS. RAMSAY, SYMMONDS, BRANCKER, CRAWFORD, MOTTLEY, DOWDING, S. A. WALCOTT and WILKINSON.—9.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been resolved in a "tie", nine honourable members voting "Aye", and nine honourable members voting "No". In accordance with the Rules I vote with the "Noes", therefore the Orders will remain as they are.

Mr. DOWDING: I ask leave that Order No. 40 which is a Vestry matter standing in my name be made Order No. 3.

Mr. ADAMS: I do not see that a Vestry matter is of more importance than helping unemployment by getting people in the Army. I suggest that a ballot be taken and let us abide by the result.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I will vote for that nevertheless. I should just like to say that certain honourable members have the habit of getting matters on the Order Paper and then moving the adjournment of the House so as to discuss them out of their place on the Order Paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already ruled that honourable members cannot move the adjournment of the House in order to discuss matters which are on the Order Paper.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am in support of the proposal to move up this Vestry matter and I propose later to ask for leave to move up Order No. 73, a pension Bill standing in my name since we are more or less agreed on the principle of giving priority to Vestry matters and matters relating to pensions.

The question that Order No. 40 be made Order No. 3 was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

THE ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to this day week, the 24th day of February, 1948, at twelve o'clock noon.

Mr. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER accordingly adjourned the House to Tuesday next, the 24th day of February, 1948, at twelve o'clock noon.