

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1950--51

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 24th April, 1951

Pursuant to adjournment the House of Assembly met at 3 p.m. today.

Present

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS (*Deputy Speaker*), Mr. L. E. SMITH (*Chairman of Committees*), Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., Messrs. F. E. MILLER, R. G. MAPP, M. E. COX, F. L. WALCOTT, G. H. ADAMS, B.A., J. E. T. BRANCKER, H. A. DOWDING, F. E. C. BETHELL, F. C. GODDARD, J. H. WILKINSON, O.B.E., E. L. WARD and W. W. REECE, K.C.

Prayers were read.

Mr. CRAWFORD entered the House and took his seat

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meetings which were held on the 3rd and 10th April, 1951, respectively, having been circulated were taken as read and confirmed.

DOCUMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Report and Statement of Revenue and Expenditure of the Highway Commissioners of the parish of St. James for the half year ended the 31st March, 1951.

NEW MEMBER TAKES HIS SEAT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a letter from the Honourable the Colonial Secretary stating that he was directed to inform me that at a meeting of the Governor-in-Executive Committee held on Thursday, the 19th April, 1951, Mr. Joseph Alleyne Haynes attended and took the necessary oaths to serve in the General Assembly of this Island as a member for the parish of St. Andrew.

Mr. HAYNES was ushered into the House by Mr. GILL and took his seat. (Cheers).

Mr. GILL also took his seat.

Mr. MOTTLEY entered the House and took his seat.

PHOTOGRAPH OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have given permission to the photographer of the "Advocate" to take a photograph of the House.

PAPER LAID

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker—I have the honour to lay on the Table of the House the following Paper:—Report of the Comptroller for Development and Welfare in the West Indies for the year 1950.

PETITION

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker.—I beg to present a Petition from the Vestry of St. Peter praying the House to pass a Bill authorising the Vestry to raise a sum not exceeding \$1,500 for the purpose of (a) erecting a Bath and Latrine at Rose Hill, St. Peter; (b) purchasing a parcel of land at Round The Town, St. Peter, and erecting a Bath and Latrine thereon; and (c) purchasing a Refuse Collector for the use of the said parish. The Petition is respectfully worded and I ask that it be taken as read.

The Petition was taken as read.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$440,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1951-52, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1951-52, No. 3, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Resolution to place the sum of \$144,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the purpose of making available the Government's contribution to the Capital cost of the establishment of a Central Milk Depot and Creamery in accordance with the terms set out in the Memorandum at the meeting of Members of the Executive Committee, Officials and Milk Producers on the 12th of April, 1951.

Mr. ADAMS: A Bill intituled an Act to continue temporarily certain emergency enactments.

Mr. ADAMS: As regards the Resolution for \$440,000, I should like to say that it was impossible

to inform hon. members of this before, but we have had a sudden enquiry from America asking us whether we can send up some emigrants. (Cheers). I am glad to see that the Opposition is waking up to a sense of its duty in supporting the Government in its endeavour to get a scheme of emigration on foot. I will ask later on for permission to deal with this Resolution as the first Order of the Day. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Deal with it now). The Other Place have been notified and they are waiting to deal with this Resolution as soon as it leaves us. I ask leave to move that Rules 88 and 89 be suspended in order to deal with this Resolution.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF RULES 88 AND 89

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Rules 88 and 89 be suspended so as to deal with the Resolution for the sum of \$440,000 of which notice has first been given.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. BRYAN entered the House and took his seat.

OTHER NOTICES

Other Notices were given as follows:—

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Bill intituled the St. Peter's Parish Loan Act, 1951.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Of the following Address:

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Governor*

The House of Assembly desire to draw to the attention of Your Excellency the fact that there is widespread and intense dissatisfaction over the current prices being paid by sugar factories for canes; that these prices which, from the commencement of the crop, bore an unsatisfactory relationship to the price of sugar, were reduced early in the crop on the excuse that unusual January rains had lowered the sucrose content of the cane and despite the fact that these rains were of short duration, the sugar factories have not yet seen fit to change the reduced prices.

2. The House would stress for Your Excellency's special consideration the circumstances that

(a) this year five thousand, eight hundred (5,800) peasant proprietors and seven thousand (7,000) estate renters will supply the factories with around 200,000 tons of sugar cane.

(b) this amount of cane does not include the tonnage which will be supplied by small plantation owners who have neither shares nor any commercial interest whatsoever in the factories which process their canes.

(c) careful calculations based on the total net value of a ton of sugar, reveal that last year peasant proprietors and plantation renters alone were paid approximately \$400,000, less for their canes than they would have received.

3. The House respectfully request that Your Excellency will take steps to ensure that the prices

paid for canes by factories this year shall be the maximum which the price of sugar will afford and that these prices be effective for all canes delivered from the beginning of the present crop; in other words, that the factories be compelled to make good the difference between what they have so far paid and the price which it is established they should pay.

Mr. HAYNES: Of the following Address:

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor*

The House of Assembly respectfully request Your Excellency to take immediate steps to put into effect the "Project" known as the East Coast Road from Belleplaine to the public road to Cattle Wash, St. Joseph, particularly, as at present, owing to the destruction of the bridge at Lakes by heavy rains, the Villages at Lakes, Corbins and other lands, are completely cut off from road communication. (Cheers).

Mr. HAYNES: Of the following Address:—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor*

The House of Assembly respectfully request Your Excellency to take immediate steps to send down legislation having for its object the amending of the Representation of the People's Act, 1901, in which it is stated that the Expenses of Elections for the General Assembly of the Island should be borne by the various parishes of the Island: In view of the very increased cost of these elections under the Act to amend the law relating to the Representation of the People's Act, that these expenses be now borne by the Central Government.

Mr. GARNER entered the House and took his seat.

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

Whether an inquiry or investigation is now taking place in connection with the Department of Highways & Transport?

2. If the answer to the above question is "Yes" will Government please state the following:—

(a) Name of the person conducting the inquiry or investigation?

(b) Terms of reference *re* such inquiry?

(c) Reasons which caused Government to institute such inquiry or investigation?

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

Is the Government aware that employees of the Highways & Transport Department have had no increase lately in their wages despite the continued rise in the cost of living?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is "Yes," will the Government undertake to give these employees an increase in wages commensurate with the present cost of living?

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

Is the Government aware that employees of the Highways & Transport Department are debarred from the use of the Labour Welfare Fund for making loans to repair their houses?

2. If the answer to No. 1. is in the affirmative will the Government rescind this restriction in view

of the fact that the above employees contribute to the Sugar Industry as much as the direct workers in that Industry?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr CUMMINS, a Bill intituled an Act to continue temporarily certain emergency enactments was read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, seconded by Mr. Cox, the St. Peter's Loan Bill, 1951, was read a first time.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker.—I ask leave to take Committee of Supply as the first Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day now stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph:—To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Colony.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction to the Committee when the House is in Committee to deal with the Resolution for which Rules 88 and 89 were suspended earlier in the day.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

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

COST OF EMIGRATION OF WORKERS TO U.S.A.

Mr. ADAMS: As hon. members will see from their cyclo-styled copies, and as I have already stated, this Resolution is for the sum of \$440,000 in respect of emigration to the United States of America, and in moving the passing of the Resolution I shall endeavour to put all the facts before honourable members. This \$440,000 together with the sum of \$100,000 which was voted in the Estimates will make just over half a million dollars to be spent in financing an emigration scheme which has just been offered to us. Hon. members will see from the addendum to the Resolution that "The Government has been informed that there is work available in the United States for from 2,000 to 4,000 Barbadians. The initial expenses payable by the Government of Barbados in respect of each labourer amounts to \$134.00. Provided a worker completes 12 weeks under contract, \$86 of this amount will be reimbursed to the Government. The amount recoverable is proportionate to the period worked. Present indications are that the majority of workers will be fully employed for between 10 and 12 weeks." I want to tell hon. members that while it might be necessary for us to approve of schemes of emigration, all schemes of emigration are not as rosy as they may appear at first sight. We have no guarantee from the employers in U.S.A. that workers will be employed for more than 12 weeks; personally, I feel that, having regard to the present situation in Korea and the rest of the world, these workers will be needed after that period, but I wish to let the House know the full financial implications of this scheme.

We have had a telegram over the week-end from the Chief Liaison Officer in Washington asking for an immediate answer as to whether this Government can send up a quota of Barbadian workers

and the request is made that they should accept employment for a period of 10 to 12 weeks from early in June. The rate of pay is higher than in the past—75 cents an hour—the rate in the past being between 45 cents and 60 cents an hour. As I have already mentioned to the House, this matter is so urgent that the Government has requested the Other Place to remain in session until this Resolution goes up to them; and I hope that while honourable members will express their point of view, they will do so in such a way that the Other Place will have this Resolution before them this afternoon. Under the original scheme the American Government paid all costs for the transportation of the workers, but since 1948 the workers have had to repay the cost of their passages from Barbados to the place of employment. Briefly, the Government is putting up this proposition; the best we can do is to get the workers there on consideration that they pay the cost of their passages up and a part of their passages coming back. The Government has considered that it would agree to pay two-thirds of the passages coming back and the workers pay the other one-third assuming, that they get this work for 12 weeks. If they get work for longer than 12 weeks, it may be necessary to ask them to pay more than one-third. I will remind honourable members that when we are competing against Jamaica nowadays, it is difficult for us to succeed unless we are willing to make concessions. The cost of passages would normally fall on the employer, the American Government no longer paying the cost of these passages, and if he can pay less money to bring over workers from the Bahamas and Jamaica than to bring them from Barbados, he will do so; that is why in the past we have had to try and bargain with the American employers for the best possible terms in order to get a quota. I say that because honourable members sometimes attack the Government if they see some notice in a newspaper that Jamaica is sending up 5,000 or 10,000 workers, forgetting that an American employer says that if it will cost him "X" dollars to bring over people from Jamaica, it will cost him "X" plus "Y" dollars to bring them over from Barbados. The passage money—the cost of transportation from Barbados to Jamaica—has been advanced by this Government since 1948, and from Jamaica to the place of employment is advanced by the employer. The cost of repatriation has been met by the employer from the place of employment to Jamaica, and by this Government from Jamaica to Barbados. From 1948 the employer paid the cost of transportation from Jamaica to Florida; he always felt that he could get everybody from Jamaica, and if we want Barbadians to be included we would have to pay the cost of transporting them to Jamaica. The employer always paid "X" dollars whether the workers came from Jamaica or Barbados; he would pay whatever the cost of transportation is, and if there is any difference, the islands paid. These workers have been asked for to work at Wisconsin, and it is estimated that the cost of transportation to Wisconsin by air will be \$108 United States currency. Of this amount, \$36 United States currency, will have to be advanced by us and in due course, of the cost of repatriation from the United States, \$36 will have to be paid by us. That will mean that \$72 United States currency, will have to be paid by us or by somebody else. I ask honourable members to take as broad-minded a view as possible of this particular aspect of the matter. The Government feel that we are being asked in effect to subsidize emigration to the tune of half a million dollars, and we are likely to get back, if the workers pay a part of the cost of

transportation, \$248,000. If these 4,000 workers are going to America for 10 to 12 weeks, unless they pay a part of the expenses back to Barbados, we will have to find \$250,000, and we may have to find another \$250,000 next week or next month if the Americans ask for more workers. The Government feel that, inasmuch as there are a number of people who are willing to pay a part of the transportation costs rather than not get to America, it is only fair to ask the Legislature to provide two-thirds of the passages back and leave it to the emigrant out of his earnings to pay the other one-third. This Government will pay the cost of recruitment which is \$40,000; no worker will be asked to pay any part of that. We must get people out of Barbados; we must enable them to go abroad and work for money; but we always have to watch how much money is coming back to Barbados, and how much money will have to be spent in order to enable that much money to be earned. The actual mechanics of the repayment will be similar to what has taken place in the past. The establishment in Queen's Park will be continued; deductions will be made from each worker's wages at the rate of \$14. United States currency per fortnight plus 25 per cent of the earnings. The employer makes the advance and out of the remission to Barbados he will first be repaid his advance which is estimated at \$72. That has been the practice for the past two years; the earnings of the workers go to the United States Savings Department in Queen's Park and out of the weekly deductions the employer is first repaid what he advanced to take the workers up to America, and then the \$36 advanced by the Barbados Government is paid from what is left. If we are spending this money in respect of the emigration of these 4,000 workers and we may have to come back for another \$250,000, that is a matter which we have to view carefully. We have no desire to stand in the way of any emigration scheme, but we feel it is fair for the Government to pay two-thirds of the transportation cost back and the workers pay the other one-third; if we pay all, we will soon find ourselves in the position of being unable to pay for another batch of workers. It does not seem to me that America is going to slacken off her re-armament programme or her request for workers. Mexico and Puerto Rico may push their case strongly, and West Indians may not be asked for in excessive numbers; but it is well that we send up these 4,000 workers which we have been asked to supply. The matter of an out and out subsidy for emigration is a matter which we have to view with great care. I do not think that there is anything more than I can add, but if honourable members ask for more information I will give it. These 4,000 men are to go up by the beginning of June, but we have to give an immediate reply to Washington that the Legislature is willing to vote the money. I feel we will find that at the end of 12 weeks these workers will have a longer period over which to pay their part of the cost of repatriation. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. COX: In seconding the motion for the passing of this Resolution, I am sure that I am more than voicing the opinion of everybody in saying that at last we have a ray of hope of getting 4,000 of our people employed in the United States of America. While it is true that the amount of the Resolution appears to be large, I do feel that with the conditions as they are in the world today, these workers might remain in the United States of America for a longer period than we expect, and, as a result bring back untold benefits to this colony. We

are glad to see that we have at last been afforded a quota of 4,000 workers. I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for the passing of this Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: At the highest level emigration can be viewed as being of such considerable benefit to the colony from so many different points of view, that it is almost unnecessary to question any reasonable amount of money which we have to spend in order to promote it. At the lowest level, the unemployment situation in the colony today is so grave that I think we will be more than justified in spending the money which has been asked for, if for no other reason than that we should be providing employment for people who are out of work. Honourable members are aware that, in many instances, countries find it necessary to spend appreciable sums of money in unproductive work so as to relieve unemployment; but emigration cannot be regarded, in so far as it applies to this colony, as an unproductive expenditure, and therefore any appreciable amount of money asked for we are justified in voting to-day. As a matter of fact, in the short space of time in which I have had to consider this matter, I have tried to get a few figures together. If these emigrants are paid 75 cents an hour, it means that within 12 weeks each emigrant ought to work for \$432 if he works on every working day for the 12 weeks. At the end of that period, the total earnings of these 4,000 workers should be more than three million Barbadian dollars and of that three million dollars at least one million dollars should find their way back to Barbados. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has told us that if the Government is called upon to pay the entire return passages for these emigrants, that will cost a quarter million dollars; if the workers are employed for 12 weeks they will pay one-third of the cost of the return passages, the Government will pay two-thirds so that we shall save roughly over \$80,000. Assuming that we pay two-thirds of the return passages, the scheme will be regarded as costing the colony around \$160,000 or around 16%. That figure is pretty high, one admits, but as I said, added to the actual value of the money coming back here, is the factor that we are providing work for a large number of persons who find themselves unemployed at the moment. I want to make a suggestion to the Government; if by any unfortunate chance these men are employed for under 12 weeks, it means that the amount with which they should reimburse the Government will not be forthcoming. Apparently the reimbursement is based on the number of weeks during which the worker is employed.

Mr. ADAMS: I quite appreciate what the honourable member is saying, and the Government sees his point. The workers will repay \$14 a fortnight; if they come back after two weeks we will recover only \$14.

Mr. CRAWFORD: My point is that the reimbursement of revenue to the Government is based on so much per week. If the reimbursement of revenue to the Government is of such primary importance, in view of the fact that the earnings of the workers will be more now than for a similar period before, why does the Government not base the reimbursement on the earnings rather than on a time limit? Under the old wage rate, a man who works for 12 weeks at 50 cents an hour would earn about \$288; now he will earn \$432. If the Government is concerned about getting back this money, it might consider the advisability of changing the principle from the basis of time to that of the workers' earnings. In any case, I do not agree with the honourable senior member for St. Joseph when he says that we have to be content with what we have been offered because Puerto Rico

and Mexico will push their case; in so far as Puerto Rico is concerned, we have to look for competition, but Mexico is not willing to send workers to the United States of America. Mexico would only send workers to America as an alternative to sending troops to Korea; rather than send soldiers to fight in Korea, Mexico would contribute to the War effort by sending a few thousand workers to America. It will be found in the near future that, in so far as West Indians are concerned, the position is not quite as bad as it may appear to be at present. If Mexico is unwilling to send workers to America, the labour market upon which America could draw would be either Puerto Rico or the West Indies. I feel that even if my figures are incorrect with regard to the actual percentage which the scheme will cost, we might make a beginning at this particular time in the manner suggested here and then, later on, the position can be altered in the light of experience gained both from the conditions which exist then and the lessons which we have learnt from sending this initial batch.

Mr. REECE: I feel it is my duty to correct the honourable senior member for St. Joseph when he said that at last the Opposition is alive to its obligation in the matter of emigration. I do not think the honourable member was serious in making that remark, because emigration was included in the platform of the Opposition at the last General Election, and we have not missed any opportunity of expressing ourselves as being in agreement with emigrating people to the United States of America or any other field which offers opportunities for work at remunerative rates. This scheme, as the honourable member has mentioned, is an expensive scheme; it will cost this colony a sum of money, the exact amount being yet unknown, because that will depend upon the number of weeks during which the workers will be employed in the United States of America. We of the Opposition do not think we should allow the possibility of the Government being unable to reimburse itself to the extent which the honourable member has mentioned, to stand in the way of the present emigration scheme. As the honourable member has said, the workers of this colony are so keen on emigration, that many of them are willing to put their hands into their own pockets and pay the expenses of getting to the United States of America. As every lawyer in this colony knows, at all times people are asking for assistance to get to the United States of America. We cannot regard this matter of emigrating people to America as a matter of dollars and cents, but as a means of relieving unemployment which takes place in this colony after every crop season. It is the wish and prayer of members on this side of the Table that these workers will remain in the United States of America for longer than 12 weeks so that not only their families, but the entire community will benefit from their stay in the States as a result of the money which they will send back here.

In recent months we have heard much about women being sent abroad. I believe I am correct in saying that at one time women registered for that purpose, but from the honourable member's remarks I think we are justified in saying that it is not intended under the present scheme to send any women among the workers who are going to the United States in June this year. I hope that in future schemes women will be given the opportunity of going out as workers to the United States. There are certain types of work which women can do better than men, and I feel that women should be selected for the type of work for which they are best suited and sent out in place of men. In estimating the actual cost of this scheme, we cannot look merely at the figures which appear in the addendum to this

Resolution, because, as we know, the workers send home their money and part of that money will find its way into the Treasury. It is exceedingly difficult really to estimate what the actual cost of any particular emigration scheme will be; but I know that money will be sent back and that money will be spent for the benefit of the workers and the good of the entire community. I have had the opportunity of speaking to a Jamaican who is a member of the legal fraternity and he assured me that Jamaica has benefited greatly as a result of emigration to the United States of America: He told me that as a result of emigration from Jamaica, many transactions in land have been carried out in the legal offices of that colony, if there is one thing that Barbadian workers should do with their money it is to purchase land; I am perfectly sure that if our people remain in the United States for any considerable length of time, the money which is sent back here will be used in purchasing land. We are supporting this Resolution, but, as the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said, every Resolution of this sort needs to be given careful consideration because, although we may have the ability to spend up to a certain amount of money, and the expenditure may justly be considered as giving temporary relief to the unemployed in this colony, yet the financial resources of the colony are limited, and we would like to see put into operation emigration schemes which have the prospect of giving employment to our people for longer terms than what is proposed in this scheme. The longer the workers are away, the less will be the cost to the Government and the greater will be the number of workers who can be sent out. We are supporting this scheme and we will do everything to encourage it. It must be borne in mind that our financial ability must be considered when it comes to a question of short term schemes; we prefer to have long-term schemes. The longer the workers can remain in the United States, the more money will be sent back here and we will be able to send up more workers. I do hope that the Government will seek avenues abroad for the employment of the women of this colony.

Mr. ALLDER: The long awaited time for the emigration of workers has arrived and I regret that, instead of our being asked to send between 2,000 and 4,000 workers, we were not asked to send 40,000. Regardless of the cost of arranging such a scheme, I feel it would be necessary to grant whatever money is asked for. Many of the unemployed will receive this news of emigration with gratitude, but there is another aspect of a scheme such as this. I notice that we are being asked to vote half a million dollars for the emigration of 4,000 workers; I also notice that if a worker does not become ill and he works for an average number of hours a day, he will earn \$36 a week and if he works for 12 weeks he will earn \$432. That is nothing to do with the cost of his meals, his theatre fare and other expenses which he might incur; it shows that we are spending this sum of half a million dollars and with the limited period of time which the emigrants will be staying in the United States of America, we do not expect to get back all that money. I also notice that it will cost \$10 for the recruitment of each worker and that is nothing to do with the cost of the staff of the Labour Department. The money for the recruitment of the workers will be spent in the payment of the doctors who will examine these 4,000 men; it will amount to \$40,000 which, I feel, is too high for this purpose. I am wondering if the Administration made any attempt to see if they could reduce the cost of this recruitment. I have been told that doctors will be employed at the rate of \$10 per hour in the re-

recruitment of these men. (Laughter). The honourable senior member for St. Thomas laughs; the honourable member himself has told me that the doctors will be paid \$10 per hour, and he further told me that he would not accept the job for \$25 an hour. One can easily see the lethargy which marks some honourable members who have had something to do with the arrangements; it seems that sufficient interest, energy and fairplay were not shown in soliciting the services of the respective officers who would be employed in the recruitment of these workers. I say that the amount for the recruitment of these workers is too high; and whatever safeguards are set up for the protection of professionals, I feel that if we are asked to spend so much money on an emigration scheme from which you cannot get back what is expected, we have to be very careful that we do not open the way for the people in America, who may have the responsibility of arranging for the repatriation of the emigrants, to ask for a large sum for their services. We should show the American officials and the Airways Company that we are not willing to spend a dollar when we can save two dollars. I feel that our doctors should be conscious of their responsibility to the community and realise that our problems are as a result of the mass of the unemployment which we have in this colony. When it is a question of our people being sent out so that they might be able to earn a livelihood for a short period, the doctors are expected to pull their weight; their charges should be nominal inasmuch as they are assisted in their private practice by the facilities which we have supplied at the General Hospital. Not only that, but as citizens of this colony it is the duty of the doctors to see that they make their charges reasonable. To say that they are justified in charging \$10 an hour in the recruitment of these workers, or that that charge is reasonable, you will still have to see what reasonableness is. Here you have a mass of people who are to be examined; the average emigrant is not expected to be ill with pains for which you have to search, so that it will only be a routine method of examination. Much time is not taken in examining the emigrants unless they show some sign of illness. I hear a noise coming from the direction of the Government benches, but I would like to draw to the attention of members of the Government the inconsistency in their policy. Last month we were asked to create the post of caretaker of Government buildings.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not entertaining that.

Mr. ALLDER: I just want to say that the wage which they fixed for that man to work whole-time was \$6.00 per week, and now I am drawing to their attention what appears to be too high a price to pay doctors for the examination of these workers. I would not be surprised if by acquiescing in the demands of certain exclusive persons in this colony other persons made extreme demands, because these demands are being made from the top; and the small people have always tried to emulate the actions of the bigger ones. I cannot see the Labour conviction on the side of the Government when they say that they are here to turn things from one side to the other, but by their decisions they show that they want to perpetuate the same old system. They are saying that Mr. "X" because of his exclusive social rights must get so much for so little service, but they ask an individual to accept little or nothing at all for the sacrifice which he makes towards the maintenance of the finances of this little colony of ours.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman,—the honourable senior member for St. John spoke. What did he say?

Mr. ALLDER: The honourable member has a sense of his importance and, as a result he forgets

his responsibility as a member of the Government. As such he is expected to fight his best so as to convince honourable members that they should support whatever he brings forward as being in the interest of the colony. I am not surprised at what the honourable member has just asked; I am hoping that the type of person which he represents will be weeded by the people.

Mr. GARNER: All of us are agreed that this emigration scheme is only a palliative to our sore trouble in this island, and is by no means a cure. We all welcome this scheme and we will go to any length in spending money to see that our unemployed people go abroad to whatever country employment is being offered, so that they can earn some extra dollars; but I would remind the honourable senior member for St. Joseph that this is only a palliative and we should make our desire so felt in Great Britain that they should know what is going on in this Caribbean area. We have a dense population here; we will always have unemployment and unemployables and therefore we have to formulate schemes other than transient emigration schemes. Quite recently I read in the columns of a local newspaper, and in the columns of a foreign one too, that Great Britain was transporting German families to certain parts of German East Africa. I intended to move the passing of an Address in this House in that connection; only yesterday the Germans were killing the British people and today Great Britain is helping them to settle as families in Africa! But here we are sitting on our rights and asking for palliatives; we want to send a few hundred people up to America, and that upsets our economy, because when they begin to earn money and get luxuries to which they are not accustomed from birth, and then that source of maintenance is cut off, you have a false economy. What I feel is that we have got to do more than bring about transient emigration schemes; we have got to let the British Government know that just as her former foes can settle in Africa, we want to settle on African soil as well. Honourable members are not taking this matter seriously; but whatever emigration scheme is brought forward, as long as there is no permanent settlement, it will disrupt our economy. We want permanent settlement for our surplus population; it is all right to have a palliative, but we must have a homeland where people can settle and develop and do whatever other people are doing. I am voting for this Resolution with pleasure and in the hope that this Government will let the British Government know that just as they can supply ships to repatriate Germans to German East Africa, we want to have a place under the sun too. Every time I talk about the African question you get some irresponsible people making a joke of it because they have not got the interest of the people at heart. The interest of the people means that they must own land; can't you see the handwriting on the wall? Wealth means power; when you have not got any wealth you are at the mercy of the people who have the wealth. I can see a little further than some honourable members; I have foresight and where there is no vision the people must perish. I have vision to see that some day America will not want emigration on this present scale; some day we will be faced with hunger, starvation and everything else. We are passing through a period which has been brought about as a result of the War and when all these things shall have passed away and we have no particular place where we can send people, what will Barbadians do? Will we all remain here and depend upon sugar? We must have sufficient foresight so that we can tell the British Government that we want a place where we can settle. I repeat that this emigration scheme is only a palliative; we have to do something more than

this in order to make our presence felt and to do for posterity something for which they will bless us.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable member's speech has been very thought provoking. We in this Assembly to-day have been labouring under the unfortunate fact that we have to consider this matter almost at a moment's notice, unlike the members of the Executive Committee who had a few days in which to consider it. We want to keep before our mind's eyes that this question of emigration is only a palliative, and if we can afford to spend \$160,000 which we will not get back, should we not consider at the same time whether or not we cannot afford to spend the same amount of money on productive work so as to find employment for people in this colony? While we can spend this money with pleasure, at the same time the sum of \$120,000 would give us the East Coast Road and find employment for about 3,000 people for over six months; and we would have lasting benefit from the expenditure. Similarly, we might be able to spend another \$160,000 in putting down a flour mill.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let the honourable member speak on the question of emigration to the United States of America.

Mr. CRAWFORD: All I am saying is that we are voting money to permit the Government to spend \$160,000 on emigration and that we should also consider whether or not we could spend another \$160,000 in putting down a flour mill which will improve the economy of the colony permanently. All I am doing is to emphasize the remarks of the honourable senior member for St. Philip on the particular ground that while we agree to this expenditure on a palliative, let us also consider spending appreciable sums of money on lasting schemes which, on the one hand, will provide employment, and on the other hand, will expand the colony's economy.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until 5.30 p.m.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

On re-assembling:

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone Orders Nos. 1 to 6, and to take Orders Nos. 7 and 8 as the next Orders of the Day.

There being no objection leave is granted.

RESOLUTIONS *Re* POSTAL RATES

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Michael—to move the passing of a Resolution that with effect from the first day of June, 1951, the postage on any postal packet set out in Column 1 of the Schedule hereto when transmitted from this Island to a place abroad otherwise than by air mail, shall be at the rate set out immediately opposite such packet in Column 2 thereof.

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution as honourable members will see, conforms with the decision

made by the Postal Convention in 1947. The Addendum is as follows:—

In terms of the Agreement reached at the Postal Convention held in Paris in 1947, and as a result of devaluation, it is necessary to increase postage rates to foreign countries in order for this Government to meet its obligations as a Member of the Universal Postal Union.

This Resolution makes provision for an increase in foreign rates to the minimum permissible under the Paris Convention. There is no change in the Empire rates, but it is considered convenient to include the rates in this Resolution for ease of reference.

I do not think that it is necessary to say any more. I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded.

The question that the Resolution do now pass is put to the House and agreed to unanimously.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Michael—to move the passing of a Resolution that with effect from the first day of June, 1951, the air mail postage on air letter forms to the destination set out in Column 1 of the Schedule hereto shall be the rate set out immediately opposite such destination in Column 2 thereof.

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is similar to the one just considered by the House. I beg therefore to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded.

The question that the Resolution do now pass is put to the House and agreed to unanimously.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of Order No. 6 standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Peter, since that honourable member is not in his seat.

There being no objection leave is granted.

RESOLUTION TO FIX PRICE OF MOLASSES

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is a Resolution to approve the rate payable to producer, and rate of tax payable to the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board on Fancy Molasses produced during the crop year 1950-51, fixed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the advice of the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board in accordance with Regulations 5 and 6 of the Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export Regulations, 1938.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this is the usual Resolution to fix the rate payable to producer and the rate of tax payable to the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board. I do not think that there is anything to be said about it. The rate payable to the producer is to be not less than 54 cents per wine gallon, and the rate of tax payable to the Board shall be one and one half cents a wine gallon.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

The question that the Resolution do now pass is put to the House and agreed to unanimously.

RESOLUTION FOR MILK DEPOT

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to deal with the Resolution standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Peter of which notice was given this morning. I am asking leave to deal with it as the next Order of the Day.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the junior member for St. Thomas, Mr. MAPP was appointed Chairman of Committees for the balance of the day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is to move the House into Committee of Supply to

deal with the Resolution of which notice was given earlier in the day.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction to the Committee to deal with the other Resolution of which notice was given earlier today.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded.

The question is put to the House and agreed to unanimously, and Mr. SPEAKER accordingly leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee of Supply, Mr. MAPP in the Chair.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the honourable senior member for St. Peter is here, and I will do nothing more than to move the passing of the Resolution. I would like to remind honourable members of a point which I did not make clear when we were discussing the reply to His Excellency the Governor's Message dealing with this subject. What was sent down in the Message was the report of the committee that made the recommendation originally that this should be a C.D. & W. Scheme. But the Government is not setting out any terms. There is going to be no law or regulation or anything of that kind from the Government. It is just as if Lodge School asked us to lend them £2,000 to build a laboratory in which to teach science, or if a cricket club was borrowing money from us to build a pavilion. So this group of people who own cows and are interested in milk production have come together and said they will start a co-operative organisation, and have asked us to lend them \$144,000. So all the suggestions made by honourable members when we discussed His Excellency's Message, useful in themselves, are nothing to do with the actual scheme. They are merely expressions of opinion. All that we are doing is saying that these people have come together and they think that they can run a successful co-operative scheme. They will draw up an agreement that they propose to do certain things, they are putting in so much money and they are asking the Government to lend them so much. I want to stress that it is purely a question of the Government lending a sum of money to a group of people who are starting a co-operative scheme. So I hope that honourable members will confine their remarks to what they feel are useful suggestions and not attack the Government for doing this or that. It is a matter for the solicitors when they draw up the agreement to insert what terms they are going to work under. The firm of Cottle Catford will be most likely the Solicitors, and the honourable junior member for St. Andrew who will know the feelings of honourable members on the matter will be able to advise his firm at first hand on how the agreement should be drawn up.

The Resolution to which I want to move an amendment reads as follows:

"Resolved that the sum of \$144,000 be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the purpose of making available Government's contribution to the capital cost of the establishment of a Central Milk Depot and Creamery in accordance with the terms set out in the memorandum on the 12th April, 1951."

If we pass the Resolution with the words "in accordance with the terms etc." it may appear to the Auditor General that unless the terms set out in His Excellency's Message are complied with, he would not be authorised to pay out the money. I think we should therefore stop at the word "Creamery." I am asking leave to withdraw the rest of the wording of that sentence.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion for the passing of the Resolution. I think that from the debates we have listened to on emigration this comes at a good time. We heard from honourable members just now that the Government should embark on more permanent schemes which would be of lasting benefit to the island. I regard this as one of those development schemes that all members of the House should welcome. Honourable members discussed at length the details of this scheme when His Excellency's Message was before the House. At that time I did not care to dilate on the matter because the honourable junior member for St. Philip took the lead. Government has now gone into the details of the scheme, and I doubt whether honourable members are going to say at this stage that the scheme is too ambitious because it calls for £30,000 and they themselves cannot give concrete examples to prove their case. What it really means to this island is that we have passed a Co-operatives Bill and this scheme is intended to be run like a co-operative scheme. To those members who argue that because Government is contributing half of the capital cost Government's voice should be half the voice of the others who are contributing I will say that a co-operative scheme cannot be run like that. In a co-operative scheme it does not matter how much money you put into it you will have as much voice as the other contributors. In Barbados or in any of these colonies you will find it difficult for the Government to embark on this scheme without the confidence of the milk producers themselves. There has been talk of this scheme being a big risk. To those honourable members who are always talking about the establishment of minor industries I will say that you will never start industries if you do not intend to run risks. This is a risk that the milk producers cannot take alone. In ordinary commercial parlance it is not the sort of transaction that would appeal to the average commercial man because he would need more as his return on such a vast sum of money. But Government feels that because of the benefit which it is felt that this scheme will bring to the community the amount of money represents a risk that it is worthwhile to take. We have just decided to spend \$50,000 on emigration which is purely employment opportunity. This scheme will need a contribution of £30,000 from the Government and it is employment opportunity plus production enterprise. I feel for these reasons that honourable members should be prepared to sit down and having given this scheme sufficient consideration, see what it really means to the future of the island. With the national income at ten million dollars, more than 50 per cent. of the people are employed on a casual basis. The percentage employed on a permanent basis is very small, and they work for very low wages. With this economic background the committee recommended this scheme. I hope that honourable members who are really prepared to do something for the island will stop the argument that the scheme is too ambitious. You will have to say that it is impossible for this scheme to be an economic success, and I defy any honourable member to say that. I therefore have much pleasure in seconding the motion for the passing of the Resolution.

Mr. MILLER: I am anxious to see this Resolution pass the House. I remember that when we were discussing His Excellency the Governor's Message we were told that it was not necessary to discuss it in detail, but that when the Resolution came down we would be able to discuss them. Today we are asked to vote £30,000. I am in agreement with this scheme. I feel that it will be of great benefit to the

island. But why is there this anxiety to rush it through today? If we are going to spend £30,000 of the taxpayers' money, give us some idea about the scheme. In trying to persuade honourable members to vote for the Resolution the honourable senior member for St. Peter said that the scheme could not be looked upon in terms of failure. Any scheme will succeed as long as you throw money into it. I think, Sir, that anxiety to have this scheme started is shared by all members of this Chamber. But I would like to have some idea as to the details of the scheme. I am wondering whether the honourable senior member for St. Peter would be good enough to give me some idea of the details. I want to rigidly criticise the butter plant idea in the Governor's Message. The production of a pound of butter will take about 12 or 16 pints of milk. I think it will work out at about 8/- a pound. We are not making the fats and oils with which we could produce margarine. I am not altogether happy about it. I have a lot of confidence in the milk scheme, but I want to know why we should be asked to vote this money today without being given an idea as to the details.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The honourable senior member is anxious to see the scheme started, and the Government is most anxious. Knowing the terrible conditions in the world today, we do not wish to continue this delay of which the Government is always being accused. For the honourable member who has just spoken to say that he does not know the details of the scheme is a misstatement. The honourable member knows the whole contents of this matter, and what has come down now does not differ from what came to the House before.

Mr. MILLER: The honourable senior member for St. Joseph said specifically that we are not pinned down to the Message from the Governor.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If I may interrupt — the honourable senior member for St. Joseph is not in his place at present. If I heard him correctly, he said that the proposals must be drawn up by solicitors. The honourable senior member for St. Peter was quite correct when he said that you have had the details in the Governor's Message. There is no need to be under the illusion that you cannot refer to those details.

Mr. MILLER: I was thinking of what the honourable senior member for St. Peter said.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable senior member for St. Peter said that it is a misstatement to say that you do not know the details. He has referred to the Message of His Excellency the Governor which was discussed in this Chamber.

Mr. MILLER: If you would let me add, Sir, the details of the scheme are the finally considered scheme. The Message from the Governor just gave an idea of what would be done. So the question of my making a misstatement is wrong, because we are still without details of more or less the way in which the scheme will work. I will repeat: I am not in favour of a butter plant. I would prefer to see a plant for making condensed milk. If it was necessary to add another ten thousand pounds to a scheme that would work for the benefit of the people I would be in agreement with it. I do not see why we should produce butter at 8/- a pound when we can import fats and oils at a cheap price and make margarine. All I am asking for is to know the details of the scheme. When you find yourself with surplus milk what are you going to do with it? Are you going to make it into butter to sell at 8/- or 9/- a pound? In the beginning you will find yourself with a large supply of surplus milk, because it will be a long time before you can educate the people to use pasteurised milk, and if you skim milk it will lose its nutritive value. I am

asking for some assurance that the butter making plant will be exchanged for a condensed milk plant. Getting pasteurising equipment will be better than starting something with a chance of failure. An English engineer will be in charge of the butter making plant. Now, we import very little butter from England. You will find that we import 20 pounds of U.K. butter as against 385,000 pounds of butter from Canada and New Zealand and Australia. Why not get a man from one of those places who has had a lot of experience in this business? I have a lurking suspicion that a lot of this equipment will become obsolete in three or four years. In 1947 there was perfected a new process of pasteurising by ultra violet rays. You take the milk to a certain degree of temperature and then break it suddenly by refrigeration. I am eager to vote the money, but I would like to know what is going to happen.

Mr. WARD: I am not going to oppose this Resolution. I feel that the Government will not be running as great a risk as if they made it a free gift. The introducer of this Resolution has seen fit to cut out a certain portion of the paragraph. Since that portion has been cut out, I will ask the honourable senior member for St. Peter if he will accept the addition of a few words. I am suggesting the insertion of the words "as a loan towards" after the word "contribution" in line 5 and the deletion of the word "to" occurring immediately after the word "contribution". I am making that suggestion because the way it reads now may make it appear that Government's contribution is a gift. So I think it should be amended in order to make it clear that it is a loan. I suppose that the people who are starting this scheme should have some business ideas, and they should put up something that will pay. If Government pushes itself too far into it, and it fails, the producers will say that Government pushed its nose in and caused the scheme to fail. If the dairy people are establishing this scheme, I think it would be better to leave it to them to say what they are putting up as a beginning. If later they think that it is necessary to broaden out, they can come back to the House for more money to do so. As long as it is a loan we have nothing to fear because the building equipment will be able to pay back the £30,000. I feel that the producers are not starting off this scheme as a joke. This is the type of minor industry which, in my opinion, if it succeeds will be a good thing for the island. I feel that it is only a matter of time to see whether it will succeed or not.

Mr. WILKINSON: I am seconding the motion made by Mr. Ward. I am not going to say very much about it. It is something that I do not know anything about. As the honourable member who has just spoken has said, if those who are interested in the production of milk feel that it is a good scheme, I do not see why the Government should not make the loan. It might seem that it is a little too ambitious for the start, but I suppose that the producers and the Government's representatives will go into all that before they actually start. Personally, I would be inclined to start off on a smaller scale with an addition if it proves successful. I do hope that the Government and the producers will give that some consideration before they actually start.

Mr. ADAMS: I accept the amendment.

Mr. ALLDER: Does Government have any guarantee that in the case of failure they will not be left with the burden in their hands? Another point is that I hope we are not spending Government funds to create a monopoly in the production of milk. It seems that the only persons who were on this committee that made the recommendation were big producers. As one honourable member has said, the scheme is a grandiose one, inasmuch as the proposed

cost of the scheme is high. Another thing that I want to draw to the attention of the committee is that we are building a creamery to preserve milk. Before that creamery can be put into use, you have to have raw material, and as far as I can see there are no means of ensuring that the needs of householders will be met by the production of milk in large enough quantities. We have seen and heard that last week-end housewives had to go without meat. Regardless of what the newspapers have written, the evil does not lie in the butcher trying to outdo the speculator.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not want to hear the honourable member's views on the meat issue.

Mr. ALLDER: What I am trying to make out is this: you cannot make use of the creamery unless you have a sufficient quantity of milk. The first thing that you have to do is to satisfy the needs of the householders, as regards the milk that you are going to produce. That brings us to the question of stock. While I agree with the scheme to set up this creamery, I feel that we should have another sum of money to be expended for the purpose of creating a number of milk producing farms. At the same time that we are saying we want a creamery in which to preserve milk we cannot get a sufficient supply for householders. So, Mr. CHAIRMAN, I feel that we should seize the opportunity to do a greater measure of stock rearing, so that when this creamery is set up we will have sufficient milk being produced, and not have a lot of machinery lying idle. It is a fact that we are short of stock. Sometime ago I made the suggestion to Government that every peasant who wanted to start a dairy or buy a head of cattle and who did not have the means of doing so, should be able to benefit from a special fund set aside for the purpose of getting a loan to buy the cattle from which the island would be sure of a generous supply of milk and meat also. Not only should we do that. We should go further and compel the plantations which have accommodation for the rearing of stock to rear them. Since the introduction of motorised means of cultivation, plantations do not worry about the raising of cattle. They should be made to do so for the purpose of providing food for the population. I have also drawn the attention of the Government to the open pastures and gullies which produce fodder only for it to be mulched into the land, because estate owners no longer need to keep the number of stock that they had to formerly. No matter how hopeful a scheme is set up, it must be a failure unless you get down to the fundamentals. We have got an example in the Lancaster flour factory which has cost the taxpayers a lot of money. Even when a plant does not get raw material to keep it going, there is still a large overhead expenditure. I am warning the Government now before they create another white elephant that the first prerequisite is to get more stock into the hands of the peasants. You are going to spend £60,000 in machinery and plant, but no provision has yet been made for increasing the amount of raw material with which this factory has to work. My fear is that as soon as you start this scheme you will find the big milk producer who is able to keep 200 heads of cattle will be having a monopoly. Those are the persons who have now got dairies, and you will find that the man with one or two heads of cattle will be unable to cope with what the big producer is doing. Whatever we do we have to be careful that it does not retard the industrial progress of the man in the street. I have seen such a thing happen in the case of bread production and the production of aerated waters, minor industries on which many a small man has reared a family. They are all in the hands of big producers now. I do not want to know that we are assisting in adding another straw which might in the end break

the camel's back. We should have legislation to compel people who have the means of producing food on which the population must live to produce that food. Most of the food that is produced locally is produced by the poor peasant who does not have more than a couple of square feet of land, or a quarter or half acre. Tomatoes, bananas etc. are only produced by the peasant. All the broad acres are devoted to the production of sugar because it takes less labour to produce a field of canes than one of tomatoes. At the same time, the wealth of the island is drained, because we have to import commodities from the other countries at high prices because the standard of living of the worker in those countries is higher than ours. I say that these plantations should be made to keep heads of cattle, pigs, sheep and goats and all those things. Let us get away from sending these vast sums of money to the Argentine every year.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not want the honourable member to generalise.

Mr. ALLDER: I am thinking of the food production in the island. I am drawing it to the attention of the Government that when we spend money on that we spend it wisely. When you spend it rightly you get a more stable community, and you maintain a greater measure of employment, and employment of a permanent nature. I am definitely sure, sir, that I feel dissatisfied when I look at the Annual Report of the Customs and see the lot of money we spend importing condensed milk and milk powder. Powdered milk was once 80 cents a pound. Last week it went to \$1.48.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member must keep to the point and keep away from powdered milk.

Mr. ALLDER: I hope that my few points have not fallen on deaf ears. While it is good to realise this money for the establishment of a creamery we should address ourselves to helping the peasants to own more stock, and encourage them to produce more milk so that every householder would be able to get a pint of milk with ease and at a reasonable price, and the surplus can then go to the creamery.

Mr. H. A. DOWDING: I did not intend to speak on this Resolution, but after listening to the last honourable member I think it is my duty to say a few words on the matter. I hope you will bear with me if I appear to stray. It is my frank opinion that unless the peasants of this island co-operate with this scheme, that the scheme will and must become a failure. The honourable member seems to have the impression that there will be no benefit arising from a scheme like this for the peasants. That is something which at the initial stage of this scheme must be immediately denied. This, sir, is a loan from the Government to a co-operative which will be formed under the law governing co-operatives which the House of Assembly has already put on the Statute Book, and the benefits which will accrue to the producers of milk, including the peasants of this island are more than anyone can visualise at the present time. A scheme of this nature must succeed so long as it is a true co-operative. If a peasant has a few heads of stock nowadays, what benefit can he derive from them apart from supplying his own family with milk and may be some next door neighbours, in addition to the manurial value. In the scheme which we are now discussing we hope that the peasant will in time be able to deliver thousands and thousands of gallons of milk. I cannot sit here and allow the honourable member's statements to go unchallenged. There is another point. He talked about plantations having land lying idle. I do not know of any idle land today. The whole economic system of this

island depends on the canes that everyone has to cultivate. But I can say this, that there are several plantations today with acres of yams still in the ground because they have not been sold. I fail to see how anyone could accuse the plantations of not co-operating in the effort to produce food. The things that have to be imported are things which the island cannot at the present moment produce. This is a scheme that will make the island able not only to pasteurise milk for home consumption, but possibly, even to export some of it. I felt it my duty to make these remarks, as I have known of this scheme from its inception.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Sir,—It is not necessary for me to answer the fantastic remarks made by the honourable member for St. John. I think it is better to allow his ludicrous statements to go unanswered, rather than prolong the debate. I want to tell the honourable senior member for St. George that the Government has been paying attention to this scheme for the last four or five years, and I believe that the technical advisers of the Government are as interested in the success of the scheme as he would like them to be.

Mr. LEWIS: I do remember reading the Message which was attached to the Report of the Committee. It started out by saying that this scheme was one for assistance under Colonial Development and Welfare. Today we have not heard it stated definitely that C.D. & W. will be out of this scheme and that the Government of Barbados will be financing it or contributing towards it by way of a loan of half the capital cost. But it has been decided to cut C.D. & W. out, and the Government feels itself obligated to put up £30,000. I am only saying that for the record.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put to the Committee and agreed to unanimously.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, the Chairman reported, and the Speaker resumed the Chair and reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

On separate motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, the Resolution passed in Committee of Supply was read a first and second time and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am moving that this House do now adjourn until this day week at 3 p.m. I am hoping that it will be possible to have a small informal committee to deal with the Bill to control underground sources of water supply. I hope that honourable members will make it possible for us to meet this way so that we may be able to do something with it. Suggestions have been put up by members of the Opposition which Government officials are willing to meet half way so that we can get something done. If we can reach an agreement in this

informal committee we can deal with the measure next Tuesday. If the honourable senior member for St. Michael can arrange with the honourable junior member for St. James and the honourable junior member for St. Philip, it may be possible to get a committee of members of three parties. I would like to point out that we will be establishing a bad precedent if we do not have the annual prorogation as soon as possible. The only reason for the non-prorogation is that there are some outstanding Bills in the Other Place which should be passed first. So, I am suggesting that we meet every week in case something comes down from the Other Place. Apart from the Water Resources Bill, the Government does not intend to do anything else. I now move formally that this House do now adjourn until this day week at 3 p.m.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am moving an amendment to the honourable member's motion. I do not think we should adjourn for one week. We have worked right through the Estimates Tuesday after Tuesday, sometimes until mid-night. I want to say too that the Government opposed the sending of the Water Resources Bill to a Select Committee, and Government postponed consideration because two not very important sections were postponed. I am making this point because the hon'ble senior member for St. Joseph wants us to meet in an informal way and discuss the matter. I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition will agree with me when I say that we have expressed our views. We asked to have the word "well" defined, and it was argued that that would be unscientific. It was brought to our notice in black and white where the word is defined in Bills in other colonies. If the honourable senior member for St. Joseph wants us to meet again I am willing to meet, but he knows our position in the matter. I think we should adjourn for more than two weeks. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has at times during consideration of the Estimates kept us here against the own feeling until 12 mid-night. I agree that if there is anything that the Government has to be done urgently the Opposition will be always willing to come. The Water Bill is nothing that we have to do in a hurry. Even if you are getting paid it does not matter, because employees are eligible for two weeks' holiday with pay.

I move, Sir, that the words "this day week" be deleted, and the words "this day three weeks" be inserted.

Mr. DOWDING seconded.

Question that the words proposed to be inserted stand part was put the vote and decided on a division as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. GARNER, Mr. MOTTLEY, Mr. DOWDING, Mr. WARD, Mr. HAYNES, Mr. WILKINSON, Mr. GILL, Mr. GODDARD, and Mr. REECE. — (9).

Noes: Mr. ALLDER, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MAPP, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. COX, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Dr. CUMMINS, and Mr. ADAMS — (8).

Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.