

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1954—55

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

11th January, 1955.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 3 o'clock p.m. today.

PRESENT:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*), Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*), His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS (*Deputy Speaker*), Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Communications, Works & Housing*), Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Chairman of Committees*), Mr. T. O. BRYAN, Mr. F. C. GODDARD, (*Leader of Opposition*), Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. J. A. HAYNES, B.A., Mr. E. ST. A. HOLDER and Mrs. E. E. BOURNE.

Prayers were read.

Mr. J. C. Mottley and Mr. O. T. Alder entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meetings which were held on the 7th and 14th December, which were printed and circulated were taken as read and confirmed.

Mr. Barrow entered the House and took his seat.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. M. E. COX: On behalf of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries, I am commanded by His Excellency the Governor to lay the Report of Study of the Scotland District, by Dr. T. S. Buie.

GOVERNMENT NOTICE

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:—

Resolution to place the sum of \$1,800 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1954-55, Part I, Current, as shown in Supplementary Estimate 1954-55 No. 35 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meet-

ing to deal with the Resolution of which notice has just been given.

STATEMENT ON EMIGRATION

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, before I enter on the Orders of the Day, I am asking leave to make a statement to the House on Emigration to the United Kingdom. The statement reads thus:—

Members will be aware that in answer to a Parliamentary question on 16th December the Home Secretary said in the House of Commons that Her Majesty's Government have under consideration the whole question of the immigration of British subjects into the United Kingdom. Until a decision has been taken on future policy it is unlikely that Her Majesty's Government will be in a position to discuss ways and means of facilitating immigration from Barbados.

Nevertheless, the Government has decided, after consultation with Her Majesty's Government, that the Minister for Trade, Industry and Labour and the Labour Commissioner should visit England later this month to look into the practical issues affecting those Barbadians who have recently gone to England in search of work. While the scope of their enquiries must in the circumstances be restricted the delegation will take the opportunity of representing the Barbados case to the authorities concerned.

Meanwhile certain information about the conditions facing immigrants on arrival has been received and is being published.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the colony.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1954-55, NO. 32

Pig-Rearing Industry

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to deal with Item No. 1, standing in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I would just only like to say that matters of this sort should be done by the House, so that the House could give the necessary permission to the Hon. Minister to take charge of Items standing in the name of someone else. I am not raising objection, but I am bringing to your notice what I consider the correct procedure.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are not objecting?

Mr. LEWIS: No sir.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the honourable member and this Committee, I wish to say that it was an oversight on my part.

3.25 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: This Resolution is for the sum of \$24,760 to supplement the Resolution which was agreed to by this House during the latter part of 1954. As you will remember, Mr. Chairman, the House has already accepted the policy of reducing as far as possible the subsidy on pickled meat imported into this colony, by encouraging the production of local pig-breeding. As a result of that, the House agreed to the subsidy of \$8,000 with the hope that that amount would have carried us through to the end of the financial year. Since the scheme started, it has been shown that quite a number of people have come forward to take advantage of the scheme; and as you will see from the figures there was an under-estimate when we agreed to the sum of \$8,000. The Addendum to this Resolution reads as follows:—

"The original estimate of the cost of the pig breeding scheme, which was inaugurated on the 6th October, 1954, was \$16,000 per annum exclusive of additional travelling, and was based on a figure of 2,000 litters per annum. In a first report dated 27th November, 1954, the Director of Agriculture disclosed that between the 6th October and the 6th November 218 litters had been inspected comprising in all 1,531 piglets, an average of 7.02 piglets per litter. The number of piglets born during the period indicated an annual rate of about 3,000 litters per annum as against 2,000 estimated. The amount of feed issued up to the 6th November was 30,300 lbs. an average of 139 lbs. per litter, costing \$2,475.

In a further report the Director of Agriculture has stated that the number of applications for subsidy issues of feed received between the 6th October and the 27th November was 600. This gives an annual rate of about 4,400 litters. The cost of feed issued up to the 27th November was \$8,000, so that funds are now exhausted. Expenditure on feed is thus now running on a monthly rate of about \$4,700 or \$56,400 per annum. This may increase as the effect of the scheme is felt. The Director of Agriculture also reports that the cost of feed has recently been increased from \$7.85 to \$8.80 per 100 lbs.

It is accordingly recommended that supplementary provision of \$24,760 be made available to meet the following items of expenditure for the remainder of the present financial year:—

And the breakdown of the amount is given as follows:—

(i) feed and transport (for 4 months at \$5,500)	\$22,000
(ii) incidentals	760
(iii) travelling allowances	2,000
Total	\$24,760

I am sure that hon. members will support this Resolution, seeing that the people who breed pigs are taking advantage of the scheme.

It is a means of improving an increase in the production of meat in this island, and at the same time, reducing the amount which we normally import for which we have to look for the necessary dollars to pay the bills. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is not in his place; and I am also sorry that the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour is not here, because both of them are concerned in this matter. This is a much bigger issue than just finding the money for encouraging pig-breeding in this island; we all want to encourage pig-breeding in this island, but there are other ways of doing it more efficiently. To begin with, the Hon. Minister who introduced this Resolution stated, that they thought the amount of \$8,000 would have been sufficient in this matter; well, that defeats the very object at which they are aiming. We hoped that \$100,000 would have been spent in this direction and we would have had an industry which is worth while. The more money you spend on pig-breeding, the bigger the industry will be. This estimate in the first place was so wrong, that I wondered if any estimate has ever been worse than this. It has now turned out that the estimate is the vicinity of between \$56,000 and \$60,000 a year; and somebody must have been responsible for these figures at the beginning. We have a Department of Science and Agriculture, we have animal husbandry, and they must have been aware of the number of pigs that are in this island and the possible number of litters we would have had in these six months. I am wondering who went wrong in this matter. I know of cases where people have been unable to get pigs' feed for the last five or six weeks; not because of the Resolution being delayed but because something went wrong at the Agriculture Department. It was a bad estimate at the beginning. When they saw that the money was running out, why didn't they come back to the House before? We are just nibbling in this matter. A more effective means of dealing with this matter would be to take the controls off pork and let us get the market value. The price of pigs' feed has gone up; how can we expect people to supply feed at the same price? In Barbados the price of pork is 2/- per lb; in Trinidad they are getting as much as 70c. per pound for pork. Let us not keep down the Cost of Living in Barbados at the expense of the pig breeders; that is false economy. We want to keep down the cost of living by suffering the Pig Industry and that cannot be done. We are subsidizing Canadian pickled pork and that should be stopped immediately. The Government is now getting out its Estimates for the coming year, and it wants to save time. Earlier in the year, Questions were tabled. Let the Government save money at the Control here relative to the taking off of control; what is the Government doing about that? Let them make up their minds between now and the month of

March; let them stop all controls which are hampering the progress of this colony.

3.35 p.m.

You want to encourage the Pig Industry, but at the same time you are stifling it by keeping the ceiling on the price far below what it should be. If you take an example from Trinidad, (you always take examples from other countries when it suits you) the price of pork in Trinidad is 70c. per lb; in Barbados it is 49c. per lb; is it fair? The price of feed has gone up during the last three or four months, but Government has not seen fit to raise that ceiling or take it off. Prices will jump, but they will settle down when people start to raise more pigs.

That is the only way you can encourage the industry. Give it every facility and every scope. That is why I regret that those two Ministers are not in their places. What I am saying is directed to them. They will formulate policy now that the Estimates are under consideration. One Minister is concerned with Pig Production and the other with the Cost of Living and Trade. One is concerned with subsidies and the other with Pig Production. I hope however, that the Minister now in charge of this Resolution will relay to them the remarks of the House today.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I too have a word to say on the matter. I believe that the House will agree that from six years ago, it was my idea that you should encourage the rearing of pigs. I think it is on record in the *Gazette* that when this scheme first came before the House I criticised the idea at the time, and said it was a difficult thing to work. You are overtaxing the Agriculture Department. We have a skilled officer as the Director of Agriculture, but I do not know that he can do anything more than look at files and search his desk. I wonder if the administration of this scheme still rests with the Director.

Under his administration there is the Cane Breeding Station separate and distinct; there is the Government laboratory end of it; the Director is also supposed to be in charge of the Fisheries Department, the Central Live-Stock Station, the other outside stations, and he has to be on all the Boards of Agriculture. If you really examine the position you will see, that much as I would like to press home the blame for the recklessness evinced in the first instance, what I said on the last occasion is on record and I am only here today to say that exactly what I have said has come true.

You can see what I mean when you realise that for this one scheme alone, travelling allowances have come to \$2,000. This is only one small branch of the Department of Agriculture. Originally, the idea of the Committee that sat on this matter was to develop the pig-industry so that we could to some extent, decrease or completely do away with the importation of pickled-pork; because on the island, we could produce enough or even a surplus of pork.

It is unfortunate that the Minister of Agriculture is not in his seat today. I do not know if the Minister of Communications is expected to take much notice of what we are saying on this matter, except to take notes for the Minister of Agriculture. The government is missing the point of this scheme. The idea is not to pump or press new capital into the industry with the hope that something will expand, or that you will blunder into success. It involves technical knowledge and planning.

What you should do is, if you are seeking to improve the strain to empower the Department of Agriculture to go around the country and if they sees any unwanted or unsuitable boars, to do away with them. What I mean is, that if a peasant has

an unsuitable boar weighing 100 lbs. exchange it with the peasant for a suitable one weighing 150 lbs. and settle the difference. At the moment, we have what I can describe as a pig factory, much to the credit of the Department. I think that the Director together with the Veterinary Officer, are entitled to some praise for the interest they have put into the new scheme. This pig factory should be encouraged. What are we doing with the boars from that Department that are released for slaughter? Government should go around and release for slaughter all unsuitable boars, since insemination is not yet practicable. You are giving a form of inducement, by presenting 200 lbs of feed for over six piglets after the owner of the piglets has paid nine or ten cents a pound for feed which bears no relevant value to the price of pork. For some reason or other, you prefer to continue on the same basis. The very feed that is fed to the piglets is not suitable. It cannot be regarded as a pig ration; and it was not created with that idea. It lacks the natural proteins essential for growth and development.

The question of feed can be simply arranged. The Cassava Factory was run at a loss last year by way of subsidising the potato industry. Potato meal was sold at about three cents a pound to the people who produce animal feeds which eventually sold at ten or eleven cents a pound. It is farcical. You can produce pig chow for sale at six or seven cents a pound. They are people who are anxious to help the Government in a scheme of this sort. If you can produce this pig chow and sell it at a reduced rate then you will be doing something.

I repeat sir, that where this scheme is concerned the Government is missing the point. This scheme is possessed of great potentialities but the approach to it is wrong. As I said before, a speech of this type would have an entirely different significance if the Minister of Agriculture was in his seat. I know that the Head of the Department is responsible to some extent for everything connected with Agriculture; but I say again, that he is being over worked. He is in charge of all the matters that I referred to before, not forgetting the Mealy Bug Pest which is something you cannot eliminate by any quick means. I do not see how he can in any one day and attend to all the work which he has to do in this particular department. This scheme deserves proper examination in the future so as to make it work and pay to the community, the dividends which it can pay if handled properly.

3.45 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, it is most regrettable that today we have three Ministers concerned with this matter absent from the House. Not only is the Minister of Agriculture who is directly concerned with pig-breeding absent but as the honourable junior member for Christ Church said, the Minister of Trade who may be mixed up in any subsidy going outside or the taking off or relaxing of controls is also absent. Then you have the Minister of Finance. All three of these Ministers are absent today. I suppose that the Minister of Communications has done his best to tell us all he knows about the scheme; so we have to be grateful for the little that we have got.

So far as this Addendum is concerned, it is one of figures. I am going to suggest to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture to stop bringing in figures; if he continues to bring in figures, he is going to lose any reputation he may have. Either he does not know how to make them up, or the people who make them up for him are not disposed to put them in the best light. However, I hope that on this occasion these are correct facts. When the Govern-

ment stated that on the last occasion this figure was based on 2,000 litters per annum what did it mean? I would like the Hon. Minister of Communications to tell me something; he must have been given some information to deal with this matter, or he should leave the matter over until the Hon. Minister who knows something of it comes in to deal with it. Is there nothing in the files to say on what those figures were based? Was this another St. Lucy bye-election trick trumped up? Did the Government pick this number out of the air? If it is based on anything at all, it should be based on some idea of what the killing of pigs is. You should say that this is the number which will meet the requirements, therefore you are prepared to subsidise on that number. You should have a census taken to the best of your ability, so that if anything went wrong and you came in here and said so, we would be obliged to sympathise with you. Sir, this figure must be based on something. If you are to avoid the charge, that in the month of October you just only brought in something to fool the public because there was a bye-election, you must be able to state the source of information.

During the last war, the Agricultural Department became our war department. There was not one officer in that Department who had anything to do with agriculture, that his direction was not turned to doing something for the war.

With that large army of Peasant Instructors over there, I am asking whether better information could not be given to the Ministry. In order to supply people with pork you made provision to subsidise 2,000 litters of pigs; you now discover that the figure is 4,400; at least that is what they are saying. Do you think you have any right to subsidise this scheme unless you were only doing so to make a show? I ask again, how did you arrive at the figure of 2,000 litters? Did you arrive at that figure because it was a round number? There is not one thing in this Addendum to show what was the method of assessment; nothing at all. You now discovered that you are getting twice as much as 2,000 and more than that, and you still come back in to subsidise it. They have now discovered that instead of sows having litters of six, they are having litters of seven. Is seven a lucky number for pigs and pig breeders?

The honourable member who should know something of this matter says that this stock feed has gone up in recent months. That can mean anything to the Government.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I object to the honourable member saying, that I said something about my knowing something about this matter.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, who said that he said something? I was referring to the honourable junior member for Christ Church. I said, the word "recently" when used by the Government can only mean in this instance that from the moment Government started subsidising this feed, the price has gone up. Government has taken off the duty of stock feed so as to keep the price down, but it has still risen. Has Government made an investigation to see that this is a reasonable increase on stock feed? These are things which the Government should look into. I remember very well that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture did not even second the motion for the Item standing part of the Head on the last occasion. The Minister of Finance could not even second it and give information. The Ministers cannot even understand that is what they should be doing and what they are paid for doing. Let them

take note from the Other Place. This is a scandalous affair. I told them on the last occasion that this scheme was nonsense. Even if there is no policy, do you mean to say that you have to wait until there is some catastrophe or some bye-election to do something? Are there no statistics in this island to be had on this matter? Do you mean to say that the Department of Science and Agriculture with all its Peasants Instructors all over the island cannot supply you with anything better? Surely eleven Vestries with their Sanitary Inspectors to see after pig sties, should be able to tell you something about this. Could Government not get some inventory on it? Do you mean to say that the Department just rushed into this matter for the sake of doing something and because there was money in the Treasury to do it? Do you mean to say that they only said: "Give us \$8,000 let us make a show and we will double up on it?" Do you mean to say that you started a scheme on the 6th October and you come back today with something for three times as much money to carry it on until the end of March? I ask again, where did you get the figure of 2,000 from?

There are too bad aspects to this matter. They do not see that as soon as they subsidise something, that the price goes up. Government is no terror for private enterprise; the only persons the Ministers of the Government try to terrorise is the people in their own Party. If you read the Minister of Agriculture's speech on the last occasion, you will see that the term "private enterprise" was every other phrase in the statement. Another thing is this: the Hon. Minister has made no statement at all as to what will happen to Controls. These Controls are leaving business in the hands of a few big people. We have never had an exposure of our control system nor have we ever had an enquiry into it.

3.55 p.m.

That is a most unfortunate thing both for the people who are doing the control and also for the populace; it is most unsatisfactory. I heard the Hon. Minister say something about a number of people! From where? St. Vincent, St. Lucia or were they not in existence when the Government made their investigations? They should have known the number of people who were coming forward up to a reasonable point at least; they should not be more than three times out. They said that something would cost \$8,000 and now to-day they are asking for really five times as much. Is that their method of conducting the important business of the people of this country? Mr. Chairman, nothing would give me greater joy than to hear the hon. senior member for St. Michael, (the Minister of Communications) as a member outside of Government which brought down something like what has been brought down here to-day—the Hon. Minister being accompanied by, or led by the Hon. Premier! What would they say of any Government which did something like this? Would any estimate they gave of anything stand the light of day? This is a grossly unfair and unbusinesslike manner of dealing with the peoples' representatives; it is unfair to the taxpayers and to everybody else, because the scheme has not been gone into properly. It was hatched up at a psychological moment and brought down here; you cannot escape the charge of gross neglect of your duty; and a severe and grave censure should fall on the head of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture. He is getting a little too genial in here, and he will promise hon. members all sorts of things and that he will bring them up for consideration, but he has never done so. He will say: "I welcome that information" and he has never brought in what he has promised. The

Hon. Minister can copy down the names of all the hon. members who have spoken, or he can do what he has been led to do. Hon. members are perfectly willing to subsidise the pig-breeding industry so long as the Government knows what they are doing; but to tell me that they are satisfied with 2,000 litters a year, although they are getting more than that, is something which is seriously wrong. Surely there will come a time when a serious charge will have to be laid against some Minister. [A MINISTER: Collective responsibility.] If we find that a Minister is so grossly incompetent, we have a right to deal with him. When you say that something is wrong, a Minister says "you mean me" therefore, if something is really proved to be wrong, you will mean him.

Mr. BARROW: No one who is a student of the political debates which take place in this Chamber, could regard anything that I have to say now as a demonstration of my opposition to the pig-breeding scheme; because, like the hon. member for St. Philip some months ago I gave notice of a series of Questions in which I intimated to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture that the money which is now being spent on the subsidisation of salted pork from overseas could better be spent on the subsidisation of local agriculture and pig-breeding schemes. Like many other Questions which have been asked in this Chamber from time to time, those Questions have remained unanswered. But Mr. Chairman, it does give me some sense of achievement to say that the Government has indirectly admitted the validity of my strictures on points such as the ones I have just enumerated, by the introduction of measures which I have advocated and of which I have asked Questions. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I have every reason for repeating that only one who is completely unacquainted with the course of political debates in this House, would accuse me of being opposed to this scheme. I feel myself all the more in a position to say what I am going to say now, because I happened to be an incipient pig-breeder myself; not that I am hoping to take advantage of this pig-breeding scheme, but I am interested from more than one point of view in the success of the scheme. I would only say this now: a cursory examination of the Addendum which has been so thoughtfully read out by the Hon. Minister of Communications for the benefit of those honourable members of this House whom he thinks cannot read, will disclose — 4.05 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: I must object to those remarks on a point of Order. It is customary in this House to read an Addendum, Objects and Reasons, and things of that sort.

Mr. BARROW: I was only trying to illustrate that all that has been vouchsafed to the members of this House was a poor reading of the Addendum which we had already read. No supplementary explanation or further enlightenment on this point on which members of the House would most like information, was given us either by the Minister of Agriculture or by the Minister who has just taken his seat.

To come back to the point. Reading the Addendum for one's self, one can only come to the conclusion that both the Minister of Agriculture and the Director of Agriculture are completely ignorant of the facts of life. By that I mean, that anyone who had had even a nodding acquaintance with the four-legged animals that are the subject of this heated debate would know, that the normal period of gestation of a sow is four months; and that the average sow can produce two litters per year, and the average litter in Barbados now that we have improved

the strain even for peasants, is between seven and eight piglets.

It seems therefore, if you accept those premises which are merely the facts of life, and which anyone interested in Agriculture as the Minister of Agriculture should be, or any one versed in animal husbandry as someone in that Department should be, they would be aware that even before this scheme was embarked upon the amount of money which was asked for originally to tide the scheme over until the end of the financial year, was hopelessly inadequate.

Over and above all that, there is another significant disclosure in the Addendum. We have had that drawn to our attention by the honourable junior member for the City. It seems to be almost axiomatic now in Barbados, that the subsidisation of any particular commodity, whether direct or indirect subsidy, (by that I mean a subsidy paid directly to the wholesalers and retailers, or alternatively a subsidy paid to the consumers) it seems to be axiomatic that that subsidy is the occasion for an increase in price of the particular commodity.

That brings me, sir, to some other Questions (which also remained unanswered) that I asked in this Chamber a few months ago. That Question was to the effect, whether the Ministers on principle agreed that the Control Board was serving any useful social or economic purpose, and would the Ministers issue a statement or take steps for the removal of price controls. As the honourable junior member for Christ Church said, a liberalisation of trade in Barbados in contra-distinction to the restriction of trade in Barbados in the hands of a few monopolistic circles.

No excuse has been given to the members of the public, both to those who buy balanced feed for the purpose of feeding pigs or to those who buy it for the purpose of feeding cattle to produce milk. No reason has been given as to why the price of imported feed should sky-rocket by approximately 12½ per cent. on the implementation of the scheme to subsidise pig breeders. I shudder to think what would have happened if members of the House in all good faith had decided (and it is a laudable scheme) to subsidise dairy-keepers in order to encourage the production of milk and the rearing of cattle in this island. I say that, because for some 2,000 sows, (I am basing my estimates on my final analysis, as given by the Minister of Communications) 4,400 litters or 2,000 sows, approximately can create a substantial increase in the price of a commodity that is almost indispensable to animal husbandry in this island.

I hate to think what would have happened, if we had succumbed to the blandishments of the dairy-keepers and subsidise the cost of food stuff for cattle. I would like to make a statement now. I am not asking any more Questions. I would like to draw to the attention, or I would like it drawn to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture, that balanced feed can be imported from the Commonwealth of Australia at a price substantially below that which prevailed at the time that this scheme was implemented in October. I would like to make another statement for the benefit of the Minister, and that is, that not only could balanced feed be imported from the Commonwealth of Australia, but balanced feed was in fact imported into this colony at a price substantially below the price of the feed now mixed by Messrs. DaCosta & Co. Ltd., and other firms who are in a favourable position; and it is entirely due to the machinations of the same Control Board that we have not had any further

importations for balanced feed for cattle from Australia. A *fortiori* it would follow, that the increase in price must be laid at the door of this Board set up by the Government.

Mr. Chairman, you will know from your experience that I am not given to making accusations, unless I have had an opportunity of scrutinising the evidence and arriving at some conclusion as to the veracity of any statements which I may feel disposed to make in this Chamber. I am not in the habit of fulminating against any particular firm or firms, or against any particular department or departments of Government for the sake of drawing attention to myself or to my constituency; but I am speaking on a matter of public importance, (that is one of the basic principles of democratic Government) the growth of monopolistic practices in this colony, which I feel are entirely against the public interest.

I would like to sound a note of warning: anything that I have said, has been said in good faith. Unless I get some satisfactory proof from someone on the Government benches that this state of affairs is going to be given the widest possible publicity, and that it would be brought to an end (if it is within the power of the Government to bring to an end this rather unfortunate practice) I intend to raise the matter again on the floor of this House.

I would end by saying this: it is high time that we employ Heads of Departments in this colony who at least know the facts of life.

4.15 p.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I am not in my right place, but I have the same things in my head. I would like this scheme examined. I agreed with it in the beginning because it was one of those things dealing with food production. There is a habit in Barbados to consider that when you speak of a desirable thing, you need not examine the financial implications of it. Take water for example; water is an essential thing; and to many people it does not matter how much money you expend to get it. You can go right in the stratosphere and if you get that and nothing else, it does not matter.

When you examine this scheme, I see nothing in it for anyone to pat themselves on the back. Mr. Chairman, I believe you have some knowledge of this matter; but even if you do not have much knowledge of this matter, it is just a matter of simple arithmetic. From what is set out in the Addendum, you can see that the average number of litters which you can expect is 4,400 per annum; and if it is going to cost the Government \$17 per litter, the Government must ask itself this question: do you think the amount of money used for this purpose is in the best interest of the community? You should also look into the question of whether by your subsidising pig breeders, whether you should begin to subsidise dairy-keepers for every pint of milk they produce, because, as you know, milk is a very desirable food for children. Each child should have two pints of milk a day. Government should ask itself this question: are we going to subsidise milk so as to allow everybody or every child to have an adequate supply of it?

I do not know anything of the scheme so far as it concerns bacon, ham and the by-products of pork; but it does seem to me, that the Government should be issued a warning by me on this scheme to-day and the warning is this: if I vote for this \$24,760 Resolution to-day to continue this scheme, it is only because I wish to give the Government the opportunity of re-examining this scheme. Government should be able to re-examine this matter

during this time and consider, if \$75,000 per annum on this scheme is what they want to embark upon. If the original figures were the ones you intended to work on, you can clearly see that you are now embarking on a scheme which is four times greater.

Another thing you must bear in mind, is that in a scheme such as this you are not increasing the purchasing power of the community. If you take this money and throw it into this scheme, it cannot be reflected in the purchasing power of the community. You are not in any way expanding the economy of the island by this project. This is not a project in which you put money into circulation, or one in which people get employment. You are not even providing the people with more food. No one will tell you that this is a climate in which you need to eat a lot of meat. As a matter of fact, there are a lot of people in this island, (I will say too many) who are suffering from high blood pressure. What do you find, sir, by this Resolution; you find that you are spending close on \$100,000 on a scheme which you never intended to spend that amount. I do not believe anybody would suggest that the Government intended to spend this amount of money on this scheme. What is going to happen, if to-morrow dairies ask for some subsidy to produce more milk for the people. I say that because it is known that many more people pay a lot of money for milk to drink.

Sir, by this scheme you are taking up \$100,000 and paying it out; and you yourself cannot justify it, because it is the figment of somebody's imagination. Sir, you have to think in terms of relating your economics to the 20th century way of thinking rather than to the 18th century when people had corned-pork jars. I feel we can as well face this thing frankly and see what it bears to your economy. If I vote for this Resolution to-day it is purely to give Government the opportunity to re-examine this scheme. I do not think this scheme can be justified from an economic point of view.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to remark that as far as I remember, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture on the last occasion did say that this was a well and carefully thought out scheme; and he gave some figures too. I am asking the Hon. Minister of Communications who has been brave enough to undertake this Resolution, to say something in reply. Let us know where this thing went wrong. Surely if you say that you have collective responsibility, you should tell us something. I am sure when this Item was discussed in Executive Committee all of the members of the Government were present. Certainly you can tell me, if any disciplinary action was taken against the people who concocted figures like this to get money out of the Treasury. Certainly, we need to know something. Members of this House cannot walk around and check up on everything themselves. Mr. Chairman, as you know, you received a copy of this Resolution only last night; Of course we knew something of it because an attempt was made to push it through on the last occasion we met. I know of one member who received his papers only today. Certainly, sir, we are entitled to know something more about this matter. We have a Ministerial system now. We are paying for this system. Certainly, there must be somebody who should do this work. There must be some basis on which you arrived at this figure of 2,000 litters.

The Agricultural Department particularly, is one which I am sure you can cut the personnel in half and the island will lose nothing by it. If they particularly got rid of some of the scientific officers, they will have a far more efficient department. I

am listening to hear exactly where this thing went wrong; and I hope that the Hon. Minister realises that after six months an estimate of five times as much has been made. It is really more than five times as much, because the estimate was \$8,000 and now it is over \$40,000.

4.25 p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: Before the honourable member replies, I think it is fair that I should state that the increased price of feed has not been the result of the previous Resolution. The Government is not subsidising the pigs' feed; the Government is buying feed for these pig-keepers whose pigs have litters. The price of the feed has risen and I do know that the public can, (if they are not prepared to pay the price of balanced animal feed) buy oil-meal, pollard and cornmeal and mix the feed themselves at a price which is not in advance of what the Comptroller of Supplies (if he still has the power to fix these prices) has fixed it. I am in this business; and unless I had made that statement, it would appear to my brothers in the business that I did not give the facts. The prices are controlled by the merchants and their association. I repeat that the increased price of feed has not been the result of the previous Resolution; the price of feed has gone up generally, and we will buy in the cheapest market. We buy pollard from Africa, oilmeal from America or Canada which ever is cheaper, and we have to buy more because people seem to think that the Canadian oilmeal is better than the American oilmeal although it is more expensive. The exchange has increased continuously over the last few months; and all that has contributed to the increased price of feed.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, it was I who made the remark that the amount had been increased thus when it was being subsidised; and it was a form of the subsidy of the feed. The Government is buying this feed and giving it to the people.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I omitted to make a point during my speech on the first occasion, and that was in connection of the matter of travelling allowance. If you look at this scheme, you will see that with the expenditure of \$24,000, nearly 10% (that is to say \$6,000) is in respect of travelling allowances. We are spending \$2,000 in travelling allowance with a scheme in which we are giving the people pigs' feed! Imagine anywhere else outside of Barbados, that where a man is receiving a gift, you have to spend \$6,000 in order to make him that gift. I really want to know what this travelling allowance involves. If you are giving people feed, what is the use of giving them a lot of padding in order to make them believe that everything must be taken to their door-step? Why have you got to take special officers to send them around? You must send an Inspector to see if a man's pig has litters, but you cannot make a man take his pigs to the Department. This idea of playing up to the people does not make any sense. People who are giving birth to children have to go to a Health Centre, and why don't you co-ordinate your services in this Department? I do not know if they have special inspectors doing this job, because this matter is under the Agricultural Department's scheme already. In this Resolution Government does not have to come down for travelling allowance, I must say that we are more than generous in this age with people who are working for their salary. In this scheme \$6,000 would be paid out in travelling allowance so as to provide these people with this pigs' feed! This is a matter in which the Government should see whether they can economise. Why have they got to spend \$6,000 per annum extra so as to provide the peasants with

a scheme of this sort? Any peasant who cannot put himself to some inconvenience in getting a gift, is not deserving of that gift. If I vote for this Resolution this afternoon I do so only in order that when the Estimates are brought down, a more realistic approach will be made to this matter; because in this age, it is of no use petting people. I repeat: I would like to hear the reason for the payment of this \$6,000 in travelling allowance in order to carry out this inspection.

4.35 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that honourable members were here when this question was first debated, in view of the fact that all the points being brought out by the Minister of Agriculture, and in view of the fact that the House accepted the policy of the scheme in principle, and realising that this Resolution is only to increase the vote to carry the scheme over the financial year, I did not think it necessary to go into all the details as was done in October when the scheme was first before the House.

Now today, the honourable junior member for the City wanted to find out who is responsible for the scheme, what is the method of assessment, who got these figures as to how many piglets are calculated for, and whether people came from St. Lucia, St. Vincent or elsewhere to get this feed. I was under the impression that the Minister of Agriculture (when he dealt with this matter before the House in October) had pointed out the necessity for the people concerned to go to the various agricultural stations and report the birth of piglets; and that after the reports were made, the Peasant Agricultural Inspector would pay a visit to the peasants and see whether the cases were eligible ones and to see how many piglets there were, so that the Department would know how much feed an individual qualified for.

Mr. Chairman, the Agricultural Department is responsible for the scheme as put up to the House. The Department gives us the figures. They go into the whole set-up and tells us how many pigs were slaughtered during the year, how many piglets were born, how short we are in meat, if we have got so many sows or so many pigs, and whether with the increase in the pig population how much meat you will get etc. The question of under-estimating is no fault of the Minister. It may be the fault of the Department. The Minister has not got the time to go and see all these pigs. The information as I said, comes from the Department. This is what the Department has put up, and the Minister has worked on these figures.

It should be borne in mind that this scheme is a sort of pilot scheme. This scheme was started so that we could see whether we could reduce the cost of the production of meat and at the same time, encourage people to breed and rear pigs in order to produce the amount of meat which we import from the various countries. Having agreed to the scheme, I thought that members of this Committee would be justified in giving the scheme a fair chance. Three months is not sufficient time. As a matter of fact, it is not yet three months since the scheme started. The honourable junior member for St. Peter dealt with pork alone and not with agriculture. I do not say that with any joy, because more often than not persons who have a little wealth, get it out of the land; but the question of fertilizers also comes under this scheme. It is not only a question of meat, but also a question of manure to which no consideration has been given.

Taking that into consideration, and taking how much you spend yearly in subsidisation of imported meat and comparing it with what you

have to spend on subsidising this scheme, I think you can come to some conclusion as to whether you wish to continue with the scheme or whether we should abandon it and continue to subsidise imported meat.

The Leader of the Opposition raised the point about removing controls. That has been discussed and debated. We have fought elections on that point; and in our platform we have made it crystal clear that we are not prepared to remove controls until we are sure that the controls serve no useful purpose. We are not convinced that the removal of control on certain items is in the interest of the community. As you will remember, sometime ago the control was removed from pork and no sooner had it been removed, than pork jumped from 42c. to 60c. a lb. The Leader of Opposition quoted the case of Trinidad. He said that in Trinidad you pay 70c. a pound for pork. Without casting any reflection on Trinidad, I am sure that the people of this island much prefer buying pork in Barbados at 48c. a pound.

We know, as I have said, that no sooner than a control is removed on a particular item, the price of that item goes up. We have had that experience with almost every item on which control has been removed. [A MEMBER: But the price goes back down.] I do not know about the price going back down. Every day we cry out for the cost of living; but you are asking the Government, although that you are saying that people can hardly exist under this cost of living, to take off controls although experience has shown that no sooner than you remove controls the price of the particular item goes up. There is no item on which control has been removed that has become cheaper. The reverse is true. To say that when you remove controls from these items the price will go up and then level off itself, is no catch to the Government.

As I have said, this scheme has just started and people who know that this scheme is in existence are waiting to take advantage of it. There are many people anxious to do that. The money, (as is explained in the Addendum) is all gone, and there are quite a few people who have young pigs (and who have not been able to get the feed that others have got as an inducement under this scheme. 4.45 p.m.)

I can only say, sir, I agree with any member who suggests that the scheme should be re-examined; because, for you to grope in the dark so to speak, you will not be in a position to see whether this is economical or not, unless you take everything into consideration. However, I must repeat that it is too early for one to say whether the scheme is workable or whether it is economical or not.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know if I have replied to all the points made by honourable members; however, I do not agree with the suggestion of the honourable junior member for the City that there was any fooling in this scheme. This was a scheme which was brought to the notice of the House in the Five Year Plan of Development and Taxation. It was brought before the House in 1952. Any honourable member who cares to refer to our Five Year Plan on Development and Taxation will see that in that plan, provision was made for the encouragement of pig-breeding in this island. This is nothing new; it is only a question of the matter being implemented during the time Ministerial Government came into being. As I have said, already, it was a good effort on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture and it should be given a fair trial before it is really condemned. Of course I should have drawn to your attention

that the principle has already been accepted. If you do not want to accept it now you should say so.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I hope the Hon. Minister of Communications would not let principle throw him off balance. There is no principle in this. Members of the government had no principle or policy when they gave consideration to this matter. Again sir, there is nothing in giving this matter a fair trial. If the Hon. Minister of Agriculture said we did not know how many piglets or sows there were or how many were slaughtered per annum, but that we intended to try it out, that would have been alright. As I see it, you have given this scheme a trial and it has failed. For the time it has been given a trial, it shows clearly that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture knew absolutely nothing of what he brought in. I ask again, what disciplinary action has been taken against the people who have misinformed the Hon. Minister of Agriculture. Are those persons who misinformed him still in that department? We should be assured that some disciplinary action has been taken against that person or persons.

The Hon. Minister of Communications mixed up two things in his reply. Firstly he talked of the scheme not yet being three months old, and of its being put to the House during consideration of the Five Year Plan. Sir, if you thought of it and put it in the Five Year Plan, why did you put it to the House in October 1954? [A VOICE: Housing!] Sir, the people are building their own houses now. I feel that the recent By-election brought about this thing. This measure has been brought into being almost in the same way that the Housing scheme was brought about; that is, fourteen people had to lose their lives before use was made of the Bay Estate; and if we did not have a man who defied the Executive Committee, you would not have any of those houses built at the Pine either.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are straying from the point.

Mr. LEWIS: I am answering the aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have been told not to take any notice of asides.

Mr. LEWIS: This is not a question of giving this scheme a fair trial. It would be more honest to say I did not know anything of this thing at all; and that somebody in the Department of Agriculture has misled the Minister lamentably. The Hon. Minister talked about five times the amount of manure; the amount of manure must be in somebody's brains not in pig pens! Sir, you have taken the subsidy off pickled pork—and you are going to misuse it in a scheme. Fancy the number of piglets is five times more than you expected, and you are still coming to the House to ask the House to give this scheme a trial. This shows that the people of Barbados are five times ahead of the Government. What you thought you were encouraging them to do, they are doing five times as much. It is wrong that we have adopted a principle to give you \$8,000 to start this scheme. Of course, the principle which we have adopted is to give you \$8,000 to last you until the end of March. Sir, not only must we be willing to do this thing but the economics of it must go hand in hand. Do you mean to tell me, that if you find that it is going to cost \$20,000,000 you must carry it out? Why did you not put down a dollar for a token scheme? It is lack of principle to come in here and use that argument. Would you come in here and say we must give you more money, than was earmarked to put up a building, no matter who has carried away the money? However sir, I do hope that some disciplinary action will be taken against the person who attempted to hatch this scheme and

foisted it on the Minister. We must bear in mind that this is no experiment; this is something which the Hon. Minister said he went into carefully, and found that the money asked for originally would do. We must have something more concrete in the future. This House cannot go on accepting things like this,—things which you claim you went into carefully, and then to find that they turned out entirely wrong. This is one of abuse of principle. It is not a question of having accepted the principle, the House must allow you to spend any amount of money on it.

4.55 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: I rise a second time to speak on this Resolution because of the observations which have been made by other hon. members since I have spoken. Since I have been sitting here, I have been wondering whether what is proposed in this Resolution, is the best way in which to ensure an increase in the production of pork in this island and to decrease the consumption of salted meat by the people of Barbados. One of the reasons why that trend of thought started in my mind, was because of the remarks made by the Hon. Minister of Communications. I really must thank the Hon. Minister for starting a trend of thought which may lead the members of this House and the public in general, to analyse a bit more closely the ramifications of the schemes which are now before us. The words which the Hon. Minister used which caused me to rise to my feet, are that we should give the scheme a fair trial; and the hon. junior member for the City used the term "experiment". It seems to me, that the terms "fair trial" and "experiment" are two terms which naturally go together; but a well thought-out scheme for the increase of the production of pork, is a question of scientific analysis and these two things are two entirely different matters altogether. It is now apparent for the first time, that far from its being based on scientific analysis and deduction, the Government has started something without proper investigation.

If you pause to think for a moment, you can only come to one or two or even three conclusions; the first is, that the under-estimation was either done through ignorance or on purpose. If it were done on purpose, it was done so that at the end of the year the Government could say that since the scheme started only 1,000 litters were produced in Barbados, and at the end of one year we have produced 4,400 litters, which statement would have been based on an unscientific analysis or a wreckless misleading of the public by those concerned. If you go back to the second question (that it was done through ignorance) I think the strictures which have been already levelled at the Government by previous speakers, will sufficiently answer that hypothesis. On the question of the under-estimation being done on purpose, however, I would like to draw the attention of hon. members to this matter. We can predict when it comes to the human population, the number of families that will have been born in Barbados the next fifteen years for the simple reason that all women of child-bearing age who bear children in the next fifteen years are already alive and are in being and under the Queen's peace, and we can make our deductions from that. If we want to know the number of pigs which we will have in the next five years, we know that all the pigs which will have litters between now and October are already in being. If the scheme had been carefully thought out and the Department had used the elaborate machinery which they have at their disposal by means of Agricultural stations, farms and Peasant Agricultural Instructors, it was within their power to give the House a fair estimate of what the scheme would have involved.

Now I want to say that my trend of thought has led me, under the propulsion of the Hon. Minister of Communications, in this direction. One reaches the point at which one must wonder whether the mere buying of balanced animal feed will necessarily lead to the production of pigs and therefore, to an increase in the volume of locally produced pork. There is no indication in the Addendum which has been placed before this House today in the same manner that a similar explanation was similarly absent from the previous Resolution on this subject, that such a logical conclusion is justified. If I know anything about the thriftiness of the Barbados pig-breeders, they do not want 100 lbs of balanced feed to send the pig to the farm, not when the Government is giving this feed. The propensity of the sow is important and the urges of the sow are important, not the urges of the Government; those are not the important considerations which affect the production of litters of pigs in the short time period. If that is so, if at least for the first year as long as the particular sows owned by peasants and other persons like yourself and myself display the normal proclivities of procreation, they would be sent out and they would produce these litters then, this scheme is a super-erogation on the part of the Ministers concerned.

5.05 p.m.

If you examine the scheme from the long run point of view, you will have to ask yourself what safeguard is there in this scheme itself to ensure that after the period from January to October (during which period I have already said that all the sows capable of giving birth to pigs in the early 1955 must have already been born) what safeguard is there if you look at the scheme from the long term point of view that the sows born later this year or next year or during the year after, will not be sent to the market and go the way of all flesh, rather than being used for the further propagation of the species? Absolutely none. The mere giving of the balanced feed will not cause more sows to be born to each mother sow, nor will it prevent people, since they use a pig as a bank, from sending a sow to the market when the Races or the Exhibition comes around, or when they have a sudden death or something like that in the family which would cause them to draw on their capital resources.

This trend of thought was put into locomotion by the Minister of Communications since we have been sitting here. In the short run, the pigs would have been born anyhow. I would like to point out to the Minister that the balanced feed cannot be fed to young pigs; it must be for the mother sows because young pigs feed at the breast of the sow for the first eight weeks. [Mr. MILLER: No, no.] Of course my colleague who is an expert on everything will tell me that you do not wean a young pig in eight weeks. He is an expert on racehorses, tenantry roads and everything else. At the end of the eight weeks you sell the pigs. It seems to me that the person who has a pig, has one because he knows that he has enough breadfruit trees and kitchen waste to feed that sow during the period of gestation and over the period that the young ones are being weaned.

So as I have said, young pigs are not direct beneficiaries under the scheme initiated by the Government; and at the end of eight weeks they will be sold either to the butchers or to other people interested in keeping pigs purely for the purpose of making money out of them. So the amount of pigs to be born does not depend on the amount of balanced feed given them but on the normal urge for propagation among pigs this year. As for the future, there is no safeguard that when sows are propagated there will be a law against selling them under a certain

age, or that people will be hampered in disposing of pigs when they choose, and frustrate the whole efforts of the Government to increase the pig population of this island.

There is a natural and normal increase in the rate of growth in the pig population in the same way that there is an increase in the growth of human population. Therefore when they come to the House with figures, they must be in a position to show that at the inception of the scheme the rate of growth of pig population was so much per thousand, and that there were so many sows and boars in existence at the inception of the scheme. They must be able to show that the normal rate of growth was so much, and that the implementation of the scheme has accounted for the increase of productivity, which it seems to me they will not be able to prove because at the beginning of the scheme they did not know how many sows there were in the Island, and *a fortiori* they could not know what the rate of increase of the pig population was.

Now when the Hon. Minister of Communications talks about manure, he may be qualified to speak on the subject; but I ask him, (in the same way that I sometimes ask my colleague) to stick to his own mill (not miller). So I am asking him, if he is the Minister of Communications, not to branch out into elaborate theories on this matter. There is a deeply ingrained superstition in Barbados against the use of pig manure. I happen to know from a purely analytical approach that pig manure ranks about second in usefulness as a fertilizer; but there are other problems attendant on the use of pig manure which far offset its use and the increased fertility from its employment.

The first problem is that of bacteria. The second is disposal. The third and most important is that people who keep pigs are not necessarily people who plant yams. I have never yet heard of anyone sending a donkey-cart to buy pig manure. The first thing that you have got to do in Barbados is to let the existing machinery really start functioning. Let the Peasant Agricultural Inspectors convince the peasants, if they are able to, that pig manure is a good thing to use. Do not say that because you buy balanced feed the productivity of the soil of Barbados will increase; because there is an intermediate step that must supervene if the pig manure is going to be employed either by the people who breed pigs or the people to whom they dispose of their manure.

There again, Mr. Chairman, you have an unscientific approach to the problem; and there again, the Government seems to think that the people who have pigs now do not feed them. That is the biggest lot of manure that I have heard for a long time. The boars and sows which are now alive are still eating, and the barrows which have been killed off during the course of the year would still be eating, and the balanced feed does not increase the productivity of the manure, nor will there be a qualitative or quantitative change.

The Minister who is in charge of this portfolio and who sets out to give the facts, should give scientific facts. Before the Government embarks on what is a laudable scheme, let us be sure that the money will achieve the objective which we want it to achieve. I agree that the amount we are spending now is too much to spend on subsidisation. I agree that fresh pork is better than pickled pork and snout; but I do not agree that spending money on balanced feed will necessarily bring about an increase in the local production of pork for the reasons that I have adduced here today.

I would like to add this: we must be careful, as the hon. junior member for St. Peter said, when we embark on capital schemes that the money which

we are spending does not flow out of the economy and so become dissipated in directions which are not directly beneficial to Barbados. When we spend \$80,000 on balanced feed, I am sure that apart from the percentage which the Commission Agents and the wholesalers will retain for themselves, 70 per cent. of that \$80,000 will find its way into the pockets of people abroad; so money will still be going out of the island.

5.15 p.m.

It would be far better if the Government had spent the \$80,000 a year in the importation of high quality sows, and then initiate some scheme for their distribution. That could be done probably with some restrictive covenant, that a sow or piglet which is sold from a Government farm should not be killed or disposed of until it has produced two or three litters of pigs. Such a scheme would be controllable, and the Government would be in a position to see that we have an increased production of pigs. The question of the feeding of these sows or piglets would be left to the people who undertook to look after them. I am sure if people are given high quality sows, they would be willing to feed them. As you know, sir, a pig is only economical in Barbados or any part of the world where there is good pasture land and water supply or where you can get low-priced food stuff. None of these factors are available to us; and it seems to me that proper consideration was not given to the points which I have enumerated. In that respect, if none other, it seems to me that the charge of gross incompetence which has been lodged at the door of the Ministry, (let me use the generic term without singling out the particular officer) was rightly laid.

I hope the next time Government comes back for money for this scheme or a similar scheme, that a scientific revision of their original premise would be arrived at.

Mr. MILLER : Mr. Chairman, it was not at all my intention to speak again, but I rise to refute some things said by my colleague. I think it is necessary for me to do so. My colleague spoke during the first half of the debate, and after he sat and had the opportunity of listening and digesting intelligent points raised by other hon. members, he decided to make another speech. One need not be an expert to make the speech which my colleague made just now; one can only be observant to make that sort of speech. Nevertheless, when you really examine all that he said, you can see the stupidity and gross folly of his remarks. My colleague started out by saying that he kept a pig at home, but from what he said, he knows nothing of the keeping of a pig. He said that the gestation period of a sow was four months. Later he said when speaking on the question of B.A. feed, that the feed was given for the sows and not the piglets. Surely, if my colleague ever kept a pig or glanced in a pig sty, he would realise how stupid he was in making that remark. It is an impossibility for any sow to nurse any litter of piglets for ten weeks. She could not digest the food matter, to do so for that matter. Surely, if my colleague kept pigs, he should know that the period of gestation of a sow is five months instead of four, and the idea of producing B.A. feed for the sows is a joke. My colleague also said pig manure is of no value.

Mr. BARROW : Mr. Chairman, I never said that pig manure is of no value. I happen to know that it is placed second on the list of fertilizers. If my colleague prizes himself on being an expert in such matters, surely, he can read a book which is in the Public Library, or he can ask the Director of Agriculture if what I say about pig manure is not

recorded. If my colleague wants to sum up for the Government, he should do so in a proper manner.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the last remark made by my colleague shows his disposition. I say again that what he said of pig manure was mere stupidity. It shows that he knows nothing at all of the matter. He said he read in a book in the Public Library about pigs; but lots of us read a lot about pigs and don't seem to understand what we read.

Another point which I would like to make for his information, is that you cannot actually buy pig feed at ten cents a pound to produce pork to sell at forty-eight cents a pound. It takes six and a half to seven pounds of feed to give one pound of pork. It is an impossibility to buy B.A. feed or any other food stuff for pigs at ten cents per pound, to produce a pig to sell for pork at forty-eight cents per pound. It therefore can be seen that it is a question as to whether Government should increase the subsidy to persons keeping pigs or remove the control price on the sale of pork. You certainly cannot produce pork to sell at the Government controlled price without affecting a loss owing to what you have to pay per pound for foodstuff to feed a pig. As I see it, none of us would desire to see any sharp increase in the price of pork. Therefore, I can quite understand the position of Government in this matter. The Hon. Minister of Communications is trying to carry on the business of his Government by undertaking to deal with this Resolution. Certainly, there are a lot of things about pigs of which he knows nothing. I am not attempting to criticise the Hon. Minister of Communications. I suppose in the interest of the Government I should say something in defence. It can be seen by this subsidisation that the Government is trying to keep down the price of pork to the consumer.

5.25 p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: In reply to a statement from the Hon. Minister of Communications that as soon as controls are taken off prices will rise, I should like to say that that is nothing new; and the Government should be quite aware of that by now. On the last occasion when they took the control off meat, the Government saw fit to take it off when there was no meat in the island. Obviously when there was no meat in the island, the price of meat rose. Then when meat was expected in the island the control was put back on. As long as the Government continue this practice they will always be in difficulties.

In this Resolution the Government is expending on travelling allowance alone the sum of \$6,000, and I will say that as long as you have control you will have an expensive administration. The Government has been advised by the Control Board and their Department ten years after the war has been over, that competition could adequately take care of the control of prices. There are a small number of things which the Government subsidises, and of which the prices will have to be controlled; but there are other things which are now being controlled; and it would be more beneficial to the island if they were to be decontrolled. I sincerely hope that they will be decontrolled. There has been a human cry in the *Trinidad Guardian* over this matter of price control, and the Hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce said that he is watching the situation.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. HOLDER: I beg to second that.

Mr. BARROW: I am speaking on the motion for the adjournment.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: A member cannot second a motion while he is sitting.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Is the honourable senior member for the City occupying the Chair?

Mr. BARROW: I am speaking on the motion that you do now report progress, Mr. Chairman. I do not know whether the object of the Hon. Minister of Social Services in moving the adjournment at this stage, is to curtail the debate. I have no intention of prolonging the debate, but Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that you gave my colleague considerable latitude—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not entertaining that at all. The honourable member will speak on the motion for the adjournment.

Mr. BARROW: At the time when the Hon. Minister of Social Services got up and made the motion for the adjournment, I was about to rise on a point of Order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member will have to wait until the honourable senior member for the City has stopped speaking with the Clerk. I am speaking to the honourable senior member for the City.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am speaking with the Clerk.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the Clerk to take his seat.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman: it seems to me that every effort is being made to stifle democratic discussion in this Chamber. I have no intention of sitting down except at your request, until I have finished speaking on the motion on which I originally rose. I had thought that up to the time that the Hon. Minister of Social Services had moved that you report progress, you had allowed my colleague considerable latitude in speaking; and I was about to rise on a point of Order to ask how is it that a man like my colleague whose only title to fame is his two and a half weeks' stay at Combermere School, was in a position—

5.35 p.m.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of Order, I just want to reply—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot entertain the hon. member.

Mr. MILLER: I am speaking on the motion for the adjournment. I earned an exhibition at Combermere School for five years. I was at that school for four years.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not entertaining anything about Combermere School.

Mr. MILLER: It is part of the consistent dishonesty of my colleague—

The question that the Chairman report progress and ask for leave to sit again was put and agreed to without division.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. Cummins seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox the House adjourned for half an hour.

5.40 p.m.

On the re-assembling:

EMIGRATION TO ENGLAND

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am going to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes as I intimated to Your Honour, to discuss what I consider a very important matter, a matter of great

public interest. Because of the late hour at which I intimated it to Your Honour last week, I did not discuss it then; but I think I should discuss it to-day, having apprised Your Honour of it before.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member insists on doing it now?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I do.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of Order. The hon. member was not here earlier to-day when I made a statement in connection with Emigration. In addition to that, the Minister for Labour is not here and I have not got the files; and naturally, if the hon. member did go on with his motion, (no one can stop him if he wants to go on with it) the motion would be just debated. He would not be in a position to get any further information as regards the policy of the Government. I would appeal to him to postpone it until next meeting when the Minister of Labour will most likely be present. I will give him a copy of the statement that I laid earlier to-day, if that will satisfy him until next week, and if he wants to discuss the subject at the next meeting.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I usually try to be constructive in my criticisms and observations. The hon. member said that the Minister of Labour is not here. The Minister of Agriculture is not here either, but we still discussed the question of pig-breeding. I propose to go on with my motion for this reason: we in the Opposition whose duty it is to make suggestions and criticisms, if we go on in the way which apparently it is the desire of the Government that we should go on in, when a statement is laid, the general public would not know at any time the feelings or views of the Opposition.

Some weeks ago in keeping with Your Honour's ruling, I brought to this Chamber, Questions relative to the Government's policy on Emigration to the U.K. In keeping with Your Honour's ruling, those Questions were presented a week before so that Your Honour could see whether they were in order or not.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I inform the hon. member that the Government is desirous of going on with the Resolution in connection with pig-breeding before the hon. member proceeds with his motion.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: With the greatest respect to Your Honour and the greatest desire to see Government's business proceeded with, we have reached a stage in this country in the set-up of party politics when if we give away our rights all the time like this, we would not be fulfilling our duty to the general public. If there were a Resolution or other matter before this House to-day that was of such urgent necessity that it had to be done immediately, I would sit gracefully and allow the Government to go on. But in the circumstances, I am not prepared to give away my right. I propose to discuss the matter.

The Questions which I asked were relative to Government's policy on emigration to the U.K. and what they propose to do to assist people wanting to go there.

Hon. M. E. COX: I understood the hon. member for the City to say that if it could be proved that the Resolution before the House was urgent, he would give way. I want to tell the hon. member that the Resolution which was under discussion at the adjournment is a very urgent one; so urgent, that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture wanted to deal with it last Tuesday, the same day he introduced it. People are waiting to get feed for their sows which have already given birth to piglets. I am saying that it is definitely an urgent matter.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: If the circumstances were different, I would come to the conclusion that the Government is afraid to have the subject discussed. We remained here until nearly 2 o'clock a.m. last week doing Government business. I intimated last Tuesday that I wanted this motion discussed and I do not intend to give way this evening. I hope that that is settled now.

Your Honour having ruled that the Questions were in order, one would have expected that in keeping with tradition and parliamentary procedure, the Questions would have been answered as they were directly asked. But immediately after the Questions were tabled a public statement was made from the Secretariat relative to the question of workers wanting to go to England. On the floor of this House the Hon. Premier made it clear that the Government would soon issue a statement. Since that time the Minister of Labour has issued a statement relative to the question of emigration, a statement which includes the questions of workers wanting to emigrate to the U.K.

I understand, sir, that the Minister of Social Services has to-day made another statement relative to this question of emigration. That must show that the Government is concerning itself with this very stupendous question. I do not think that any of us in the Opposition would attempt to say that the Government is not interested. I would repeat that. But I think that what we can say or what we can question, is whether they are sufficiently interested as to set the machinery in motion without delay.

In all these talks about emigration, sir, we have been led to believe, (and I have been told on good authority; and rightly so) there is the question of housing in the U.K. In this connection, I would quote one person in whom I have the utmost confidence and who has just returned from England. I am referring to the former Leader of the Opposition, Mr. J. H. Wilkinson. I took the opportunity of discussing with him the question of work in England, and he mentioned that there was work for the asking, especially for skilled men; but he agreed, (and I have sufficient confidence in his statement) that there was the question of housing which was a rather difficult one.

To digress for a minute on that particular point, I would like to say this: when I listened here to the Premier in his reply to the hon. senior member for St. Philip, he referred to the fact that there were eight and nine people living in a room, and that there were West Indians in England going in for exploitation by renting rooms and then letting them out to other West Indians. When the Premier said that, I could not help but smile; because it was really only a few weeks after, that the Premier and myself had to meet at the Salvation Army Night Shelter where we saw for ourselves only one instance of how a good number of the unemployed and destitute live.

I am going to make a statement now which, however harsh it may seem, is true. Those of us who have had personal experience of going abroad, know that housing conditions, bad as they are in England, cannot be so bad that those of our people who are interested in work would not endure them.

6.25 p.m.

I go further than that. While I cannot like some hon. members in this Chamber say I went to England and saw living conditions there, I can say equally that I have lived in a northern country where weather conditions are similar to England; and I can say further, that it has been my experience a few years after the 1914 War when West Indians were emigrating to the United States by the thousands, to observe what was called hot-beds—that is,

persons who worked at night rented a room and slept during the day in it, and people who worked in the day, rented the same room and slept in it at night. The Hon. Minister of Social Services knows of those conditions. I can call a number of persons occupying positions of trust in this island who lived under similar conditions in the United States. Because of the opportunity of finding employment, and in order to work for a living to support a family, they were prepared to endure such conditions. I am sure that living conditions in England today cannot be any worse for the average unemployed able-bodied person in Barbados. Many of these able-bodied persons now live in very congested areas, and in small 18 x 10 houses where you can find six and eight of them living together. It may sound harsh, but it is true to say that our young men and women are prepared, despite what news may be reported in the Press and despite what hardships may be painted, to go to England in search of a livelihood and to work for a living.

I do not want to take this opportunity to make capital of the unfortunate remarks which were used by the Hon. Premier at a very incorrect moment. I say so, because to err is human; and I believe on reflection, that he must have realised that to have made such a statement was a very stupid thing to do. The statement which the Hon. Premier made was relative to what I may refer to as the unwashed, unwanted and under-privileged, or for fear anybody might say that those were not his words, I refer to his remark of Tom, Dick and Harry and the ordinary man. Sir, it is the ordinary man who is going to England in search of work and who is willing to emigrate to any country. It is the ordinary man who if he gets the opportunity, will go out of this country and will remit part of his earnings to his family here, and in that way assist in building the economy of this island. I have always contended that whatever scheme we may embark on in this country, whatever trial scheme we may put into operation, emigration is our only salvation; and it has proven so for years and years. It is the only salvation for Barbados. Therefore, for fear that the Government is not aware of it, I must remind them. As a matter of fact, I believe Government is aware of it.

Later on in the debate, you are going to hear from me, (and rightly so,) that the people of this country feel very suspicious of you in this matter. When one reads the view expressed by the Chamber of Commerce in reply to an enquiry made from Great Britain relative to workers from this country emigrating there, one can very well see why they will feel suspicious of you. Who is the Chamber of Commerce in this country? Almost everybody will say it is comprised of the employers and the ruling classes of this country. There was a time when people, who occupied the Government would possibly get on soap boxes and tell you that it is the ruling classes who would not like to see you go out of the country because they want cheap labour; but from my experience and insight into the business of this country, especially ten years ago when our boys went to America, I can say that anybody in business in this country would be considered more than an idiot to think in the terms which some members of the Government want you to believe; that is, that the ruling classes or employers do not wish the people of this country to emigrate. Sir, when people go out of this country and send back money, it means prosperity for Barbados. When we had a great number of our workers in the United States, it showed that statement was correct.

Mr. Speaker, on the entire question of housing conditions in England, despite the statement of the Government, despite some of the reports which have been published in the Press from time to time of the conditions in the United Kingdom, the people are still making an effort to go there. The sight which no thinking person of this country will forget, which no person who has any soul or who has the interest of Barbados at heart will forget, is the one which presented itself to us at the Baggage Warehouse two days before Christmas, when a batch of our people left for England. Sir, that is a time when every human being likes to be at home and in the surroundings of the family; but what did you see at the Baggage Warehouse? You saw young men and women going out, so to speak, into an unknown world; you saw young men and women just eager to leave home, (what to him or her would have been their castle,) to go out to some place to work for something to help their loved ones here to spend a better Christmas. That sir, should be an indication to the Government despite the talk which is true that living conditions are not all that can be desired in England, that our people are yet willing to brave conditions in order to work for a living. You know the old proverb, "It is better to die by the sword, than by famine." Without any apology to the Labour Department, I am going to say that unemployment conditions in this country have reached the stage to similar to what they were in 1939. This is not mere from the stand-point of statistics. Those of us who see people day after day making applications for work, those of us who see teenagers and the unemployed family man day after day roaming the streets asking for work and begging for something to eat, know that such a statement is true. Mr. Speaker, I am awfully sorry that the Hon. Premier is not here; but I know that nobody in Barbados would accuse me of not being able to speak according to the dictates of my conscience. When the job of Messenger and Library Attendant of this House became vacant and was advertised for, over 200 people applied; I should like it to be specially recorded that these applicants were interviewed by the senior members of this House in batches of about two dozen or so. Fortunately or unfortunately, two dozen or so of those applicants came up for examination before me and the distinguished Premier. I thought then, it would have been a wonderful opportunity as I was not a Labour Party member to ask each of them a particular question. I may say this: I cannot be convinced that down in the conscience of the Hon. Premier he will be so stupid as to say that our people do not wish to go to England. I took the opportunity to enquire from those persons we examined, to ask them this one question: "would you be prepared, in preference to your being appointed to this job of Messenger of this House, to go to England?" All of the twenty-five applicants save one said: "I would certainly prefer to go to England, if I can get aid with part of my passage money." Only one of them said, he would stay in Barbados and do the job. I regret I have to say this in the absence of the Hon. Premier, but he, I am sure, will bear me out.

6.35 p.m.

Just come out to the position of Government, and place yourself back down to the bottom; with the greatest respect to the Chairman of Committees and the hon. junior member for St. Thomas I ask, "What would I be, if fortune had not smiled on me?" It is amusing to think that you can say in England to-day, "If you are not careful you will have the same Negro problem that America has." Is that a plague or a disease? Don't you think that members of this Government should stand up against such

utterances when these utterances are made? Of course the United States of America has a problem; their problem is, that only high offices such as the President and Judge of the Supreme Court are held by certain people; however the Government should stand up against such statements being made in connection with this Negro problem. What I have said in this House is true; and what has been written in the Press is true. You may as well face facts; they may sound crude and harsh but these things are true. They are afraid of the mixture of Black men and White women. This is a West Indian issue; this is the bread and butter of these people. These people are asking for work. From the statement which has been made here to-day, I understand that the Labour Commissioner and the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour are going to England to look into the practical issues affecting those Barbadians who have already gone to England in search of work. That is an absolute, wicked waste of time and money. The Hon. Premier went to England, and the Secretary of the Labour Union in this colony has just returned from Europe or England or wherever he went, [Laughter] I ask, have they got on a public platform and stated that people cannot get any work in England? The Hon. Premier pooh-poohed the idea and then when he was brought face to face with it, he said that there was a lot of work in England but the living conditions there are deplorable. I ask: could those conditions be more deplorable than having six or eight people living in a room and some of them sleeping on bags under the bed. If I did not possess some christian qualities about me, I would pray that the boat which is carrying these people to England to investigate the conditions affecting those people who have already gone there would founder. Mr. Harold Stuart, the Hon. Premier said, is at the Colonial Office looking after after Colonial Students; I say if you go to England to work you do not want anybody to look after you. I suggest in the first place that they could use the Youth Employment Officer who is connected with the Labour Commissioner's Department and begin to register people. It is not merely a question of registering people, but I want it to be known that we who are in the Opposition will have to subscribe to this. First of all, they should use those people who can pay or who can assist in paying their passage; if the passage money is \$300 you lend whatever you can according to what a man has got. Of the 25 people whom the Premier and myself interviewed for the post of Messenger and Library Attendant of this House, 24 of them could provide one half of the passage money to go to England if they were loaned the other half. I suggest that we get a Committee to deal with those persons who are willing to go out and of the type of employment they would like.

6.45 p.m.

The Government should tell the people, sir, that not only is it true that when they get to England they can find work, but that during the period that they are out of work they will be on the dole and will get £2.10 a week. There is a lurking suspicion in the minds of people, (and apparently rightly so) that the influence of the Colonial Office is being brought to bear on the Government not to prevent people, but not to encourage them to go to England. No one can say with any honesty that the Government of Barbados are preventing people from going to England; but what one can say with the utmost honesty and confidence, is that the Government is doing nothing to encourage and assist people who want work to go to England. You are not preventing them, but you are doing nothing to help them.

Now a statement was issued today. Emigration, in my opinion, like the health of a country, should be beyond party politics. When people go away and work, this country prospers. Nothing that I say here today on the floor of this House has anything to do with party. I am saying it as another human being and as a person who through the blessing of God, has found himself in a position that he has not got to go and look for work in England. But I still feel that had I been in the position whence I came, had I not a dollar, or had I \$50.00, and I heard that there was work in England, and I realised that England was a country which had all the wealth made from this island, I would like to know that I could get some assistance to go to England to work, not to live permanently.

No normal, sensible Barbadian, (I do not mean the type who wants to strut around and play Englishman) no normal, sensible Barbadian thinks that there is any place in the world like Barbados. But a hungry man is a dangerous man; and wherever there is an opportunity for work, everything should be done to assist him to go.

In my Questions I asked whether the Government was prepared to help anyone besides nurses. Now you will recall, sir, that the question of nurses going to England was discussed here and the Government had a scheme whereby they were willing to help and assist in the passage of nurses who were selected. As regards that particular scheme I said, and I will say it again that there are officials here who were doing every possible thing to stand in the way of some of those nurses and girls who wanted to go to England. I mentioned to the Minister of Social Services that the Matron at the Hospital and other officials had said to young girls who were applying, "Why do you not stay and nurse your own people in this country? They want nursing more than the people in England."

Government has a policy, however, of helping a few girls after they have been selected. I mentioned in this House that there were some girls who held School Certificates etc; but I wanted it to be known that it was not only the School Certificate boys and girls whom we must look after. They are not the only people in the island. I mentioned that there is a system in England, (and for the sake of words the Minister of Labour in his usual style contradicted what I said and tried to make out that I knew nothing about it, and that he was the only person interested in it and who knew anything about it) by which, to use the phraseology used in America, they were State Registered nurses, (persons who had reached a certain standard academically) and then there were practical nurses. There was very little difference in salary, but those girls who are superannuated in school and who only reach Fourth Form in the secondary schools can become practical nurses. If a man is doing good service in that respect in this island, it is Mr. Louis Lynch at the Modern High School.

I do not speak through my hat, Mr. Speaker. I am in possession of letters from hospitals in England asking me to recommend girls for such posts. I have discussed this with the Minister of Social Services whom I have always found to be amiable, and I have actually shown him the letters. There are a number of these young girls without one cent. Some of them have \$75.00 and others \$150.00, all willing to go to England; but it is the policy of this Government to help only those girls who have been selected by the Labour Department, the Director of Medical Services or the Matron of the Hospital. That is not good enough. I grant that it is a help; but that is not the only thing.

I will say that I got hold of the Minister of Social Services, but it is difficult at times to speak to the Minister of Trade and some of the others. They have become so high and lofty, that they seem to forget where they were yesterday and where they may be tomorrow. [A MEMBER: Where will they be tomorrow?] I will not say that. I am saying where they may be tomorrow.

Government had a system, and there are poor people who do not know that they could borrow one cent. It was only when a man went to mortgage his house and land because his daughter had been selected and had to leave in 15 days, (to mortgage your house will cost you \$40.00 or \$50.00 through a solicitor) that I said I would test the Government and the Minister of Social Services was able to point out the policy of the Government and the particular lady got \$200.00 on loan. That is not generally known, nor is it good enough.

I will go further and say, that it is not generally known that girls who cannot pass the standard required by the Matron etc., can secure work as practical nurses. Mr. Speaker, they are making it very difficult for Barbadian and West Indian girls. It will not be surprising if in the not very distant future, these officials begin to require an Arts Degree or a Bachelor of Science Degree from West Indians to become nurses in England, when in truth and in fact, an English girl does not have to possess a School Certificate to become a nurse in England. Let the Government contradict that.

6.55 pm.

I will not be at all surprised, if within the next two weeks these officials demand that these girls have a B.A. degree to go to England to become a nurse. What they are doing to prevent those girls from going there, is something pathetic. I am saying it is not necessary for those girls to even have a School Certificate to become a nurse; therefore, I would counsel the Government to broaden its scheme. Of course, the Hon. Minister of Trade said, that his Ministry has written and asked about the matter; but I know they are given a list of hospitals which are asking us to produce a Certificate of Health on the part of each of these girls and not an educational or School Certificate.

Now, the Government did state its willingness to pay the passage of these student nurses, though it was not particularly willing to assist the man in the street to go to England. I agree with the Government. I do not agree with the statement, "Go up whomsoever will; I will pay for you to go to England." It is not good enough merely to say that you should loan people money to go to England; neither is it good enough for the Government to say that it is investigating the matter through the Colonial Office and awaiting an answer. Sir, this prosperity is not going to last longer than six years; and if you do not do something right now to assist our people to go there immediately, and you keep on saying that you are waiting on the Colonial Office, you are betraying your trust by such actions. Government's members must always bear in mind that we are first Barbadians, then West Indians, and after that anything else. We could be then members of the Commonwealth of Nations. Sir, this is a terrible state of affairs. We cannot sit idly and do nothing on the matter. We must think of Barbadians first. You cannot accept trusteeship, parenthood, guardianship and all of that and then do nothing. Someone said to me recently, that they only want university graduates in England; they are going to pass a law to stop others from going there. I said in reply: do you know the organisation called United Nations? Do you

know the country called Russia? They dare not do it. No one can call me a Communist; but even if he did, it would make no difference. I have heard the Hon. Premier get up in here and say that Joseph Stalin was the greatest man in the world. Yet nobody would say that the Hon. Premier is a Communist. Anybody who says that, would be entirely wrong. If it were said that he was a Conservative, well then that statement may be right! That is by the way! I only want to say: do not sit complacently and watch your brothers suffer.

Mr. Speaker, I am addressing these remarks to all of us on this side of the table. It is our solemn duty to offer the Government something constructive on this matter. Do not get in here and say that Government should vote some money to get people to England. Of course, I know someone may say that it is not a foreign country and anybody can go there, because there are no emigration barriers. All you need to do is to get a passport, pay the passage, and you can get there. Of course everybody knows that there are some white people in this country who hate anything with a dark skin; equally so, there are some white people who take a man as any other man. This is not a question of merely saying that anyone can go to England. This attempt to fool the people should cease. You know very well that the Colonial Office will do nothing to encourage the people who are of African descent from this country or any other West Indian colony to come to England to seek work.

I am going to make another special statement and I know that deep down in the consciences of members of the Government, they know that this statement is true.

7.05 p.m.

At the Committee meeting on the post of Messenger and Library Attendant to which I referred previously, I asked: would you be prepared in preference to this job to go to England? Of these 25 people one man said: I would prefer to remain in Barbados and do this job; and the other 24 said that they would prefer to go to England if they could get a part of the passage money. That is a statement of fact recorded at a meeting in the Lobby of this House. That was a private discussion and I say this for what it is worth: I said I did not subscribe to the idea that you should set up a bureau and say "whoever wants to go to England come here, here is your passage money, you can go." I do not subscribe to that; but in conversation with the Hon. Premier I said, that by virtue of my business and vocation I come across thousands of people who would like to go to England to work. I came across them during the campaign for the St. Lucy bye-election and I have met at my home thousands of people who could only raise a part of the passage money to go to England, and who will be willing to go there and become parties to the venture. If this is a venture, to make sure that you are going to pull your weight, then you must pull your pocket. We asked a number of people, if the Government were prepared to put out any portion of their passage money would they be able to find the balance? I know many people would not be able to find the money, but I know they will get their friends to help them. I do not subscribe to the idea that you should merely set up a bureau and say "Who ever wants to go to England, here is the passage money;" what I do subscribe to is this: we have unemployed people in this island (I do not only read the "funnies" in the *Advocate*) but there is work in England and our people must be helped. The statements made by the Government, matured as

they are, are not good enough. I am trying to be as constructive as possible. We have the man power; there is work in England; in time of trouble we have answered the call. However, it is refreshing to know that despite one or two racial bigots in England, you still have people who have a sense of justice and fair play and who are willing to see something done for the Colonials; but it is unfortunate that in Barbados, you have not got that same spirit prevailing. You have your industrial centres in England, you have your farming centres and if it would not be unparliamentary I would wonder if some people are not Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde at the same time. I say that for this reason: to look at the people of this country and say that the matter is being investigated in official circles in England from the point of view of the Colonial Office and the like, is not good enough. I say that while the grass is growing, these horses are starving; while the matter is being investigated thousands and thousands of people in Barbados would like to get work. It is amazing to hear that people who were born here attempting to tell West Indians that there is cold weather in England, and that they cannot stand it. I have gone to the United States of America, Mr. Speaker, and you have gone there too; there is no prosperity for everyone, but you can give people an opportunity. It was first reported that the Honourable Premier had said that he could not see Barbadians selling their houses and their cattle and sheep and even their land, in order to go to England. I said then that that statement showed how much down to the earth the Hon. Premier was in respect of the people of this colony. I say this as a statement of fact and it can be checked: (my friends on the other side, if they can be so termed, refer to me as a "Land shark"; I take that for what it is worth, because at times it is better to be a "land shark" than to be another type of shark!) [laughter] but I have seen people who have sold their houses and land, and I can testify to the fact that their bank accounts have been growing in this country since they have gone to England, and they can replace not only their houses and land and cattle, but they have been supporting their families; and they have even replaced their houses by better ones on their return to this colony. I repeat, that people are willing to go to England; it is not a country where it is necessary to have immigration laws and barriers. It is true that the Government has done nothing to prevent the issuing of Passports to people to go to England, but there is in the air a little rumour that only a certain type of people will get passports to go to that country; and there is a further rumour that when people go for forms they will not get them. There is another rumour of people having to go to Justices of the Peace, Magistrates and so on to have their Passports signed, and then these people are being taken all around the Mulberry bush; but in spite of all that, they are still going to England. If you publish tomorrow that the boats which are carrying these people to England were taking them in shark-infested waters and that the people were dying from starvation, the Barbadian workers will still take their chance.

7.15 p.m.

The next thing the Government should do is to set up in England a bureau or a liaison department or call it whatever you like; I am sure that this House would be willing to pass a sufficiently adequate sum of money to pay for it. There must be a number of Barbadians or West Indians in England of sufficient intelligence and integrity to go on such a committee. It should be for the purpose of collecting back portions of the loans made by the Govern-

ment to workers in England. Barbadians are the most honest people in the world, and the Government need have no fear of not getting back the majority of any loans made.

Now of course we have a scheme for workers who go to America; we advanced passage money to these emigrants and we did every sort of thing. In England you have the industrial areas and the agricultural areas. It is unfortunate that a large number of emigrants are only going to settle in the cities; but that is because you have not got such a department as the one I have suggested.

This Legislature, (I speak for the entire Opposition) would be prepared to vote sufficient money to keep the department running in England so as to be able to keep check with the various centres, and to collect from workers for the purpose of getting back for this Government such sums as are loaned. That department can also assist emigrants when they arrive in England in finding ways and means of getting work. I say that for this reason: you have a number of West Indian students and other people from the West Indies who have been living in England for years, and who are interested in West Indian development. I do not mean those water-washed, white-washed West Indians who become Englishmen overnight; I mean those who are interested in other West Indians living in England. I can think of many names. The Premier himself mentioned one or two of them to me.

It would be better in my opinion to set that department up. Set up a local department also, and start the ball rolling. As night follows day, the Labour Party of Barbados is entitled to lose its seats as a result of sending this two-man delegation on a joy ride to England to ask the Colonial Office "please, double please." I am going to predict this now: the future of the Labour Party depends on the way in which this Government treats this question of emigration. Smile and laugh! I repeat that. When women see men coming home Saturday after Saturday without anything they will make up their minds against you and it will be a terrible state of affairs. If you sit on the fence and refuse to do anything so that their sons, daughters, husbands and brothers can go out and get some work, they will see that you are removed from power. That is a prediction which I make here in this House tonight.

Mr. Speaker, other members are going to speak on this matter. I am sure that a great number of them feel as I do. I end where I began. There is work in England for the asking; there is work especially for the skilled type of labour. There are no immigration barriers to prevent our people from going there. There is the question of housing; but Barbadians are willing to go and take this chance if there are three, or four, or even five or six sleeping in one bed. Let them have a chance to go.

Finally, I have an appeal to make; it is a public appeal. I have got letters from friends in England, (I am not going to apologise like other members) letters telling me that the behaviour of some of the West Indians, including Jamaicans is not all that could be desired. My public appeal to those whom I would sit here and vote money to help, would be to conduct themselves, if they go to England, in the way in which their forefathers conducted themselves when they went to Panama and to the U.S.A. which made a way for other Barbadians—their good manners, their behaviour and the labour that they gave.

I would like to appeal to them that if and when the Government assists them to go to England, to let their conduct be such that the English people

will say like the American employers, that they would have Barbadians every day. They will see that the colour of the skins of Barbadians makes no difference. They will see that their behaviour is befitting any standard of a European people. Let that be an example. Let that be something which in England which will assist us in sending more Barbadians.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the House adjourn for five minutes. I will wait to hear other honourable members' opinions. In my criticisms I have tried in every way to help put up suggestions. Set up a Committee or Board in England. The Legislature would be willing to pay for it, because the dividends will be great. If we pay £5,000 or £6,000 a year or even £10,000 a year the dividends will be great. People will go and work, and will get back some of the money. Naturally we will lose some. Some of those who get loans may die; some many not pay back theirs. We can write that off. But money will come back to this country for the support of hundreds of unemployed people and the dividends will be so great, that you will go down in the hearts of the people of this country as having truly done something to relieve them in the year 1955, in which year where employment is concerned, it has gone back to the conditions of 1939.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, personally, although I appreciate the urgency of this matter, I would have preferred—

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member seconding the motion?

7.25 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I propose to do so, sir. As I was saying, I would have preferred if the hon. Mover of the motion had awaited the presence in the Chamber of the Premier and the Minister of Trade and Labour. But perhaps the honourable member has a grievance. Sometime ago, he tabled some Questions in the House in connection with this matter, and the Government instead of replying to the Questions, made a public statement in the Press. Last Tuesday he intimated to Your Honour, I understand, as well as to other honourable members, that he proposed to initiate a debate on the matter sometime during that sitting.

The time was not available to him, because the Government's Business occupied the entire session. To-day, the Government has brought in another half-baked Statement and has not yet given any reply to the Questions. Therefore, if the honourable senior member for the City moves the adjournment of the House to discuss this question in the absence of the appropriate Minister, to some extent he can be excused.

Now, sir, I propose to be very brief on the matter. I merely want to refer to one or two matters in the Statement which was laid on the table of the House today by the Government. The Statement reads thus: "Members will be aware that in answer to a Parliamentary question on 16th December the Home Secretary said in the House of Commons that Her Majesty's Government have under consideration the whole question of the immigration of British subjects into the United Kingdom. Until a decision has been taken on future policy it is unlikely that Her Majesty's Government will be in a position to discuss ways and means of facilitating immigration from Barbados."

Well now, the Government which made this Statement must be aware of the Statement which was published in the local Press last Sunday to the effect that it is very unlikely that Her Majesty's Government will institute any immigration ban

against colonial subjects to Britain. All along, Government has been saying that it cannot initiate policy in the matter, it has to wait and see what Her Majesty's Government is doing in the matter. Now that it has on fairly good authority that both of the major parties in Great Britain are unopposed to the initiation of any legislation which would place a ban on the entry of colonials into Great Britain, and although that statement has not been made official, (the source from which it came is sufficient to make it authoritative) this Government is still hesitant on this question.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the honourable senior member for St. Philip is correct to say that this statement is not an official statement; because, on the 12th November last, that statement was made by the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies in the House of Commons.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable member knows that since then, we have been told the British Government is reviewing the entire question. He also knows that this local Government is sheltering behind that statement as an excuse for doing nothing. Although the Tory Government did make that statement, when the matter comes up for further consideration, it may be rescinded. However, the fact remains that it has not been rescinded, therefore, the local Government is entirely in order, if it thinks it is desirable to get on with this matter. But this Government is sheltering still behind the excuse that it is waiting on the British Government.

The Statement laid today goes on to read thus: "Nevertheless, the Government has decided, after consultation with Her Majesty's Government, that the Minister for Trade, Industry and Labour and the Labour Commissioner should visit England later this month to look into the practical issues affecting those Barbadians who have recently gone to England in search of work."

Let the public understand carefully, that when the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour and the Labour Commissioner go to England, they are not going there to endeavour to get more Barbadians there. They are going merely to look into the practical issues affecting those Barbadians who have recently gone to England in search of work.

The statement goes on to read as follows:

"While the scope of their enquiries must in the circumstances be restricted the delegation will take the opportunity of representing the Barbados case to the authorities concerned."

What does that mean? It merely means that the Labour Commissioner and the Minister of this Government will be going to look into the conditions affecting Barbadians who have gone there already; and while there, they will take the opportunity of representing the Barbados case to the authorities concerned. Sir, they can tell the Colonial Office no more of the local situation than what the Colonial Office already knows. The Barbados case has been represented to the Colonial Office over and over again. There is a mass of official documents putting up the Barbados case at the Colonial Office already. As far back as 1938, a British Royal Commission in putting the case of emigration claims of Barbados, said that it should rank first. The Colonial Office knows of all the conditions affecting Barbados; it knows the Barbados case from A to Z. It knows that we should rank A1 in any case of emigration. Therefore when a delegation comprised of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour and the Labour Commissioner is going to the United Kingdom to look into the conditions of the few Barbadians there and to take the opportunity to put the Barbados case, that is absolute nonsense.

The delegation should be going to do two things. The first is to tell the Colonial Office point blank: 'You know that there are thousands of our workers in your country now to man your factories and other industries, agricultural and otherwise; in the Midlands alone, you need 45,000; if the men of themselves cannot find a job, assist them to get one.' We do not want a delegation to go there merely to look into the conditions of the people who have gone there already, because we did not help them to get there. If they had not gone there by themselves, the Government would not have to send a delegation there at all; because, Government has not been sympathetic to this matter. A delegation recently returned from Great Britain and the Hon. Premier himself, pooh-poohed the idea of Barbadians wanting to go to England to seek for work. At a public meeting in St. Lucy he said that they would not go. The Hon. Premier knows nothing of the conditions affecting them here, nor is he sympathetic to their going.

I repeat, what the delegation should concern itself with is not at putting the Barbados case to Colonial Office; it should say to Colonial Office that we have the men; we are willing to formulate some scheme to assist some of our young men and women to get there, and we want you to assist in placing them in jobs when they get there. Perhaps, the Colonial Office would facilitate the Government in getting back the money which we advanced the emigrants, and by that, help us to regain the money which we loaned them to get there. It is not good enough to go and tell Colonial Office that a few Barbadians there want houses to live in, or to put the Barbados case. The delegation should be going there to put the policy of the Barbados Government on the matter.

Furthermore, there is this fact—the delegation proposed by the Government is only an absolute waste of time.
7.35 p.m.

What the delegation should go on, should be a cut and dried scheme; not to tell the Colonial Office that the few people who are in England want a Welfare Officer to put the case of Barbadians. The delegation should put the policy of the Barbados Government on the matter; and, furthermore, it is an absolute waste of time to send up the delegation proposed by the Government. I am very sorry that the Hon. Minister for Trade, Industry and Labour is not here to-day, because of the twenty-four honourable members of this House, it is almost impossible to find one who is more incapable than he is of putting the case of Barbados as it should be put. I have already charged him on the floor of this House for having prejudiced the case of Barbadian workers going to America, by not knowing what to say when the American officials came down here last year. Of course he denied the statement; he said it was not true that he told the Americans what magnificent wages our sugar workers get during the crop: and the American reaction was: what the workers wanted to go to America for, if they were getting these magnificent wages? When I said that, the Hon. Minister said it was not true, but his statements on the floor of this House throughout this emigration issue, show that he is not interested in this matter. The honourable senior member for St. John, the honourable junior member for St. Lucy and myself, happened to go to Government House in connection with this matter and both of these honourable members will support me in saying that the Honourable Minister showed himself out of touch with the situation; and he was not at all in sympathy with any attempt being made to help Barbadian workers to get to Britain. I hope

that this debate will continue until he returns here, because from his writing in the Press, (although he should not be writing in the Press now) he has made it clear that he would not move a finger to assist in any real mass emigration to the United Kingdom. Therefore to take him up with a Government Official to go to England in connection with this matter of emigration is an absolute waste of time. When you read what the Government says about this matter, you can say that they could almost send up anybody; why do they not send up the Social Welfare Officer Miss Betty Arne, or some nurse or somebody like that? I repeat, that to send up the Hon. Minister for Trade, Industry and Labour and the Labour Commissioner is an absolute waste of time and money. If the Government is sending a delegation to put up a proper case for Barbados, do not let them send up the delegation which they propose to send.

In a matter of this sort you do not want to send merely an official delegation; you want to send a delegation on as broad a basis as possible. The Government need not delude themselves that when the Labour Commissioner gives a talk anybody in this Island will believe what is published. As a matter of fact, this Statement here and the one which preceded it on this question of emigration reveal better than anything I can say what is the mind and intention of the Hon. Minister of Labour in connection with this matter. There is not a single word or line in this Statement today which will reveal that the Government is really and deeply interested in this matter; not one single word in this Statement will reveal that. Imagine Barbadians going to England on their own scheme, in spite of opposition and without the help of the Government! And are we to take up money from the Treasury to send out two people to England to find out how these Barbadians are getting on, to enquire into the conditions affecting them? We have a Trade Commissioner up there, and we have a Welfare Department and what-not, but we are still going to take up the Labour Commissioner and the Minister of Trade and Industry to go there and find out what is happening. I am submitting that the delegation should have got there long before the people got there, and actually tried to get jobs for people so that when the people get there, instead of walking around irresponsibly looking for work, they would have found themselves in jobs. When we talked about sending a delegation to England some three months or so ago, the Hon. Minister of Labour said that the Hon. Premier had just returned from that country and he must have discussed the matter at the Colonial Office, and therefore there would be of no use in sending a delegation there. They are fooling people that they are sending a delegation to go into this matter, in order to say that the delegation will go and enquire into the conditions of the people who have already gone up and to put up a case for Barbados. In the circumstances, it is an absolute waste of time and money to send up this delegation. What the Government should be doing is this: they should be saying that in view of the likelihood of Her Majesty's Government placing any restriction on the entry of West Indians into Britain, we have decided to do so-and-so, and we are sending a delegation to scour areas in Britain where there is work for people so that when the people get there, they will find work to do; and that we are setting up an organisation to see after their welfare and to receive the money we advance for payment to the Barbados Government. But every person who can raise funds is going to England and to say that you are spending money in sending up this delega-

tion, is to give the feeling that the public are idiots and cannot read or think for themselves, and to disclose the true nature of the Government's policy in this matter.

7.45 p.m.

The Government has done nothing and it intends to do nothing except to mark time, play the fool, and endeavour at all times to becloud the issues involved. That is the full nature of the Government's policy. If they think that they will get away with it they are vastly mistaken. As it is, they are only noticing this question because they have been forced to by public agitation. Left to them, they would have done nothing because they do not want to offend the British Government.

Although the British Government knows that it can do nothing to prevent West Indians from coming to the U.K., in their heart of hearts they do not welcome the large influx of West Indian workers there. That is why I suggested here two and a half months ago, that we should make it plain in putting our case to the British Government, that we are not sending our people there to stay forever. We are not sending them to settle there permanently.

I personally look forward to the time when West Indian industrial development will have reached such a stage, that we can take care of our entire population without sending them abroad. I personally would like to think that we would not have to send a single worker outside to look for work. But I also realise that as long as the present Government remains in office, it is a waste of time to expect any industrial development in this country which would be capable of ensuring employment to any appreciable portion of the unemployed.

Therefore, sir, the only solution, the only immediate solution is emigration. I want to emphasise that point. I do not want anyone either here or abroad to get the idea, that I feel that the entire beginning and end of improvement of the West Indian economic position is emigration. There shall be, I hope, a time in the very near future when in Barbados and other Caribbean colonies the rate of progress of industrial development is such, that we can find work at home for our own people.

As a matter of fact, I would much prefer to see a half million pounds being spent on economic development throughout the entire area. But I am sufficiently realistic to know that that will take time to develop. I say that it is the duty of the Barbados Government to impress on the British Government that we are not off loading an element of our population on them forever. But admitting that the U.K. can find work for them just now and that we cannot, we are asking them to put this portion of our people in work temporarily, under contract if they like, and when they no longer have use for them they can come back home and we hope to be able to employ them.

If this Government had any faith, any vision, any foresight, they would appreciate that if we send 7,000 Barbadians to the U.K. it is not merely a question of sending them there to get work; there are other implications. They are going to learn new skills to work in industries and to take part in industrial development that we have not got here. When they return to the West Indies they will come back bringing these skills with them. Those are the people whom we will need to help us develop a West Indian nation.

It is beyond the conception of the Government to appreciate the vital importance of sending 5,000 or 10,000 Barbadian workers to the U.K. to work in industries and to acquire technical skills to get a chance of furthering their studies, and to advance

themselves educationally and finally to return here and place their newly acquired skills at the disposal of the West Indian nation.

I will confess now that that has been the overriding factor in my mind in agitating this issue. I see far beyond the immediate advantage of these workers acquiring a few dollars for which they cannot work here now. Although I have never said it before, there is no harm in saying it now: that if there was no other advantage involved than the one I have just referred to, it would be the bounden duty of everyone in this colony to realise his duty to his fellow citizens and assist in getting some of our people to Europe now.

That is why, Sir, I am so strong in my condemnation of the Government's policy or lack of policy in this matter. That is why I will exert every ounce of strength that I possess, to see to it that either this Government take practical advantage of the opportunity offered or that it be removed forcibly in order to make room for one which is prepared to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I now beg to second the motion made by the honourable senior member for the City.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, no member of this House can fail to be moved, if he is really interested, by the problem of emigration from this island. I go further and say, Sir, that I believe that all of us who sit around this table representing the people of our constituencies as we do, must have piles of letters, if not on our persons as is the case of the honourable senior member for the City, or in our brief cases, then certainly somewhere in our desks.

The tenor of those letters is: "Can you do anything to get me to England?" Or it may be an inquiry as it usually is as to: "How soon the Government will take an interest in this matter and lend us the money to get to England." That is what is agitating the minds of the people, and of course, Sir, while the Government is making up its mind, the people of this island are making all sorts of incredible sacrifices to get to England and find employment. They are not for a moment thinking of the alternative motives which the honourable senior member for St. Philip mentioned. All that they want is to be able to work and send money back for their parents or their relatives and dependents, and to enjoy a better kind of life than they have known hitherto.

That is the background against which the Government should act on this matter, realising that since they can do nothing for the people of this island by way of finding full, or nearly full employment for them, the least they could offer as an alternative is finding work, remunerative work outside this island for the people whom it cannot help inside the island. That should be the first consideration of the Government.

The next consideration should be, that when once you become interested in helping people to get out and helping them to find employment in the U.K., you should see to it that they go to such employment in the best possible circumstances and under the greatest possible aegis, neither of which has been done.

7.55 p.m.

Now, sir, if Barbadians and other West Indians like to go even at the cost of great sacrifice to themselves and are making the efforts to go, and are succeeding in their efforts to get themselves there, the circumstance which makes it necessary for us to give examination need not have taken place. This Government has the effrontery to tell us, that the Hon. Minister of Trade and the Labour Commissioner will go to England to see what can be done for the few Barbadians who have got there by their own

efforts, and who now find themselves in work. I want to say here and now, that if you wish to throw cold water on the few Barbadians who have managed to get themselves to England, and to make it impossible or at least difficult for others to go under the best possible auspices, you can dispatch the Minister of Trade there. I am sorry he is not in his place. I do not know what mischief he is conniving where he is now, but this plain speaking has got to be said. If I were invading in a military engagement and I saw the Hon. Minister of Trade on the other side I would feel certain that I cannot fail; I would even feel reinforced. I would feel that his presence in the enemy's camp was an asset to me. I should not, Mr. Speaker, indeed I cannot feel happy to hear that the Hon. Minister of Trade is going to the United Kingdom to make negotiations in this matter; but even if he has the best will in the world, there is a reason why he will not succeed; it is because of the terms of reference which are given here according to the statement which was laid on the Table of the House to-day. That statement will not help him to succeed.

Two months ago, when all this matter could have been handled at a greater advantage to us, I was one of four people who asked at a delegation at Government House, that the Head of the Administration considered sending out to England a parliamentary delegation. I, for my part, insisted on a parliamentary delegation, and for this reason: this matter of unemployment in this country is so serious a business, that it must be attacked by all the representatives of the people at its most vulnerable point. I do not know what is the experience of the Ministers of this Government with regard to unemployment, but presumably they have constituents, and such constituents must have been coming to them from time to time asking them for work. I am sure that the pressure of public opinion on this issue must have been so great on them, that they must feel as representatives of the people they should do something tangible about it. I feel that way about it. Therefore, I do not insist on a delegation comprising of the Hon. Minister of Trade and the Labour Commissioner, but that a parliamentary delegation should go to England to contact those people there whom you are supposed to represent, and also to make it clear in any such negotiations in England that we are the direct representatives of the people. It is not for me standing here as I do, to say who should comprise the parliamentary delegation. It may be said, that anybody who would suggest that a parliamentary delegation must go would necessarily want to be on it. That is the kind of objection which is usually made by those people who want to object to it on any grounds. I do not fear to meet that objection. I meet it by saying, if a person chosen feels that the people who choose him have the best reason for choosing him, he has no reason why he should not accept the choice. I insist on a parliamentary delegation because I wish this House to have a direct interest in this matter; and I also wish that the delegation when it goes to England, will do more than what is started here in this statement.

Those of us on this side of this Table who have been insisting on a delegation to be sent to England in this matter, have not in mind the holding of negotiations with the Colonial Office as to the advisability of the emigration of Barbadians there. On the contrary, we hold the idea that whoever was empowered by this House to go to the United Kingdom would go not in the first place to meet the Colonial Office, but firstly to get into contact directly with employers of

labour, and secondly, to look into the welfare of our workers there; and possibly after that, to get into contact with the municipal authorities of the area; where it was thought possible for West Indians to find work. After that had been done, such a delegation could profitably take up with the United Kingdom Government all other matters relating to the subject. But to send a delegation only to look into the case of those Barbadians who have already got there on their own, is to lay the delegation open to persuasion by the Colonial Office that the Barbadians who are there already are seeing it so hard, that the delegation must use all its efforts to dissuade others from coming. Knowing the Hon. Minister of Labour as I do, I cannot credit him with enough strength of will or with that adaptability, to withstand even the most silly argument which may be put to him from anyone in the Colonial Office. I feel sure that he will not know how to reply to any such argument; nor will he be able once he goes there according to the terms of reference in this statement, to see employers. He will not be able to see employers of labour after he goes to the Colonial Office. It will be borne on him that the difficulties of sending Barbadians and other West Indians are so great, that a period of marking time must be endured before the next shipment is allowed to go, therefore there will be no point in his seeing employers.

8.05 p.m.

And indeed, Sir, if you go with these terms of reference principally to look after those whom you have not already helped to go there and then vaguely, to take the opportunity as it is written here, to represent the Barbados case, if you just go like that, you will have prevented yourself from taking any bargaining power with you. I therefore feel, that some attempt should be made to take this Government out of its complacency; I do not know what can do that. It seems to me as if, contrary to expectations, where we had looked to see the Government up and doing and pulsating with life, we see as Disraeli said of Mr. Gladstone's third Government—a rock of existing volcanoes. I would take issue with Disraeli on this course; existing volcanoes have a grandeur about them which I cannot find pre-eminent in this Government and if volcanoes is a fitting metaphor to use I would say that the Government is extinct. (*Laughter*).

ADJOURNMENT

At this point Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for three quarters of an hour.

Mr. BRANCKER: I beg to second that.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, a motion is already before the House that this House do now adjourn for five minutes. That motion was seconded by the hon. senior member for St. Philip and therefore the latter motion has not yet resolved itself; how can we have another motion? I am suggesting, that the right motion to be made now is that the further debate on this motion be postponed. You cannot have a motion for the adjournment of the House for five minutes, and before that motion is put have another motion for the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion for the adjournment of the House for five minutes was made in order to discuss a matter of public importance. That was a specific motion. In all Assemblies you will find that a motion which is made for adjournment in order to discuss a matter of public importance is not the ordinary type of adjournment. Therefore, there cannot be any confusion between the two motions or any

similarity between the two. Ordinarily it would appear that a motion cannot be made for the adjournment of the House for five minutes and then another motion made for the adjournment for three quarters of an hour; but the explanation is given that a motion for the adjournment of the House for five minutes in order to discuss a matter of public importance is a separate and distinct motion.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that there is a Rule of this House in respect of meal time, and it does not matter what motion is before the House; the House is automatically adjourned without any question being put.

Hon. M. E. COX: I would like to see that Rule.

Mr. SPEAKER: Every hon. member knows that the motion which has been made by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy is a meal time motion, whereas the motion made by the hon. senior member for the City was a motion in order to discuss a matter of public importance.

The question that this House do now adjourn for three quarters of an hour was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

8.15 p.m.

On Resumption.

EMIGRATION TO ENGLAND RESUMED

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, for many a long day this question of emigration has agitated the minds of the people of this country, and that is not surprising, having regard to the fact that our greatest problem is that of over-population and the means of supplying work for our large number of people, which unfortunately we are not able to do. In consequence the minds of legislators, and in fact, of all public spirited people, are from time to time concerned with seeking, and where possible securing outlets for our teeming population.

When it comes to the question of emigration to the U.K. I think we should look at it very carefully and examine it from two points of view. From the long term point of view, I feel that it is proper to send a delegation to the U.K.; but the task of that delegation should be, in my opinion, to make immediate contacts with employers of labour in that country to ascertain what openings and how many openings there will be immediately available for persons from this country, and the type of employment which these employers have to offer.

That, Mr. Speaker, is a thing that should be done rightaway. Having focussed the limelight of publicity on this subject, you can well appreciate that persons from European countries who seem to have no difficulty in arriving in the U.K. and settling down into jobs (people from Poland, Austria and various other European countries) will redouble their efforts to get in, and it is essential that we try and get some of our people over there without delay before violent competition sets in.

Now, sir, I would commend to Government, (and I see that one member of the Cabinet is seated, and I have no doubt that he is paying attention) that we know that there are at least two ships about to leave during the course of the month for the U.K. with workers. One is the much advertised Italian liner, and I see that a Dutch liner is undertaking to take people for a slightly less price than the Italian liner. The Dutch liner will be proceeding direct to England and emigrants will therefore avoid that long journey from south western Europe to the U.K.

The immediate thing which I suggest the Government should do is to ensure that these people, our fellow citizens, who as has been said earlier in this debate have sold, pawned and borrowed and by other means obtained passage money, have at least some warm clothing. At this time of the year it is the cold that must be feared most; and as we have heard, this is one of the most severe winters that England has had for many a long year. So we should see to it that the people leaving on these ships this month and other months during the year, are given warm clothing. This House would not dare not to sanction a Resolution to ensure that these people are properly protected against the severities and ravages of the English winter.

Then, sir, when we so equip those who are going; we should send a delegation of effective and dynamic persons to immediately contact with the aid perhaps of the Trade Commissioner or the West India Committee or any well meaning persons, (of course the Government may be loath to use the services of the Trade Commissioner as he does not have the blessing of the Barbados Government) but get a delegation who will be able to contact U.K. employers and those who had vacancies in the U.K. sometime ago for workers.

Now, emigration with Little England is I think, like foreign policy when it comes to big England. It is a matter which is beyond party controversy. Even the Conservative Party at least pays lip service to the cause of emigration. This is one case in which I would raise no objection to an all party delegation, so as to ensure that there would be no attempt to delay by the Opposition or any other part of this community, the sending of this delegation or the implementation of their recommendations.

As soon, then, as we hear from the people whom we send that the employers say they can take 500, 600, 1,000 or 2,000 workers it should be the intention of the Government, once we have that material, to pay the whole passage or part of the passage of these workers or even charter a boat.

As regards the personnel of the delegation we want dynamic people. I certainly absolutely oppose the idea of sending a Government Official. Let us face the facts. Even with an official like the Labour Commissioner whom we know is a very mild, lukewarm, tepid sort of Government Official who certainly enjoys the social life of Barbados to the fullest if not its salubrious climate, a Government Official is the last person, especially a United Kingdom Official, to send on such a delegation.

The arrival in large quantities of coloured persons from the colonies to the U.K. is a source of embarrassment to them. That is a thing which we cannot get away from. Of course they will not mention it publicly. We hear such slogans as 'All British subjects; all alike; no distinction made.' But they are not really appreciative of the possible colour problem with which they will be faced; because we know that the Barbadian is prolific, and we know that you may soon have a very interesting mixed race springing up in the U.K. So while they are rendering lip service to the equality of all British subjects, we know that they are not enthusiastic about this large number of coloured colonials arriving in the U.K.

9.05 p.m.

If we appreciate that however well a Labour Commissioner may mean to us, he must realise what the Imperial Government will think about it. One cannot imagine, even as efficient a Labour Commissioner as our former Labour Commissioner, Mr. Guy Perrin was, (far less one on whom it is incumbent to take up-

on himself very seriously to pursue a policy which he knows in his heart of hearts will be allergic to the British Government) would be so enthusiastic. After all, we have no further employment to offer our Labour Commissioner. The post of Financial Secretary is at least occupied if not filled, and our Labour Commissioner must of necessity look for promotion outside. We cannot give him the promotion outside, therefore, he must look for it from the British Government.

Mr. Speaker, our Labour Commissioner cannot be other than lukewarm about this settlement of Barbadians in the United Kingdom, or rather of this emigration of Barbadians to the United Kingdom. Why I say settlement, is if Barbadians give efficient service, they may remain indefinitely.

Reference was made to a cable which was sent from the London Chamber of Commerce to the local Chamber of Commerce, and to a certain extent I commend our local Chamber on their reply, although perhaps they did not mean it. Certainly, it is a reply to which exception cannot be taken, except from the standpoint that though they were asked about the emigration from the West Indian standpoint they replied only as if they were speaking from the standpoint of Barbados. It is true that the enquiry was sent to the Barbados Chamber of Commerce, but I presume it was sent to this Chamber because Barbados is the hub of the West Indies. The London Chamber of Commerce enquired of the matter from the West Indian standpoint, and in the reply no mention was made of Jamaica and the unemployment there. We must bear in mind that this query was due more than anything else to what the *Daily Express* rightly expressed as the Cuban Black Pact. As you know, Cuban cigars are admitted into the United Kingdom while Jamaica cigars are kept out; and the thousands of persons who were employed in the Jamaica Cigar Industry no longer can find employment in their country; therefore, they have gone to seek work in the United Kingdom. It's a pity that the Chamber of Commerce could not answer the question in all its fullness without failing to emphasise the Barbadian aspect of it, at least that aspect which concerns us most.

I will now refer to the delegation and the terms of reference of the delegation as was told to us this afternoon. I must confess that it is uninspiring. I hope the wording of it has been drafted by some minor secretary, or one whose strong point is not English and one who does not represent the point of view of the Government in regard to the terms of reference of the delegation. It starts off thus: "After consultation with Her Majesty's Government, this Government, has decided that the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour, and the Labour Commissioner should visit England later this month to look into the practical issues affecting those Barbadians who have recently gone to England in search of work." It starts off to tell you what they are appointed to look into, as if some one told you that these people were already there and they are going there to look into their case. That is too casual; too offhand! It is confining the delegation to look into the case of those Barbadians who have already gone. It is considering the past and the present, but not making provision for the future. I would like to feel that as many Barbadians as are at present employed in the United Kingdom, many more times that number would be likely to be engaged. The statement goes on "while the scope of their enquiries must in the circumstances be restricted"—I am wondering if the word "must" is appropriate and if it is necessary. Why must the scope of this delegation be restricted? Why should not that delegation be authorized to contact employers of labourers in the United Kingdom and other persons who have vacancies on their staff? Why can't the delegation say to such people

"you have so many vacancies; what type of workmen will you require; we can telegraph our local Government and get it to interview such persons as would be capable to do the work and let the Government send them over." Why should you say that the scope of the enquiries must be restricted? The statement goes on to read "the delegation will take the opportunity of representing the Barbados case to the authorities concerned." The way that phrase is worded, reads as if that question is to be incidental to the purpose. Finally, the statement reads: "meanwhile certain information about the conditions facing immigrants on arriving has been received and is being published." I am one who is all for facts and information being published, but it is not enough merely to publish certain information about the conditions facing immigrants on arrival. I presume that information must have been received from the highest quarter and from the most authentic source. We do not want any information being published to deprive our people from taking their chance to go over there for employment. The immediate problem which these people have to face is that they should not be without warm clothing. Once they are one-third of the journey out, they will find themselves in need of warm clothing; but when it comes to the housing problem, although one wants it to be known, the worse conditions of overcrowding which I have heard from correspondents in London is not as bad as housing conditions amongst Barbadians who are now in this country. The worse case does not surpass that of this country. Therefore, do not let us make out that the problem is so overwhelmingly serious as to deter those who want to seek employment there. Let me say, that the persons who go there are making good, and are finding work which they would not be able to find in this country.

9.15 p.m.

One last word of warning I would sound. The honourable senior member has spoken about the issuing of passports; I can support him as to that. I have had some communication with the Commissioner of Police on this question of the issuing of passports. I know of cases in which persons who are seeking to go to the United Kingdom have been told "we will not issue the passport first; you must first bring your ticket from the Steamship Company before we issue you a passport. You can fill in your application form, if you like, but unless you bring your ticket fully paid for, we will not issue you a passport." That is the policy of the department, and it seems to me that the departmental head is either acting arbitrarily or he is acting on instructions on which he feels he should act. I remember only about two or three years ago when I sent to buy a ticket to go to another Caribbean colony the Steamship Company said: "you should have sent your passport; we promised in your case that you will have it and we will issue you a ticket." In those days it was the Steamship Company saying you should have your passport first, so that nowadays there is a complete change over for some reason or other; you cannot get your passport until you produce your ticket which is fully paid for. It would be interesting to discover the reason for that change, if it were not that that department is trying to make it difficult or impossible for persons to go from this country to the United Kingdom. I understand they say "presumably you have the money to go to the United Kingdom and what is your objection to going and getting the ticket first?" I cannot see why there should be this reversal of policy if it were not intended to make it difficult for coloured persons to go to the United Kingdom.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have made the main points I wanted to make; and I do hope that the members of

the Cabinet will convey to the appropriate quarters the points which I have stressed; because, it is up to us who are endeavouring to build the Social Welfare State to ensure that we will not allow people to go to a cold climate without a suitable scheme. That is a very necessary thing. After the delegation has gone and made its contacts and telegraphed to say how many workers of each particular class are needed, then it is up to us to provide the means of getting these people across as has been done in the case of emigration to the United States of America. We should not be worrying about the claims of a certain section in the United Kingdom who do not want people to go there and cause a mixed racial problem; that is no concern of us at all. We want our fellow citizens to avail themselves of the opportunities of obtaining work which they cannot obtain here because of our over-population. I think that we should take that line of action; our concern is to get work for Barbadians, and not just to embarrass the British Government who may feel themselves embarrassed because of the presence of a few Barbadians. If we take that approach, we will ensure that the type of persons who go out will be a good advertisement for Barbados and there are thousands of Barbadians who are willing to go out and who would be a first class advertisement for Barbados.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I was not in my place when this House resumed after the dinner adjournment to resume my speech, and I now crave your permission to do so.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member may proceed.

Mr. TUDOR: There is an aspect of this matter which cannot be stressed sufficiently, and it is that we have not paid enough attention to this matter of emigration to England from the point of view of the United Kingdom Government. Sir, the fact that large numbers of West Indians are going up by whatever ways and means they can and in such large numbers, is in itself not merely a credit to the British Government but also a condemnation of its Colonial policy. It is a credit in the sense that conditions so far may have been changed after the war that Britain can now boast of having full employment and that is something to be proud about, but on the other hand, the fact that conditions in the British Colonies are so bad that people would prefer to face any hardships in leaving their homes rather than stay and face greater hardships — that fact is a condemnation of British Colonial policy. Therefore, this Government of Barbados when it realises that, has no right to start off to tackle this problem by giving the impression that it is accommodating itself to the British Government.

9.25 p.m.

It is not right for the Government to restrict its own manoeuvre by waiting in the first place to see what the attitude of the British Government is; and in the second place, when it does take action, to take action on such a small scale. That is why sir, that the more I look at this problem and the more I read and study the statement laid before us, I think the terms of reference of whatever delegation goes should not be the terms that are set out here. But even if the Government insists on keeping these terms of reference and sending the delegation to do precisely what is laid down here, I cannot urge upon them too strongly that they should reverse the terms of reference. As it reads now, the Government has decided after consultation with Her Majesty's Government, that the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour and the Labour Commissioner should visit England later this month to look into the practical

issues affecting those Barbadians who have recently gone to England in search of work. While the scope of their enquiries must in the circumstances be restricted, the delegation will take the opportunity of representing the Barbados case to the authorities concerned.

In all seriousness, Mr. Speaker, I contend that the latter of these terms of reference should be the main interest of any delegation going to England, and not merely a sideline. As I said before, we should make a determined assault on the employers first of all. They are the only people concerned. The Colonial Office itself would only be concerned, if it had so far forgotten itself as to cause the English cabinet to introduce legislation to stop us from coming. Then the Government would have to become engaged in a battle royal in the Colonial Office; but there is no way the Colonial Office can help us in this issue, except what help they can give after the employers have told us that they want so many thousands or so many hundreds of our workers, and that they are prepared to pay them so much and so much for such a period of time. (*Cheers*).

It is only after substantial arrangements had been gone into, that the Colonial Office can facilitate (if it wishes) the arrival of Barbadians and other West Indians in the U.K. Even if the Colonial Office does not wish to do that no great injury is done; because we will have already agreed with the employers as to the kind of work and the scope of work; and it is almost certain that our people will be employed by people and with firms who already have their own welfare organisations existing. Therefore, I cannot see what is preventing this Government from acting. At least, I know; but this is not a public platform and therefore, for the purposes of this debate I would rather not mention it.

Here you are as a Government; up to now, since you have been in office, you have not been able to satisfy the people of this island that you have a proper employment policy for them. Of course you have said you are in favour of having every one employed; but saying it like that, is like saying that you are in favour of heaven. The answer is that you had better be. If therefore you discover that it is the best intention, (for the purpose of this debate I give them credit for good intentions) that you cannot employ everyone in this island, the very admission of your inability to find employment for everyone should be the greatest possible urge to you to see that those who wish to go abroad and find employment, receive the greatest amount of support possible. That is the very least we should do; but you will not do it if you stick your toes in and believe that all of us who are urging it upon you, are only trying to embarrass you.

Even if in our criticism we embarrass you, the embarrassment you feel is nothing compared with the suffering and deprivation of the persons in whose interest we are acting. So if you are the people's Government, you should count it your bounden duty and pleasure to suffer a little embarrassment in order that the thousands of people whom you cannot help should get the help which you should give them if you were organised properly as a Government.

Mr. Speaker, the issues are simple and plain. It is now true without question that employment can be found in the U.K. for large numbers of Barbadian citizens. It is also true, and true to the shame of this Government, (or it should be) that those whom you have not helped have managed to arrive in the U.K. and that they have in some cases impoverished their relatives in the process. That should make

you bow your heads in shame, and wonder if that is a fair requital of the votes you have been given.

Here you have a situation now, in which you find yourselves called upon to act. You should jump into the situation, which to do you justice, you have not really created because the opposition to it and your reluctance even to consider it, must surely mean that you do not take it seriously. But Barbadians are in the U.K.; more are going, and you cannot stop them. (*Cheers*). You now find that you must do something. You said that you waited to see the attitude of the British Government, but if you yourself were a responsible Government, you would have known beforehand what that attitude would be. Do not fool yourselves that the British Government has just been turning this thing over in their minds as an academic problem; I feel there must have been discussions at Cabinet level, and even higher, (at Privy Council level) to consider the advisability of stopping the influx. The results of such legislation in the House of Commons even if it had passed and received royal assent, would have been more formidable and more disadvantageous to the British Government which even Mr. Churchill, redoubtable as he is, would not have cared to face.

The British Government can do nothing. It has told you it can do nothing; but now that it finds that it must do something it says, "send a delegation, but make sure you send a lukewarm one." All this I see as I read this Statement. The whole idea behind it is to attempt to accommodate the Barbados Government and the embarrassment which the British Government experiences.

9.35 p.m.

After all, we are Barbadians first, as the honourable senior member for the City is always saying. If the British Government finds itself in an embarrassing position, then we as Barbadians should take advantage of that embarrassing position. If, for a moment the Colonial Office finds itself with all its guards down and cannot strike a blow in its own defence as it would like, the thing which we should do is to wade into the fray with all our guns blazing; and the way for us to bring about this pressure, is to make a bee-line off the Colonial Office and visit potential employers. The British Government cannot prevent this House from sending a delegation of its own members to trade with potential employers. It cannot do that for two reasons. It cannot restrict the entry of colonials and therefore, any Barbadian going there will be allowed to land. The inability of the Colonial Office to restrict the entry of West Indians must mean that it cannot say to the British employers whom they should and should not employ. Employers themselves, if any attempt were to be made to restrict their choice, would soon make their resentment felt where the British Government will feel it more keenly; that is, at a bye-election or at the next General Election, or by discussion with the International Press. If this Government feels timid, we on this side of the House can give it the necessary encouragement; but we can only encourage it in good work. We say "yes, we want a delegation" but one at parliamentary level. Of course the delegation must be led by the Hon. Minister of Trade because we have Ministerial system of Government, but the Hon. Minister of Trade must be surrounded and buttressed. Words seem to fail me to impress upon you the necessity of strengthening the Hon. Minister of Trade. He must be accompanied by people who will urge him to take a strong stand at all times, and to see that he concedes nothing to the Colonial Office; and in his negotiations with the prospective employers, that he clutches every least

single advantage he can for the Barbadians, and that he insists on the most reasonable and favourable terms and conditions of work, remuneration, welfare opportunities and all the like. When he has done all that he can, (as an afterthought, but as a necessary part of what he has been sent to see) he can then look into the disadvantages affecting the Barbadians whom he did not send there. If any of them is suffering, see what he can do to alleviate that suffering, and so link the prosperity and the new opportunities which he would be creating for Barbadians together with the opportunities and advantages which he should have fought for those Barbadians already there.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it perfectly clear that I will only support the idea of a parliamentary delegation. It is not a question of, if you cannot get what you like take the next best thing. The next best thing would be two parliamentary delegations, not a delegation comprised of the Hon. Minister of Trade and the Labour Commissioner alone. I will be prepared to support any reasonable charge on the Treasury for the establishment, if necessary, of a Liaison Officer in the United Kingdom for any reasonable length of time which such an Officer would warrant for carrying on in the interest of Barbadian workers at a high level, from where this proposed delegation leaves off. I wish to assure the Government, Mr. Speaker, that this House will not prevent the Government in any way from looking after the problem of unemployment by withholding the supply of money. If the Government loses out on this matter, it will not be, I submit, that our suggestions were silly or ill-timed; it will be so because it is blinded by the sort of prejudices which make it impossible for certain people to do what is right or to see more clearly. The last possible place you should encourage that is in a Legislative Assembly.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: On the last occasion when a debate on this matter arose, I put forward the view that it was right that you should approach this matter on a more or less territorial basis. I then advocated the idea that a delegation of West Indian Governments should meet the United Kingdom Government in the United Kingdom to discuss the matter. I need to speak a bit more on this emigration to the United Kingdom today, because, the Government has served us within recent days with copious statements; whether they are statements of speeches, there are frequent in coming here. If you have to insist on this matter there is the fact, and the undeniable fact, that if people are leaving the West Indies in such large numbers for England, (I am not thinking in terms of Barbados alone) that all is not well in Denmark. It is a fact that people are taking up all their hard earned cash in order to get them to England, but it shows that all is not well in Denmark. Let us admit that; and if you start on that premise you can well see why they are going. Do not let us worry about that the Hon. Minister of Trade may think because we know what is his affliction, and we have to bear with it. However, we cannot think of having a delegation without him. We are not responsible for his being given that portfolio. What we do say when we have a matter such as this, is that we want to put our best foot forward; we do not want to put our peg-leg forward. When we look at the composition of the delegation, what do we find? It is led by the Hon. Minister of Labour supported by the Commissioner of Labour, so we can see at once what we are in for. We can see the writing on the wall already. I do not want to make it appear as if we are attacking this issue on personalities, but you cannot help in debating the

persons who comprise a delegation in an issue like this. We know very well that the Government can decide by its own imagination not only to send the Hon. Minister of Labour or the Labour Commissioner, but that it can decide to send the most notorious character in the street on a delegation such as this, and we have no alternative.

Reading this statement of policy, it does give you an indication of how gradually you can contract yourself into a narrow coterie of people, and not wishful of taking advice from those who are capable of giving it from their own convictions. This document reveals the lack of sufficient background. It shows that this whole question is treated as an after thought of what one felt he should tell the public. Some of us get a bit nervous when someone speaks of us as being Africans or Negroes. Some forget that all of us with this colour came here with the same common background.

9.45 p.m.

This whole problem of emigration is catching up with us in the 20th century. It is just like retribution; the British Government has to face what it has planted, and, like the Biblical injunction—what a man soweth, that shall he also reap. The idea of planting people in other countries without any safeguard for their economic future is now catching up with them. The people have grown up; and those of us who can say these things without anybody chiding us for being anti-British, let us face this problem today. All the Negroes who have been planted here 300 years ago find it impossible to eke out an economic existence. In this island today, how many white boys from Harrison College, Lodge School and Combermere School are unemployed? None. In this island of Barbados unemployment is only divided among one section of the Community; and that particular section of the community has taken upon itself to say that they are bursting hands and going wherever they can get employment. However, the people who can find the money so that they can provide their children with an opportunity are not in that category; we can employ certain people in our kitchens and we perpetuate a system which was founded many years ago. We must say in this 20th century that that was a relic of the old days and we have to remove these things today. I must say that this emigration business is one which has not been sponsored by the Government; it is a spontaneous movement by the people and we need not be afraid. Some of us who sit in this Assembly today are the products of those who went on the emigration movement which started at the beginning of this century; and what has happened? That period is like the period before the Great War when 50 million people emigrated to Australia and to the continent of Europe because the economic pressure was so great, that even people from the British Isles emigrated to Australia and Canada. You go through the West Indies and you can see wherever there has been a notable success; every nine out of ten coloured children owe their success to the United States of America or to the people who emigrated to Panama. The whole thing is working like a cycle; after a World War you have an inflated economy which lulls you into a position that you are better off than others and now that things are wearing off you are getting this exodus of people to the United Kingdom. Some people seem to lull themselves into complacency by saying that from time immemorial, you had a population problem in Barbados. It is like the Biblical injunction that the poor will always be with you; therefore, we can let poverty remain and do nothing about it. However, we have to find the ways and means of

eradicating poverty from our midst. It is still a condition that somebody has to have a lot and we will be contented with the little; the idea of half a loaf being better than no loaf at all has lulled people in a position to accept conditions here, and that in the Great Beyond we will have something better, that is the old idea. But those of us who have a sense of reality will realise that these things cannot help us any more. We have to face all these things. The position is this: a large number of our children are leaving the schools and some of us at sometime or other have to be confronted with people who want employment. I do not believe that any member of this House faces the position of his son or daughter being unemployed; but think of the fathers and mothers who are not working for enough to be able to assist their children! It is a fact that people are going to England in the time of winter and despite the pictures which you see printed in the *Advocate* that cannot prevent them from going. Somebody has said that it is better to die by the sword than by the famine.

9.55 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, we are passing through a very serious period, more so at a time when all of what I regard as intellectual resources of this island which should be used, are not being used; and we do not get the best that we have, and the minimum we have is taking not only the role of consultation but also of dispensation. This Statement that has been laid proves that.

I take a very serious view of the matter because, I as a Barbadian, feel that unemployment is a thing about which you must not be content to say that we are taking steps, and to use the clichés about active steps will be taken to ameliorate this and that. In an instance such as this, what do you find? The Statement mentions questions asked in Parliament and what the Home Secretary said in the House of Commons in reply to those questions.

There are some honourable members who have lived in Great Britain. I have paid some visits to that country too. This question of emigration is one that has been discussed by the I.C.F.T.U. In 1941, the Premier attended the foundation conference of that organization in London as the delegate from this colony, and this is what was said on emigration: "We recognise that in some few countries the needs of the population may be so great in relation to available resources that no reasonable amount of National or International effort can provide them where they are with an adequate standard of living. In such cases this voluntary emigration of workers should be encouraged and facilitated."

The Premier, as I said, was at that conference. They laid it down as a solemn Resolution that they regarded voluntary emigration to be a necessity in such cases, because they knew that certain areas were in need of it. Where the British Government is concerned in this matter, sometimes we have to thank God that there are different ideologies in the world to keep people on their toes. If there were not different ideologies at the U.N.O., if there were not Soviet Russia, things might be a lot different. But the fact is that you cannot pass legislation which will be so much grist for your opponents' mill.

What I do say, is that we should face this issue. The British Government could not refuse to support a loan for our Deep Water Harbour nor can they pass legislation restricting colonials going to Britain; not with what is going on at the U.N.O.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair, and Mr. Deputy Speaker took the Chair.

The British Government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is not like the Trinidad Government or like any other Government which can say that an emigrant must produce £30 and can only stay a few months. Those who have lived in the U.K. know that as far as our complexion is concerned, we have to learn that we are not responsible for it. We are not responsible for how we are made. We know that Great Britain is an island, not a Continent; they have not been accustomed to having large numbers of people like us going there. They regard this invasion as a threat to their social and cultural existence. As you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, some of them feel that we are so prolific in our natural resources that we will change the whole composition of the British community in a couple of years. We are not responsible if we have some gifts that other people do not possess; it is a matter of divine dispensation. However, people get to appreciate and love you after they know you.

The Government on its side has been very lukewarm. A statement of policy by the Government is always a suggestion that all the odds are against them in throwing the dice. The Chancellor of the Exchequer in Great Britain has said, that far from putting up any barriers against us they prefer to keep us at home, and they will send more money on industrial development in the West Indies. Let us have it. British Guiana and British Honduras need development. Help us to do it; not like those who talk about Federation, not like those who say we want Dominion Status, and then sneeringly ask if we can get it when we go begging.

We know how the British Government look at these territories. Because of their policy we came here as slaves. Some honourable members talk about their origin; but to tell some people about Africans you will think that you are asking them to reopen the Black Hole of Calcutta and go and live in it. You hear some people say that their origin is Irish; there are some West Indians who like to believe what English people tell them that they sound more like Irishmen or Welshmen. I am hoping that this matter will be an eye opener for this Government. We who pretend to be Socialists in this island, must begin to learn that we must not build the sort of economic structure that prevents the proper distribution of the wealth of this country. We must free ourselves from this belief that the poor will always be with us. We must free ourselves from that, if we want to build economic structure that has any bearing on a 20th Century socialist community. What is taking place in this island is not a true reflection of what should take place. No white boy leaving Harrison College or the Lodge School, finds it difficult to get a job. He can always worm his way into some corner or other and get employment. You only have difficulty when the mark of the beast is on you. The Government can build all the playing fields it likes at the schools, but when the children leave those schools, where are you going to put them?

10.05 p.m.

Sir, you cannot educate a man for a job; you educate a man to be a citizen. As soon as you begin to educate a man to be a robot, that education is false. You must educate a man to be a citizen because he has to live and work with others who are doing the same work he is doing. Your education must be so broad, that it should serve you in all aspects of your life.

The statement reads further thus:

Nevertheless, the Government has decided, after consultation with Her Majesty's Government, that the Minister for Trade, Industry and Labour

and the Labour Commissioner should visit England later this month to look into the practical issues affecting those Barbadians who have recently gone to England in search of work.

Sir, I know of the practical issues affecting those West Indians who have recently gone to England. I have just passed through England and I know something of the situation there. You are going to find that as soon as a West Indian arrives in London or at Plymouth and he has no particular person to meet him, that he has no other alternative but to wander around until he sees a face like his; and he probably will take a lodging for the time being with that person, or some person whom that person may recommend to him. No person who went to the United Kingdom will tell you that he liked it on the first day; especially if he happened to go there during the winter. I have had the experience of going there during the winter and although I had all the warm clothing that was necessary, I felt like coming back home. It is only after a couple of weeks after you are there that this feeling wears away.

Do not think New York in the 1920's was what it is to-day. When West Indians went there in the 1920's, they had to put up with hard conditions; but they adapted themselves to the conditions because they wanted employment. It is a fact that if they did not put up with the hard conditions, many Barbadians would not have got better education. They stuck it. I see nothing wrong in people telling you of some of the difficulties with which you will have to face. As you know, Sir, some people in this community can only eat meat once a week—on Sundays. Daily people come to me and tell me they do not know where they are going to get something to give them tea the next day, furthermore breakfast. What are the practical issues affecting those Barbadians who have recently gone to England in search of work? The fact is that Barbadians are now going up there in numbers, therefore, obviously, they are going to meet with some difficulties. I have heard of some people from here who emigrated to Panama in the early part of this century, and some of them died soon after they got there. But the fact remains that wherever there is congestion so great as it is here, there must be some outlet; therefore, the people are taking upon themselves the opportunity to go out of the country. Those are the practical issues which must be faced.

The Statement reads as follows further on: "While the scope of their enquiries must in the circumstances be restricted the delegation will take the opportunity of representing the Barbados case to the authorities concerned."

Let us be patient. Who are the authorities concerned that you are going to ask Mr. Pickwood, the Labour Commissioner to make representation on your part? The Labour Commissioner is a Colonial Civil Servant. Soon and very soon, he will be looking for promotion elsewhere; and the people to give him that promotion are the people at the Colonial Office. What sort of representation can you get from a Colonial Civil Servant who is white and English, and is seeing Barbadians of this colour going to his homeland in search of work. Imagine the plight of the Labour Commissioner putting the case of the Barbadian people in England. As I have said earlier, you cannot avoid the affliction of having the Hon. Minister of Labour going to England on the delegation; and for that reason I do not agree with other members when they talk of sending a parliamentary delegation. I do not see other hon. members who would like to go to England on this parliamentary

delegation doing anything effectively along with the Hon. Minister of Trade. I do not see how much can be done, if the hon. junior member for St. Lucy and the hon. senior member for St. Philip were members of the delegation. I am sure we will hear from here, more talking of them in England than we would like to hear. Sir, you will have to allow this delegation to be constituted as it is.

Another thing which you must bear in mind is that this Government is sending this delegation, and you cannot expect that the Government, constituted as it is, would liberalise the delegation unless a metamorphosis comes over it. I heard when the Deep Water Harbour Delegation was being discussed in this Chamber, the suggestion that the Head of the Administration should go because with the issues involved, you must have a little something more than the ordinary person to put the case, and because we as local people did not have this little something. In this case, these practical issues which this delegation is going to England to look into, strike at the bottom of the British heart and more than their lending us money. As a matter of fact, they might think of loaning you money to keep you out. As you know, you cannot invite the same man who loaned you money to take dinner with you. There are many people from whom you can borrow money but whom you cannot invite at home.

10.15 p.m.

On this question of emigration I cannot see the effectiveness of this delegation comprised as it is. We are not sending anybody to Wisconsin or Florida to see what kind of barracks the people live in; we are not sending anybody on any familiarisation tour. The Minister of Labour said earlier in the session that we must give them a little time. He needs time but when you have this sort of delegation spearheading your attack and appealing for time, and the Hon. Minister will be Vice-Admiral and Pope in this matter, what do you expect? I feel that this issue is a very important one indeed and I am glad that a delegation is going; but I am sorry to say that in this issue which involves a West Indian matter, only the Barbados Government has seen fit to send a delegation. The R.E.C. has a meeting tomorrow and one of the things on the agenda of this R.E.C. meeting, is the question of West Indian emigration to the United Kingdom and of students in Great Britain. As I said before, I am sure that if the Jamaican Government had pressed the R.E.C. to get something, you would have had a big delegation going up. When we realise how pressing this situation is, I would be the last person to say anything against it; because, I do not regard matters such as this as one in connection with any political vote. I argue that Barbados is still individualistic; some people will get back in this Assembly all the time no matter what other people say. The people know who can deliver the goods and they know who cannot deliver the goods. People are not going to Great Britain on any joy ride, or just to see if Lord Nelson is really in Trafalgar Square or to see Her Majesty the Queen; people who are going to England are desperately in need of work. I hope that nothing I have said about the person who is heading the delegation will be taken as anything personal; but I do feel that you need somebody who can carry more than physical appearance and an air of arrogance to meet people, so that when you are finished you are still friendly with them. If you have not been made up of that sort of thing, it is one of the worst things to put people in jobs for which they are not fitted either temperamentally or otherwise to perform. We must all wish this delegation success; in the final

analysis we must do something to help these people. I cannot commit myself in one way or the other to say how we should help them.

In the United Kingdom assistance was given to people who are leaving England to go to Australia; those of us who know anything about cricket will know that the fast bowler Larwood is now living in Australia; he emigrated there. As I said earlier, we need an International Committee on European emigration to assist in this matter; it is true that we have not got down to this problem of emigrating people, because we have not yet become independent territories. India can talk directly to the United Nations, but we have to speak as a colony through Great Britain. Until we get our independence, I say there is no harm in anybody feeling that we are inconveniencing anybody.

Sometimes it makes you feel as if it is a crime to be black. I believe that historically some of the worst things have been associated with the black people. Even in terms of local parlance in this country, you hear people saying, "Mr. So-and-So is a gentleman, he is only black." Something is wrong with him. These things are associated with black people. I hope, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this kind of language will not cause any embarrassment to you because you are not among those who regard people in that light; but we must rid ourselves of this idea that if you are working on the same basis as anybody else, you should not be thought to be embarrassing to anybody. I do feel in the same way as anybody else; therefore, we have got to rid ourselves of this idea that because people have not seen you for a long time there is a difference in the species. If people go to the United Kingdom and it is going to be any source of embarrassment to the people in England, then I am glad of that source of embarrassment because we will be able to get some economic development.

As I said on the last occasion, I would not advise a Barbadian to go, or not to go to England. If you tell him not to go, he will say that you do not want him to go out and improve himself; and if you tell him to go and he sees hard, he will say that is what you encouraged him to do. Let those who want to go, go. Get them to England or get them somewhere. I have read a document laid here by a Minister who implies that there is no place in the wide world who wants Barbadians.

10.25 p.m.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the honourable member say what document is that?

MR. F. L. WALCOTT: It was a recital of historical events that took place long ago. It even contained something about the case of the island of Santo Domingo to which the Minister of Social Services went, and an account of which was never published.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable member referring to a Document laid on the Table of this House?

MR. F. L. WALCOTT: Yes; but as we have no way of debating these documents, I made reference to that. As far as the delegation is concerned, I am sorry to see that it is not West Indian in character and that it does not reflect more virility. I would have preferred to see the delegation composed of the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Communications. Say what you like, the Minister of Communications is a politician, and political exigencies will make him see that there are 80,000 people in St. Michael, and that he should do his best where this question is concerned. I would like to give Jack his jacket. I believe that that Minister would be more inspired. On all the delegations on which he has

served, he has more or less endeared himself to strangers at least.

Another point that I would make is this: apart from the employers in Great Britain, we must face the fact that that country is a highly industrialised one; and that the Trade Union Movement is strong indeed. It is not like in Barbados or the West Indies as a whole, where a Government can ride rough shod over the Trade Union. The Trade Unions in Great Britain will make it difficult for any Government of any particular complexion if the Government started to do anything that the Unions did not approve of. During the War when they brought Italians over from Europe to work in the mines, there had to be a distinct agreement with the Trade Unions. We know that in Great Britain the British worker is a unionist and will protect himself first; there is nothing wrong with that. I never make a man feel that I will leave my home without food and minister to others first. I must put in fuel first before I can work for others. So the British worker will see about himself first. You have to deal with the Trade Unions. You have to work through them and see their reaction apart from the British Government's reaction. You must soften up the Trade Unions first. Perhaps the Government is sending the Labour Commissioner to do that part of the work.

However, sir, I wish the delegation success; because all of us in this community no matter what our views are, feel that as far as employment is concerned we must all do our best to help people to earn a livelihood. I hope, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we will hear some reply from the Government. Of course I heard the Minister of Social Services say that the Minister of Trade and Labour is not here. I would say that if he were here, it would be worse. However, he does not have to be here to deal with this, because this is a corporate decision of the Executive; I mean this Statement. I do not take it that this is the Minister of Labour's own work; not that he is incapable, but I would say that the Minister of Social Services who is acting for the Premier should be able to say something about this.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

I am sorry that this Government did not think it fit to ask some of the other West Indian Governments (especially Jamaica) to go on this delegation; because, it would lift this matter out of the Barbadian context. I think the Government is aware that there are more Jamaicans who have emigrated to England than Barbadians. I hope it is not too late for them to get the Jamaican Government to join them. I have observed that people from Grenada and some of the other Windward Islands have joined this exodus too. I hope that the Government will take that into consideration if it decides to revise this matter.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, in considering this matter, the first thing you have to decide is whether there are jobs available in England for our people. I think that that is pretty well established by the opinion expressed in English newspapers. In addition to that, people who have gone to England on their own seem to have got employment; and I think that it is the letters that have come back from people who have got employment, that have caused the exodus of persons from these parts who are going to England willing to brave any hardships so as to better their positions. That is not unusual; and therefore, I am quite sure that they must have heard of someone who had actually gone and got employment before they decided to go.

Well, the next thing to do would be to grab every opportunity of getting our people there. It

strikes me sir, that I have been hearing about the Jamaicans going to the U.K. to look for work and probably finding it for quite a long time; and the idea of going and what can be called emigration to the U.K. must have been inspired in Barbadians, from the fact that other West Indians, particularly Jamaicans, were going there.

Is this matter really a matter for the British Government? I do not think so. What did we do as far as emigration to the U.S.A. is concerned? As far as I know, we negotiated with the employers who wanted labour; and since the U.S.A. is to us a foreign place the employers and the Trade Unions had to get the immigration barriers lifted so that our workers could get a temporary settlement. But Mr. Speaker, such conditions do not apply to the entry of West Indians into the U.K. As far as West Indians are concerned, this is not a matter that has taken place during the last three months. This has been going on for a long time.

10.35 p.m.

I emphasize that point so as to make this one: we have had members of the Government of Barbados going to the U.K. almost incessantly. At the very time when our own exodus was taking place, we had the Hon. Premier, the Head of the Administration and our Financial Secretary in England; what were we told when the delegation was leaving here? We were told that the Head of the Administration was going along with the delegation so that if the time was propitious to go to the United States and possibly Canada, they would seek out opportunities of employment for Barbadians. Well, sir, that delegation which left here to mix talks on emigration with talks on the Deep Water Harbour Scheme, was in the United Kingdom when these conditions of employment in the United Kingdom were presenting themselves. I know that it has been claimed by the Hon. Premier that he did look into the emigration problem of Barbados workers in the United Kingdom; but the Government cannot escape the charge of its lukewarmness in the matter or its unwillingness to embarrass the British Government. As we have heard to-night, the last Royal Commission put Barbados first for consideration in any scheme for emigration. The Hon. Premier in an interview with the local Press on his return from the Deep Water Harbour talks, told of all the important things that were discussed on that matter. He said that it might be found to be necessary that we would not need more than two berths in the construction of the harbour, but he never said a single word on emigration. He never even told us that he was refused admission to some hotel in Canada; we had to learn that afterwards. He did say afterwards that he discussed emigration, but he never told us with whom he discussed the matter. The fact remains that on this vital matter of emigration and taking into account that that delegation on leaving here said that it was going into another man's country to seek employment for our workers, that it returned back to this island and never said anything of the prospects of emigration in the United Kingdom. Sir, the feeling is prevalent that the Barbados Government as at present constituted, does not wish to embarrass the British Government by sending labourers from here there. That is a charge which can be laid against it and can be substantiated.

The United Kingdom and particularly England, is rampant with employment. The English people must have gone somewhere else; and if they have gone somewhere else, then they must have left their beds and homes; therefore the people who have gone there to do the jobs of those people who have left should find accommodation in those vacated homes.

The situation cannot be as hopeless as it is made out to be. There must be an explanation.

We find here in this statement this sentence: "Until a decision has been taken on future policy it is unlikely that Her Majesty's Government will be in a position to discuss ways and means of facilitating immigration from Barbados." It was very difficult for me to find out who is it to make this decision. It does not say. They are considering what they can do to keep the people out; and if the British Government can find a way out without having its name dragged into a debate of United Nations and made to look ridiculous, it will find a way out.

The statement goes on to read thus: "Nevertheless, the Government has decided, after consultation with Her Majesty's Government, that the Minister for Trade, Industry and Labour and the Labour Commissioner should visit England later this month to look into the practical issues affecting those Barbadians who have recently gone to England in search of work."

As it reads, you are going there to see what you can do for the people who are already there. You are not going up there to find jobs for them and others. If you say that you are going to see if they are having any hardship, then the proper persons whom you should send on that delegation are the Hon. Minister of Social Services and the official concerned with that—the Social Welfare Officer. We have only heard recently of these great hardships that have been experienced by the immigrants there. Just at the time when the House of Commons is dealing with this question at Cabinet level, we find the Press interviewing some of the immigrants. Bear in mind that the immigrant on his arrival is not only enduring physical hardships but he is mentally disturbed; the first thing that would hit him is home sickness. He would prefer to get back home. Even with some people who go somewhere to spend a holiday, the first thing that comes to their mind is the desire to get back home. It is under those conditions that the information from these immigrants is extracted and published. You will find on the front page of every newspaper, information to dissuade other people from going. They are even trying to tell them before they get to England what hardships they are going to encounter when they come across the continent; and that is because the agent for the ship which these emigrants are going by, is not one of the big six. I understand that the greatest difficulty is put into the way of that person.

10.45 p.m.

I must admit that this Statement is not a statement of enthusiasm about finding work for people. This is what they say in this Statement:

"While the scope of their enquiries must in the circumstances be restricted the delegation will take the opportunity of representing the Barbados case to the authorities concerned."

This Statement does not say that while this delegation is in England, it will take the opportunity of seeing if there is any difficulty in getting work for people. You do not want to go there to do social welfare work; you are going there to explore the possibility of finding work for West Indians, and you will be taking into account the people who are already there. The Government must alter its attitude towards this matter. The idea is getting around that you do not want to embarrass the British Government because you are expecting from them some Imperial honour or something like that: that is a wrong attitude to adopt and the Government is really to be blamed in this matter.

As to this question of difficulties being put in the way of people getting Passports, I should like to say that we have just increased the price of a Passport. If the increase does not cover the actual cost of the Passport then let us raise the price again; but do not prevent people from getting a future in some other place which they feel would be better. The British people do not deny that there is work to be done up there; visitors have said that there is work up there and there is also documentary proof of it. People will not say these things if they were not true; you must develop some top-class diplomacy and do your job. Do not attempt to fool us that you are really pursuing this matter vigorously when you are obviously not doing so. The particular thing which we should hear is that you are taking the opportunity of discussing this matter, because I have seen that things are not so rosy up there.

The honourable junior member for St. Peter has been able to say that this matter is on the agenda of the Regional Economic Committee; I do not think it is time for us to decide something when they are discussing it in the R.E.C. They may decide to send up a delegation which might have more weight. If we can get this matter looked after with the weight of the R.E.C., then I would support that. I think that at least the Government should have said that the matter is on the agenda of the R.E.C. and that the Hon. Minister who would be normally attending the meeting of that Committee, will decide whether they are dealing with this matter on a regional basis. This is merely saying something for the purpose of giving the impression that you are doing something, when you are probably not doing it in the right way in order to get the best results.

There is another aspect of this matter which strikes me and it is this: we are really nothing to do with the people in the United Kingdom feeling embarrassed about emigration to that country; if they feel embarrassed, well let them feel so. If a Labour Government were in England today and there was a Conservative Government in Barbados, they would do their best to find out what would embarrass them and encourage it. I say that we have got to ignore that aspect of the question. If British subjects in the United Kingdom have jobs to be done and they cannot get anybody to do them, and we are suffering from over population and unemployment, then I feel that the call should come from the employers of the United Kingdom. Our Government should join in getting work for people seeing that they have these jobs to do and cannot get anybody to do them.

10.55 p.m.

Talking about Englishmen emigrating to Canada reminds me that I noticed that we are spending money out of our entertainment fund to entertain tourists from Canada. I wondered when I was reading my paper this morning, if the Minister of Trade and Labour had got up and said, "I hear you have a lot of wide open spaces in Canada; would you accept some of our people to go there as permanent tourists?" You do not need to embarrass any one, but you could ask that some of our people be allowed to go to Canada and develop some of that land that Canada has. Find out what those people who want to have us as labourers and maid servants would do, if you went to Canada in large numbers. I would like to see something like that being done. The Government spends money on sugar people, the money which those people should spend on themselves in fighting their own battles. The Government is also spending money on tourists. If the labouring classes want you to do something for

them, do it; because, it seems that everybody to-day wants the Government to do something for them.

It seems to me that the Barbados Government has got to get up and get in this matter of finding work, instead of writing these White Papers and Statements. Let the papers be really white; that is, do not write on them at all; because, the Government is merely trying its very best to get out of the situation instead of facing up to it. They have given that impression, and I hope they will not continue with it. I also hope they will not say that the members of this House are trying to embarrass them.

I have talked with some of the people who have gone to England and some of their relatives, and the general impression is that this Government is thinking too much of what the British Government is saying instead of pursuing a policy by which they can get a number of Barbadians in the U.K. to work.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I have a few points to make. I think that the Government having heard the speeches made this evening, is at this stage considering whether to withdraw this unhappy document. If it is withdrawn, Government will be saved from further misery. I also want to say that this idea of sending a delegation composed of the Minister of Trade and the Labour Commissioner is really wrong. This issue is a West Indian issue; and there is no doubt that in all the islands in this area we have numbers of suffering people anxious to emigrate anywhere. The Government should discontinue this idea of such a delegation and let us have a West Indian approach to it.

I do not think that the Government would like its efforts to be a failure. I do not believe that the members of the Government would like to be associated with failure of any type, nor do I think that the members of the Government share this view about not wanting to embarrass the British Government.

What is unhappy about the matter, is the lack of socialist philosophy in dealing with it. I think that the West Indian population is something like three and a half million. I think that the population of England is something like 46 million. They could absorb a million people from the West Indies even without recognition. Statistics show that hardly more than 10 per cent of a population ever emigrate. If you think of the British Caribbean however, it would more likely be about 33 per cent who would emigrate. If it happened to be that a million of our people emigrated to the U.K. in five years, they could be easily absorbed in England.

As regards the question of the black man and his burden, I have discovered that there are some who are as black as the pot's bottom and they do not seem to be aware that they are. The hon. senior member for St. Lucy made a very strong statement this evening about the Commissioner of Police denying citizens of this country Passports. I believe that this is a criminal thing to do; and I hope that all members of the House will regard it with the same seriousness with which I regard it. I am asking that it be taken to the Executive. When you deny the citizen of a country a Passport, you rob him of one of his elementary rights.

I believe that the British Government will not deny West Indian Negroes the right of coming into that country purely because, the British Government is one of the signatories of the Declaration of Human Rights, although we can look at a country where three quarters of the population are tucked away in prison; I mean Kenya. But that is hardly likely to happen in the Caribbean.

All this talk about embarrassing the British Government is nonsense. Great Britain finds it

necessary to use her black colonials in time of war, and if in time of peace they go to England in search of work, is that something that should embarrass the British Government?

11.05 p.m.

Sometimes I am lost, as I search and examine the many statements made by many members of this Chamber. We did not come here by any sweet will of anybody. In the Caribbean there is nothing historical to prove that there is any difference in us, except with the few who really came here at the beginning and who really did not pass on their names to either of any of the black or white folks of that period. Without any exception, Sir, I say there is no question about the truth of such a statement.

What I am amazed to think of is this: this Government in an enlightened age like this could produce a document like this which is completely devoid of any philosophy, to say nothing of the early tenets of democracy and other tenets of socialism. I believe members of the Government have reached the stage where they realise that this is no longer a worthy document to pass on to the representatives of the people. I am wondering if it is only given to be regarded as something in sympathy with the situation.

Sir, I think even hardened criminals have a right to apply for a Passport. It is for the authorities on the other side of the bridge to say "No, you should not enter." No citizen who wants to go somewhere in search of employment should be denied that opportunity. I am making a second appeal to the Hon. Minister of Social Services (who on many occasions has shown some courage in that he would take this as a very close approach to Christianity in any of its forms) that the Commissioner of Police should not try in any way to deny a citizen the right to a Passport. Sir, I pray that what has been said in this Chamber will be observed. And I also pray that those who think that we should not embarrass the Mother Country would do nothing to prevent our people from going there. As a matter of fact, I think we should not mind if we embarrass them since they have not offered to take some of our population there.

With these few remarks, I hope that the members of the Government present will regard this as a very unfortunate episode in the history of our development. As I was saying, I think the embarrassment is with us. I think they should feel rather embarrassed and shame that they have not asked us to send some of our people there.

Mr. Speaker, I am now asking that further discussion on this debate be postponed.

Mr. BARROW: I beg to second that.

11.15 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I think it is rather strange to ask for a postponement of this matter at this stage. The Minister under whose portfolio this matter falls is not here today, and when he comes back he will not have heard what has taken place. I appealed earlier to the hon. senior member for the City to see that this debate should not have taken place, at least not tonight. It was quite evident that the particular Minister should be here to put the Government's point of view. I am not in favour of the postponement of this matter. The Government has been blamed for all sorts of things, it has been blamed for not being interested in emigration, of not wanting to embarrass the British Government and so on. I cannot fully—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is not in order to speak on the main question; he may only speak on the motion for the postponement.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I am not in favour of the postponement of this matter for the reasons which I will give. The Government has been accused of all sorts of things; I do not know why the five of us who form this Government should be less interested in the employment of people in this island than those honourable members who are on the other side. Somebody has referred to the document which was laid on the table of this House a few weeks ago which showed, that the Government has been doing its best to find employment for people outside of Barbados, and the success or failure of this venture was reported in that document. On this question of emigration to the United Kingdom, I think one or two honourable members ought to know that a Government cannot foster or sponsor emigration *vis-a-vis* another Government unless there is a working agreement with that other Government. As soon as this question of emigration to the United States of America was mooted, the Government of Barbados approached the British Government on the question. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: They had no right to do that.] It may be said of the five of us who form this Government that we are ignoramuses, fools, dummies and so on, but we thought fit to do it; and as regards the existing circumstances up to now there is the question of housing and other things, such as the honourable junior member for St. Peter has mentioned about the Unions. The Unions have a big say on this question of emigration to the United States; so much so, that up to a few months ago they thought we should not have any emigration. Therefore the Government faced with these matters has said, that the whole question of emigration is under review and we must not do anything until we hear to the contrary. That is the general picture as I know it. Since then there have been certain communications taking place between the Hon. Minister of Labour and the Colonial Office. I do not know what took place but I do know that there were certain communications passing between them. I quite agree with the economic background as given by the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

There have been one or two deliberate mis-statements made by one or two hon. members.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the honourable member can refer to that matter at this stage, because he is now speaking on the motion for postponement. He will have ample time to speak on that question.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I do not agree with that sir, but, if you say so, I will bow to it. I am not voting in favour of the postponement of this matter, but please let me deal with the matter. As far as this Statement is concerned, certain people purported to pick it to pieces. They say that it is just tom-foolery to send up a delegation of this sort to the United Kingdom; but this is deliberately set out in the first paragraph of the Statement:

"Until a decision has been taken on future policies it is unlikely that Her Majesty's Government will be in a position to discuss ways and means of facilitating immigration from Barbados."

That was our decision from the beginning; until a definite decision has been made this delegation could not touch on the big question of emigration. I think it is only natural in view of what we have been hearing, that the Hon. Minister of Labour and the Labour Commissioner should investigate the conditions on the spot.

The delegation is not going to England with their mouths muzzled; and you are not sending them to do anything at all. This Government is sending

them. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Not this Government.]

11.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Things are beginning to get out of hand. Hon. members will please contain themselves.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: This Government is sending the delegation to the U.K. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that I am not allowed to speak on the original motion. I am sorry I did not rise earlier.

Hon. M. E. COX: In view of the fact that a motion for the adjournment takes precedence over everything else, Mr. Speaker, may I move that the House adjourn for ten minutes in order that I may make a statement on emigration?

Mr. SPEAKER: I will not allow that.

The question that further consideration of the motion be postponed was put, Mr. Speaker declaring the "ayes" have it.

On a division being called for the question was put and resolved in a tie, the House voting as follows:—

"Ayes": Mr. BARROW, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MILLER, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. TUDOR, Mr. ALIDER and Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY—7.

"Noes": Mr. SMITH, Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. BRYAN, and Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY—7.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has resolved itself in a tie, seven honourable members voting "aye" and seven voting "no." I now vote with the "Ayes." The House will now resume Committee of Supply.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY RESUMED

Mr. Speaker, left the Chair, and the House resumed Committee of Supply Mr. Smith being in the Chair.

Pig Industry Debate—Cont'd

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I think that we should have at least had some motion that the House go back into Committee of Supply. However, sir, I am very glad that we have gone to this particular Resolution. I am making an appeal to the hon. junior member for St. George. I understand that when he took up his colleague on a matter pertaining to this Resolution, he did not know what he was talking about; and the information which he gave has proved to be incorrect. I am asking him to be man enough to deny it now or to promise the House that he will check up on the facts and make a statement to the House. If he does not do that, it will be used as evidence against him in the future. It sometimes happens that a member may be genuinely misled or his memory may not serve him rightly; but the present case is one of an honourable member deliberately taking up another on a particular matter, and by doing so, he might have encouraged me to vote one way or another feeling that he knew what he was talking about.

Mr. MILLER: This is about the fourth time that the honourable member has brought up this subject to me; and I have already told him, that I would check up on the question of the gestation period of pigs.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please allow me to speak. The Resolution before us is for \$24,760 for the purpose of pig-breeding. I do not want to hear anything apart from this Resolution.

Mr. MILLER: You are asking me sir, to deal with the Resolution which concerns a subsidy for the pig-breeding scheme, therefore, we are discussing

pigs. The honourable junior member for the City took me up on something, and you did not remind him to stick to the Resolution. This is the fourth time that the honourable member has asked me about it, and I have told him that I have the literature at home and I will check upon the facts; and that if I find that what I said about the gestation period is wrong, I would come back to the House and correct it. I think I know the honourable member and I give him my promise.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is nothing to do with the Resolution.

Mr. MILLER: We are talking about pig breeding, and what I am referring to now deals with the gestation period of pigs. I do not see that there is anything wrong if my colleague made certain statements and I told him that he was incorrect.

The honourable member made some statement in here earlier today and I told him he is wrong. However, I promised him on three occasions that I would check it and if I am wrong I will tell him so.

11.35 p.m.

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

Leave to Take Item, No. 2

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, as I said when leave was asked by the Hon. Minister for Communications, Works and Housing to take Item No. 1 that leave should have been asked for in the House; but that was not done due to an oversight by me. I am also asking leave to take Item 2, standing in the name of the Hon. Premier.

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

Supplementary Estimates, 1954-55, No. 33

Harbour and Shipping

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, this item is for the sum of \$23,750 to supplement the Estimates, 1954-55, Part I — Current, as shown in the Schedule to the Resolution. As usual I propose to take the items Head by Head. The first item is Lighting, under Head V — Harbour and Shipping. As will be seen from the note the cost of lighting expenses at Highgate Signal Station is included in the sum of \$24 provided under this item in the current Estimates. During the current financial year electricity was installed in the Government quarters provided for the use of the Signaller at this Station, and it is now estimated that the sum of \$16 will be needed to meet the cost of the increased consumption of electricity to the end of the financial year.

I beg to move that Head V stand part.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

The question that Head V stand part was put and agreed to without division.

Head IX—Public Market

Head IX—Public Market was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Head IX—Public Market deals with supplementary provision of \$1,858 to meet the revised estimated expenditure for light, water and stationery. The note sets out the items clearly; I beg to move that Head IX stand part.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I only want to bring this little matter to the notice of the Hon. Minister. I would like him to tell either the Directors of the Electric Company or those of the Gas Company, that when it comes to the lighting which they supply, to let us really get some light. The lighting which the Government is paying for is really a joke. You have to light a match to find something under any of those lights.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without giving expression to something which I took up with the Hon. Minister for Agriculture privately. I may say at the outset, that he remedied the situation at once. It is in connection with the lighting at the Public Market. I would just like to say to some of the Government officials that I am elected to this Chamber by the people, and I am not put here as some members of the Legislature from places where those officials came, that is, I am not put here by the Governor; therefore, when I express my view I express it fearlessly of anyone. I am only responsible to the people who elected me. Let me tell the present Superintendent of the Public Market that he comes here to deal with people who are a little more enlightened than those in St. Kitts where he has been trained in animal husbandry.

Now, during the flying fish season we allow the lights in the Fish Market to remain burning while people are there awaiting fishing boats that are out to sea. The Superintendent gave instructions that the lights should be turned off and further instructions to even take out the bulbs. I raised the question with the Superintendent who thought I was poking my nose in matters which did not concern me. I had to get the Hon. Minister of Agriculture to give instructions that those lights be put back in. When I made enquiry into the matter, the Superintendent was rather indignant. He took umbrage and used some remark about colour of persons. I am going to be very mild. I suppose he has not yet heard sufficient of me. I issue this merely as a warning to him. I shall poke my nose anywhere in this country that is spending money from the Government.

I see no necessity for turning off the lights in the market. As I have said, I had to phone the Hon. Minister for Agriculture to get him to give instructions to put them back on. [VOICES: Let there be light!] What is it if you have to pay a little more for light while 50 or 60 people may be sitting in the Fish Market awaiting a flying fish boat? The Minute which he put in relating to the Resolution is true. Of course those people will sit there and play cards; but after all, they have no clubs.

When the hon. junior member for St. Peter was in charge of that Department, I asked him to put a special light at the Fish Market to guide the boats when they come in at night; stupidly, even that light was put out. We do not want this parsimonious attitude when dealing with our fishermen. I am going to be mild on this occasion with this gentleman. Let him know that he might come in for a share that I have given other people; especially when I find that they belong to a type who leaves us with the suspicion that they would demoralise the youth of this country.

11.45 p.m.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I have a little point to put before the Committee. I did not expect the hon. senior member for the City would have expressed his feelings on the attitude of the Superintendent of the Public Market while we were dealing with this matter. As a matter of fact, there is another Resolution coming

up granting him that right. I would only like to say that there is a lot of truth in what the hon. member has said. I was rather gratified to hear that from the simple remark by the Hon. Minister for Agriculture 'Let there be light,' there was light; and that that was the end of the matter. I do not know if arising out of the same question, I should say that it was remarked that this Superintendent owing to his cruelty killed a Negro boy.

I just want to say this because it is my duty to do so. I am quite satisfied that that statement was made and he was very rude in referring to the "Negro boy." I hope he will read this and that he will not practise it in Barbados again. However this note in (2) (b) says this:—"The refrigerating plant is using an increased amount of water for its condensing system." I believe that that can be saved. I want what I am saying to go on record, because the Hon. Minister of Agriculture will probably have something to say about it. The condensing part of the plant is of the type which is never ever exposed to sunlight. I believe that the provision of a little roof would increase the efficiency of the plant, and it would save the cost of electricity and the amount of water which is being wasted. It would suppress the formation of moss which in itself is an insulation.

Mr. LEWIS: We have had an expert to report on this plant and I do not think the report bears out what we have just heard. However that is a matter for the experts. I have been asking for a long time (and I have never been able to get a proper answer) as to whether I am right or wrong in this matter: the Hon. Minister is always claiming to take back something to the Executive and discuss it. I want to know whether any of this water is being used for the purpose of washing rum bottles? Can I get an answer to that question now? Or will somebody promise to enquire into the matter for me? I know that the custom is to refund money, but I am also noting that this question has now gone from \$900 to \$1,700. I hope that when we come to deal with the Estimates, somebody would have made a note of this question and will answer it.

The question that Head IX stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without any divisions.

Head XXII—Public Library

Head XXII—Public Library was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, under Head XXII there is a revote of money in connection with the Public Library. I beg to move that this Head stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister has said that we have here a revote of money for the Public Library, but I do not see that here. What is stated here is this: "Through an oversight, funds to meet certain unsettled bills totalling \$816,47 incurred by the Public Library during the financial year, 1953—54, were not included in the Current Estimates as a revote." That is a very peculiar way of putting it; you will notice a little lower down something in connection with the financial year 1953—54. You have Estimates in 1953—54 and you have Estimates in 1954—55 and it would be a very peculiar thing to put in a revote of money in the next year's Estimates. What we have here is not true; this could not possibly be the explanation of it, because if the financial year ends on the 31st March and the new

year starts on the 1st April and you are considering the Estimates in February, that would have to be a specific dealing. I repeat that this could not be the proper explanation in this matter; if this is the normal running of this institution, they should pay their bills as soon as they are presented. If during the year you find that the amount is not sufficient then you can have Supplementary Estimates; but in this case you will have to give a further explanation as to how you came to know that the money would lapse. You will have Supplementary Estimates during the year and if you find that you will have expended the amount in January or February you should have Supplementary Estimates. If you order goods through the Crown Agents and they do not arrive by January let it be put in the Estimates as something outstanding, but not for the ordinary running of the Department.

In the normal running of the Library you will have to have Supplementary Estimates next year. I am continually saying that in cases where you have orders for items outstanding with the Crown Agents, you know you have the orders and yet you make no provision for them in the Estimates. You may have failed to have proper Supplementary Estimates during 1953—54, but you cannot put in \$816 in the way which it is put in here. If you have books on order and the price has gone up, ask for Supplementary Estimates during the year.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: According to my file the position arose because a letter of instructions which was sent from the Library to the Accountant General's Office could not be traced.

Mr. LEWIS: That is the explanation.

The question that Head XXII—stand part—was put and agreed to.

Head XXXII—Highways and Transport

Head XXXII — Highways and Transport was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: The sum of \$200 is being asked for the repair of a Road Roller taken over by the Highway Commissioners of St. Joseph, and \$3,120 is being asked for as a revote of the amount passed last year to meet the cost of replacing a concrete mixer which was transferred from the Department of Highways and Transport to the Department of Agriculture for use in connection with a scheme to counter the Mealy Bug pests.

I beg to move that Head XXXII—stand part.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second the motion.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, sometime in the year 1954 the parish roads of the parish you have the honour to represent, (chiefly on Your Honour's instigation I believe) were taken over by the Department of Highways and Transport. St. Joseph therefore now joins that happy band of parishes which come under the direct control of the Central Government along I believe with St. Lucy, St. Michael and St. Andrew to the best of my recollection. Other parishes such as the parish which I represent, still have to go cap in hand every year and request certain amounts by way of subvention from the Central Government towards the upkeep and the macadamisation of the tenantry roads in the respective parishes.

The parish of St. George has a long list of roads and a very alarming history of neglect on the part of the Central Government, when it comes to allocation of funds for the repairs of these tenantry roads. I do not want anything that I say now to be taken

as either a reflection on you sir. I would like honourable members to pay attention to what I am saying, because it is a matter of grave importance; I do not want it to be taken as a reflection on you, neither do I want it to appear as a censure of my colleague.

It is rather remarkable that while we have a list of approximately 17 tenantry areas in St. George with varying densities of population, within the last few months of the taking over of the parish roads in St. Joseph there are bulldozers working on land adjoining property owned by the honourable junior member for St. Joseph and the honourable junior member for St. George. I am not saying that there is anything improper or any favouritism involved in it. I would like the Minister of Communications to explain how it is that areas where you have a great density of population, can only get sometimes 1,000 feet of road per year while the particular spot to which I am referring goes down a steep hill, (I went to see it for myself) and I could see no tenantry house there at all.

Desirable as it would be, for the future reclamation of the land on the Spa Hill, that would be a long term capital project. I do not see how your estate or my colleague's, could merit attention now, to the total dereliction of the parish which I have the honour to represent. Pay a visit to the Spa Hill and you will see the bulldozers working. Mr. Chairman, you must be well aware that what I am saying is true.

As I have said, it may be desirable from a long term point of view to reclaim the land. That might have arisen out of Dr. Buie's recommendation; and in the dim and distant future it may be desirable to have a proper road going through there. My geography and my knowledge of the topography of that area may not be as good as yours, but I see no tenantry houses along that road, and I see no justification for the paltry allowance which we get in my parish when other parishes enjoy such sums, and a parish which has now only come under the dispensation of the Highways & Transport Department, has a road being done that does not pass a single dwelling house apart from the dwelling houses of my colleague and yourself.

I would be lacking in a sense of responsibility to my constituents and the whole of Barbados if I did not ask for an explanation of that. My idea always was that these funds for the repair of tenantry roads were used primarily to allow people living in those districts to bring out not only canes, since you do not build roads for canes, but for people. Building or repairing roads for bringing out canes is the old plantation idea.

I see no justification for what I have referred to and I am asking for an explanation of it. I do not want to embarrass anyone. You embarrass yourself when you are in a position of trust, by permitting any appearance, any semblance of partiality or favouritism, in the spending of public funds.

I am not saying that the expenditure is over partial or that my colleague is wrong. I am saying that it does not look good and I would like an explanation. I want that point to be abundantly clear. 12.05 a.m.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, again my colleague has ended his debate on his colleague. I never attacked him. I have had two blistering attacks from him already today. Like the honourable senior member for the City, I have never been tutored at a university, therefore I have no university to disgrace. Before I go any further I would defy him

to name one road that classifies as a tenantry road in St. George. He is unable to name one. He doesn't know the parish so well. He talks of knowing the Spa Road in St. Joseph.

Mr. BARROW: I saw the condition of the road and I saw the bulldozer.

Mr. MILLER: What I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, is that that road does not classify as a tenantry road. It has been a parish road before any of us in here was born. It fell into disrepair from the time of the flood, about six years ago. For the past six years, the Commissioners of Highways for St. Joseph put that road up for repairs and for the last three years it was at the top of the list of the roads in that parish that were set down for repairs. The year before Government took over the roads in that parish, there was some question as to whether that road was classified as a tenantry road or whether it was a parish road. I can say that the road is owned by the parish. Last year part of it which is in the parish of St. Andrew, was repaired right up to the boundary line.

I was told by the engineer that only part of that road, 250 feet or so, is to be repaired. Probably, the repair of it would be broken up into four or five phases. I take it as being contemptuous or even malicious what my colleague has said. I am not the owner, nor do I have any part of ownership in the Spa Plantation to which he refers. It is true to say that the taxes of that plantation is collected from my sister. However, I will not ask him to withdraw the remarks he made of me because it is consistent with him. You will not expect a horse to approach you with horns like a cow. I believe a lot of these occurrences come from upbringing.

This road is not a tenantry road, nor is it a question of building a road on tenantry lands. Again, I defy my colleague to call one road in St. George, which has been regarded as a tenantry road that has been included.

Mr. BARROW: I can give you the names of 17 roads tomorrow.

Mr. MILLER: I want him to give me one tonight.

Mr. BARROW: Monroe Village.

Mr. MILLER: I was sure he would go to the road through Monroe Village. That is why I defied him to call one road that is classified as a tenantry road. That road cannot be classified as a tenantry road. It shows that he is not sufficiently interested in the parish he has the honour to represent.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, the honourable senior member for St. George is always accusing me of partiality and other things. One thing I am going to assure him is that with all the accusations he may make against me, he will never see any of them come true. First of all, the honourable senior member for St. George is confusing himself with the vote which is given for the repair of tenantry roads and that which is given for the repair of parish roads. I think every member of this House ought to know that the sum of \$132,000 was put aside in the 1954-55 Estimates for the purpose of repairing tenantry roads throughout the Island. Part of that money is allocated to the Highway Commissioners of the various parishes which carry out their own repairs and the others to the Director of Highways and Transport to repair those tenantry roads which come under his responsibility. 12.15 a.m.

As to this particular road, I think it is since last year that I saw it and was convinced, (and even now I am more convinced from the arguments put forward by people who reaped canes in that area)

that they find it very difficult and very expensive to get their canes from this area over the hill to Andrews factory when the reaping season comes off. That this road should be repaired. The lorries carry less canes because the hills are very steep; I was convinced and I am still convinced, that in order to encourage the people who grow canes in that area to plant canes which benefit the whole island, the road should be repaired; That road has been put on the list for repairs long before the Government took over. The estimated cost of the construction of this road is \$15,000. It was thought that a start should be made during this financial year so that the canes instead of being transported over the hills, could be transported through Brucevale and Haggatts which would be cheaper. This has nothing whatever to do with the tenantry roads; funds for the repair of this road come from the amount of the Capital Estimate to which we have agreed.

The honourable member almost insinuated that this money comes from tenantry roads fund, and that this and that road is repaired. However I repeat that this road is repaired out of capital funds. I have already said that the tenantry roads have nothing to do with the matter. And while we are on the subject of tenantry roads, I would like to say that I had the list of these roads which was submitted to the government since in 1944 when a Committee was set up under the chairmanship of the late Sir Dudley Leacock. Since then, so far as the construction of tenantry road is concerned, St. George is more advanced than many other parishes. It is more advanced in that respect than St. Michael. I am sorry that I have not got the list which I should have had as on the last occasion on which we were discussing this matter. In any case there is no question of any partiality; it is a question of assisting peasants to get out their canes from the area, and to encourage people to grow the canes on which we all live.

Mr. BARROW: I do not see any reason for people to be getting hurt and to be accusing me of all sorts of dishonest motives.

Hon. M. E. COX: The honourable member has accused me of partiality.

Mr. MILLER: My honourable colleague says that there is no question of people getting hurt—

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, although it was a matter of great embarrassment to me, we must avoid any semblance of partiality; and I said that with that degree of sincerity which I am accustomed to use, when the Hon. Minister would have an explanation which would satisfy those who were querying the expenditure. That should not give rise to the vituperative attack by my colleague and the Minister and the members of the public who are concerned in this matter of the expenditure of money from the Treasury, no matter by what name he chooses to classify the expenditure on a project of this nature. It is our duty in public life to avoid any semblance of partiality; and I asked the question so that the Hon. Minister would have the opportunity of going into the matter. The mere fact that a road passes through my backyard does not mean that I have inveigled anybody into doing anything. I never suggested or even insinuated that my colleague had been involved in such a matter, and I was very surprised and hurt at the attack he made on me purely for raising the matter in this House and bringing to the attention of the Hon. Minister something which has been mooted and bruited all over St. Joseph and the surrounding parishes. It is better for us to be able to give free and frank disclosures in this House so that nobody could have the opportunity of attacking

me or my colleague or even you Mr. Chairman, without giving the facts. Since both the Hon. Minister and my colleague have chosen to take me up on the matter instead of thanking me for performing the service which I have performed, I would like to establish that this is a matter of a bulldozer being used to level the land before it and completely to alter the course of construction where the construction and the alteration do not exist.

12.25 a.m.

Now, I would like to say this: you are the representative Mr. Chairman, of the parish and you would know if that road is on the tenantry road list or not. If it were not which list did my colleague refer to? When did it graduate for a tenantry road into a parish road? The question of the number of houses down there is important. I would like to see roads between every house. I am not against the construction of roads. My main purpose of rising to my feet was to give the Minister of Communications a chance to explain fully and frankly and in all true sincerity, what the position was and to convince me that that road should have priority over the other roads in all the parishes.

I do not see why the Commissioners of Highways in their wisdom did not either deem it fit and treat it as a priority, and put it on top of the list. If it were at the top of the list all that time, and if it were a parish road, why was it not put in a proper state of repair? I think that the Hon. Minister has said that \$15,000 will be spent on that road. I will ask my colleague if he can tell the House that for the past five years the total sum of \$15,000 has been spent on tenantry roads in St. George.

I am sorry that this Resolution did not come up earlier today when I had my brief case, because I would have been able to supply him with some figures of all the money spent on tenantry roads in the parish referred to.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, on this question of tenantry roads I have had some experience long before the Minister had his portfolio. I will make my remarks on this matter very brief; because from what the honourable senior member for St. George has intimated, it does appear to me that the Minister will have to give some explanation. I know how members feel and I just want to throw this out. The Minister for Transport has a portfolio, a most popular portfolio, a portfolio with which he can do much to alleviate the special conditions of this country.

I want to make my position clear. I have not got to beg the Minister of Communications to do any road for me, and I am not going to either. [Hon. M. E. COX: No one has to]. But it is my duty when I come to this Chamber to represent my constituents. I want to draw to his attention that he has told me here, that when it comes to the repair of tenantry roads it is not only a question of priority, but a question of density of population. In and out of season I have hammered the question of the New Orleans. The Hon. Minister has referred to the fact occasionally, that people have made money out of the Orleans. On the last occasion the question of Carrington's village came up. I went myself and found that a road was being done there when the Hon. Minister said that it was not so.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of Order. When did I say a road was not being done there?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: When I made the statement that a road had drawn priority in Carrington's Village, the Hon. Minister said that the whole question of Carrington's Village and the Kensington area was under consideration. I said that I heard

that one road was being done at Carrington's Village. I am being very mild in this matter. Policy is that of the Minister. That is to say that the Government decides on the policy for tenantry roads and the Minister's duty is to call the engineers and advise them as to the priority to be given to this, that or the other area. They should be consistent. If they are consistent, honourable members will be able to tell their constituents "this is the policy of the Government and therefore you cannot point anything at them. The policy will be to do the roads and tenancies according to density of population or priority."

I can tell the Hon. Minister that tenancies in this island which have been recently developed and which are way down on the list, have been selected to be put in order. I know one which has been developed since 1875, and which has not been put in order yet. I am not going to say much more. I am merely issuing a warning. I am not the Minister and I do not hold the list, he is the Minister and that is his duty; the policy is that of the Government. 12.35 a.m.

It has been drawn to my notice that representation was made to the Hon. Minister of Communications relative to roads in certain areas owned by persons who are not favourably disposed towards him, and he told them to go and see me. Let this be understood by the Hon. Minister for Communications: it is not your money; you are the Minister; it is our duty to respect you for the office you hold, but mark well, I am not afraid to give to you what you deserve. I am saying that Kensington land was sold out before Carrington's Village. I sold both of them; so I must know. Mine is a demand I am not asking any favours.

Secondly, I want to say that there seems to be a practice for the Government not to see that its officers and engineers carry out its policy. Whatever be the Government's policy, whether it is to give priority to those roads according to density of population or to say which roads should be given priority, I am not questioning; I am only saying that owing to the office which the Hon. Minister for Communications occupies, as the honourable senior member for St. George has rightly said, he must let it appear as if there is no partiality. Bear in mind, I am not accusing the Hon. Minister of partiality.

I again tell the Hon. Minister, whether it was done as a joke or not, I was told that reference was made by him when asked about the repairing of a certain tenantry road, to see me. If that is so, it is not the attitude which the Hon. Minister should adopt. I know the list of roads which the Hon. Minister found when he took up his office. The Government has not been consistent in its policy and the Department of Highways and Transport says that it is unblame-worthy. Roads have been repaired in recently developed tenancies as against roads which were in need of repairs in tenancies which were tenancies for very many years, and which were on the list submitted by the Health Commissioners of St. Michael. We were told here that these roads are done by priority. I will only draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister that the question of priority has not been followed. I am not saying that the question of the dates in which they were given notice of is the correct way of doing them. I can quite understand the Hon. Minister visiting and seeing for himself the density of an area and saying that because of that, this or that road should be done. I am hoping sir, repairs having been started on roads in Carrington's Village which I feel really deserve repairing, that the Hon. Minister should normally consider that the roads in the New Orleans also deserve repairing.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I hate to delay this Committee any longer on this question, but the statement which was made by the hon. senior member for the City should not go unchallenged. I want to deny categorically that since I was Minister someone came to me for any road to be repaired, and I told them to see the hon. member. I will challenge the hon. member to mention the road, as I was not pressing him to reveal the name of the individual. On the last occasion, when this question of tenantry roads was being discussed, I told the hon. member when he referred to a road in Carrington's Village being repaired, that Kensington occupied a similar position as Carrington's Village. I told him that no petition was sent in by the people of Kensington to show that they were willing to give up those roads. One of the first things I did as soon as I took up office after Ministerial Status was instituted, was to get all the files dealing with all the roads in Barbados and more particularly tenantry roads. I went through the various lists from the beginning. 12.45 a.m.

As I said, the records start from 1944 when Sir Dudley Leacock was Chairman of that Committee. After discovering that there was no record of petitions in respect of the repairs to the roads in Carrington's Village, I hinted to someone who approached me about repairing these roads, that the people of Carrington's Village should send in a petition. I drafted the petition for them, and the people signed it and sent it in. Up to then no petition had been submitted by residents of Kensington area. In the meantime allocations were already made. Sometime after the residents of the Kensington area submitted a similar petition, and I promised that in the coming financial year that I would treat it in similar fashion to Carrington's Village. It is not true to say that these roads were submitted to the Government before; neither is there any truth in the statement that someone came to me since Ministerial Government started in respect to repairs to a road or roads, and I sent him to the honourable senior member for the City.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The honourable member wants to make people believe that he is a paragon of virtue. I want to prove to the honourable member how he distorts things. Carrington's Village was not sold until 1945; and will the honourable member tell this Committee how Kensington New Road came to be repaired and whether any petition had been sent in or not? That is a simple question. The honourable member is trying to say that I do not know what I am talking about.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, am I to stand here and listen to this discussion between these two honourable members? What is before this Committee is the overhauling of a road roller.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Parish roads are mentioned in the note.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: With the greatest respect to the Honourable Leader of this House, Mr. Chairman, it is a good thing that you ruled in that manner. Nothing will make me lose my temper faster—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Don't lose your temper.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: It is only when I got up to speak that—

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: The honourable member had already spoken and he is now speaking for the second time.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I speak as I like. I have the greatest respect for the Honourable Minister, and it is a pity that I have that respect for him because I would get up and talk. As I was

saying, the Honourable Minister of Communications made his reply and I was trying to show that none of these villages was sold out until 1945. The Government appointed Sir Dudley Leacock as Chairman of a Committee and asked the Committee to get in the list of these roads. The Honourable Minister for Communications knows as well as I do that Kensington New Road had been fixed right through, and what I am asking him is this: how was that road fixed if the petition had not been sent in? I say that that petition had been put in, otherwise they could not have repaired the Kensington road. I am asking the honourable member to go and look for that petition. There seems to be a tendency to select roads out of the recommendations which are made, and the question of partiality should not arise. It strikes me that when you hear statements made as those which have been made today, honourable members must be very, very careful in dealing with matters of this sort. It is a very good thing for those of us who are not interested from the point of view of roads to say, this, that, and the other; but the entire question of roads in the Parish of St. Michael and in the City of Bridgetown is one which I will raise from time to time. The Ministers hold jobs and it is only the one man who can fire them out that can convince them of anything; he will convince them by dictating to them.

12.55 a.m.

Mr. MILLER: I am only worried about the policy involved. I have been told that they planned to spend \$3,000 on the section of the road which has to be done, and with the ratio per year it will take five years. [Hon. M. E. COX: Who said anything like that?] I am only saying that if they are spending \$15,000 and they are spending \$3,000 a year, it would appear that it would require five years to do these roads. As has already been said, you should shun the very appearance of evil.

I just want to let the Minister know that he must shun the very appearance of evil. The honourable member, my colleague, never saw the area at all. He is telling lies; and that is a disgraceful thing for any man to do.

Mr. BARROW: I rise on a point of Order. The honourable member has said that I am telling lies. I hope that you will from your office, exercise influence on the honourable member. I will ask you to ask him to withdraw that statement. In a previous speech he said that I was peeping from behind a bulldozer; now he has said that I have never been to the area at all.

Mr. MILLER: Every one knows that; but if it makes him any happier, I will withdraw it.

Mr. BARROW: I am asking him to withdraw it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You said that there are no tenants down there.

Mr. BARROW: I did not say that you or my colleague do not have tenants. I am saying the road is not a tenantry road.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable junior member for St. George withdraw the remarks complained of?

Mr. MILLER: I am not capable of anything unparliamentary, I will do anything that will uphold the honour of this ancient Chamber. If my colleague asks me to withdraw my statement I will do so. A rose by any other name is just as sweet. I will still say that it is unfortunate that he did not go to the site.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, the relationship of the honourable senior member for St. George with the party in power, or the situation of the road in the parish that you and also the Premier have the power to represent in this honourable Chamber

should not reduce the serious consideration which members of this Chamber should give the charges made by the honourable senior member for St. George.

I got up purposely to draw it to the attention of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works and to ask him to compare his policy in this particular matter with his policy as regards to the construction of a road in Welch Town in St. John. That road was done continuously until it reached a peasant proprietor, who unfortunately had land on both sides of the road. The Commissioners of Highways of St. John solicited the permission of the Hon. Minister who put up a very persistent battle and refused to give permission to make the road continuous, so that the peasants would not have to go around that road which is very difficult terrain; Coach Hill is a very dangerous hill. The Road Commissioners intended to make this road continuous so as to attach it to another main road which would facilitate the movement of traffic during the crop season.

As I have said, the Minister was persistent in his refusal even though the Road Commissioners had a balance of money in hand, and no great expenditure of Government's funds was being considered. Now one hears that a bulldozer is at present opening a new road over lands which it is claimed are possessed by the honourable junior member for St. George or his family. These are things which cannot be hidden. The public can drive up there and see for themselves what is happening, as I intend to do.

When things of this sort are permitted to occur and one has to speak out against them, one is charged with pulling down the name or names of a Minister or Ministers. There is no consistent policy Mr. Chairman. I am saying that it is wrong to allow a road to be constructed through a small piece of peasant land; it cannot be consistent to allow it to be done when it passes through Plantation land. I have no reason to doubt the veracity of the statements made by the honourable senior member for St. George, because I presume that a bulldozer is something too big to be hidden; and the honourable member must have seen a bulldozer on his colleague's plantation.

01.05 a.m.

I am saying if the honourable member's statement is correct, (I have not seen the area, but I will go up there to-morrow and prove it for myself) I take this opportunity to remind the Honourable Minister of Communications if he wants to be above suspicion, he must allow his policy to be consistent even although it may hurt some. If you are going to repair roads you should disregard where they are situated or who lives in the district. If you are going to refuse to repair a road or to put it under proper construction simply because one person owns land on both sides of the proposed road, you should say so; but you cannot turn it down in one parish and in another parish you permit a similar type of road to be done in the interest of a colleague. When I use the word colleague I do so, because I feel all the members of a party are colleagues. Sir, I only rose from my seat to say that.

Hon. M. E. COX: Permit me to make one last remark, Mr. Chairman. I told the honourable senior member for St. John on the last occasion that the road which he made mention of could be repaired out of parish roads funds. The road in St. Joseph is not repaired out of tenantry roads funds.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, all I want to say is that this road is *ad hoc* on the Vestry list.

No Quorum

The Clerk drew to the Chairman's notice that there was not a quorum and the Chairman reported to Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and after reporting accordingly asked the Clerk to ring the bell for a minute.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: It has been brought to my attention that there is no quorum, and there is now still no quorum. This House now stands adjourned until next Tuesday, 18th January, 1955 at 3 o'clock p.m.