

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1954-55

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 28th June, 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. G. H. ADAMS, C.M.G., Q.C., B.A., (*Premier*)
 Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M.
 (*Minister of Social Services*), Hon. M. E. COX,
 (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*)
 Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, Mr. F. C. GODDARD (*Leader of the Opposition*)
 Mr. E. ST.A. HOLDER, Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN and Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 3rd May, 1955 having been circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded by His Excellency to lay the following:— Approved Estimates for the year 1955-56, which is the bound copy of the Estimates that we have passed.

Hon. M. E. COX: In accordance with the promise which I made during the consideration of the Estimates, I beg to lay the Report of the Department of Highways & Transport for the year 1954-55.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Reply to Question No. 45 asked by the hon. junior member for St. George regarding increments for workers receiving wages according to Key Scale rates.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows—

Hon. M. E. COX: Resolution to approve the Book of Reference and Plan of the proposed ex-

tension of the Waterworks in the parish of St. Michael.

PRIVATE NOTICES

A Private Member's Notice was given as follows:—

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Of the following Address:

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency The Governor

1. The House of Assembly is of the opinion that for the development of the economy of Barbados and for the purpose of providing for the needs of its growing population that Seawell Airport be opened to International Air Carriers of any nation and more especially to those of the U.S.A. as the greatest potential source of our growing Tourist Industry, without qualifications other than those specified by International Air Regulations.
2. The House requests Your Excellency to transmit this Address by cable to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies.

ANGLICAN CHURCH BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Anglican Church Act, 1911.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: In connection with this Order, I am informed that the House on a previous occasion expressed the wish or view that the moving of the passing of a Resolution to pay for the temporary appointment of a Vicar of St. Simon's which was before the House, was putting the cart before the horse and that an amendment to the Anglican Church Act should be considered first. The Government sees the force of that argument; and in addition to that the Government realises that the Bill just laid before the House as was originally drafted, did not really cover the Government's position. It was pointed out to the House that the Bill first laid in the House would cut across the section which says that at the end of six months if there was a vacancy, that vacancy should be filled. The proposed amendment should have read (as far

as the present policy of the Government is concerned) that in future appointments may be continued to be made as at present, with the proviso that no future appointment carries with it a pension. As soon as you allow appointments to be filled now, when you have made up your mind to disendow the Church you are possibly giving jobs to parsons who at the end of six months will be entitled to go on the Pension List. In consequence of that, I am asking leave to withdraw the Bill as it reads and to substitute the present Bill subsequently introduced which makes the Government's decision quite clear. The only difference between the Local Government Bill and this Bill is that the Local Government Bill is on the Statute Book although it has not yet been brought into effect. We are abolishing the old Vestry system; we are abolishing the endowment of the Church as we have proclaimed over and over again; and it follows that the Government can say that we are no longer appointing parochial people on the old terms or making provision for railway employees or allowing clergymen to be appointed under conditions which will carry a pension. I am sorry that some honourable members are not in their places.

3.25 p.m.

This Government is not prepared just to chuck bricks at the Church; this Government definitely feels that the Church is separated from the State. And far from being an appendage we feel that the Church should talk down to the State. So long as a Clergyman is depending on his wages or salary from members of this House, so long the Church would not have more than a moral authority in matters of religion; therefore, there is no question of making the Church suffer or chucking bricks at it. The financial provision and assistance which the Government has in mind to offer to the Church will be based on the Government's policy. The Church is not to suffer; we intend to give them time to build up a capital fund from which they can pay clergymen.

When it comes to pensions we would be obligated to continue the pensions of those who are now on the Government's Pension List; but we do not propose to appoint Vicars on the old scale by which we will be legally bound to pay them pensions. We are normally bound to see that any person who has already been appointed and holds office until the time comes for disestablishment and disendowment does not suffer.

I am glad to say that as far as the Bishop is concerned we see eye to eye with respect to the future financial arrangements and I do not think there is going to be any clash; so I can give honourable members the assurance that from the Government's point of view we are merely doing what we ought to do. Just as we brought in a new Bill to say that you should not appoint a Parochial Treasurer for Christ Church on the old terms, so have we done with respect to the clergymen.

If members of the House were to look up the Act as it stands, they would see that the only thing we have done in this proposed amendment is to see that the present situation does not automatically react on the Government's Pension List. I have given the Bishop the assurance that nobody appointed now under this amendment to the Act will be taken into consideration for pensions until we finally compute what financial arrangements will be available to give to the Church. I suggested, (I do not say that it is definitely the policy of the Government) that we take over all School property, and if it is worth say, £78,000 we will give them £80,000

for it. That is a possibility. I threw that out as a suggestion because honourable members should not say that we are wasting money on the Church now we are going to cut them off and let them fend for themselves. Let me repeat that this Bill before us is no more hitting at the Church than the Act which came down here sometime ago amending the Vestry Act so that the Vestry of Christ Church could only appoint a temporary Parochial Treasurer; therefore, I invite honourable members to agree to the second reading of this Bill.

I beg to move that this Bill to amend the Anglican Church Act, 1911, be now read a second time.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I did not expect the Hon. Premier would have said anything other than that the severance of the Church from the State would be treated as sympathetically as one would expect, because in Barbados I think, all the parties are of the same opinion that the Church does good service which can be considered a social service and which it is our desire to see continued.

I do not wish any remarks which I may make and which may be contrary to those of the Hon. Premier to be taken as a Party issue, because this is not a Party issue; this is for the good of Barbados. And if the Church is so well established in the minds of all of us, certainly it should not be the intention of any of us to disrupt it for any political reason.

The Bill is quite simple. All it seeks to do is to take away the appointment of any Vicar, Rector or Curate from being appointed by the Church's Appointments Board and give the Government authority to appoint them on a temporary basis with no pension rights attached to the appointment. I do not wish to go into that yet; but what I claim is that this Bill should not have been put before us until we have had a discussion in the House at least on disestablishment and disendowment of the Anglican Church. Although it has been the intention of the Government for months to disestablish the church, it has not been debated in this Chamber; and I would really like to feel the reaction from all quarters of this House on this matter. I know that there will be a division of opinion on it. We have heard this afternoon for the first time the attitude of the Government in a small way of what they have in mind on this matter. When the Hon. Premier said that this Bill was introduced because he did not wish any more appointments made that would bind the Government to pension rights, I would just like to remind him that to qualify for a pension you must have ten years' service. Now a statement should be made, (apart from the fact that it is the intention of the Government to disestablish and disendow the Church) as to whether you are coming to the House with something to have a discussion on the matter; and then this Bill would automatically follow. That should be done because it would be difficult for the Bishop or the Appointments Board to fill appointments if and when vacancies occur; because, even in a small way with the Vestries Extension Act, 1954, which gives the power to Vestries to make only temporary or acting appointments, we are finding it difficult indeed to get suitable applicants for existing posts. I will cite the one in Christ Church when the office of Parochial Treasurer became vacant. We had one applicant applying for the post and he was hesitant of leaving his job to take up the appointment. We certainly do not wish the Church to fall into that.

3.35 p.m.

I know that talks may have proceeded with between the Government and the Bishop, but opinions

on the matter have not yet been brought to this House and expressed in true perspective. To bring in this Bill and then have to negotiate with the Church authorities as to what manner disendowment will take, it may be that they may feel not certainly at rest; because if they did not accept certain terms which they thought unfavourable, you will see that they could be cut off in this matter. The Government may have all the good intentions, but I feel that these negotiations which may come about may be so delicate that we would not wish anybody to say that they had been forced to accept certain conditions from Government.

We wish the happiest relations to exist between Government and the Church right through the negotiations. It is Government's policy; but I am sure the Hon. Premier will agree with me that some full discussion in this Chamber would lead off general public opinion on the matter. We have had certain correspondence in the newspapers, but the Barbadian people are not going to accept correspondence. After a discussion in this Chamber we would be very sure to get public opinion as to what they think on this subject.

I wish that Government, even at this stage, would consider whether this Bill is not a little premature. Let us say that a time limit had been set on Government's intentions to do this; that they intended to do it in the near future when there was sufficient expression of opinion or when it had been debated in this Chamber and that they would be coming in with this Bill as soon as possible. It could not make much difference; I do not know of many appointments. I think there is only one outstanding appointment to be made, but I do not wish it to be thought that this is being brought in as a measure for negotiations, and that is what might be said and is said in certain quarters. I hope that the Government will consider that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I suppose that is one subject which could be debated in this Chamber for an unlimited time. When the Bill which was withdrawn came before this Chamber, hon. members expressed the view similar to that which the Leader of the Opposition has given expression to today.

First I am going to say that the view which I expressed at the time was to the effect that I doubted whether the Hon. Premier as a lawyer, had seen the Bill other than when it was introduced; and speaking as a layman, I felt and could discern that that Bill could not do what the Government had expressed.

I suppose that there is not one of us who have not suffered indignities at the hands of somebody in this country; but because of that I think that we should disabuse our minds of any ill feeling which may have been caused by a new clergyman and look at this matter not as a business or corporation, but as an institution which has through the ages and despite what some people might think, made its contribution to the progress of the people of this country.

I am not going to make a speech today on the question of disendowment or disestablishment of the Church at all. I believe in discussing this matter, every Government member will agree that historically speaking, it is a matter which has caused more wars and more disagreements between nations, individuals and families than any other subject under the sun. As you will recall, I have contributed my quota on another occasion in here when the entire circumstances surrounding the established Church was being discussed.

Now, sir, at the outset I am going to say that if I vote alone I will not support the passing of this Bill at this stage. This is my reason: as far back as thirty odd years ago, one of the planks of the platform of the political aspirants (I am not going to call them socialists) which was so easily digestible by the gullible and by the general masses, (and I must say that I too at one time thought it very attractive, and I may have used it as a plank, and that is an admission) one of the planks in the platform of political aspirants was this same question of the disendowment and disestablishment of the Church.

We are paying clergymen for what they are doing; that, you will agree with me, has been discussed all over this island. At one time it was in the forefront; at another time nationalisation gave place to it, and various other questions have given place to it since then. If it was part of the Government's policy during its campaign in the last General Election, I am prepared to say that it was not part of its written policy; and as it was absent from the written policy (and I think you can recall this too) sooner or later, every member of the Government party, at some time or other, shied away from it. In other words, they actually left it alone. But they are the Government today. And if in their wisdom (I am going to be very calm and very cautious) they think, as the one in the majority in this House, that it is the correct thing to do, then I say that it would be very unique if they took steps to do it in this way.

For years and years where people were members of the Anglican Church, whether in times of stress, in times of necessity, in times of joy (and that applies to the celebration of weddings), they have always claimed themselves to be Anglicans. If this Government feels that it would be infinitely better to disendow or say separate the Church from the trammels of the state, then why not come down with the Bill also and let this Chamber discuss freely, as we should, the whole question of disendowment and disestablishment and let this Chamber know what would be the policy of the Government towards the Church. As the Leader of the Opposition has said, we have for the first time heard a view expressed upon the matter. There are two ways about it, everybody in Barbados must know by now that the Government has in times past, made it known that it is their policy to disendow and disestablish the Church. It is also a fact that they have set up a committee to go into the matter and to report to Government.

3.45 p.m.

The Government has it in its power to do something which is best for the country. If we feel that it is not the best thing for the country then we can vote against it. They have apprised a Synod of what would be their future policy and they have set up a Committee to make recommendations, not for disestablishment I suppose, but in the place of disendowment as to what should be done and what should not be done. It is not because you can, by an Act of Legislation and with a majority to say "Aye" and it goes through, to be dealt with in that way; in the whole civilised world it has not been done in that way.

I have discussed this matter with people and I have made it clear that it cannot be denied that for the last 30 years we have heard about disendowment of the Church; but it has been either unwittingly or shrewdly left out of their Manifesto and those who occupy exalted seats in the Government have not mentioned it. However I made it clear that those who

have views like myself and the others too can express those views, but it does not mean that the Church should be disestablished or not. If you have drawn your policy to the attention of the Synod, the representative body of the Clergy and Laity of the Anglican Community in Barbados, I will say this: you will find from the statistics relative to emigration to the United States of America that a man who entered the Church possibly only once since his Baptism, still has his faith. If you were to take the statistics at the Cemetery you would find that despite our forefathers who made capital of freedom of religion, in the last rites of burying the dead you are entitled to have a parson of the Anglican persuasion to commit your body to earth. You will find that in the Metropolitan parish (although you actually provide by statute for a Clerk in Holy Orders to commit the bodies of the dead and you actually give the right and also pay for the committal for other persons who do not profess the Anglican religion) you will find that more than seven-eighths of the people claim the right of committal from the State.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does it not strike the hon. member that he is not speaking so much in relation to this Partial Suspension Bill as on disestablishment?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: It might appear so, sir, but I am studiously avoiding making the speech which I will have to make on another occasion; I am merely touching the fringe of it. One would have thought that with the setting up of this Committee to go into this matter the Government would have waited on some report and let the representatives of the people discuss the matter, rather than deal with it in this way.

The Hon. Premier has intimated that this Bill is similar to the Vestry Extension Bill of 1954. If it is intended to be so, it is not so; and I will show him that it is not so. The first thing you did when you were campaigning over this island was to say that if you got a majority you would abandon the Queen Anne's system of Government; therefore it is your duty to abolish it. Before you actually abolished it you brought out somebody to report to the Government and the people, which seemed to be the correct thing to do; and following that procedure the Government appointed a Committee to report to it. Sir John Maude was not appointed to report to the Government on whether they should abolish the Vestry system; he was appointed to see what was to be brought up when the Vestry System was abolished. If you appointed a Committee to say if this Church is to be disendowed or not what should we do.

3.55 p.m.

Well now, in the Vestries' case a recommendation was made as to what we should do, and the Government in order to bring something into being brought in an Act to freeze the Vestry system.

What does that Act say? That Act says that in extending the life of the Vestries you should only make temporary or acting appointments; that is all it says. Nowhere in that Bill do you say that temporary or acting appointments are not entitled to pension rights. It is to the contrary, because the Act makes it quite clear that there will be no suffering in the time lag. It is not a case which the Premier says is on all fours. I submit that is not correct. If that is the intention of the Government it is not embodied in this Bill. On the other hand, the Premier says, that as far as the Government is concerned he does not want to have anybody appointed under the Bill. The Bill says,

"Provided that during such period as this Act continues in force the Board may make temporary appointments to any such vacancies."

Here is where the sting is in this Bill, it goes on to say—

"Provided further that no such temporary appointments shall confer on the person so appointed any rights or benefits under or by virtue of the Pensions' Act, 1947, or the Widows and Orphans Pensions Act, 1928."

That proviso is really not in the Vestries Extension Act, 1954. Of course, the Government has the power and if they want to do that they can do so, but why make the marked difference with your dealings with the Church on the one hand, and your dealing with the Vestry system on the other hand.

Now sir, on the other hand when the Hon. Premier says that he had discussion with the Bishop and Synod and they had seen eye to eye on certain points, no one here knows what those points were. With the greatest respect to His Lordship the Bishop I must say that he does not occupy the same position as the Hon. Premier. The Bishop as head of the Church must be directed by the Synod, but the Premier as Head of the Government actually formulates the policy of the Government. The Bishop has no party to formulate policy in the Synod; he must be, and it is his duty to be directed by and to express the views of Synod.

Like the honourable members who spoke on the last occasion, I feel that not only did that Bill put the cart before the horse, but we also feel that this Bill too is actually putting the cart before the horse. What I would say, sir, is that the other Bill was in truth and in fact setting about to do what the Bill itself did not contain; only what the Government wanted done. In other words the criticism at that time was that the Bill was drafted badly. What that Bill actually said was that the Bill suspended the right of the Executive Committee but left the right to the Appointment Committee to make the appointments, and I said at that time that I wondered whether a lawyer had seen this Bill. All that Bill said was that the Executive Committee would not exercise this right; but in the Act it did not prevent the Appointments Committee from exercising its rights, so when I say putting the cart before the horse I mean to say that that Bill was drafted badly.

Reading the Anglican Church Act you had to come to conclusion that that Bill was drafted in accordance with the views expressed. Well, as a result of that criticism, the Bill was withdrawn and this Bill brought in its place. We are still saying to-day that this is putting the cart before the horse.

Of course no amount of talk from the Opposition or the views expressed against it could prevent the Government from having it passed. It is their policy. But as the Leader of the Opposition has said, you are going to have views expressed on this Bill from all sides of this House; and I do hope that any view expressed on this matter dealing with the Church would be kept, as he has said, on a high level.

There are those who would point out the ills of the Church, and there are those of us who can point out the good done by those in position in the Church; and you can put them side by side to see if the good that has been done is overshadowed by the bad or if the bad has wiped out the good. I am sure you will see that the good which has been done has overshadowed the bad.

I submit, sir, that I would prefer to see continued the one percent of the revenue of this colony which is paid to the Anglican community and which gives every living soul in this country a right to call upon incumbents of every Anglican Church, whether those people acknowledge it or not. Let me say at this stage of our development, political or otherwise,

that be he Englishman, West Indian or Barbadian, we will see to it that gone are the days when clergymen can very well say in their Cure "I am not taking you now, or I am doing this now."

However sir, I am not prepared to discuss that side of the question to-day. The time might come when we will be able to discuss that side of it. Until then, let me say what are my fears and what I think are everybody's fears. If you accept this amendment to the Anglican Church Act, you agree that no appointment should be made unless it is temporary, and you also say that the person who has been appointed on such a basis should not enjoy any pension right; I am submitting that there is a shortage of clergymen to-day in the West Indian community. 4.05 p.m.

To some people merely to mention the word clergyman is as a red rag is to a bull. Some people think that we can go through this world enjoying everything and there is no necessity even for a clergyman. I am no religious bigot, but I do believe in the necessity for a clergyman. Inasmuch as you have to have a Social Welfare Officer there is the necessity for religion in a community. I cannot see how the small percentage of our revenue that is utilised by the Church should make any tremendous difference.

I am going to reserve all of my arguments regarding the abolition of the Church for the occasion when we shall discuss it; but to vote for this today will be actually admitting that we of the Opposition agree right away. We accept in all sincerity what the Hon. Premier has said. I have gone so far as to suggest to the Premier that with the school property whatever this is worth we might give 25% more "lest they should suffer." I accept that with all sincerity; but is he not putting the cart before the horse. The Hon. Premier has told the Barbadian people for the first time that he would not like to see the Church suffer, but is not that putting the cart before the horse?

According to the view expressed by the Premier and according to the Bill before us and what the Leader of the Opposition has said, why put in this Section when in fact a person cannot ably qualify for a pension under ten years? In other words, is it or is it not the intention of the Government to institute a system of disendowment? If the answer to that is yes, speaking purely as a layman, I can see your bringing in some sort of a Bill but not one as strong as this. Actually such will not be necessary for this reason: a man who is employed in the Government is never qualified for a pension until he has served ten years. But if that is not the Government's view and they are going to do something within ten years, the Premier may answer and say yes; but if you should appoint him and he has only served five years, that is if he should die after five years, he is not entitled to a pension, I anticipate that the Premier would say no.

Mr. Speaker, is the Government then saying that they are not going to do anything for a man who has served five years? If you are not going to do anything for a period of service of five years then who is to say that that is an honest, conscientious and sincere view expressed by the Premier. The Church does not mean anymore to me than as an individual because there are some people living in utter darkness and they are among some of the best.

I heard only a few days ago of the attitude of the malhearted cow of a man in the employment of the Anglican Church; he should be cast into utter darkness. It is most unfortunate that he is the type

of person whom his people should expect better from [A VOICE: Who is he? Let the Speaker name him.] Now we have accepted the remarks of the Hon. Premier with all sincerity; but this is 1955. If what he says is true, that disendowment is going to come into operation within the next five years, then why this? If it is coming into operation according to the Hon. Premier within the next five years the necessity for this would not arise. He would have brought the Bill into operation and no person would have any claim upon the Government if he died in the service, pensionable or otherwise. But if it is necessary, says the Premier, this Bill makes the position similar to the Vestries Extension Act.

I submit that this is not so, because nothing is said here under the Vestries Extension Act about pensions. Furthermore I recall that the statement "that they should not suffer" was made here when we actually went into this Bill that extends the Vestry system and gives the right to temporary employees, especially in cases where you have the right to employ any person on a temporary or acting basis. But this goes further. If you will study the Local Government Bill you will see provided there that when the actual Local Government takes over from the Vestry, that this is actually provided for in there. So it is really not on all fours.

I hope the day will come when we shall have a full-dressed debate on the question of the disendowment and disestablishment of the Church and I shall be able to question this Honourable Chamber and see if I can persuade them in any way. 4.15 p.m.

I am therefore saying, today, that in the circumstances this is putting the cart before the horse in asking us to agree in a small measure to the disendowment and disestablishment of the Church. This is actually asking us to agree to the immediate disendowment of the Church by taking away certain rights which appointed persons would enjoy ordinarily. I am therefore unable to support the second reading of this Bill, as it stands today, because I feel that the opportunity should be given us to discuss the entire matter surrounding the disendowment of the Church before you bring down this Bill.

I repeat that as there is a shortage of clergymen throughout the West Indies, it is either necessary or unnecessary; and it strikes me now that where St. Simon's is concerned, I suppose it is common knowledge that clergymen from as far as the United Kingdom and throughout the West Indies have been offered the post and it was difficult to get anybody to accept; but recently you are able to get one released from British Guiana, one who preferred to come back to Barbados. Some people believe that as soon as you are a clergyman you must be relegated to walking about begging people for pennies, threepences and sixpences and you must live on that.

I would prefer to give further grants to the Church. We actually give grants to the Wesleyan the Moravian and Roman Catholic Churches. However, I cannot support the second reading of this Bill, because this is not on all-fours with the Vestries Extension Bill. I therefore submit that this is putting the cart before the horse and we should not make a decision yet, knowing the policy of the future. We have to take into account what might happen as regards the Government's policy between now and the next five years. If after passing this Bill something went wrong between now and the next five years, it will be said that this is already in operation. The Government's policy being what

it is, why do they want this Bill? Of course the paying of a stipend to anybody who is connected with religion is like a red rag to a bull. I regret that I am unable to support the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not surprised at the tenor of the remarks of the last speaker, in principle, he is antagonistic to both the disendowment and the disestablishment of the Church. I agree with him when he submits that neither morally nor legally is the Government justified in taking the step proposed in this Bill until in some way or other the position with regard to disestablishment and disendowment has been resolved. It is hardly fair to initiate the disendowment of the Church in this manner. You either go the whole hog or do nothing at all. There could not be any excuse for the delay or the refusal of the Government up to now to settle the issue in one way or the other. It seems sir, to put it mildly, to be unjust and unfair to single out this particular Cure because it is vacant for this type of treatment. Be that as it may, it is not often that I find myself supporting matters brought on the floor of this House by the Government; and on the few occasions when they should be supported silently, I support them silently; and whenever I have to support them in part, I do so.

However, I personally am convinced that since the need for disendowment and disestablishment is perfectly clear and since we can no longer afford to provide the relatively speaking enormous sums of money which we spend every year on the Anglican Church, we have to begin somewhere. To my mind the Anglican Church costs the State too much every year; the salary of the Bishop and the Clergy and the large pension list which we are already carrying, to say nothing about the large expenditure incurred by the Clergy every year in ecclesiastical matters to which we might also add annual rental value of the vicarages and what-not, all these amount to a total tidy sum for what? I do not see how this colony could afford the luxury of a State-paid Church; if you total up the expenditure on the Established Church every year you will find that it is over a quarter million dollars. We vote 30,000 odd dollars in the Estimates annually but that is not all which is spent. The Parochial Authorities who can hardly afford to pay decent poor relief or who cannot afford to repair the roads in their parishes without subventions from the Government, have left the roads in order to support this State-paid Church. Many a poor parish, poor in comparison with the revenue of the other parishes, have found themselves under the law saddled every year with this additional burden. 4.25 p.m.

I am sure the honourable senior member for the City who is such a devout Church goer, (as far as I understand he is a pillar of St. Mary's and an ardent opponent of both disestablishment and disendowment) would concede that the Anglican Church has no stronger a hold on the community generally speaking than any of the other non-conformist bodies. I am sure he will concede that the work which the Anglican Church does, both religious and socially, is not greater than that done by the Methodists, Moravian and the Salvation Army.

If the Anglican Church which is the State-paid Church had the support of the community, you would not find as you are finding to-day, so many mushroom churches springing up overnight appealing to the people; and not only appealing to them but getting their support. In consequence, I am inclined to the view that there is something absolutely wrong with the Established Church; either that its hold on

the masses which it is supposed to have no longer exists or that the Clergy have grown fat and lazy in consequence of not having to exert themselves unduly, and because they can go every month to the Treasury and draw their stipends without having to make any special effort. Because of that, the Church as a body has suffered.

I am amazed and I am sure most honourable members are, at the number of little churches which spring up in this country every year, and in a short time have a fairly presentable edifice constructed and maintained by and with the contributions of the members which they have; and yet the Anglican Church which is comparatively wealthy, having fairly big endowments and having their glebe lands (one rectory has 60 acres of the best arable land in the parish that it is situated) and in spite of their comparatively secure position of both the Church and its incumbents, the State is saddled annually to the tune of nearly \$100,000. In so far as I am concerned, the Church should have come to an end a long time ago.

Although I am willing to say that in principle it is wrong to disestablish and disendow the Church like this, I still feel that a case can be made out for not adding one cent more to the Anglican Church in Barbados, therefore I am inclined to support the proposals in this Bill. What will be worse, will be after having passed this Bill the Government sits down supinely as they have done for the last nine years and do absolutely nothing about disestablishment and disendowment. The Church is entitled to know where it stands and the people who are going into this Ministry should know whether or not they are going to a disestablished and disendowed Church or whether the present rosy position would continue indefinitely. It is not good enough merely to say that in this particular case, the Bishop finds it difficult to fill this vacant Cure and the responsibility is therefore passed to the Governor-in-Executive Committee to fill it, and because of that they are taking the opportunity to see that the new incumbent of St. Simons will have no claims on the Government in the existing legislation. That is not good enough; the Government should be bold enough as to come right out and put the issue before the Legislature and the public.

One thing which worries me is this: let us assume that the Government did present legislation to this Chamber for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Anglican Church, and let us assume that it passed this Chamber, we have no guarantee that as we are at present constituted that such legislation would pass the Other Place; so it is hardly fair, looking at it broadly, to take certain Cures as we are doing with St. Simons and disendow them and then for some reason or other the Legislature does not give consent for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Anglican Church.

This position has not arisen overnight. The Government has been aware of it for some time and it has had time enough to test the opinion of both Houses of the Legislature on this important point and to have it settled one way or the other. It may well be that this Session will come to an end before this matter is settled in a way which I would like or in a way which the Government might like; I am not so sure myself. Should that be the case, what will happen? Will the Government which will succeed them, perhaps not committed to disestablishment and disendowment, again endow the Cure of St. Simons? I say it is not good enough. Let the principle be stated once and for all so that you would not have to take these small bites at the cherry. Lots of people are now entering the

service of the Church; why should people enter now without the same privileges and pensions rights which their brother clergymen already have and have enjoyed for years and would enjoy for some time which none of us would know? That is the point which worries me.
4.35 p.m.

It is as if we are backing out on the Church, saying: "if you want to go to church, go; but do not expect any of the privileges such as people have been enjoying for the last two or three centuries." It may also be argued that the fact that this post has been vacant for over six months, and that the Bishop and his Committee have not been able to fill it, is due to the threat of disestablishment and disendowment of the Church. If that be the case, the question also arises that if it cannot be filled by the Committee through that threat, how then does the Governor-in-Executive expect to fill it, when it translates this threat into a reality in so far as this particular cure is concerned? I do not know what the facts are, but I should not be surprised to hear from somebody who knows; because previously they were securing the established Church with the pension rights of the Civil Service. Therefore, if they are not going to enjoy it any longer, then let them join one of the other Non-conformist churches. It would therefore be very welcome news to me to hear what are the prospects of the Government for filling this particular vacancy after this Bill has become law. It may well be, of course that some member of the Government has pretensions to the Ministry and may be expecting to fill the post himself, and since we are unaware of this knowledge we are still likely to hear of it. But why, for love of the Almighty, cannot some member of the Government fill it after it has been disestablished and disendowed? Perhaps sooner or later the Government will tell us and stop this shilly-shallying business. They should take steps to introduce legislation once and for all to sever the Church and the State.

Bishop Hughes was brought here to this Country for the expressed purpose of assisting in the disestablishment of the Church. He left in utter disgust at the refusal of the Government to do nothing about it. He has gone and perhaps another will come.

His term of office coincided with the regime of the present Government. That Government said it was going to introduce disestablishment and disendowment and I knew that the head of the Church in the person of Bishop Hughes was in agreement with it. I am of the opinion that he did so in more than one pronouncement; and when he was about to leave this country he castigated the Government for having done nothing to further the matter for which he had been appointed here. When he resigned from his appointment he did not leave the country in no uncertainty at all as to why he had left. I believe he thought at first that they were interested in doing something about the matter.

Here we are in the year 1955 telling you that Government is going to fill a vacancy and that there will be no pension rights attached to the post. To me the principle is wrong; and although I may support it for certain reasons, I cannot see anybody in this Country agreeing with the opinion of four or six people that this is the right way to go about it. My supporting this Bill is entirely based upon the fact that a quarter million dollars is too much to put out of the Treasury for the church; and while we have got to make a start somewhere to curtail this expenditure, for Heaven's sake let it be done the right way.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, it is not entirely wrong for the Mover of a proposal to speak again after he has sat down. My remarks now are only addressed to the honourable senior member for St. John. I wish to ask that if anybody should speak after me that I be permitted to reply to him.

I want to kill two misconceptions. I am not accusing anybody deliberately of making a mistake; it may be due to bad memory. What the honourable member who has just sat down has said everybody expected him to say. He has so over-worked the argument for disendowment and disestablishment that he could not possibly say anything otherwise than that he is not in favour of an established church. He has to say something, therefore he tries to give the impression that he is supporting the Government.

Let me say this: it is not a question of inserting the thin edge of the wedge; that is an unfortunate expression to use, because it is not true. If the vicar of St. Simon had not disappeared or died or resigned or whatever it is that happened to him, [A VOICE: Disappeared?] I apologise for not remembering what happened to him, this Resolution would not have been before the House today.

This is my argument: you say that it is your policy to disendow and disestablish the Church; if you did not bring in this Bill and you allowed an appointment to be made, that man would have to be appointed under the old conditions. This case of the St. Simon's cure having happened, you have got to introduce this amending Bill. If the hon. member would read the Bill he would see the reason for my argument. To talk about singling out St. Simon is sheer nonsense.

It may be a question of promotion, but if somebody is promoted somebody else has to fill his place and that person will not get a pension then. It is entirely wrong to say that we are singling out the Cure of St. Simons for this treatment. If Mr. Granum were to die now the Parochial Treasurer for St. Michael would only be appointed temporarily. We did not pick out St. Thomas because the Parochial Treasurer of that parish, as far as I know, is still alive. The fact that the Cure of St. Simons is vacant and the post has to be filled necessarily forces us to come here with this Bill.

It is not a question of any lack of courage on the part of the Government; the last honourable member who spoke should be the last person to say what he said. Bishop Hughes came here with an absolute agreement; I could hardly have done more work than I have done on this question of the disendowment of the Church with Bishop Hughes and in recent months, the present Bishop. Owing to the direct political activities of a couple of turbulent priests under the persuasion of the honourable junior member for St. James who went around canvassing, they got the Synod to oppose Bishop Hughes. We reached agreement and Sir Alfred Savage appointed the honourable senior member for St. Philip who was President of a party on its death bed, (it was not yet dead and so we had to recognise it) Mr. Wilkinson, who was then President of the Electors' Association and myself, as the Leaders of the three parties in the House to meet the Bishop and get the details to give to the House. How then could anybody talk about the Government electing to pick any one Cure for this treatment? After that, a gentleman not far from St. Michael's Cathedral, because he had his knife in the Bishop and secured opposition to Bishop Hughes—Do you think that Bishop Hughes wanted to leave Barbados?

The honourable senior member for St. Philip spoke about the quarter million dollars which we spend on the Church; next week it will be half million dollars.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I distinctly referred to the amount which we spend on the Anglican Church. With the amount spent on vicarages and so on, I said this would total a quarter million dollars.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: You do not count the clothes which a clergyman may get cheaper than me! However, I put it to Bishop Hughes to let us do what British Guiana had done. All of this I have in my files at home. Instead of doing that the Bishop said: "Give me what you give the Church now for twelve or fifteen years and then lop it off altogether; that would give us time to build up our own finances." I said: "Please yourself, if you prefer that alternative I will promise you that the Government will go on with it."

I do not agree with the honourable senior member for St. Philip chucking bricks at the Church. We should disendow the Church. The world is in the perilous condition in which it is now because the Church has lost its authority; the spiritual life of every nation has gone down, and that therefore leaves the Church free to dictate to the State instead of being the handmaid of the State.

All that was to be done was that the honourable senior member for St. Philip, Mr. Wilkinson and I would work out these details with the alternative plans and come down to the House with them; but the political canvassing and the St. John rows with the Bishop broke the neck of it. There was a turbulent vicar in Christ Church—Christ Church has produced a lot of turbulent people except the Minister for Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries [Laughter].

The Bishop informed me that a vicar of a Cure in Christ Church had got extended leave while in England and the person who ought to be the boss only knew about this leave when he read it in the *Official Gazette* of Barbados. Those are the anomalies which should be wiped out. I only mentioned all of that in order to show how far we went into this matter. The present Bishop succeeds Bishop Hughes. Perhaps I should not say anything more about that now, but it was because of the attitude of the Synod that Bishop Hughes left Barbados. The last culminating thing was the St. John rows. 4.45 p.m.

If the Government has not yet come down with a Bill to disestablish and disendow the Anglican Church, it is because we are still waiting and hoping that a more reasonable frame of mind would appear on the ecclesiastical side. The situation does not seem to be getting any better at the present, therefore, we say we are moving now. However, I have given His Lordship the Bishop the assurance before he left the island that I am not going to do anything behind his back. Unfortunately for us, that would mean a delay of a few months.

I may say that we have agreed on the question of disestablishment. We have made it quite clear that we are not discussing that part of it. We have told them that if you send a Committee, we would deal with the question of how best to do it and how to do it with the minimum of inconvenience, but that the question of disestablishment or disendowment is not going to be discussed because that matter is settled already. That is the only reason why it has not been on the Statute Book.

I would just like to reply to the hon. junior member for Christ Church as to the remark he made that the question of disestablishment and disendow-

ment has not yet been crystallised. In 1951, when he came to this Chamber with a Resolution to increase the salaries of the Bishop, the Rectors and Vicars as well as something with respect to Boscobelle, it was reported to the Executive Committee that there was much criticism in the House against the raising of the salaries of these Clergymen; the general feeling being Committee in 1951, so it is impossible to say that the feeling was not crystallised. What was said then was: "Give them more money? We want to get rid of them altogether." Therefore, it is impossible to say that the matter was not crystallised.

Let me tell the hon. senior member for the City that a Barbadian who said he was going to the St. Simons' Cure is now ready to go. The hon. member asked: "What are the prospects of the Government filling this particular post?" I can tell him that it is filled already as far as the willingness of a Clergyman from British Guiana to come to fill it.

Sir, everybody who is going to be appointed now is going to be appointed without pension rights; and when we say temporarily, it must be borne in mind that you are going to get clergymen of over 60 years applying for some of these Cures and you cannot employ them otherwise. That is why we have to say temporarily. We do have one or two of those clergymen who would take one or two of these jobs; and it is known that you cannot employ a man over 60 years permanently by law, you must appoint him temporarily. Gentlemen of the Ecclesia can be appointed temporarily and die here at 95.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I rise at a point of correction, Mr. Speaker. A clergyman of the Anglican Church must retire at 70 years of age.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Every lawyer who is a lawyer likes to learn of new law as he goes along; and this is a new one. I say again that if a clergyman is appointed temporarily, he can be so appointed until he is as old as Methuselah.

Sir, there is no difference between this Bill and the Vestries Extension Act. The only difference is that the Vestries Extension Act is on the Statute Book but this is not yet on the Statute Book. The principle of both is the same. It is the same thing as when you agree to give backpay; the only difference is that it is to be the opposite; that is, you say that whenever I agree to the raise which I will give you, it will date back from the time I agreed to do so. Therefore, whenever you fill a Cure now, you go to work with the understanding that all that you will be getting is a temporary salary but you will not be getting a pension; therefore you go to work with your eyes open that you are taking a job with the principle established that the Government no longer will be giving a pension. You can get a job but not a pension.

It is utterly untrue to say that Government is afraid of public opinion in this matter; it is the opposite.

I am making this public statement because some people feel that religion will suffer if we do not make it clear that the State is not anti-religious. I therefore want to make it clear that when we come down with something for disestablishment and disendowment of the Anglican Church, something will be put in somewhere stating the Protestant Church of England is still to be the religion of the country without attaching it to the State so to speak. I say again that some people have fantastic ideas about members of the Government and their attitude to spiritual things; but I do not know of any member of the Government who is prepared to attack the Church. However strongly we say to disestablish it, we want to see the Church stronger. And we believe that if it is removed from the State it would become stronger.

The question that this Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative on a division as follows:—

*Ayes:—*Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. L. E. SMITH, Mr. St. E. HOLDER, Mrs. E. E. BOURNE, Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Mr. T. O. BRYAN, Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, Mr. W. A. CRAWFORD, Mr. VAUGHAN and Mr. O. T. ALLDER.—12.

*Noes:—*Mr. F. C. GODDARD, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY.—2.

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

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. Smith being in the Chair.

On separate motions of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX in each case, clauses 1—3 inclusive were called and passed.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of this Bill in Committee.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. Chairman left the Chair, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. L. E. SMITH, the House was adjourned for half an hour.
5.10 p.m.

On Re-assembling,

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, we propose to go with the next Order on the Order Paper.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

Resolution for St. Simon's Cure

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The first Resolution which is a Resolution for the sum of \$2,793, is something which follows on what we did earlier to-day in connection with the Anglican Church Bill. A parson has been obtained; he is a Clergyman in British Guiana and he is willing to come over here to fill this vacancy at St. Simons. He knows that the Government proposes to put before the Legislature these new conditions so that when he comes here he will not be surprised at the conditions. He will be appointed at the same salary as the previous holder of the Cure; he will not be entitled to any pension. I understand that this particular gentleman is comparatively young and the use of the word "temporary" in the Bill will not apply to him; but it will mean that in future anybody at whatever age may be appointed at the salary which is now fixed for

Vicars and Rectors. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

Resolution for Family Planning Association and Boy Scouts

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: The next Resolution Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution to place the sum of \$7,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1955-56, Part I, Current, as shown in Supplementary Estimate 1955-56 No. 9, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

The first Item in the Schedule is an amount of \$2,000 as a grant to the Boys' Scouts' Association, the next Item is an amount of \$5,000 as a grant to the Barbados Family Planning Association. As regards the Family Planning Association, that speaks for itself. I think every Barbadian is interested in this matter of family planning on account of the population pressure which exists in a very acute form in Barbados today. The figures presented in the Report of the Registrar shows the increase in the population of Barbados. In the 1946 census the number given was 192,841; in 1952: 219,015, in 1953: 223,000; and at the end of 1954: 227,000. It will therefore be seen that the population of this island is increasing at the rate of 3,000 or 4,000 a year; and in a small place like Barbados it must necessarily cause everybody some concern.

The Government realised that some active steps had to be taken in the matter and appointed a Committee of which the Hon. Dr. C. H. St. John was Chairman. I myself, happened to be a member of the Committee as well as the hon. senior member for St. Philip and the hon. senior member for St. John. This Committee examined the situation exhaustively and thoroughly and made a report which was laid on the table of this House. One of the recommendations of that Committee was the practice of practical family planning. That Committee met on several occasions and took evidence from clergymen and other interested members of the community and after sifting all of this evidence, among other things the Committee recommended a scheme of practical family planning. That Scheme was commended by the Family Planning Association of Barbados with which hon. members, I am sure, are quite familiar.

The Government as you know, sir, has expressed itself as being in favour of this form of assistance as a long term policy. We know that it will not produce immediate results but we have expressed ourselves as being in favour of this measure. The Family Planning Association of Barbados sent a Nurse who studied at the General Hospital to be trained in this matter, and the Government has permitted the use of a room at the General Hospital and also at the Health Clinics where this lady can meet and advise all those persons who are interested in receiving advice on this matter. The Association is also getting its own equipment and it is asking the Government to come to its assistance by way of a grant.

Now sir, as I said before, this is a very acute question; I am sure that every member of this House realises the effects of over-population in a small area like this. I think that we are about the third most thickly populated place in the world; and with our small area and having only a one crop economy, it

is quite evident that there must be some assistance given to these people who are interested in this matter, I repeat; and those who think they need advice can seek the advice of this Nurse. I am sure the number of these people is increasing.

5.55 p.m.

Now, sir, we know very well the ill effects of over-population. The honourable senior member for the City, like myself comes into contact with cases of disease, malnutrition and conditions of that sort which is a direct result of over-population and over-crowding. We today are concerned, and the honourable senior member for the City is very much concerned, with tuberculosis; and not we alone, but every well-thinking person of the community. We do know that with tuberculosis, the figures are on the increase; and one of the reasons for the increase is due to over-crowding, plus malnutrition. That is only one of the infectious diseases but there are lots of other infectious diseases which come as a result of over-crowding. Then with over-crowding, a large population means the lack of work for everyone; and not being able to employ the numbers we have, means much unemployment and much unemployment results in a lowering of the standard of living and immorality. Such conditions result from over-population.

There are also the physical effects as regards a mother of a large family. There are women who have children every year and that results in the lowering of the health of the mothers. Medical science believes that there should be at least a period of two years between the births of children; and during that two years mothers should be well nourished in order to regain their health before going on to the next child. We know that only in the cases of the well-to-do that mothers can get sufficient nourishment to restore them to that state of health in which they should approach their next child; and very often, the mothers of the great number of children are those who are not in a fit state financially to provide for themselves the nourishment which they need to restore them to that state of health.

I have only mentioned a few ill effects of over-crowding and over-population as we see it. There are also the smaller effects such as those as regards education. With the rapid increase of our population by three or four thousand annually, it is becoming increasingly difficult to house children in schools from year to year. You know that it is one of the burning questions of the day to provide schools to house the children who should be in school at the school age. And again, when they leave school, there is the difficulty of getting work for them. It is an old saying that in Barbados there are very few jobs and lots of people to apply for them;—people who are very often qualified to do those jobs; from Civil Servants right down.

I must say, sir, that as Minister of Social Services, I am alarmed at the increasing rate of juvenile delinquency in the island over the past few years. I do not know if it is known generally, but the figures show that every year over the past few years more and more cases of children going to Dodds appear; but that is not all, because in most cases, the Probation Officers enquiring into those cases try to make an adjustment before those cases go to Court; and even if they go to Court they try to settle it without the children having to go to that institution. Those who go to the institution are the smallest number. It would be surprising to tell you that just two or three years ago, the children at the Government Industrial School numbered only

66, but today that number has risen to 92. Very often, when those cases are investigated, it is found that they are children of large families and the mothers and fathers have to go to work and leave them at home without proper care and attention; and it is those cases which every Barbadian is asking whether you can do something to remedy the state of affairs of that sort.

6.05 p.m.

We know, as I said before, that the mothers very often have to go out to work. They cannot remain at home because they may have from three to six children to support with very often no father to help. Such are generally the prevailing conditions. We have therefore come to the stage when we should ask ourselves this question: what of the future? What are the prospects of the future, since as I said before, there has been a decrease in the death rate of infants due largely to the work of the Health Centres where the emphasis is placed on ante-natal care of mothers and the care of children after birth which causes them to grow into a sound state of health? When we consider these measures, some of which are carried out by private clinics together with the improvement in medical care, the remarkable effects of modern drugs and their influence upon the longevity of mankind, we can see that the prospects of the future must be very alarming; and we might very well ask ourselves what are we going to do about it?

Now, there are various methods or means of reducing the population from the point of view of the workers. One such means has been the question of emigration. That was examined very carefully by the local Committee set up by the Governor and comprised such members as: Hon. Dr. St. John, (Chairman), Hon. F. C. Hutson, Hon. V. C. Gale, Hon. Dr. Cato, the Senior Member for St. Philip, the Junior Member for Christ Church, the Senior Member for St. John, the Senior Member for St. Andrew, and Mr. Williams, who was then the Junior Member for St. Lucy. I think that I can say without boasting, that we did a very good job of examining the prospects of emigration, especially to the United States of America. Emigration to Canada and countries within the Caribbean [A VOICE: England!] and England, as the hon. senior Member for the City says, were also examined.

We are all acquainted with the emigration problems of those countries. We know that emigration to the United States is only a trickle, a hundred a year, I believe it is. There is also the contract for labour to America, the numbers of which are being reduced every year. I think it has been reduced now to about one hundred a year. That also is a short term matter; and while it gives some immediate relief, yet it does not bring the condition to what we would like because it is not permanent. The permanent as we all know is only 100 a year.

We all know what emigration is in Canada. The Minister for Emigration not so long ago issued a White Paper on emigration and the prospects of other schemes that were tackled; and among the places investigated were the Argentine, Australia, Bermuda, Borneo, Brazil, British Guiana, British Honduras, Canada, French West Indies, The Netherlands, Nigeria, Panama, San Domingo and the United Kingdom. For the benefit of the hon. senior member for the City there is a similar Scheme in operation to the United Kingdom. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Shame.] Government-assisted Nurses are being sent to the United Kingdom for furthering their studies in Nursing, and some for complete education in Nursing. That has been in operation about a year or so, but that also is only a trickle. Recently (about

a week ago) you may have seen that the position with the domestics for emigration to the United Kingdom has been examined. An agreement has been reached and in a very short time the first batch of domestics will be going up to the United Kingdom for further training. But as I have said before those are all trickles; efforts which just catch the surface. The point I am making is that the Government has been active in investigating the possibility of emigration to big countries.

There were also other recommendations most of which hon. members are acquainted with already, such as industrialisation and tourism which were all examined exhaustively by the Committee. It is not only in Barbados that the Committee has concerned itself with this problem.

6.15 p.m.

It is not only the local Committee which concerns itself with this problem. You will remember, sir, that during the end of last year Lord Simon came to Barbados. He examined the position in Barbados with respect to our economy and other things, and he too was very much alarmed at our population. He also spoke about emigration and he also felt that the problem should be tackled by way of Family Planning. Then sir, we had a lady from America, Miss Naomi Thomas sent down by the Family Planning Association. She travelled all over Barbados and made good contact with people individually and in groups and also examined vital statistics, economic and other conditions, Social Services and the like, and she also felt that a system of Family Planning was one of the means that would meet the problem and assist in solving this over-population problem which now presents itself to us.

There was a debate which took place in the House of Lords in July, 1953, when some members of that august body spoke on the population of the West Indies generally, but more particularly of Jamaica and Barbados. They have not said anything more than what we know already; reference was made to the difficulties in Barbados, the poor housing conditions and also to the matter of birth control.

Nobody is forcing the practice of birth control on anybody. As I said earlier the Clinics are provided, and these Clinics are there for those who wish to make use of them. Those who want to get this advice can get it and those who do not want to do so do not have to go for this advice.

This debate in the House of Lords does not tell us anything more than what we ourselves know. Tourism is quite good in itself; we know that every square inch of land in Barbados which is arable is already under cultivation.

As I have already stressed, this problem is an acute one which must be solved. I know that certain honourable members of this Chamber are not in favour of the practice of Birth Control. We do not expect that everybody will be in favour of everything. A lot of people in the early days of Christianity were not in favour of it, but it has turned out to be a very good thing. The honourable senior member for the City will tell you sir that it is a very good thing. However, the question is whether we should go on in an ostrich-like fashion, burying our heads in the sand and pretending that the problem is not there, or whether we should come out openly and acknowledge that the problem is there; and each man tackle it so that he may produce effective results in the shortest possible space of time. These are conditions which we know exist in Barbados; and we as true citizens should want to

maintain or achieve a higher standard of living for these children which we should educate to the best of our ability, and not to have ten or twelve children when we can only adequately provide for three or four, maintaining them in the way of food, clothing and education and bringing them up as useful citizens who can take their place in the community. It is a question of whether we want to do that or whether we should go on with a rampant increase from year to year.

From my experience as a medical practitioner going into the homes of people, (and very often they come to me) I am very familiar with their circumstances; and I know that this rapid increase in population cannot go on as it has been going on, because on some day it will produce alarming results. I know that there are more and more people who are daily finding out that they cannot care adequately for their families. A lady came to me yesterday morning with her eighth child when the seventh was still very young. I think that this knowledge should be placed at the disposal of these people. Let us not fool ourselves that the practice of birth control is something new in this island; we know that it has been practised by people of the well-to-do classes who could afford to have more children; but they limit the number of their children. I think it is only fair that means should be taken to extend this knowledge to the less fortunate people who, because of the lack of amenities in their homes and other factors, find themselves producing large families from year to year.

6.25 p.m.

I think that this avenue of Family Planning should be opened to people if they so desire it and wish to take advantage of it. Those who for one reason or the other are not interested in a service of this sort, (maybe on religious grounds or through fear or ignorance) need not approach the Clinic where this advice is given. But sir, I am a responsible citizen and in view of my profession, I know just what the consequence of this rapid increase in population is leading to; and I think that those members of this House who feel as I do should take every opportunity by way of advising and other means, to help these unfortunate people in the circumstances which they now find themselves.

Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with Item 53, Family Planning Association, for which the sum of \$5,000 is to be voted. The Resolution is in two parts but I am dealing with this Item separately. I beg to move that this vote for \$5,000 do now stand part.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have listened carefully to the honourable Introducer. I am not making my speech yet; I want to know from him exactly for what is this \$5,000 to do.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: As you know sir, there is this Family Planning Association which collects funds from people who are kindly disposed towards work of this sort. The Association has a nurse to pay and they are buying their own goods. Whether they are condiments or jellies, the Association is advising the people to use them; and the Association is distributing them at cost to those who are able to pay for them, and those who are unable to pay for them will still get them. The only discrimination of the Association is that the persons seeking advice must have established a family, not necessarily by marriage; that is, the person may have a common law husband and they must be living together as man and wife for years and have produced children.

This Association does not want to encourage promiscuity, consequently, they are saying that people who have established families if they come to the clinic will get the advice and pay for it at a cost; and if they are unable to pay the whole cost, they will still get it for what they can afford to pay, and those who are unable to pay anything will still get it. In short, nobody who is qualified will be turned back. The Association is asking the Government for assistance; hence this vote. As I have said, the work will be carried out at the Hospital and at the Health Centre.

Mr. Chairman, I again beg to move that Item 53, Family Planning Association, do now stand part.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir,—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I want to draw to honourable members' attention that the Hon. Minister made a very lengthy speech on this vote. He touched on emigration, unemployment and things of that sort; but I have not seen mention of any such things in this Resolution. Therefore, I am reminding honourable members that they will not be allowed to stray on all of those things. I am only going to entertain what is in front of us.

Mr. VAUGHAN: With your permission, Mr. Chairman, in family planning the question of unemployment and the side issues which you have just mentioned and which were mentioned by the Hon. Minister of Social Services are essential to the proper discussion; and I submit respectfully that you are bound to mention those subjects if you are dealing with that subject. Consequently, you will be making a mistake if you prevent honourable members form touching on them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I can only go by what I see in the Item.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I must begin by saying that I had no idea that this Resolution would have been put before the House today. I only saw a copy of it just a few hours earlier. 6.35 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This matter is here as the second Item on the Order Paper and the hon. member says he had no idea of it. Why was it put as the second Item on the Order Paper?

Mr. CRAWFORD: If the Hon. Minister would listen to what I am saying he would not make a spectacle of himself, because this morning I rang the Clerk of the House to know whether my papers were ready and he told me that they would be sent over at mid-day.

If you were to summarise all that the Honourable Minister who has just sat down has said in introducing this Resolution, you would be able to reduce it to these few words: the population of Barbados has shown some increase; the Ministry or the Government to which the honourable member belongs has no plans for the improvement and development of the country; we have no plan for providing employment, therefore the only thing we can do is to ask the people to stop having children. In order to justify that policy, he quoted from Miss Naomi Thomas and from Lord Simon in the British House of Lords; in Britain mind you, not in Barbados!

Now in the year 1945 what did the House of Lords know about Barbados? And since when was Lord Simon an authority on what is happening here? Since when has he come to tell us what we are to do with what, in my opinion, constitutes the greatest asset of our country: our population? We have been given to understand that this proposal in support of birth control is not part of the Government's policy.

Let us begin by understanding first and foremost, that birth control does not constitute an item on the manifesto which they put to the country in 1945 or what ever year it was. However a few people in Barbados, none as lucky as the Hon. Minister, have for some reason or other become very apprehensive about the growth of the population of this country; therefore they are determined to do what they can about it. Of course the only solution they can offer is birth control; and the Ministers of the Government are so naive as not to appreciate what is the basic motive underlying all this propaganda. They cannot understand that the same scientific theories do not apply with equal force in all countries; and they are willing to rush behind the proposals of birth control feeling that birth control is the answer. He quotes Naomi Thomas; how did Miss Naomi Thomas get to Barbados? She was brought here on lecture tour by the same people to whom I am referring: the same small clique who have grown justifiably apprehensive of the population because they know that political power and other power are indispensibly associated with population power, and they are therefore taking a long range view. If they can begin now to do something to limit this population, who knows the time may come when for one reason or another the political situation which has resulted from the power in this large population may change somewhat.

The hon. member has not quoted one single fact or theory to substantiate any proposal by a Government in Barbados on questions of financial assistance to birth control. He has of course dealt with none of these conditions which are caused by those situations; and he himself has been so aware of the invalidity of his arguments that he has had to bring in Lord Simon, the House of Lords and what-not to bolster his case.

How did this originate? It originated with the Hon. Frank Hutson who professes, as a study, to be very concerned over the growth of a section of the population. I want to ask the Hon. Minister whether he thinks that Mr. Hutson is really interested in this problem because of any deep feeling for the national interest of Barbados. I am not saying that Mr. Hutson may not feel that if we had less mouths to feed things might not be different; but neither he nor the Hon. Minister can bring any arguments to prove that family planning is the answer to the problem. He also cited Dr. Cato; he said that Dr. Cato was a member of the Committee who recommended Birth Control. But both Dr. Cato and himself refused to endorse the report that family planning was the answer. I am going to quote Dr. Cato's reservation before I am finished. I cannot really believe that the Hon. Minister believes half of what he says. Merely quoting that increased population leads to juvenile delinquency does not prove anything in the special context of Barbados. As a matter of fact, when he started to talk about juvenile delinquency and overpopulation I wondered whether he was not talking with his tongue in his cheek. He would not do now what he is doing at the only reformatory for juvenile delinquency in Barbados. We have an institution called Dodds to which male juvenile delinquents are sent for reform, and the law permits the Government to make a small charge during their detention there. So far as I know no Government in the history of this Island has ever exercised its legal right to make parents or guardians of children who go there pay their detention except the Hon. Minister's. This Government has gone so far as to make the authorities prosecute people who do not pay for their children's detention at Dodds.

If he felt that juvenile delinquency was the direct result of the increase in the numbers of the population, could he not instruct the Superintendent to tackle this specially? Because until such time as his family planning theories begin to take effect, your increased population must give you more juvenile delinquency according to him. I here quote the Reformatory and Industrial Act, 1926 Section 48.

"On the complaint of the Superintendent of the School or of any police or of any police officer at any time during the continuance of any boy in the School the Police Magistrate having jurisdiction at the place where the parent, step-parent, or other person liable to maintain such boy resides, may, on summons to the parent or step-parent or other person liable as aforesaid, examine into his or her ability and may, if he thinks fit, make an order on him or her for the payment to the Superintendent of the School, or to any agent appointed by him in writing, of such weekly sum not exceeding two shillings per week, as to him seems reasonable during the whole or any part of the period for which the boy is liable to be detained."

6.45 p.m.

Under that Section the Superintendent of Dodds on the instructions of the Government can prosecute people. You will find before the Magistrates weekly cases for non-payment of fees. Does that indicate any sympathy with the position which the Hon. Minister has said has created this over-population? Birth control is not in effect yet; the population is still increasing and you are getting more boys as juvenile delinquents, and you are asking people to pay for their support. Another argument of the hon. member is that birth control is not new to Barbados, and it is practised by a section of the population. Do you think if people could buy children they would not go and buy them? In some cases it is a question of economic reasons; and in other cases it is a question of the pain contingent upon child birth. They have a child or two children and they stop there; but if they could get these children without the physical injury to their health the rich would go on getting them. It is not because they do not want them; it is not because some people practice birth control for reasons best known to themselves that other people must follow suit. I do see that; one has to admit that in a community in which there are insufficient jobs for the population, naturally you must have unemployment and certain social evils arising therefrom; but in a community such as this, the first effort to solve this problem is not birth control. It is the Government's duty first and foremost to endeavour with all the means at its disposal to provide more jobs for the people; or otherwise, as an hon. member has said, they will have to give more poor relief.

You will be surprised to know, Mr. Chairman, that in the late 40's when the emigration scheme was at its height and we had an appreciable number of people abroad in Aruba, Curacao and the United States of America, there were several Vestries who paid out nothing by way of poor relief. I think that the Christ Church Vestry for some time did not have a single application for poor relief, because the section of the population which was employed abroad sent back part of their earnings to their people at home and the Parochial authorities were relieved of the strain which in normal times they would have to pay in appreciable sums by way of poor relief.

If proper reference were made to the economic conditions of the people and more jobs provided for

them you would not have to resort to family planning. Family planning is a last resort in some countries in Europe; they pay a bonus to people for every child they have; they do not intend to limit the production of the population.

I am alarmed at the easy manner in which the Government has allowed itself to be bamboozled into thinking that birth control will solve the problem and that it is the real answer to the problem. It is not any part of their policy; I have no recollection of having read or heard any Minister or member of the Government's Bench at election time profess to be interested in family planning to the point of financially aiding it if they constituted the Government. I am therefore at a loss to find out what is really operating in their minds that they so easily allow themselves to be led down this path of family planning.

As I said a little earlier, as a member of this Committee appointed by the two Houses of the Legislature to consider this question of over-population in Barbados, Hon. Dr. A. S. Cato did not express any general agreement with the recommendations of the Committee. The Hon. Minister said that this Committee did a very fine job; but all things being considered, I am surprised to hear him say so; because in my mind and in the minds of other hon. members of the Committee including Dr. Cato and in the minds of other members of the public, the report is a very poor document. I cast no reflection on the Chairman of the Committee; but neither from the point of view of literary or other stand points this report does not reflect credit on the members who comprised it. For a matter of this importance, the Committee in its report merely played with the whole question and refused to pay due attention to the complicated problem which the question posed. This is what Hon. Dr. Cato said in his note of reservation attached to the report. He said this:

"While I agree in general with the Report, I fear that it is difficult to resist the conclusion that it is rather too parochial in its outlook. Neither the problem of over-population nor its solutions is a purely local matter and I think that its relation to the overall picture in the Caribbean area should be emphasised and representations on the subject made to the appropriate authorities."

6.55 p.m.

He goes on to say:—

"I consider it essential that the Report should include the following recommendations—"

Now, sir, these recommendations I shall read because I want them included in the report on this debate in view of what the Hon. Minister of Social Services has said. Dr. Cato strongly urged the Committee to accept his recommendations. It is not to say that Dr. Cato merely refused to sign the Report; he went as far as to draft these recommendations before and he circularised them to the Committee. He was particularly anxious that the Committee should include his recommendations in the main body of the Report; and it was only because the Committee refused to endorse what he said that he had to take this action of getting his views before the public. His recommendations were:—

"a" that Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom should be asked to use their good offices to secure opportunities for emigration to other parts of the British Commonwealth, particularly to Canada and, possibly Australia."

"As far as Canada is concerned, her geographical position, her long history of mutual trade and other interests, have put her in a unique position with regard to the West Indies and, in addition, strategic considerations make it clear that a stable West

Indies can only be to Canada's advantage. In this connection, I consider that a formula should be devised by which Canada should have direct representation on the Caribbean Commission."

He then dilates on that. A little further he says—

"With regard to Australia, there seems to have been in recent years a relaxation of the traditional emigration policy. A vast number of displaced Europeans have been admitted and lately immigration has been started from Malta. There can be no harm in sounding out the possibilities of emigration of a certain number of West Indians who, after all, are British in tradition and culture."

"The people of the West Indies are second to none in their loyalty to the Crown and to the concept of Commonwealth and Empire. To them this means that their problems are Commonwealth problems and should be faced from this high level. To deny them help and interest on a Commonwealth basis is to leave them vulnerable to ideologies directly opposed to all that the concept of Commonwealth and Empire represents."

"(b) That the Legislatures of the Caribbean should make a genuine and determined effort to make Federation of the British West Indies an accomplished fact. The West Indies can no longer expect to be heard in the Councils of the world so long as they remain self-centred and isolated ground speaking with lone voices. With a federated West Indies, decisions on the free movement of a surplus population from densely to sparsely populated areas should not prove insoluble; more attractive opportunities and conditions could be granted for the investment of capital, both foreign and Commonwealth, whereby new industries, controlled on a regional basis, could be developed and proper markets secured. Representations should also be renewed to the British Government on the question of reciprocal concessions in respect of aid to pioneer industries. In my view the Report has treated all too cursorily the whole question of the development of secondary industries."

In other words, here is a document which the Hon. Minister says is such a fine report, and on which the Committee had done such a good job; but yet you have a distinguished member of that Committee telling you "the Report has treated all too cursorily the whole question of the development of secondary industries."

Here in the tail piece of that distinguished member's reservation, is the sting of what he has to say. He says:—

"The main recommendation in the draft Report of the Select Committee is the introduction of a system of family planning under Government auspices. I would stress the scientific truth that a raising of the standards of living is accompanied by a decline in the birth rate. Limitation of offspring is already practised extensively in the higher income groups throughout the Island and its introduction into Barbados among the less educated and responsible classes of the community would not go as far towards the solution of over-population as the Committee appears to believe and in my view would take a much longer time to show results than the Committee hopes."

That is what he says, and the Hon. Minister of Social Services says that he considers from his medical and scientific knowledge that he should recommend to the Government that it should sponsor and aid financially this proposal to introduce family planning here. I presume that Dr. Cato similarly drew his policy on his medical knowledge when he said that the introduction of family planning would not go as far towards the solution of over-population as the Committee appears to believe; and further, that in his view it would take a much longer time to show results than the Committee hopes. If that is so, where

is the justification for the quotation by the Hon. Minister from this Report in support of his family planning baby? I know for absolute certainty, as Dr Cato has actually written in the report that he was convinced of the opinion, that the Committee had not paid to any extent due attention to all the aspects of the problem with which it was appointed to deal.

Sir, you cannot consider a question of over-population merely by a few vital statistics, then to rehash a few ideas which are current, and then to take a report which you have on that to recommend the introduction of family planning in Barbados. There is a slight increase in the population of Barbados, but the increase in the population is not as high as that of Puerto Rico or other places which have the same problem.

If the Government had exhausted every possible means of economic development, if it had attacked the matter of emigration in the manner suggested by Dr. Cato and others, and then after some time it found out that the results were not what they hoped them to be, then they might even be some justification in a general recommendation by the Government that it might be well for the people to practise birth control, as the Government is doing. To actually pick-up public funds to give to a small organisation to spend on it in a country like this, and at this stage of our development, is to say the least on the part of this Government constituted as this is.

7.05 p.m.

Now with regard to the Report of the Committee, I said that both Dr. Cato and myself had made certain reservations in connection with the recommendations of the Committee; and I quoted Dr. Cato at length because the Minister of Social Services, a Negro Barbadian, having before him the evidence of a man like Dr. Cato refused to refer to it but cited the House of Lords in support of his family planning theories. Could you conceive of anything more indiscrete? West Indians are running daily to Britain looking for work; the entire British population, the British Government and Parliament are concerned about this problem of Negroes coming into the country and threatening to create certain social problems; why should some member of the House of Lords who have no influence on British policy lay down the doctrine of what is good for a Negro Government to adopt for the Negro people of Barbados.

I have no doubt that the British House of Lords, (except perhaps a few who have economic interest in the West Indies) would not mind whether or not you had 2,000 or 200,000 people except that they may feel that the less people you have over there, the less the British Exchequer would be called upon to support. But the last thing that I would like to hear is that the Minister of Social Services should set them up as an authority on a question in Barbados. I should like to know whether a Minister in any African colony would quote a dictum of a member of the House of Lords in support of the introduction of a policy so vitally affecting the people in his own country. Does he think that Mr. Manley of Jamaica or Nkrumah of the Gold Coast cares one tinker of what the British House of Lords thinks about the population of Nigeria? Does he think that Nkrumah would be so drunk as to get up in the Gold Coast Parliament and say that the British House of Lords thought that they should limit the population of the Gold Coast? If the Hon. Minister here could tell us that in the opinion of his Government and in his opinion, by an irrefutable argument that such and such a policy should be adopted, all well and good; but do not tell us that Lord Simon who paid a visit here could tell us to

do so and so. If Miss Naomi Thomas was brought here by the Family Planning Association, what do you expect her to do? I asked Miss Thomas on more than one occasion, if she were living in Barbados what she would think of the population and she laughed.

Miss Thomas is an expert in this particular branch of Sociology and she makes her living out of that business. Mr. Hutson, Mrs. Ronald Tree and a few other wealthy people on the St. James Coast who have a lot of time on their hands, time to invent all sorts of fancy notions, think that it would be a good idea if, when they are running about and driving about the streets of Barbados, they saw less people. So they brought an employee of the Organisation in the United States (a Negro employee) to come down here and tell the people of Barbados that this is a good thing because they feel that the people would accept it more readily coming from her, than they would coming from themselves. They brought down Miss Thomas and she did what she was brought to do. We ought to view an expert on Family Planning in much the same light as we view our expert on the Deep Water Harbour; but do not quote your Family Planning expert because that was what she came here for.

Now, this was my reservation on the Committee's Report. I said: that from the evidence which was presented to the Committee, I am prepared, at this stage, to endorse the recommendation contained in the formal report with reference to the introduction of the system of family planning under the aegis of the Government. "While I am appreciative of the fact that emigration can only be of temporary assistance and can never be expected permanently to stabilise the population, I am yet of the opinion that the most strenuous efforts should be made by certain members of the population abroad, more or less simultaneously with private endeavours of agricultural and industrial development, should assist in the reduction of unemployment; and on the investigation by a capable health service, the position might be improved, say, within another few years."

I formerly supported the condition on industrial development contained in the Note of reservation by the Hon. Dr. Cato which was put up to the Committee for discussion; and I want the emphasis laid on the fact that Dr. Cato had seen this. He made the reservation weeks before; but the Committee was so bent on this family planning business that it ignored the rational recommendation of Dr. Cato. I need hardly say that the majority of that Committee went there with the intention to summon a few witnesses, hear what they had to say, and then draw up their theory about birth control; they were not prepared to listen to or give favourable consideration to anything else. 7.15 p.m.

I further stated this:

"With specific reference to Emigration, I am of the opinion that the experience of Puerto Rico might be cited where the annual natural population increase is 3% as compared with 1.8% in Barbados."

In other words, the population increase in Puerto Rico is more than twice that of Barbados. I went on to say this:

"The emigration annually of Puerto Ricans to the U.S.A. is said to have become a factor of great importance in the economic and population picture of Puerto Rico."

The total population of Puerto Rico is estimated at 2,225,000 and the annual natural increase at 66,750. During the years 1945-52, the migratory current of Puerto Ricans reached a net balance of 244,800 persons, and averaged 34,971 per year.

This is more than half the natural population increase.

In the year 1951, net emigration totalled 52,900 persons and during the first nine months of 1952, the net emigration exceeded 67,000. Mr. Rafael de J. Cordero, Chief Financial Officer of the Insular Government, pointed out that it was hoped that in 1953 that the net emigration would entirely eliminate the natural increase in population."

This is a country with an annual natural increase of population of 3% as compared with 1.8% in Barbados. Admittedly, the facilities for emigration are better; but the question is that in spite of this 3% increase in population, in one year, 1953, the net emigration would entirely eliminate the natural increase in population.

Mr. Cordero went further. He emphasized that "should the current high level of emigration be maintained, the resident population would cease to increase and perhaps decrease." "Emigration," he says, "of a greater portion of adults than children and a disproportion between the sexes of the adults would be also expected, at least temporarily, to reduce the fertility of the population which remained in the country."

That is to say that if more adults than children emigrated the more you will expect a fall in the birth rate. I quoted all that to emphasise the immediate effect of appreciable emigration on this population increase. It is a well established fact that with proper arrangements, the United Kingdom today could absorb 10,000 or 15,000 Barbadians easily. It is well known that they need over 300,000 people in Great Britain to do the work which has to be done.

Now the Government can give a bunch of family planning cranks \$5,000 to play with but they cannot see their way to send people on a contract to the United Kingdom. Because they have this bee in their bonnet about birth control, they can spend \$500 this year and \$1,500 next year and everybody will enjoy themselves. Do they really seriously believe that they will get economic returns for this expenditure? I am not so stupid as to believe that they are not a few people who would voluntarily restrict the production of offsprings if the means for so doing were available to them; but that is a question of lectures by Social Welfare Officers, Health Visitors and so on, speaking to people over a period of time, and if they regard it as proper making certain recommendations. That is not a matter which the Government of Barbados should at this time adopt as a policy.

If a private organisation composed of cranks or people with a bee in their bonnet decide to preach birth control, I do not say that we should lock them up; let them enjoy themselves; if people will contribute money voluntarily to this matter, let them go ahead and do it. You have a lot of bizarre occupations enjoyed among the wealthy people with a lot of time at their disposal in this island, and it would be very interesting to hear or read of the peculiar methods in which the leisure classes all over the world indulge in order to while away the enormous amount of time which they have on their hands; therefore I do not think it would do any harm if we allowed this family planning organisation to establish and collect funds from wherever they can.

I cannot imagine any Minister putting his hands in his pocket and giving them money; but when it comes to the inexhaustible Treasury, then it is a different matter to them.

In my opinion because there is this slight increase in the birth-rate in this colony over a number of years, there is no reason for us to get panicky

and be led away by these birth control proponents and begin to expend the Government funds on their projects. I know that it can be claimed that other countries in the Caribbean are practising or have practised birth control; but I cannot think off hand of any of them which is doing it with the financial support of the State. I know for instance that in Puerto Rico the Government does not object in principle to family planning; but they are not regarding family planning as the beginning and the end of solving Puerto Rico's population. Is there any other country in the Caribbean with Puerto Rico's intensive development programme?

7.25 p.m.

Are we in Barbados or in another British West Indian colony now beginning to approximate the national attempt of Puerto Rico to improve the country's economy? The answer is, that even if in conjunction with this remarkable effort of economic development there was also now some suggestion of Family Planning it would do. Let us remember that the natural net increase annually of the population of Puerto Rico is still ahead of ours. I think theirs is 3%; ours is 1.8%. In other words, if we were to start more industrial development (and both Dr. Cato and myself have suggested it) we may not get even this 50% reduction which we would have to think of in this family planning business.

I regard the natural facility of the Barbadian to procreate as a divine blessing. I am only inclined to suggest to reduce the birth-rate among the unfit and even to suggest sterilisation; that is, people who are suffering from incurable, mental or other diseases. We can suggest family planning to them, but for the average healthy person in the community I would endeavour to ensure that we can find work for them when they reach the age to seek employment.

Sir, I am not concerned with a lot of the people's objections which I imagine can be raised against birth control. Numerous authorities can be cited one way or the other. There can be objections on religious and ethical grounds and numerous other points; but apart from that, I do say that it is not in the national interest, all things considered, that the Government of Barbados should go on record in 1955 as not only sponsoring birth control but of actually expending public funds on its introduction and adoption. So far as I know, no political party in Barbados depending on popular support has ever suggested to the country that it believed in birth control to be the answer to the evils complained of by the Minister in his introductory speech; and I am not prepared to swallow as the Government is doing, hook, line and sinker, the half-baked proposals and the very special pleadings of the birth control cranks in Barbados.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, this is a most delicate issue before this House as far as the feelings of our people are concerned. It has generated lots of political propaganda because of the knowledge which our people in this country have of birth control. When I spoke to the masses of people in this country, the majority of them knew absolutely nothing of the scientific practice of birth control. Some years ago, when it was mentioned, parents forbade their children to drink the milk which was given to them at the schools because they thought it contained birth control aids; so you can very well understand, Mr. Chairman, that certain politicians would seek to exploit the people's prejudices.

Now, sir, the hon. member who just sat did not deal with birth control nor the over-population problem in truth; he dealt with the Minister who introduced it. Sir, at the risk of great unpopularity I am

going to defend it; and before I sit, I hope that I would have defended it and proved the rationality of the majority.

The Government does not suggest that birth control is an immediate remedy to our social problems; it has not suggested that at all. It has suggested that birth control is one of the remedies to prevent an increasing worse social condition in the future. It has suggested that birth control is one of the remedies to prevent a certain lamentable destitution facing us in the future.

7.35 p.m.

The theory of surplus population is not absolute; it is conditional. If you can find work for people, if you can set up a living standard for the population there is no problem. Birth control then becomes a matter pure and simple for the people who want or do not want a large family for biological medical or physical reasons. It is not a problem if you can meet the increase in population with a better standard of living or even by maintaining the present desirable standard of living. But can we, (especially those of us who call ourselves socialist and progressive) ignore and condemn a method which will prevent increasing social misery in this country, unless the people learn some other means of checking it? We cannot be dishonest with ourselves and tell the people to increase indiscriminately. If we are dishonest with ourselves and advocate such a solution the increase in population means an increase in misery. [A VOICE: That is not logical].

Let us look at the facts. There is nothing in the theory of birth control which prevents any of the proposed remedies the hon. member has suggested from being used. Emigration is no solution to the problem as we know it; it is no more a solution to the present evil than those who imagine that birth control is an immediate solution.

We cannot compel any country to take our surplus population. Some people in the West Indies do not want us; the leading political element in British Guiana do not want Barbadians there. In Honduras the leading political element that just came into power there are strictly opposed to the emigration of Barbadians. Those are countries of the West, empty countries that can take all the population of the West Indies to develop their territories.

Mr. Chairman, the question of emigration is almost unlimited. Emigration must be backed by substantial capital [Cheers]. We cannot send people abroad to other countries of great potential development [A VOICE: Like Great Britain?] such as British Guiana and British Honduras, countries of vast but useless wealth as it at present lies, and wealth that needs development. There is wealth in British Guiana, wealth in British Honduras, and in some places wealth of a depth which you cannot see here. Mr. Chairman, why does the vast element in British Guiana become such an attraction? There is only one answer: the depth and the need for the development of that place. It is a rich country; potentially rich, but the capital is not there to develop it. If our people who are not wanted has a chance of going there, it must be backed by substantial capital in order that emigration to those two countries might be of benefit to the emigrants. Sir, so far as the history of emigration is concerned, emigration has not yet been proved to be a solution to an overpopulated country; and again I would like to remind the House that over-population is a relative term. Let us take Italy during the years before the first World War: in 1921 Italy exported her poor by the millions; but to-day Italy is among the poorest countries in Europe, and overpopulated

because it cannot find employment for its several millions. [A VOICE: So they got birth control!] Birth control is practised in every country. The Catholics are not against birth control. As explosive as that statement may sound, it must be remembered that they advocate natural control such as abstinence and the use of the safe period which is practical.

It is an untrue statement to say that the Catholics are opposed to birth control; they are opposed to artificial birth control. The greatest religious body in the world, (people who are strictly dogmatic in their religious sentiments) does not oppose birth control.

What is the use of talking about Jamaica or introducing Nigeria and Puerto Rico into the argument when it is known that the Government of Puerto Rico encourages clinics and subsidises the clinics. I feel there is no comparison inasmuch as the problems are not identical. In Barbados to the acre of arable land they are 1,861 persons, whereas in Puerto Rico to the acre of arable land there are 6,028 people. Of course by reason of its size this country can afford to have a large population. We have three times the number of people comparatively speaking than Puerto Rico has; therefore how can the problems be identical. Although Puerto Rico is not rich or have our density of population, yet they practise birth control. Puerto Rico has an immense industrial development, and Puerto Ricans emigrate freely to the United States. We cannot compel the United States to take our citizens, we cannot even compel the United Kingdom to take our citizens. [A VOICE: Nonsense]. That is a plain statement of fact. [A VOICE: But talk sense]. With the United Kingdom, if a recession should set in what do you expect would happen. The emigrants will be all bundling back to Barbados. Do you think that Puerto Ricans will not be going back?

Hon. Members will see from what I have said before, that emigration is not necessarily the permanent solution. [A VOICE: Who said it was?] It can be a very valuable temporary solution; but it is not a permanent solution.
7.45 p.m.

I think that the heat generated by certain honourable members on the moral and social issue of birth control is perhaps the most delicate grounds on which to travel. The people who frown upon illegitimacy have been violently condemned. None of us are so senseless or intolerable as to look down upon illegitimate children; that is totally absurd and unadulterated. A child did not bring itself into this world, and a child, regardless of the advent of its birth, should be a social charge of the State if the parents are unable to take care of it. It is a fact that dozens of young men and women who have children never wanted them; and if they knew how not to get them they would never have had them. That is a fact, and anybody who denies it is a hypocrite.

Many people who have three children never wanted the third; some of them who have two without marriage never wanted the second. I am talking what all of us know about. It is unfair for people to have unwanted children through the lack of knowledge of how not to have them. They do not want children because they cannot find the means of supporting them as they feel they should be supported. Our people are not less moral in any way than people anywhere else; but the results of their immorality are disastrous in a way in which they are not in England, through lack of knowledge. When a woman in England has her illegitimate time, as European tradition would call

it, she knows that no evil can result from her illegitimate pastime. She knows that no bastard can be the result because she has the knowledge of how to prevent it; but our people who are no worse than the women in England or Europe or America do not know how to prevent that. Therefore they must get the unwanted child or the unwanted five children, sometimes for different men who forget them. Those are the evils of the lack of knowledge of birth control, and those are the evils which, if this society is to advance and raise the social standard, should be controlled.

The law about putting money on men does not stop the evil. Of course unemployment is very rampant here; and I personally believe that if women could get employment easily they would not notice many a man, for that notice tends to bring them into irresponsible trouble.

Many a woman if she were working would not have many a child for many a man; many of them just get a child as another means of support. Those are the conditions under which I would support the setting up of Birth Control Clinics. It is only fair to a certain section of the population that they ought to know how not to have unwanted children. It is a fact that there are unwanted children by certain mothers; I would say something more on this matter, but it would be too explosive for our traditional age. And the doctors know it too! A lot of abortion is being practised in this country; would women practise abortion when they want children?

Those are social facts, not political dreams or propaganda, and it is far better for the health of the women; and they are going further in trying to procure an abortion although in some instances it is not realised that she does herself more harm in trying to procure an abortion than in bringing a child.

At this stage, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for three quarters of an hour.

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

The motion was put and agreed to, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

On re-assembling.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 24. It is very urgent; it is in connection with the Deep Water Harbour.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I think it is the same Hon. Leader of the House who earlier today told an hon. member that he could not plead ignorance about the House doing something today because that Order was set down as the second Item on the Order Paper. The same Minister is now asking leave to discuss Order No. 24 which is a Resolution seeking acceptance in principle of Sir Eric Millbourn's Report on the Deep Water Harbour. Certainly, the Hon. Minister has lost his sense of proportion or there is something very wrong.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member objecting to leave?

Mr. LEWIS: Sir, I am not only objecting but I am giving my reasons for it. I hope that it will appeal to the Hon. Minister that some consideration

should be given to what we discuss in the House. It does not seem right to me that at this hour we should deal with an Item which is set down so low on the Order Paper. We were in Committee of Supply on the adjournment and we were dealing with a Resolution which contained two Items (1) for the Boys Scouts Association, and (2) for the Family Planning Association. One would have expected that the Hon. Leader of the House would have gone back to that immediately and got it out of the way.

The Hon. Minister chose to deal with Family Planning a subject which he knew would have brought down some sort of debate. Now he is leaving off that and asking us to discuss a matter like the Deep Water Harbour which is set down so low on the Order Paper.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. SPEAKER: As long as there is objection the question must be put immediately.

The question is that leave be granted the Hon. Member to proceed with Order No. 24. Hon. members in favour will please say "Aye" and those against will please say "No".

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I was only asking you to ring the Bell before the question is put.

The question was decided in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. SMITH, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. MILLER and Mr. VAUGHAN.—8.

Noes: Mr. BARROW, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY and Mr. GODDARD.—4.

Resolution to Approve Deep Water Harbour Report

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 24 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing: to move the passing of the Resolution seeking acceptance in principle of Sir Eric Millbourn's Report on the Deep Water Harbour.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry in the first place that I have had to, as it were, get this Resolution through at perhaps what might be considered by some hon. members at short notice. I can see something in what the hon. junior member for the City has said in that this Resolution is placed low on the Order Paper. But in view of the fact that this question of the construction of the Deep Water Harbour has been discussed for years and in recent months approval has been given to its implementations, and more particularly since on Tuesday last this House agreed to a Resolution for \$50,000 for the improvement of access roads to the Harbour, I feel although the Item is a little low on the Order Paper that this Resolution should occasion no surprise to hon. members, especially when there is no great departure from the proposals already put forward and of which this House has already approved.

It will be remembered (I think it was some time in October last year) that the House agreed to the construction of the Deep Water Harbour at a cost of approximately £4,750,000, soon afterwards a delegation left this island and went to the United Kingdom for the purpose of discussing the possibility of raising this loan. The discussion took place with persons knowledgeable in so far as the construction of harbours are concerned, and as a result of that, a delegation came to this island recently to discuss the possibilities of reducing the amount originally suggested to be spent on the Deep Water Harbour by the local Committee appointed to deal with it.

Now sir, the Resolution reads as follows: "Resolved that this House place on record its accept-

ance in principle of Sir Eric Millbourn's Report on the Deep Water Harbour; and that the House pledges itself to support the Government in the implementation of the terms of the said Report."

Hon. Members will remember that a similar Resolution was passed by this House when dealing with the implementation of the Report of the Hospital Planning Committee.

With the exception of the reduction in the number of berths, and the amount of land which is to be reclaimed, there is very little difference between the Report of the Local Committee and that of the Committee of Sir Eric Millbourn was Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, when Sir Eric Millbourn came to this island accompanied by Commander Hughes who was attached to the Ministry of Transport in the United Kingdom and Mr. Coode he made a cross-examination from among the representatives of the community, on this subject generally. There was at the time in existence an advisory committee under the chairmanship of the Financial Secretary, comprised of marine superintendents of various shipping companies, also the Deep Water Advisory Committee under the chairmanship of Sir John Saint, and representatives of the mercantile body and shipping agents.

As the Report points out, after discussing the question with those various bodies, those bodies were convinced that the proposals put forward by Sir Eric Millbourn, (although they were not set down in black and white as in the Report which followed) they were convinced that a Deep Water Harbour should be constructed at a cost submitted by Sir Eric Millbourn on page 10 of the Report. In that Report Sir Eric Millbourn recommended that the Breakwater should be rebuilt at a cost of £3,006,000 made up as follows: Breakwater £1,204,000; Quay wall £355,000; Dredging, £430,000; Rubble Bank, £66,000; Additional Filling, £242,000; Inter-Island and Schooner Berth, £150,000; Two Transit Sheds £90,000; Roads £75,000; Services, £30,000; Tug £100,000; Contingencies £132,000; Fees and Engineering Supervision £132,000. He further points out that to this figure must be added the cost of a Breakwater if it is found necessary during the construction of the Deep Water Harbour, at £250,000.

That is more or less the most important part of the Report. I have passed around the Plan so that Hon. Members can have a look at it.

As I said before, in view of the fact that we have all agreed and are convinced that we must, if we want to get a reasonable share of the world's shipping business, and if we want to recapture even if not in full a part of the trans-shipment trade, then we will have to construct a Deep Water Harbour. Having been convinced that it is absolutely essential in the interest of improving this island, the Government has accepted this Report and it is now before the House in the hope that hon. members will agree to adopt it along the lines suggested in the Resolution.

If there are any questions which hon. members would like to ask, so far as I have at my disposal, I shall be most willing to answer them. With these few remarks I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask leave to refer to Item No. 2 on the Order Paper.

There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. Minister.

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

Family Planning Debate

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the adjournment, the hon. junior member for St. John was speaking.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, when my address was interrupted just now I was saying that I note the prevalence of the practice of abortion in this island. On this subject we are only traditionally squeamish and suffering from a false prudery where even the mention of such things is concerned; but it is actually established in the highest civilised countries. Abortion is practised at centres in Switzerland. If a woman finds herself pregnant she can go to the doctor and if she can give him some just reason as to why she desires an abortion, it is legally performed. I can say that that kind of thing takes place purely because a woman does not want four or five children as the case may be. I am not advocating any irresponsible or indiscriminate promiscuity. Do not think for one moment that I am not conscious of the moral values of the population. But I am supporting this Resolution purely because of my conviction that there are hundreds and hundreds of women in this country who would like to have a knowledge of birth control, and that it should not be denied them in any such clinics that may be established for its practice.

9.05 p.m.

When it comes to the question of birth control being a remedy for our problem, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, I do not think that the Government should regard it as being an immediate remedy for our problem. I would say we want to have more employment through industrialisation and emigration plus birth control. I would not leave out birth control for this reason: if we desire even to maintain the present standard of living, there must be an increase of wealth continuously; and where that increase of wealth is less than the increase of population, our already low standards will not only fail to be maintained, but you can see the possibility of a lower population. We all welcome industrialisation but there is no guarantee that industrialisation is going to be so rapid that it will meet our rising social problem. Industrialisation is one of the means of meeting the problem, but it has not been anywhere as rapid as it has been in Puerto Rico.

While I do not condemn those of us who deplore the illegitimate rate of population, it is a fact that generally speaking the illegitimate child is less cared for than the legitimate child. The illegitimate child has not got that same protection and parental responsibility as the legitimate child; that is why there is an evil. If we refer to the latest report of the Department of Social Welfare we will discover that the deplorable infantile death rate is always higher from year to year in the case of illegitimate births than in the case of the legitimate ones. Therefore illegitimacy is not condemned principally through any reason of status; but the reason which should be legitimately condemned is the increase in suffering of the illegitimate child. Generally speaking, the illegitimate child suffers more than the legitimate child.

The honourable senior member for St. Philip stated the reasons which the Hon. Dr. Cato gave in connection with emigration and industrialisation. I must mention again that the advocating of birth control does not prohibit our pushing industrialisation

and emigration; that is only one of the remedies to meet the increasing social problem. This Resolution before us does not rule out the attempt at emigration; my contention is that as a permanent solution to this problem, birth control is as essential as any other measure. It will be told to you that the rate of increase in the population of the United Kingdom is double our rate, but the density of population in the United Kingdom is not on all fours with the density of population in this island.

Again I have to emphasise that we are measuring this Resolution against the problem which we are facing, and the problem which we are facing, is a unique one in the British Empire. We have nearly the highest density of population in the world per acre per square mile; so that when we say that in England the rate of population is increasing twice as fast it should be remembered that England has a highly industrialised economy with the ability to absorb the increasing number. We have not got that: I am not saying that England should not absorb some of our population; but unless they are going to absorb our population permanently, then there is no solution to the problem. It is of no use comparing the double rate of population in England as against ourselves as if the same conditions in England were similar to the conditions here. The *per capita* wealth in England is about five or six times the *per capita* wealth of Barbados.

One hon. member has mentioned that he would rather welcome the sterilisation of the individual. Well sir, that is a queer Hitlerite, sociological theory. Who is to determine who is the individual?

9.15 p.m.

You have some people situated in the lowest economic standard much more fit to produce than those in the upper standards. You cannot sterilize people; that is a dangerous policy. In order to do so you must have a policy of compulsion, and you cannot introduce a compulsory issue in such an essential social matter.

When these birth control clinics are established there will be nothing compulsory about them. A woman may only go to the clinic if she wants a knowledge of birth control. [A VOICE: You are very strong on that point.] I have to be strong because there is a lot of ignorance about this thing. The Government is not compelling anybody to go there to learn of birth control; this will be a means that anybody who wants to have a knowledge of it can go there. "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof," says the text. That is very philosophical; and in the realms of theological speculation it is even truer; but we know that in the practical life of this world it is not true. And if the avarice of men for sex continues, soon we will not have the earth or the fullness. So to sit back and say the Lord has given us the earth for us to multiply as we please is unrealistic, silly, and even can be a wicked statement. I do not subscribe to that nonsense. I see nothing evil in the establishment of birth control clinics as this Resolution seeks to provide; and indeed, on the other hand, I can see through the establishment of it the possibility of a great social benefit to the future of the community.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, this is a rather controversial matter; it is a matter which affects vitally the general populace of the island, and it is a matter to which one must give a great amount of thought. I am going to begin by making observations on one or two things which caused me to question the Introducer of the Resolution when he was completing his speech. The Hon. Minister of Social Services said that there was nothing com-

pulsory about a person seeking advice from the clinic, and that it was something which the Government was putting there to be used if you wanted the information. The Hon. Minister will recall that immediately before he sat, I asked him to tell me what the \$5,000 in the Resolution was for, because he had spoken at length and that is a very rare thing for that honourable member to do; he is usually very brief and to the point. In his speech he touched on the limitation of the family, on promiscuity, on over-population, on emigration, on production of industries and on all those things combined; and then finally he touched on the report of the Committee appointed to go into the question of over-population in Barbados. I asked him at the end to tell me for what was this \$5,000. It merely says here in the Addendum that you want it: "As the Barbados Family Planning Association has applied for a grant-in-aid to enable the Association to provide a Family Planning Service, the need for which is reflected in the report of the joint Committee appointed by the two Houses of the Legislature to examine the question of over-population in Barbados, 1954." The note goes on to say that the Association which is already providing a Family Planning Service at the General Hospital and at the Health Centre Speightstown is supported by voluntary contributions but needs the additional sum of \$5,000 to meet expenses up to March 31st, 1956. I think the Hon. Minister actually replied in these words: "This is to pay salaries." I asked him what salary is to pay and how much. He then went on to say that it was for the purpose of purchasing material for the use of persons who wanted to make use of the clinic and who would, if they cared to use them, could acquire them at cost price from this clinic. I think I am right in what I am saying. The Minister then went on to say that if anyone did not have the money they would still be given the contraceptives. If I am not right I hope the Minister will correct me.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: What I did say was that those who are unable to pay would get the advice free. I said some would only pay a portion of the cost if they could not pay all, and those who could afford to pay the full cost would do so.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I think I am right in saying that those who can pay for these contraceptives would do so, and those who cannot pay would be given them free and those who cannot pay all would pay part of the cost. I want this House to believe me when I say that nothing I might say should be interpreted to mean that I am one of those people who think you should encourage promiscuity, instead of Family Planning. The Hon. Minister went on to say that the clinic was not encouraging promiscuity and that the Family Planning Officer or nurse, whoever it is, made it quite clear that only families, so to speak, whether the children are legitimate or illegitimate, so long as the fathers and mothers were living together, whether there was legalised matrimony or not, would be assisted.

9.25 p.m.

Now, that sounds very good coming from the Church; it is not good coming from the State. I am not here to ask the Government, or anybody-else for that matter, to encourage promiscuity; but I am here to draw this to your attention: that the real difficulty in dealing with children and families does not arise with the limiting of big families, etc. Indeed, a man of moderate income gets as much happiness out of his eight or nine children even in the absence of wealth or money; (in fact, happiness is not measured

in the way as some Ministers think it is measured); that man gets as much happiness out of life as the man with one or two children and a big Bank Account. Happiness is not measured in dollars.

Now the honourable member says that they have decided that this \$5,000 will go towards the running of this Family Planning service; but at the expense of all the people in the country a few people will be helped. That is a nice thing from the Church; let the Church do its work. I wish to ask the Government this: are you saying that you are not going to be a realist in the face of real problems? This is sex education; not Family Planning. Start in the schools. Call it biology, urge or whatever you like. The urge comes to the human animal as soon as he reaches a certain age; but according to this Scheme, you are saying that the great difficulty lies in your children not born in wedlock and not born to parents who stay together. They are to be penalised. Because of that they will have no part in the service or the knowledge available at these centres. That is all it amounts to.

Mr. Chairman, I am not thinking now of the selling at cost of contraceptives to these persons. Let us, for instance, take the people in three categories: married families, (people who live together as husband and wife), and the great number of unmarried, who must, by the laws of nature, have the same feeling as the settled families. These last mentioned are going to be denied the right of any of this knowledge; they are those who need it most. [A VOICE: They who most need it.]

Let us also consider the case of a man in the Civil Service as conditions were not so long ago when they were not so many houses. A man went into the Civil Service and got married earning \$50 to \$70 a month. By the time he reached the age where he was getting \$300 a month, his children had finished their education. Only when you are advanced in age do you begin to realise that you have actually passed through the sort of experience which I have just mentioned by way of analogy. I want you to follow the logic in this argument clearly. The settled families, although they may have a number of children, their way of life and their willingness to raise families eventually brings a measure of happiness. The other families with children not born in wedlock but are acknowledged as husband and wife, and rightly so, they also will be given that information; but those who would need it most will not get it.

Because some of us have passed the age of the urge, let us not frown for a moment or look down with scorn upon fellow human beings. We have passed that same way. I wish to say this, Mr. Chairman, when I am finished let them say that I am backing promiscuity. I am a realist. The people who need this knowledge most will also have this urge and they cannot deny it. They are the people whom you say have been giving you the children, and they are the people whom you should give the knowledge.

A story was once told of the young daughter of an Earl who after she had returned from the honeymoon she looked at him and said: "Daddy that is what you call a honeymoon? I think you should now let us spend a honeymoon."

Are you actually saying that we are not giving these people the knowledge in order to allow them to have more illegitimate children. You know that you cannot prevent two young people from obeying the sex urge; they do not go for the purpose of getting any children. Nevertheless you are saying that you are going to vote this \$5,000 and then the knowledge must be denied these people. Hence you are saying that we should have more illegitimate.

9.35 p.m.

On the other hand, Miss Thomas was here; she is a wonderful personality, a wonderful character and a most respectable person to speak with. Quite a number of people on the Family Planning Committee knew my stand in this matter and I met this lady. I have a very great regard for the 16 million Negroes in the United States of America; I have been following their way of life for all my life because it is an example to the people of the West Indies. I met this lady and the first question which I put to her was this: is it not a fact that enlightened Negro opinion refuses to back this idea? She knew that I knew what I was speaking about. I respected her views, she respected mine, and that was that.

I am not arguing that the Government thinks this is a panacea for all the ills which are facing this colony, but this is a matter which should not have been in here. I listened carefully to the hon. junior member for St. John in his usual flamboyant speech and I wondered if he had been sitting on this side of the table and the hon. junior member for St. James, the hon. junior member for Christ Church and the majority of them had brought forward this Resolution, what would have been his reaction to it. I can give my quotation from Holy Writ to suit his quotation about "the Earth being the Lord's and the fullness thereof."

What I am worried about in this Resolution is that it says that the joint Committee appointed by the two Houses of the Legislature to examine the question of over-population in Barbados — Let me say here and now that Barbados is not over-populated; the position really is that there is under-employment in this colony. This seems to be approached more from the brotherhood of man than the fatherhood of God. In reading the Report of this Committee, well I want to keep this debate on a high level, but when I look at this Report I could pick it to pieces. I want to quote the Hon. Dr. Cato; this is what he says:

"While I agree in general with the Report, I fear that it is difficult to resist the conclusion that it is rather too parochial in its outlook....."

When the Hon. Minister who introduced this Resolution quoted the figures as to the population of this colony, he omitted to say, I think by accident, that those figures were prepared for them. These figures are not the growth of population; it is all because people had returned from the United States of America. I grant the Government this: emigration and the setting up of industries and the like will help us.

There is nothing wrong in having private associations; you have the Old Ladies Home and other Homes, and so there is nothing wrong about having these private associations. I want to say that knowledge about sex is absolutely essential and that should be a question of education. There is no reason why an elementary school girl at the age of 14 years should not be told what is going to happen to her; you should not wait until she faces the danger and then come in here and talk about setting up Birth Control Clinics. Because a woman is not fortunate in getting married then she is denied this knowledge; I submit that this matter must be dealt with better than that.

Hon. Dr. Cato goes on to say this:—"Neither the problem of over-population nor its solution is a purely local matter and I think that its relation to the overall picture in the Caribbean area should be emphasised and representations on the subject made to the appropriate authorities."

That is about all I should like to add. Hon. Dr. Cato is the same West Indian as the Hon. Minister of Social Services. This is the Hon. Dr. Cato who sat on this Committee with Hon. Dr. St. John and the Hon. F. C. Hutson. However Mr. Chairman, I do not think I will worry to take the names of the Committee. [Mr.

LEWIS: One by one?] No, one by each! [Laughter].

I fear that they are a lot of hon. members in this House who will feel that this is the wrong approach to this matter, but they have not got the courage of their convictions to say anything about it. Some people think when the Government brings down anything to this House we must have a little Sunday School in here. Mr. Chairman, I am voting against this Resolution because I do not think it is the right approach to this problem.

9.45 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that this limitation of families in the sense suggested by the Hon. Minister of Social Services is the correct thing. I know that there is a grave problem (I may say a difficult problem) in Barbados, but the difficult problem is not that of large families at all. I have seen in this country and in other countries in large families parents who have accepted the christian virtue of rearing a family and who realise that to rear such a family is a sacrifice, and they get on very well. Too often today people want to speak of how well they can enjoy themselves, how many cocktail parties they can attend and how often they can be out-of-doors during the twenty-four hours of the day rather than to give themselves up to the sacrifice of family rearing. There are people who have a christian love for rearing a large family.

I wholeheartedly agree with the Hon. Minister when he says that this is a great problem, but I may say the problem is that of the unwanted children of promiscuity. They are by large the overwhelming majority and it is those whom we should help. I say help those persons first with sex education. I am saying that it is between the small teen-ager and grown up who suffers tremendously through a lack of this knowledge; but you have brought this Resolution in here to help only those persons who have established families. When you do that you are denying thousands of young women and men the knowledge; and when you deny them that knowledge you must expect what is going to happen.

I am saying that your first approach to the subject should be in the schools. You have your secondary girls' schools and you should start off your education in this matter with those girls who are above twelve years. You have a right so to do. You have a doctor who is Minister of Social Services and I am surprised that he has not advised it. Are you going to wait until a young girl is face to face with the danger. You know that girls from the age of twelve are faced with a sex urge and they have a sex urge. Little girls at the age of twelve seldom know what danger faces them because they have a sex urge. I am saying start your sex education from the bottom. In all countries of the world this is a problem, but for me to vote for this Resolution as it stands I will be a traitor to my conscience.

Let me say that were it not for the figures quoted by the hon. junior member for St. Thomas that the population in this place has now risen to 227,000, not one of you would have been in here I wonder if the Hon. Minister realises that. Let us face facts. I quite agree with what Dr. Cato said in his reservation on the Report on over-population. I agree that you should not approach this problem in a parochial way.

I listened to the honourable junior member for St. John as well as the Hon. Minister of Social Services. The honourable junior member for St. John said as regards emigration that no place is prepared to take you. I look at it in this way: we are members of the British Commonwealth; Is this

question being raised because of what the Englishman would have us termed, that is, that we are a people of limited pigmentation? Are you asking people of our colour to lower their birth rate because you do not want to absorb them in other communities? I feel quite strongly about this matter.

I told the honourable junior member for Christ Church to allow me to be free to speak on this matter. Is it not a pathetic thing to read that hundreds are wanted in the United Kingdom and although that is so, they do not want to absorb the Negroes of the British West Indies in their communities? They are saying that you should limit your population in Barbados when the only natural resources which you have is to breed. [Laughter] Do not laugh at that. I say that you should send 5,000 Barbadians to England; send all these unwanted babies there: They want them. If you send them there, you will see the invisible income which you will get within the next five months coming through the Post Office after they get there.

I am going to say something which I know is going to offend certain members. The hon. junior member for St. John said "the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof." It is significantly strange that the question of family planning is all we can get put to us from whom I would call the ultra rich. I am saying this with the greatest feeling towards the Hon. Mr. Ronald Tree and Mr. Streat. It is significantly strange that all they can tell the people of Barbados is to stop breeding; "do not get so many children." Sir, I would be dishonest to my people to vote for this and I am not voting for it. Let me say this to Mr. Ronald Tree, or should I say 'Family Tree:' it is all very nice to come here and say: "I want to help the people of Barbados and in order to do so I am going to give them certain knowledge in sex education." That is all well and good: but that is not all.

9.55 p.m.

When my colleagues and I stood up and said why put the barriers on these people going to Canada and the United States they, replied to us: "oh that is nothing. Oh they have done a lot for us!"

I am not supporting any limitation of any families. You have your United Nations Organisation and many other organisations, but I wish that all the West Indian people would face this as the Barbadians are facing it. We know we are an inferior race. We are not going to get up and fight. You have just had a war and we were told that our brothers in Canada and the United Kingdom were fighting, and we could not do otherwise than go up and help them; but afterwards these said people who went to the war were told by the Canadians and others: "We may bring in Germans, but you, West Indian people must remain with your families in the West Indies; we do not want you."

I am not supporting it; this must not be approached in a parochial sense says Dr. Cato. It is a common thing with all the political ideologies except that of democracy to say rather than telling or suggesting birth control to us, to suggest they might burn us.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of explanation. I should like to remind the hon. member that his pigmentation is not the minority in the commonwealth at all; it is the great of the commonwealth at all; it is the great majority.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I do not want to take up the hon. member on that. If you want to associate yourself with Asiatics it is a matter for you; you are talking nonsense. Personally so far as the hon. junior member for St. John is concerned what he has said is

beyond his conscience. I should never even begin to talk anything about elimination.

One of the members on this Committee who signed the Report at the meeting got up and said it is not true that coloured people will not be admitted to Canada. I said: Oh Lord! Do you read or are you trying to fool somebody? In addition to that we have heard remarks in here from the Minister of Trade or from some other Minister about embarrassing people in England.

What right have you to think of the embarrassment to the world? Can these people cause any embarrassment to a British Government? They are members of a Commonwealth. All you can tell the people of Barbados to do as the Hon. Leader of the House has said is: we have tried industries, we have tried emigration, we have tried all these things, therefore all we have to do is to limit our production of children. We really cannot agree with that. Dr. Cato goes on to say in his reservation:—

"The main recommendation in the draft Report of the Select Committee is the introduction of a system of family planning under Government auspices. I would stress the scientific truth that a raising of the standards of living is accompanied by a decline in the birth rate."

Here the British Government has people of the Commonwealth who must come to their rescue at any minute; and here you have people in other countries with food being stored up with a view to burning it and actually burning it; here you have in our Caribbean area a people (a healthy people, we are not talking about syphilitic people) and you have in other countries storehouses of food to burn. God struck at the heart of the English people for it; and they had to pick up the milk and send it down here.

There are thousands and thousands of people down here who do not see milk; and they have milk spoiled in England. Is it christianlike to say that you can have food to burn and instead of helping these people you tell them to limit their production? I want to tell you this: when Frederick Douglas was sent from the South to the East of the United States on tour, he asked a certain individual: "Well what shall I say of your people?" The person replied: "Tell them we are rising." You know how we rise; we have only risen numerically.

Those that are sound must bear the infirmities of the weak; that is why I am a staunch advocate of free enterprise. Make money; but let the Government stand by and take away their 3½% in income tax. That is how I look at it.

It is surprising however to see the type of people who support this question of limiting your production of children: multi-double-multi millionaires.

10.15 p.m.

I am not against a general sex education. Something happened when I was a lad which I have not seen happened here since I have grown up. Dr. Williams and Dr. Dean use to go around to the schools lecturing to youth on the matter of venereal disease and other forms of sexual education; here a lot of people want to draw a lot of money to sit down and do nothing for it, but they have come here and talked about birth control. I say this knowledge begins in the schools.

The Hon. Minister of Social Services says that this knowledge should be given to married people. I have examined the position of 98% of those cases which come before the Board of Guardians of St. Michael and they are not children of husbands and wives who live together; that is not the trouble at all. I challenge the people who sit down here if they know anything about this matter at all. I say that

99% of these cases are not the cases of women who have children for men of whom they are the wives; there are cases of young women who say: "I am 16 or 17 years of age and I have two children".

I want to say this: whether you are rich or poor, whether you are black or white, you have a sex urge and these are the people whom you are denying this assistance. I see all this looking down with scorn and contempt on your, or rather our, sisters; and that is the great difficulty with many of us as soon as we get a little higher.

You are denying this help to people who would not go to get children; do not mind what the Church will tell you that you must abstain from this and that, and it is a matter of the "safe period" and things of that sort; that is stupid. Says the Hon. Minister of Social Services: "You go to the Hospital or the Health Centre for this knowledge; we want families, not promiscuity." I say that if you are encouraging that, you are doing tremendous harm to the country because that is selfishness. A lot of people who have seven or eight children will tell you that they saw hard, but they have reared their children and they have a tremendous lot of pride in it. You are now saying; "Don't have that type of family any more."

There is a common saying that a good "live with is better than any marriage." You are saying to a group of people: "We will give you this knowledge." That is one group of people, but what about the other group of people? I think that you would do better if you had a monastery; why not establish a monastery? [Laughter.] I do not encourage promiscuity, but I say if you are confronted with a matter then you have to face it. You are saying to people: "You are outcast; you have two children and we do not want you here. We are giving this knowledge only if you are married or if you are living in a house with this man;" Why are you going to withhold this information from these other people? I am sure that you will agree with me, Mr. Chairman, that they should start with this knowledge in the schools.

There is the absolute necessity for sex education; in all the schools in the United States of America sex education is taught today. Just to go to a minority group in these parts and say "limit your production because you will solve the question of unemployment" is not the right thing. I repeat, sir, that there is not a question of over-population in Barbados; there is a question of unemployment. While Barbadians are unemployed in England that country is taking in people to work. The Hon. Minister of Social Services has said that the Scheme for the employment of Domestic Servants is on the way and we will send up people. I repeat that our problem is not over-population; the Government only needs to make an approach to the United Kingdom for the employment of our people.

10.15 p.m.

You can see what is happening to France as a result of this limiting of population. You are saying that you must limit your population, yet in England you are allowing people to come from Czechoslovakia and settle and are allowing your people to go to Canada to settle. You must look at this question in a broad way and from that standpoint; they are the people who are telling you that the only salvation you have is to limit your population.

Mr. Chairman, I know that this is something brought in by the Government and there would be hardly a dissident voice to it; but I see this matter from that point of view.

Sir, I have been following the progress of the emancipated of the West Indies and the Americans for some time; and I am of the considered opinion that the only reason that you have marched forward is because you have shown by your numbers that you are rising. I am not speaking of the Indians. You have caused nations of the world to look upon you because of your numbers with some concern. Let me finally say that there should be an institute for teaching sex education, but that sex education must not be limited to married women and people who have families. If you do that you are bound to find out that you are leaving out the majority who are producing. You should do something not merely for the husband and wife or the people who are living together in a house but you should do something for everyone. I am not supporting this Resolution as it stands.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I feel that I should take part in this debate. What was surprising to me was to hear during the early stages of the debate points as regards sterilisation and abortion cropping up in speeches of hon. members. Let me say at once that the early pilgrims of the local Family Planning Association came into being purely at the request of several people who were in search of this particular brand of advice.

Family Planning or Planned Parenthood never reaches the stage of abortion or sterilisation; as a matter of fact, any advice given by this Association really comes to an abrupt end the moment that the Association is aware of conception in the individual seeking advice. Any woman or girl who has declared herself pregnant is forbidden to use the advice of the Association.

Now, sir, there has been some argument against the use of contraceptives, but I believe if honourable members were aware of the amount of contraceptives which are used and sold in this island they would be flabbergasted; and I am speaking only of those who use it primarily for social economics.

Another factor which you must realise, Mr. Chairman, is that the International Organisations which function in this new and particular field are at pains to exercise the greatest care that this advice and its equipment and supplies are not released to reckless individuals or those of the promiscuous type who seek to misuse this advice; therefore, I think it is unfortunate that the honourable senior member for the City should have referred to whom he termed helpless girls who if they ask for this advice it should be given them.

The question before us is not an idea from the Government; it emanated from a body which has done its best from charity to further it. And other individuals who feel that it would require money to carry this idea into effect were willing to make contributions to it. As a result of that feeling we had a nurse who was sent abroad to learn this work, and she has returned and is operating at two institutions.

What is unfortunate about the matter is, that she can only be hired on a part time basis; and it would be a great deal better if she could be hired on a whole time basis where she could visit other institutions such as the Baby Creche and the Maternity Hospital so that her service would be of some greater advantage.

What I am worried about is that the Association which is supported by voluntary subscriptions need this sum of \$5,000 to meet expenses up to March 31, 1956, owing to the fact, as I have said, because of the limited funds of the Association it is

not possible to carry out the work on a whole time basis I know you will agree that it will serve no useful purpose to just hire this nurse on a part time basis.

Another thing which should be borne in mind is that the first shipment of supplies for this Association was given by its American counterpart, and it is not expected that the Association will be able to continue on the charity of these philanthropists who were so willing to give it a send off. As a society who is unable to pay will be given the advice; those who are able to pay a little will get it as well as those who are able to pay the cost for it. As we all know, we have two sections in our community. The well-to-do already practice planned parenthood, but it is the other section who does not know of this advice. Another thing which I think I am correct in stating is, that the people are saying that the Government should subsidise all the contraceptives which come to the island; they feel that they should be allowed to come in free of duty, if you really want the Association to serve its purpose.

I think in certain shipments we have to pay a duty on American supplies; something like forty dollars. I believe you will appreciate in considering the finances of this Association, this question of having to pay this duty out of general funds. I believe that the Association is doing a tremendous job, but to try to assist a whole population is not by any means an easy task in a matter such as family planning. I cannot imagine any hon. member of this House attempting to play politics with this.

In the Report of the last meeting of this Body we were told that on the first occasion at the Speights-town Centre, there were more people than the Nurses could cope with. It is a question of an insufficiency of supplies and the senior Nurse has asked that the number be restricted because she believed that it was beyond her to handle.

I see no reason why the hon. member should continue his criticisms of an idea like this. I have read that in Japan there is legalised abortions. Family planning comes to an abrupt end with an abortion. I have been reading further some articles on family planning in Japan, and I remember there is a case in point where an average worker had applied and had five abortions in the course of one year. It is regarded in countries like Japan as a Casualty. Something happens and when people believe for some reason or other that pregnancy is present, they can stop in at the nearest institution where an abortion will be carried out sooner or later. However, I do not believe that that will reach this country.

What I am unhappy about is that I believe that the wrong attitude towards this whole question has been adopted for one reason or another. I believe that this debate will be answered by several letters in the Press; there are several other organisations which will no doubt take opportunity to suppress the activities of this Association. But having regard to the idea underlying it, the very least that we can do is to give it a little financial assistance. It is beyond the means of the Association to carry out its proposed programme and we have asked the Government for three to five thousand dollars to take care of our budget while we look forward to future development. At this stage I think it is better that I say no more.

Mr. GODDARD: What the junior member for St. George has said is perfectly correct. I do not want to detain the House much longer but I was told that on the first afternoon at the clinic of St. Peter with very little advertising (because we had refrained

from too much advertising) seventeen women turned up for instruction in sex education. We feel that if they do not get it in the early stages at school they must get it at some future time. It would be better if in our schools we could give some sort of sex education; but that does not prevent us or rule out the idea that we must not try to do it at some later stage.

It is unfortunate that we have given it so many names. If we had not run into that error so much trouble would hardly have resulted. Nobody is compelled to accept this service and even after you have got the information you are not compelled to use it.

The medical profession is almost 100% in support behind this; and though the Hon. Dr. Cato has been quoted so much to-night by persons who are trying to make out a case against it, I would say that Dr. Cato has given good advice; but where he made his reservation was in saying that we should not group our population problem. In the reservations one of the subjects was emigration another industrialisation and a third family planning.

There are many families which if the women had this information would not be so large as they are; and for economic reasons these large families should never be. I think any family has the right to say how many children they can afford to have and limit their families accordingly. It is done nowadays in the higher categories of social life; and why should it not be done in those below? The first business of an administration is that they should realise the great need for these clinics, and that they should have attached to them some persons who can give them this sex education. I am sure that within a very short time the success at these clinics would be very greatly appreciated, not only by the Government but also by the public.

I have been told by the doctor at that clinic that he is impressed by this great need. The midwives have told me that in their experience from house to house, they were asked for information. We do not generally realise what it means to have sex education in Barbados.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, there is a lot to be said both for and against a Resolution of this kind. We have seen and heard to-night that hon. members so far are either for or against it. I am going to put forward some views to-night against it; and by the time the vote is about to be taken I hope some hon. member will assist me in making up my mind.

It is said that we have a surplus population in Barbados; what signs or statistics have we seen for emphasising this point? I have not heard anybody said anything about that yet.

10.35 p.m.

You hear that there is great unemployment; ask anybody how many people are unemployed and they cannot tell you. As I was saying we have heard a great deal of the surplus population of Barbados and we know that there is a great deal of unemployment; but we seem to be afraid of statistics. Let us discover the number of unemployed people and let us see if we cannot assist in this problem. We are a developed country from the point of view that it is said that every square inch of land is cultivated and productive. The method of measuring your surplus population is to say that you have so many to the square mile and so many to the arable acreage of land, and Barbados therefore presents two aspects of a population problem. To justify the Government at least in any Family Planning Scheme you may say that we go the length of limiting the production of our staple industry, which is sugar; and therefore if you have a limitation of your crop on which your eco-

nomy is based, it is only logical that you should limit the number of people who should exist on that crop.

I think from the figures and the proportions alone a case can be made out for the redistribution of seats. I therefore am asking that some attention should be paid to it; that Government should think quite seriously about the redistribution of seats to provide for single member constituencies. I am saying that for one man to have 4,000 electors might be an ideal thing; and it would only mean that if the electors are 100,000 that one more member would come to this House. You would not have to think of another member in any particular constituency until you have reached twice 4,000 electors in that particular constituency; I do not think there is any danger when you accept the principle of single-member constituencies of having to chop and change every five years. I do not think you will be called upon to redistribute your seats until once in every generation. It would lend itself to a better representation of the people; and members of this House would feel much more happy if there was a similar number of constituents in every constituency to which they had to attend.

Another aspect of the matter is that up to now we have no idea in this House as to what the electoral machinery would be to the would-be legislator for the Federal Parliament. If the persons offering themselves for election to the Federal Legislature have got to campaign as it were over the whole island, it is naturally going to be a tremendous strain; because you are asking the candidates for the Federal Legislature to make contacts with possibly 200,000 people.

How can we ensure that the issue of Federation would be properly presented to the electorate if a candidate has to make all those contacts. Therefore, when you consider what is to come you will see the futility in leaving it as it is. If we can manage to accept the principle of single member constituencies and put it into practice, it would be possible for any four or five of these constituencies to be joined together to serve as a Federal Constituency for each one of the seats in the Federal Chamber; a candidate for election to the Federal House of Representatives would know immediately that he has only got to seek the votes of only 20 or 24 thousand people which from the point of view of the Federation is much more reasonable. The constitution of which the Hon. Minister of Communications now represents can well be a Federal Constituency; I therefore think, Mr. Speaker that some attention should be paid to it.

Sir, it does not matter if the principle is not accepted here and now while we are arguing it, but it does raise some matters which would have to be raised; because the principle is part of the technique of running and managing elections; not only for this House and for the change which is to come in local administration, but also in the higher aspect of federation.

With those remarks, as I have said, I associate myself with the aims of this Bill. I welcome more the provision for the annual registration of voters and I think where that is concerned, Government ought to find some means of making it clear to and to encourage prospective voters among the young. It is their right and privilege to vote; and we should leave no stone unturned among those who have to conduct elections to see that people come in large numbers every year to be registered to exercise their right to vote.

5.55 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe everyone should welcome the consolidating of these

two Acts for the purpose of clarifying the Representation of the People Act.

Science has given greater prospects of a longer life; it has also increased the productivity of your soil, and you may get more from one acre of land than you used to get before. Therefore on the land on which you supported a number of people, you may be able to support more people now.

A good means of limiting your population is to teach the people birth control; and I may say that in this Assembly birth control at one time got mixed up with the actual giving of milk to school children. In those days you could not mention anything about birth control, not even if you brought it in under the guise of family planning. I am glad that that is not the case to-day; but, sir, when we hear that it is a parochial method of tackling the problem, especially when it comes at a time when we are entering on a federation of the British West Indies, we should ask ourselves these questions; have we really tackled the problem in a really scientific manner? Are there too many people in Barbados for Barbados or are there too many people for the British West Indies to maintain? To my way of thinking, if we have decided those questions in the affirmative, then it is time for the Government to enter into the assistance of a family planning scheme.

Let us now take what I will call the arguments against Birth Control. We have not taken the trouble to discover the population which the West Indies can support; we do not know what are the potential resources of the West Indies; we have made little or no effort to find them out. We are colonies owned and regulated by the metropolitan Government and it is a question as to whether it has been discovered that the population of the British West Indies as a whole is increasing to the extent that it is dangerous to expect that we can maintain it. Where are those statistics? I would like to see them.

Let us take this idea of family planning as it has been taken on in Barbados; it has taken root at a time when it brings suspicion to those who actively support it and urge it. At no time in the history of Barbados or in the history of the British West Indies can we say that there were 300,000 odd jobs ahead and the Barbadian's share is alright.

But this is in a country or Mother-Country where the Barbadian who would readily like to emigrate, might not be wanted. When someone from that country comes out here and advocates birth control or limitation of the population, that person only brings suspicion upon himself. I ask again, what efforts have we made in respect of unemployment? Even if we have made some efforts, have they been successful in placing people in employment in the numbers that we hear are required in Great Britain? We are now sending a goodly number of our people out to England and the good aspect of that emigration is that it includes both men and women. Previously, it was predominantly emigration for men and that dislocated your population and brought problems in its trail. The present type of emigration is to my mind a better and balanced type and will benefit you a great deal more.

The question which you should ask yourself is: if you are in a Commonwealth of Nations, is that Commonwealth short of population? If it is not short of population it is only then that you would be doing the Commonwealth a service by limiting your population. Can anybody say that the British Commonwealth of Nations is overpopulated? I have not heard anybody saying anything about that.

I will go back to the point where suspicion has been thrown on this scheme. If you take into consideration this matter carefully you will see that the people who might have to teach this Family Planning are the people whom you are not getting to teach it. You knew that if you got a white woman to teach it, the people would say that you do not want the black people to breed; so you took great care to see that you imported a black woman to teach the people. To my way of thinking that will throw suspicion on your scheme. If you want to teach the people something get down to it in the open. Why not import both black and white women to teach this thing? You will remember that a certain speech was wanted for Colonials and Colonialism in the United Nations Assembly, and a very similar thing was done; they got somebody of the same colour to make the speech. It is those things to my mind which throw suspicion on schemes like this. They might be very good, but why are they brought about in this way?

Mr. Chairman, you can place all your surplus population over there. If you have not trained people, certainly you can train them there. Those are the points which I want to bring home to you. I do not like the attitude of some ex-member of the House of Commons who sees himself so generous as to allow some black woman to occupy his house, but who do not want black people to go to England in any large numbers. On my part I would like to see the emigration of people to England on a much higher plain.

Now, let us take the actual operation of the scheme for family planning. You say that you are going to assist people who have already started to have families so that they would not have too many children; do you near too many for themselves or too many for the State? As my colleague rightly pointed out, it appears that you got this thing so one-sided that you are going to leave out one part of the population; that part which according to your statistics disgraces you. You are allowing that part to continue to increase. Are you going to get a team of Inspectors to go behind her to discover whether she is telling you the truth that she has established a family? If you get a team of Inspectors to do that, are you going to send her away and tell her to come back at another time as soon as you have investigated her case? If you are going to do that, how can you sensibly tell that this advice will be only given to certain people? How are you going to distinguish them? As you know, in your Barbados a few of these people who want this information and who live in Bridgetown are going to journey to the Speightstown Health Centre to get it, as well as some who live in Speightstown will journey to Bridgetown for it. It is the people from Bridgetown who are going to trick you by going to Speightstown for this advice. I hope that they do trick you.

I heard from one honourable member tonight the statement that it would astound honourable members of this House to know the amount of money spent in the importation of contraceptives. I think the honourable member was in honour bound to bring that information here. I would like to know the figure. Let us get that figure. Let us get that figure and let us see if this \$5,000 is not a refund of the duty or part of it. That is all this Resolution might be.

Sir, I feel that what you need in this country is birth control information and that that information should be available to everybody who want it.

But as I have said, this Family Planning Association has come up in a set of circumstances which has thrown suspicion on its *bona fides*.

This Government which claims to be tackling the housing problem of this community and all the other problems, has come now to find out that it is difficult to tackle them, and they are resorting to supporting a scheme for Family Planning. Has this Government confessed that it has failed in tackling these problems? Members of this House got up and urged a more virile policy on the part of Government to exploit opportunities for employment abroad; and if that suggestion had been enthusiastically taken up by members of the Government and they had not succeeded as they would have liked, one would have accepted this when they came and said that they had done their best.

Even now we see advertised that over 382,000 people are wanted for work in the United Kingdom. What sort of help are we giving to people who want to emigrate to the United Kingdom? Are we bold enough to say that we would assist people to go to the United Kingdom in search of employment? Do not let us ask the people on that side if you want our people? Let us take their newspaper advertisements for it; let us ask them: can you take this intelligent labour force which we have here and train them to do that work which you have? Let us say to them: "let us assist you in solving your problem by sending over some of our people." 10.55 p.m.

More people are emigrating; more people are going away; more people are in many circumstances taking their industry with them and placing it elsewhere.

I think that if we can discover a method of family planning in the hope that we can cure our population problem it is going to make us even more lethargic towards our emigration scheme. I do not think that that matter has been tackled properly at all. I was one of those associated here with an idea to figure on a quarter million people wanted for employment in the United Kingdom. Since then I have seen it mentioned in English papers that they could offer to take even more.

We have known of people living in Barbados who have gone to England and found employment there. Naturally, it is difficult; there are always housing problems in connection with any influx of population; but can that not be remedied? Surely some temporary arrangements can be made until the population has settled down; and it will settle down if you need the people for whom you are advertising.

Mr. Chairman, Barbados has come to the fore in the Federation talks about freedom of movement. You are going to limit your own population, but can you prevent an influx of West Indians in this country after the big talk you have made about freedom of movement in the British West Indies?

Long ago we should have taken a stand against the haphazard manner of promoting industrialism in the Caribbean. Should the same island which will ship its cement to Barbados keep out labour from Barbados? If we intend to federate then we should stop bickering with people, and stop talking about somebody who is elected leader in some other West Indian colony because he is more radical than we are. When was the last labour Conference that we had in this area? The last one was so long ago that I do not suppose many members will remember it. We have had Conference upon Conference; but have we had a Conference upon West Indian labour? We are now falling back upon the line of least resistance.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that there is some movement for the adjournment and as it is a matter that is to be dealt with in Committee, I at this stage move that you do now report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mrs. BOURNE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Resolution in Committee and the postponement of another. I also ask leave for the Committee to sit again.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask to have it made clear as to which Resolution the motion is made on.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I did not understand that the Resolution for \$2,300 had been passed. If I had known that, I would have made the motion that you do now report the passing of one Resolution and ask leave to sit again.

The question that the Chairman do now report the passing of one Resolution in Committee and ask leave to sit again was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. Chairman left the Chair, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of \$2,793 be now read a first time.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.
The question was put and agreed to.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this Resolution be now read a second time.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.
The question was put and agreed to.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this Resolution be now agreed to.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.
The question was put and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House, in consultation with the

Leader of the Opposition, have agreed that in order to continue with this Resolution and the other two Bills, the next meeting of the House should be on Thursday next at 2.00 o'clock p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister has proposed that the House should meet on Thursday next at 2 o'clock p.m. Is there any objection?

Mr. GODDARD: I had agreed with the Hon. Leader of the House to facilitate the Government in this matter; but since then I have consulted with others and they feel that since Thursday is the end of the month they would like an adjournment until next Tuesday at 10 a.m. I have only risen to explain my position.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If we are not meeting until next Tuesday, I am asking leave to give notice of a motion relative to the passing of a Resolution to approve the Report of the Conference on movement of persons within a British Caribbean Federation. I say that because it has been intimated to all the colonies that it would be a very useful thing to give an expression of opinion on this matter early because we are not yet out of the week. If we are not meeting until next Tuesday I am asking leave to give that notice, otherwise the matter will not appear on the Order Paper. I am therefore asking leave to move the consideration of the Report of the Conference on movement of persons within a British Caribbean Federation.

There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. Premier to give the notice.

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next at 2 o'clock p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next at 2 o'clock p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.
11.15 p.m.

The first of these is the fact that the
 second of these is the fact that the
 third of these is the fact that the
 fourth of these is the fact that the
 fifth of these is the fact that the
 sixth of these is the fact that the
 seventh of these is the fact that the
 eighth of these is the fact that the
 ninth of these is the fact that the
 tenth of these is the fact that the
 eleventh of these is the fact that the
 twelfth of these is the fact that the
 thirteenth of these is the fact that the
 fourteenth of these is the fact that the
 fifteenth of these is the fact that the
 sixteenth of these is the fact that the
 seventeenth of these is the fact that the
 eighteenth of these is the fact that the
 nineteenth of these is the fact that the
 twentieth of these is the fact that the
 twenty-first of these is the fact that the
 twenty-second of these is the fact that the
 twenty-third of these is the fact that the
 twenty-fourth of these is the fact that the
 twenty-fifth of these is the fact that the
 twenty-sixth of these is the fact that the
 twenty-seventh of these is the fact that the
 twenty-eighth of these is the fact that the
 twenty-ninth of these is the fact that the
 thirtieth of these is the fact that the
 thirty-first of these is the fact that the
 thirty-second of these is the fact that the
 thirty-third of these is the fact that the
 thirty-fourth of these is the fact that the
 thirty-fifth of these is the fact that the
 thirty-sixth of these is the fact that the
 thirty-seventh of these is the fact that the
 thirty-eighth of these is the fact that the
 thirty-ninth of these is the fact that the
 fortieth of these is the fact that the
 forty-first of these is the fact that the
 forty-second of these is the fact that the
 forty-third of these is the fact that the
 forty-fourth of these is the fact that the
 forty-fifth of these is the fact that the
 forty-sixth of these is the fact that the
 forty-seventh of these is the fact that the
 forty-eighth of these is the fact that the
 forty-ninth of these is the fact that the
 fiftieth of these is the fact that the
 fifty-first of these is the fact that the
 fifty-second of these is the fact that the
 fifty-third of these is the fact that the
 fifty-fourth of these is the fact that the
 fifty-fifth of these is the fact that the
 fifty-sixth of these is the fact that the
 fifty-seventh of these is the fact that the
 fifty-eighth of these is the fact that the
 fifty-ninth of these is the fact that the
 sixtieth of these is the fact that the
 sixty-first of these is the fact that the
 sixty-second of these is the fact that the
 sixty-third of these is the fact that the
 sixty-fourth of these is the fact that the
 sixty-fifth of these is the fact that the
 sixty-sixth of these is the fact that the
 sixty-seventh of these is the fact that the
 sixty-eighth of these is the fact that the
 sixty-ninth of these is the fact that the
 seventieth of these is the fact that the
 seventy-first of these is the fact that the
 seventy-second of these is the fact that the
 seventy-third of these is the fact that the
 seventy-fourth of these is the fact that the
 seventy-fifth of these is the fact that the
 seventy-sixth of these is the fact that the
 seventy-seventh of these is the fact that the
 seventy-eighth of these is the fact that the
 seventy-ninth of these is the fact that the
 eightieth of these is the fact that the
 eighty-first of these is the fact that the
 eighty-second of these is the fact that the
 eighty-third of these is the fact that the
 eighty-fourth of these is the fact that the
 eighty-fifth of these is the fact that the
 eighty-sixth of these is the fact that the
 eighty-seventh of these is the fact that the
 eighty-eighth of these is the fact that the
 eighty-ninth of these is the fact that the
 ninetieth of these is the fact that the
 ninety-first of these is the fact that the
 ninety-second of these is the fact that the
 ninety-third of these is the fact that the
 ninety-fourth of these is the fact that the
 ninety-fifth of these is the fact that the
 ninety-sixth of these is the fact that the
 ninety-seventh of these is the fact that the
 ninety-eighth of these is the fact that the
 ninety-ninth of these is the fact that the
 hundredth of these is the fact that the

1. The first step in the process of the investigation is the identification of the problem. This is done by the investigator who is assigned to the case. The investigator must first identify the problem and then determine the scope of the problem. This is done by the investigator who is assigned to the case. The investigator must first identify the problem and then determine the scope of the problem.

2. The second step in the process of the investigation is the collection of data. This is done by the investigator who is assigned to the case. The investigator must first identify the problem and then determine the scope of the problem. This is done by the investigator who is assigned to the case. The investigator must first identify the problem and then determine the scope of the problem.

3. The third step in the process of the investigation is the analysis of the data. This is done by the investigator who is assigned to the case. The investigator must first identify the problem and then determine the scope of the problem. This is done by the investigator who is assigned to the case. The investigator must first identify the problem and then determine the scope of the problem.

4. The fourth step in the process of the investigation is the interpretation of the data. This is done by the investigator who is assigned to the case. The investigator must first identify the problem and then determine the scope of the problem. This is done by the investigator who is assigned to the case. The investigator must first identify the problem and then determine the scope of the problem.

5. The fifth step in the process of the investigation is the presentation of the results. This is done by the investigator who is assigned to the case. The investigator must first identify the problem and then determine the scope of the problem. This is done by the investigator who is assigned to the case. The investigator must first identify the problem and then determine the scope of the problem.