

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1954—55

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 10th March, 1955.

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

PRESENT:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*), Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*), Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Communications, Works & Housing*), Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Chairman of Committees*), Mr. F. C. GODDARD, (*Leader of Opposition*), Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. E. STA. HOLDER, Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands & Fisheries*), MRS. E. E. BOURNE, Mr. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc., and Mr. J. C. TUDOR, M.A.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meeting are not yet ready for confirmation.

PRIVATE NOTICE

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move for a vote of no confidence in the Chairman of Committees.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I was not in my place a moment ago when Questions were called, and I am now asking leave to give notice of certain Questions.

There being no objection leave was granted the hon. member.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Questions:—

To enquire of the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Labour:—

Whether the Minister is aware that peasants in the country districts are experiencing difficulty in getting factories to accept their canes at the rate that these peasants are capable of reaping the said canes?

2. Whether the Minister is aware that peasants may have to bring their canes from the farthest part of St. Joseph or other distant parts of the

island to Warrens or thereabouts to effect a sale?

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:—

Whether the Government would consider purchasing Joes River Factory and siting it in a central spot to alleviate the difficulty of peasants?

To enquire of the Minister of Communications:—

Whether Government has taken any steps to implement the Address passed by this House relating to the installation of slot machine telephones in the Bathsheba areas; and if not, why not?

ESTIMATES—Cont'd.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: The first Order of the Day is to resume Committee on the Estimates.

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

12.25 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask that Head 28, Subsidies and Grants, be re-committed. I suppose I should give reasons for doing so and my reasons are that although practically all the Items under this Head members are well acquainted with, there is one particular Item that is practically new; and seeing that it was discussed in the very early hours of the morning, and further if you are to take the numerical strength of the Government, it will appear anything will pass; nevertheless, I suppose there is always that democratic feeling that there are always two sides to the picture. It is true to say that it has been said before by the learned Premier that it is not the duty of the Government to see that members of the Opposition stay in their places; but still there is always a certain amount of reason, there is always a certain amount of feeling that should be exercised by anybody in power; and I believe I can safely say, speaking for the official Opposition, there is not the slightest desire to hold up any measure or to delay the passing of these Estimates. That view is far from us; but when there are Items which are new under a particular Head and our views on those Items are not in keeping with the views of the Government, we should be given opportunity to express our views; especially when it is considered that when this Head was to be decided members had already been sitting for a long time—over 16 hours. Sir, even in the Armed Forces where there is the most rigid discipline especially when a country is at war, consideration is always given to human endurance. As I have said, Government should not

be afraid of anything because it has the majority and this matter will pass; but I repeat that for the sake of democracy, nothing should be done or even appear to be done to stifle the opinion of the other side.

When the Leader of the Opposition in this country, whose duty it is to offer constructive criticism and who I want to assure you should like the opportunity to speak on this matter—

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I rise on a point of Order. The honourable member is dealing with something which is out of order. He is asking that Head 28 be re-committed. He cannot debate the matter now. I think the question should be put to the vote. The question of recommitting a Head is not a point to be debated.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I do not think you are going to let anybody rule for you. My motion has not even been seconded; and you will observe I am taking my time and I am only trying to appeal to members of this Committee. I know you will not let honourable members guide you, but if anybody is making a motion for the recommitment of a particular Head, obviously he must try to convince you and other members of this Chamber as to the reason for his doing so. You will note that I am taking great care not to touch on any particular Item under the Head. As a matter of fact, I was watching you very carefully and I say you were listening to me intently.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I rise again on a point of Order. The honourable senior member for the City is out of order. He is asking leave to recommit Head 28 and if the honourable member is asking leave, he cannot debate the whole thing over. As I have said just now there is nothing to be debated. You cannot debate on the recommitment of a Head.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Again, Sir, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable member sit. The honourable senior member for the City is asking leave to recommit Head 28; "Subsidies and Grants". If there is no objection leave is granted the honourable member.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I object.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: When? After the Chairman said so.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You will now make a motion that the Head be re-committed.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: In moving that Head 28, Subsidies and Grants be re-committed—

A VOICE: You cannot do that.
12.35 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Surely, you Mr. Chairman have ruled that leave being granted I can make the motion; I am giving reasons—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It cannot be a question of giving reasons.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Do you rule, Mr. Chairman, that I am not entitled to make the motion that this Head be re-committed and speak on it?

Mr. BARROW: On a point of Order. I am asking Mr. Chairman, that you send for the Speaker in view of the fact that members of the Government are making subversive attempts to advise you on matters which are within Your Honour's province. In view of the grave dissatisfaction of members of this House as to the way in which Hon. Ministers interfere with the Chairman of Committees, I am asking you to send for the Speaker in view of the fact that I will ask for the Speaker's ruling as to whether this Head of the Estimates was properly passed and reported, and whether it was done as it should have been done.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: On a point of Order. On this question of leave being granted I wanted to raise an objection to that. I was not given the opportunity to object to this leave being granted in view of the way the motion was put. The hon. member cannot ask for leave on his feet and do not sit down; you sit down and the motion is put by the Clerk. You did not give the Committee the opportunity when putting the question that leave was being asked for. I am objecting to leave being granted and the hon. member has not allowed me to do that. I am objecting to leave being granted for a reason different from that of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas. The reasons which the senior member for the City is giving for the re-commitment of the Head could not be valid reasons because he should have been here.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I want to see the procedure carried on in this House with dignity and integrity and at least with impartiality. You said that if there was no objection leave would be granted. I am perfectly willing to abide by your ruling, but I hope that at least your ruling would appear to be impartial. All I am doing now is giving my reasons as to why I asked that this Head be re-committed. I am not holding up anything; I am asking for something which is reasonable. You have already said that leave was granted and I am now giving my reasons.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: On a point of Order. I am objecting—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have said that there being no objection leave was granted. I am asking the hon. senior member for the City to make the motion for the re-commitment of this Head; but rather than do that the hon. member is going on to speak. The hon. junior member for St. Peter is objecting.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: You have ruled that leave was granted.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not so; it is your duty to make the motion.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am making the motion.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of Order. In view of the grave disorder arising from the Ministerial Benches and the attempts to intimidate the Chair, I am asking that the Speaker be sent for. There was an occasion in which there was an irregularity in procedure and you, Mr. Chairman, sent for the Speaker. I am asking you to do that again. The first ground on which I am asking you to do that is the attempts which are being made by the Ministerial Benches to intimidate the Chair; and the second ground is the irregularity which occurred in respect of this Head in Committee. I want the Speaker's ruling on it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not entertaining any more speeches in this connection. I will allow the member for the City to state his reasons, but I cannot allow him to go into any part of the particular Head.
12.45 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I quite agree with you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to draw this to your attention. Having granted me leave to make a motion, all that the honourable junior member for St. Peter has to do, if the motion is seconded, is to vote against it.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: That is not the point. In putting that motion to the Committee Your Honour said, "The honourable member is asking leave. There being no objection....." Where could I get an opportunity to object to the leave being granted? You never paused; that is my point. A few weeks ago a member wanted something done, the Minister objected, we took a vote on it and leave was not granted. The same thing should be done now. I am objecting to this method of the honourable

member in attempting to delay the debate unnecessarily.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I object strongly to that. I do not want to delay any debate.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable senior member for the City has made himself quite clear.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: My point is that the honourable member wanted leave to do it, and I was objecting to leave being granted. What the honourable member is trying to do is wrong. In the normal way when an objection is taken the question has to be decided by a vote.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The motion will be that this particular Head be recommitted. If the honourable junior member for St. Peter is against it he only has to vote against it.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: You having ruled sir, I will proceed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member will not be allowed to go into any discussion of the Head.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I will give reasons why I think the Head should be recommitted. I do not have the slightest intention of delaying debate. I do not know why the honourable member should think that I want to delay anything. [Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Because it is true.] As I said sir, while it is not the duty of the Government to see that the members of the Opposition are in their places, I will give as part of my reasons the circumstances under which this particular Head was passed and the time at which it was passed.

Even in the Armed Forces when a country is at war, and when there is the strictest discipline to be observed and where there is the strictest secrecy to be observed, and rightly so in some cases, there is always consideration given to the fact that there is a limit to human endurance.

I would be the biggest numbskull after the experience which I have had here and elsewhere in public life, to attempt to re-open discussion on this Head. Hence, in the most respectful and parliamentary way I am asking leave that the Head be recommitted. My primary reason is that if you considered the numerical strength of the Government and the attitude they usually adopt here, it would be possible to pass every Head of the Estimates without an amendment or even discussion. While that is so, it is nevertheless in keeping with the principles of democracy to allow other points of view to be made.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not know why it should be suggested that because the Opposition would crave the patience—[Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: You are talking foolishness. If I were the Chairman, you could not go on talking.] I am accustomed to that. I must warn this House against attempting to force something through with a view to stifling debate. This House in the early hours of the morning in some manner which I cannot understand, (because I was not here) actually got through this Head; and as I said, there are one or two Items in this particular Head which show a departure from the Government's policy in dealing with matters pertaining to the particular Head.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Do not go into the Head.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am not doing that sir. Therefore, I feel that to do justice to all concerned, and to avoid what I see is coming, you should recommit this Head. It would avoid a tremendous amount of unpleasantness if there is an opportunity given to have the views of those who did not have an opportunity to be here when the Head was passed, although they should have been here. But as I have said, there is a limit to human endurance and in order

to avoid unpleasantness, the most simple thing to do would be to recommit the Head—so as to hear points of view other than those expressed by Government. To hear those points of view would be in my opinion, to do justice to all concerned. 12.55 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, why should there be this anxiety and this fear of having this Head recommitted I do not know. Lest anyone should think that Parliament has no real hours, I repeat, there must be a limit to human endurance; there is a limit to yours and mine. There are occasions when because of fatigue you lose some sort of balance, and it is for that reason I say you will lose your balance when you work from 12 noon a day to 6 a.m. the next morning; that is working 18 hours a day. However no matter what anybody might think, there is no question of delaying this matter and I am speaking from the depth of my heart. The whole idea behind it is to have a view expressed on certain Items under the particular Head; and it would alleviate and avoid quite a lot of unpleasantness if I be allowed to do so. I regret what I saw in the Press this morning on this matter. I realised the heat which must have been generated during the early hours of the morning on this question.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member would realise that I am giving you very much latitude to convince the Honourable Ministers and myself; but if you insist on going all the way out, I certainly would ask you to desist. I just do not want that to happen because I will be accused of stifling debate but I think I have given you sufficient latitude, and I am only asking you not to go all the way out and not to repeat yourself all the time.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, you may have said so merely because I am not speaking in the usual strain that you expect to hear me speak; but when you interrupted me, I was just beginning to wind up my plea which I was making. You have suggested that I have been speaking for sometime, (apparently I have not been able to convince any honourable member) but I want to assure you that I am not in that mood for speaking at length. Judging from your expression, you invite me to go on but I am not in that mood. Let me say that I know the very fact that I have raised this question seems to annoy some honourable members; but I have not entered this Chamber at the request of certain honourable members. If I did I will have to sit and ask the question whether I should speak or not. Under the circumstances Sir, rather than have this matter gone in from another angle I most respectfully suggest, despite the feeling of certain honourable members, that Head 28 Subsidies and Grants be recommitted purely with the view of allowing honourable members to discuss certain Items under it and purely with the view to erase the impression that has got around that the debate had been stifled in the early hours of the morning and the time which this Committee discussed it was done with any other than the purest of motives. I see no harm in recommitting this Head; I see everything that is good.

Finally I may say that some honourable members may say that I had the right to be in here when the Head was discussed. Even some members who were not in here at that time may say so; but I again say there is a limit to human endurance and there are times when I stay on in this House as well as members of the official Opposition to accommodate members of the Government when members of the Government themselves are

out of the House. This Opposition has not the slightest idea of delaying this matter. What I am doing is with the highest motive and as I have said, to avoid unpleasantness. I appeal to honourable members by saying if you merely recommit this it cannot prevent these Estimates from being passed in time. I sit down with the assurance that this Head will be recommitted so as to avoid an unpleasant situation which I foresee if it is not recommitted; and I may say that although the Government has the strength now, they will have to go to the public to judge. With those remarks I beg to move that Head 28 be recommitted.

1.05 p.m.

Mr. ALLDER: All of this——

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you seconding the motion?

Mr. ALLDER: I am seconding the motion for the sake of discussion. All fools should learn——

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not allowing any debate on the motion.

Mr. ALLDER: Am I not to state my reasons for seconding the motion? I said that I am seconding the motion for the purpose of discussion.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not allowing any debate on the motion.

Mr. ALLDER: It is my privilege to observe the *pros* and *cons* as regards the re-committal of this particular Head, and I say that the delay which has come about as a result of the non-compromising attitude of the Hon. Premier——

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am appealing to the honourable member not to go on any further with that. Let the honourable member second the motion and let the matter be put to the vote.

Mr. ALLDER: I am saying that on reading the newspapers this morning——

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I repeat that I am not allowing any debate on this matter.

Mr. ALLDER: I want to state my reasons for seconding the motion. I was not in the House on the night before or yesterday morning when the motion was taken——

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am appealing to the honourable member again not to debate the motion; I am not entertaining it.

Mr. ALLDER: I do not want to disobey the ruling of the Chair. My observation on the matter——

At this stage Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chairman of Committees has reported to me that the honourable senior member for St. John has disobeyed his ruling. That is the report which has been made to me. The honourable senior member for St. John can defend himself against the charge of disobeying the Chair. [A pause.] I am hearing honourable members attempting to make suggestions to the honourable member on whom I have called; that is disorder pure and simple.

Mr. ALLDER: I should like to ask you to state in what way has the Chairman of Committees arrived at the conclusion that I disobeyed him?

Mr. SPEAKER: I shall call upon the honourable member to desist from making that kind of speech.

Mr. ALLDER: May I explain? As customary I got up to second the motion which was made by the honourable senior member for the City. I started to explain to the Chairman of Committees why I was seconding the motion and the Chairman before he allowed me to develop the point I was making so that he could be informed as to what

argument I would put forward, told me that he was not permitting any debate on the matter.

I tried to remind him of the custom that is followed here to give a member an opportunity to express his reasons for seconding a motion. It was a great surprise to me when Your Honour informed the House that the Chairman of Committees had reported that he was disobeyed. He did not ask me to sit; he only asked me to desist from straying from the point. I did not have the time to develop my argument.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must inform the House that with respect to the Chair (when I say the Chair, I mean the Chairman of Committees or the Speaker when the House is not in Committee) the Chair should always be obeyed. If the Chairman makes a ruling, that ruling must be obeyed even if it is questioned after on a substantive motion. If the honourable member was asked to desist I think he should have obeyed. What was reported to me is that the Chairman ruled that no debate should follow on a motion for recommitment. The Chairman having allowed one member to state his reasons, I think that the honourable senior member for St. John should have been allowed also. But if he was asked to desist because he had become tedious he should have instantly obeyed. I am insisting on that.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, while I agree with all that Your Honour has said, I would like to point out that at no time did the Chairman of Committees give definite instructions to the honourable member. He never asked him to desist; and therefore the honourable member could not be said to have disobeyed his ruling.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of Order, Mr. Speaker. I asked the Chairman of Committees in view of the disorder which existed at that time consequent upon certain acts on the part of the Ministerial benches——

Mr. SPEAKER: I will hear none of that at the moment. Mr. Chairman has made no such report to me. I am only dealing with what has been reported to me. The honourable member cannot point out disorder to me at this stage.

Mr. BARROW: I did ask the Chairman of Committees in view of the disorder which I mentioned, and in view of the fact that Your Honour will be acquainted with the irregularity of the passing of this Head——

Mr. SPEAKER: I will hear none of that. The honourable member is out of order.

Mr. BARROW: I thought Your Honour had been summoned to deal with that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I can only deal with what has been reported to me by the Chairman.

Mr. BARROW: I will ask Your Honour to investigate that matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will do so.

Mr. BARROW: I rise on a point of privilege. I consider that in refusing to acquaint Your Honour with something which transpired and which is of great importance——

Mr. SPEAKER: That cannot be dealt with in the House.

Mr. BARROW: I am asking Your Honour to make an investigation of it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chairman having ruled that no debate should follow the motion for recommitment, the honourable senior member for the City was allowed to give reasons. I will not say what I would have done. The House will now resume Committee.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Head 28 be recommitted. Honourable members in favour will

please say "Aye" and those against will please say "No." I think the "Noes" have it.

On a division being called for, the question was put and resolved in the Negative the Committee dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. BARROW, Mr. TUDOR, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. HAYNES, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY and Mr. GODDARD—6.

Noes: Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. ERYAN, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT and Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY.—9

Head XXIX — Miscellaneous

Head XXIX — Miscellaneous Services — was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an amendment to Item 11 before I move that this Head stand part. It is as a result of the increase in the value of the Government's property. Hon. members will notice that up to last year the value of Government property insured was approximately \$10,000,000. That has been increased to \$11,617,800. As a result of that increase it becomes necessary to increase the vote to meet insurance during this financial year. I am asking leave to increase this Item by \$8,100.

I beg to move that the sum of \$530,281 be voted under Head XXIX.
1.25 p.m.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The Head Miscellaneous Services is really a miscellaneous Head and I do not know which Minister is responsible for all I wish to say on it. I will begin by making a comment on Item No. 4 Purchase of safes for Government Departments. The Note to the Item reads as follows: "Provision for the purchase of a safe and stand which can immediately be made available when required for the safe custody of Government funds." As I see it, there is no immediate need for this safe; but you are buying a safe to be used as what in shipping terms is termed as a stand-by; you are keeping this in case of an emergency.

With respect to Item 11 Insurance of Government Buildings and so on, I would like to ask the Hon. Minister in charge if Government has under consideration the insurance of its buildings. I think Government should take the risk in order to relieve taxpayers of this recurrent expenditure.

With respect to Item 17, Compensation and charges under Workmen's Compensation Act, 1943. I would like to know if the Government is accepting the recommendation of Professor Richardson with respect to Workmen's Compensation. Professor Richardson has recommended that it would be good if Government would carry its own insurance in this respect. I would like to know what are the Government's views on that.

Item 28, Government Binding and Printing, has been increased by \$5,000 to make \$114,000 to be voted for that purpose. I am glad to hear that the Government is anticipating the establishment of its own printery because it can be seen from this present vote, what is going to be our position in the next ten years in this respect. The sum of \$114,000 is a substantial amount of money to pay out for that purpose; and it is about time for Government to think about the establishment of its own printery.

I turn now to Item 35. Conferences, for which the sum of \$18,000 is to be voted. I would like to draw to your attention what I see in the newspaper about conferences; and I would like to ask

the Hon. Minister in charge what is the new policy in regard to sending people to the West Indian Conference. I would like to know if the Government feels with the constitutional change that has taken place, that the delegates should be appointed in the present manner. This Assembly has not been informed one way or the other. The last time that a West Indian Conference was to be convened a Message came from His Excellency the Governor and in that Message it was stated: "In accordance with the procedure adopted on the occasion of the fourth Session of the Conference in 1950, it is suggested that both the delegates should be nominated by the Legislature from unofficial members of the Legislature." I would like to know why the method of selection has been changed. As far as I know our constitutional position is no different from what it used to be before Ministerial Government, and because no amendments had to be made to the Executive Committee Act. I do not think that the introduction of Ministerial Status necessarily meant that the legislative rights of this honourable Chamber have been removed.

In respect of selecting the personnel who should be nominated as a panel this is what the Message states: "In accordance with the procedure laid down by the Secretary of State for the Colonies that the candidate put forward shall be nominated by the elected body of the Legislature, His Excellency invites the hon. House to nominate the Barbados candidate, who need not necessarily be one of its members, for inclusion on the panel from which the election of Commissioners and Alternates will be made."

How is it now that our constitutional position is so changed, that the Legislature which is to nominate these candidates has not been called upon to make these nominations? I am not protesting against the candidates named, but I am protesting against the procedure not only here, but in these territories where Ministerial Status has been given. The West Indian Conference is not a Government conference; it is not even like the Federation Conference to which the Hon. Premier is going. The West Indian Conference is an advisory affair and you only make recommendations to the Government; therefore I cannot see the reason why there should be this departure in procedure. On the last occasion the Legislature nominated the candidates, I feel if Government has certain people it wanted to be nominated as candidates to that conference, their names could be hinted; but the procedure should be done in the way it should have been done, that is through the Legislature. It seems to me a serious departure from the normal policy. On the last occasion the delegate which this Legislature nominated was the Hon. Premier. The suggestion came from the House of Assembly and I cannot see the reason the Executive Committee which is not a fully elective body in the sense, could have undertaken to change that policy and nominate the candidate for that Conference.

This departure in policy should come for some sort of ruling. I feel we should follow the pattern of what is done in the other colonies. On the last occasion the Jamaica Government nominated Mr. Manley and another member who is now enjoying the hospitality of one of Her Majesty's Institution, Mr. Simmonds. I really cannot understand why the Government should have undertaken on this occasion to prevent the Legislature from exercising what can be regarded as the normal thing to do. It seems to me that you can only come to the conclusion that the Government was afraid that the candidates whom they had in mind would never have succeeded.

ed in going to the conference. I do not know whether members of the Legislature are so trip-crazy that they would object to the candidates proposed. I do not know if Government feels that there is a group who are conniving against them in these things. I really would like an explanation for this constitutional departure. I feel that the House should be treated with more courtesy when it comes to the selection of the candidates for these two conferences.

1.35 p.m.

Moreover, I think that this House should be treated with a little more courtesy when it comes to the question of these conferences. We were told in an off-hand manner that the Hon. Premier was going to the Federation Conference; I am suggesting that that is a matter for the Legislature to debate, in view of the fact that this Conference will be a Government Conference; it is the Governments who have to decide to hold this Conference. I am not suggesting that the Governor should have said who are going to be delegates to this Conference; what I am really objecting to is this: why should we wait until the eve of these things to know who are the persons selected for this Conference? I would like to have the Minister's view on that matter.

As regards Item No. 41, "Public Service Commission", I am going to speak slowly because I would like the Reporters to take down what I have to say on this occasion correctly. I am not suggesting that they do not take down what I say correctly, but they claim that I am a quick speaker. I will preface my remarks by saying this: there is a feeling that if a member of this Chamber criticises a Department, he is objecting to the person who is controlling that Department. We all should have confidence in a Public Service Commission because it removes nepotism, that is, giving your brother, uncle or sister-in-law a job when other people are more favourable for holding that job; therefore a Public Service Commission is essential. While it is a matter for the Head of the Administration it is a matter on which I am expressing a view. I feel that in the interest of this island and in the interest of the Public Service Commission the Chairman of that Commission is Hon. Sir John Saint who is also a member of the Executive Committee. This is my feeling: I have nothing against the honourable gentlemen; I have found him to be an excellent officer who has served the colony well, and he is a man of outstanding ability. So far as his integrity and character are concerned, they are unimpeachable. With all of that, you will see that there is nothing in my mind against the person. What I do feel is this: now that you have evolved a Ministerial system of Government and the Executive Committee is still the instrument of policy in this island I do feel that someone who is holding such a high position as Chairman of the Public Service Commission should not be one and at the same time a member of the highest policy-making body in this island. This gentleman is also a member of the Executive Council of this island which is an even higher position. I feel that the time has come when he should be either one or the other. If he advises His Excellency in Executive Council or on the Executive Committee, I have no objection to that; but I believe that any fool can see that there is an anomalous position where the head of a body like the Public Service Commission also decides what should take place in the island. As a member of the Executive Committee he must know what takes place in the island and he will be the same person knowing everything about the Public Service itself. I do not

feel that these two posts should be held by the same person; a member of the Executive Committee should not be a member of the Public Service Commission. While I am on that matter, I would like to say that no matter how admirable a person is I do not like to see in a place where you have a redundant population that you should have a person who is the Establishment Officer sitting along with another member of the Public Service Commission who is his brother. That seems to me to be a sort of situation where you should aim at getting somebody else who is not a brother to that person who is already the Establishment Officer. It is not a question of anything having happened, but justice must appear to be done. I would add this: I do not care if anybody takes objection to that, and therefore I make no apology for what I have said.

As regard Item 56, "Actuarial Investigations into Widows and Orphans Pension Scheme" I would like to know what this means. I see that this sum of \$400 is a revote; do you intend to get rid of the Widows and Orphans Pension Scheme or what? Do you intend to replace it by something better? If you ask what the widows receive from that you will realise that you are taking from the Civil Servants money which might be better used.

In connection with Item 60 "Advice on Local Government" the Note says this: "Expenses of Adviser etc. in connection with the introduction of the New Local Government System under Local Government Act 1954-51." That is not good enough. This amount of \$17,000 is a bit of a tidy sum and I would like to know how it is proposed to get rid of this \$17,000. It is a new item. Do you intend to have a Local Government Adviser and after you elect him, to send one of your good Civil Servants up for training or do you intend to send up one of your Civil Servants to be trained and familiarise yourself in administrative work just as was done in Trinidad when Mr. Fung was sent up and was able to take over from Sir John Imrie when he went up? We usually feel that our local boys are not good enough to occupy the chairs of some of these high officers.

I would like to know what are the Government's views on the questions that I put before them under this Head.

1.45 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: If the Hon. Minister is going to reply, I would like to ask something about this matter that brought down so much debate last year,—Item 49, Maintenance of Speightstown Assembly Hall. Can the Hon. Minister tell us whether that hall has been more generously used and whether the activities in it have increased anymore? My opinion is to the contrary.

While I am on my feet, I would like to say that I remember taking up this question that members of the public service must not be mixed up in politics; and yet you take a politician from the highest points and place them on the Civil Service Commission (like some of the people in the Executive Council or the Legislative Council) and then say they are not politicians. I do not know what they are; you cannot call them statesmen. Where do they display their statesmanship? Consideration should be given to that. Here is a man in charge of the Public Service Commission which holds secret meetings, and as the hon. member says, you cannot tell what are the views of people like him on anything; yet such people are on the Government's policy making body.

Of course I have heard from someone who knows, that the Ministers are really not responsible for any departments; that the Executive Committee is the policy making-body and the Ministers are really only

Heads of Departments carrying out the wishes of the Executive Committee. As I see it, it is not necessary for the Chairman of the Public Service Commission or any member of that body to know what is Government's policy. Government must have a policy which is founded on truth and justice. Let them be truthful to themselves and honest to every one else, and do justice to those already in the service and to those who apply for posts in the service; the members of the Commission do not have to clutter up their heads with Government's policy.

An honourable member has touched on conferences. As I have already warned this House, we have got into the habit of giving block votes for everything and once you have given them money for these conferences, they have the right to decide on what conference they will attend and who is to go etc. So that is a matter on which you cannot expect the Government to be very courteous towards you. In any case the present Government has no record of courtesy towards the House. If it is something about a Steamship Service it might ask you before hand; but if the Government has friends in B.W.I.A. it will decide about giving them a subsidy and then tell you about it. As far as conferences are concerned, what the House should do is to cut the amount in half and let the Government attend their conferences on that amount.

I have had to ask questions about the Fishery Officer going around to conferences and about other conferences like the Social Welfare Officers' Conference. I cannot imagine what sort of conference that would be; I am referring the Social Welfare Conference in Jamaica. Do they have to go to Jamaica to see what is happening there so as to try it out in Barbados, or to see that what happens in Jamaica does not happen here? Do you mean that these people are not trained for their jobs? I would like to see the report of that conference; to see what they discussed. I cannot see why Social Welfare Officers in this area need to have a conference if they are people specially trained for their jobs. Even the doctors do not get together like that. I suppose I will be told that I have said that because I do not have much faith in that department; but even in the case of Fishery Officer, I do not see why he should have to go to England to know how to fish in Barbados; or why he should have to go to Florida to find out the best fishing banks off Barbados. If he has special knowledge to give people in Florida it would be alright and then he could make at least one trip. The Government of course thinks that we can send our Fishery Officer to any conference because we have enough money in the Treasury to afford all those luxuries.

Mr. GODDARD: I am speaking on Item 52, Public Utilities Board. I am raising this again because I mentioned it in my second reading speech as honourable members will remember. There was no reply to any second reading speech; but that is now past history. I asked the Premier then if they contemplated the appointment of this Board in the near future. The Board has not been appointed, so there has been no expenditure; but this year they have increased the vote by \$1,500. I would like to know how advance they are with that scheme. I take it that a statement can be made as to why they have increased this amount. Under Item 60, Advice on Local Government, I would like to hear the Minister's reply to the honourable junior member for St. Peter or myself as to how the Government intends to spend \$17,000 on this matter.

1.55 p.m.
They must have some particulars because correspondence has been going on between the Government

and the Colonial Office as to how best to collaborate the whole Vestry system according to the new Maude Bill. A statement from the Government would be very welcome on this question.

With respect to Item II, Insurance of Government Buildings I know that insurance has increased and it is wise that Government should have their offices fully covered. I would like to refer you to the Note which refers us to revenue, Head 8 Item 18 (1) because if you look there, you will see what we are recovering from the funds received from Government buildings and the amount is \$9,120. What we propose to pay has been set out in the amount to be voted this year \$46,265. I only drew that to your attention because there was a time when contributions were made every year to these insurance funds. Government has stopped it and that money is put to revenue.

There are some other Heads which I had proposed to speak on but remarks have already been made on them. I would welcome some expressions of opinion from the Government on some of those Items.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, some of the Items which I propose to talk on has been raised by other honourable members, therefore I would not enumerate on them until I have heard a reply from the Minister in charge; I say that with the distinct understanding that I would speak on them later. With respect to Item 15, Expenses under the Apprenticeship Bursaries Act, 1928, I am wondering if the Minister in charge can tell me what is the Government's policy so far as expanding the Bursary system and what Government proposes to do in the future in this respect. I am sure all of us appreciate the necessity for equipping youngsters leaving schools with the necessary trades for the future. I have said that on more than one occasion inside here and I think I should repeat it again. When it comes to the actual allowance to those youngsters it is rather inadequate, and I feel more encouragement should be offered them by giving them a greater allowance. At this particular stage, in view of the fact that apparently the most competent artisans are working in your Public Works Department and the building schemes would afford greater opportunities for many of our youngsters to learn trades, we should cease pursuing the old policy of apportioning these youngsters to craftsmen who get little or no work. I think in this respect Government should revise part of its policy by putting some of these youngsters in the Public Works Department in order to allow them to gain more experience than they are gaining in private concerns at present. If I should give more reasons why you should increase that allowance to the youngsters is because it has been represented to me, that many of the boys who go to these trades are drawn from homes where the parents can ill afford to keep them in lunch, and if we are looking to them to keep the high standard of Barbadian craftsmanship up, we must do everything possible to encourage them.

Item 60 is for advice on Local Government and the amount to be voted is \$17,000. The Note to it reads as follows "Expenses of Adviser, etc., in connection with the introduction of new local government system under Local Government Act, 1954-51."

Will the Hon. Minister of Social Services inform us how far has the Government got in this matter? This is a new Item and it is put down here in connection with the introduction of Local Government. Will the Hon. Minister of Social Services tell us what steps have been taken to secure the services of this Adviser and when it is proposed to bring this system of Government into operation. We are looking forward to this system of Government being put into operation as soon as possible; and while we do not want this

figure broken down in every detail, we would like to know how it is to be spent. I anticipate that you are bringing out somebody with knowledge as to how Local Government is being run to give us some idea. How is this \$17,000 to be spent in this respect?

I will now deal with Item 52, Public Utilities Board. The amount of \$4,500 is to be voted for that purpose and the Note says that it is recoverable. Surely since the setting up of this Board, since the passing of this Act, we feel something should be done. The Hon. Minister should inform us whether the Board is operating or what is happening in that respect. Let me ask how far advanced have you got with respect to Public Utilities. Last year \$3,000 was voted for that purpose and spent, and this year we are voting \$1,500 in excess of last year's amount. That necessitates some explanation from the Hon. Minister of Trade.

I think of the Items under this Head, Item No. 50 is of the greatest importance to this Island. As a matter of fact, I am prepared to say that there is nothing to be discussed in these Estimates that is of greater importance to this community than Item 50 which deals with emigration expenses. I suppose every honourable member should speak on it. Uppermost in the minds of everybody in this country today is the question of emigration.

2.05 p.m.

Under this Item 50, Emigration Expenses, you have made total provision only. Whether you were dealing with general emigration or not, this is the opportunity for all members to speak on emigration. There is in this country, provision being made under the Victoria Emigration Act in respect of which up to now I have not seen anything done to assist any young women. There is another scheme of emigration in which the Government presently gives assistance to those persons who are selected by them to go to England. I must here draw to the Government's attention, (if I recall it right) that there is a Board set up to which application can be made by distressed women for the purpose of leaving the island. I am wondering whether the Hon. Minister was zealous enough to find out what steps have been taken to implement this scheme, and if any applications which have been made under this Act have been considered I know that the Government has actually a Civil Servant appointed as Secretary, and I want to know if any applications have been made under that Act or what has been done under the Act to assist anybody in any way. The scheme which the Government has now to assist these girls who have been selected to go to England I consider to be wrong; the policy of the Government in dealing with an emigration is to help with one-half of the passage those girls who have been selected under their scheme to go to England. [Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: That does not come under this Act.]

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am sorry to interrupt the honourable member. What he is saying would come better under the head of "Labour". This Item under this Head is dealing with a specific Act, and what the hon. member is saying about people going to Great Britain does not come under this Act.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Do you understand what I am speaking on, Mr. Chairman? Let one of them go into the Chair; I would not say anything to stop them.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The hon. member should not lose his temper. Let him open his book and see what this matter refers to. Nobody is stopping him, but this is nothing to do with nurses going to England. If he were to refer to the Note he will see that this refers to the Victoria Emigration Act.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I do not lose my temper because I might not get it back. I am speaking on this question of emigration. I say that there is a policy whereby the Government helps with one-half of the passage when girls are selected for hospitals in the U.K., by the panel appointed by the Government namely: the Matron at the General Hospital, the Director of Medical Services, and the Labour Commissioner. I am just referring to the Government's policy; I have said something to the Hon. Minister of Trade, I have said that there are a number of girls who have made representations to the Government and they have been told point-blank "Unless you are selected under the scheme of Government we cannot help you." I am appealing to the Government to see that that is not the right policy. In a few day's time a number of these girls will be leaving this colony for England, and they can prove that representations have been made to the Government; I am asking the Government to review their policy in helping only girls whom they select to go to England.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, if you allow the honourable member to flout the Act other honourable members can do the same thing. In so far as the honourable member losing his temper is concerned, it does not matter to me if he loses it and does not get it back. I am appealing to the honourable member to see that the money which is being used for emigration is in respect of the Labour Department. That is where the hon. member should address his remarks; the Government cannot have a policy under this Act.

2.15 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Since when am I to be told by a member of this House when I am to speak?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member should not adopt that attitude. He should clearly see—

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I cannot clearly see anything. If you take up Miscellaneous you will see—Do not mind him.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Do not mind whom? The honourable member must address the Chair.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Do not mind the hon. junior member for St. Peter. It is no sense stopping me, Mr. Chairman. Members will not allow you to remain impartial. It is a good thing that you have an impartial outlook.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member proceed and let us get somewhere.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I was trying to make a point when the hon. member interrupted me. I can see what it is; we have been meeting since 12 o'clock and hon. members are hungry. If the Government desires to adjourn at this stage, I will move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again. I now make that motion formally.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am sorry to intervene again. We agree with adjourning at this stage. Let the hon. member read the Act of 1904-2. There is a schedule which reads Brazil, Columbia, Ecuador etc. The United Kingdom is not mentioned. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am still speaking on it.] Cannot the hon. member wait until we get down to emigration?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: With the greatest respect to you Sir, I am on my feet.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that I do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again. Hon. members in favour will please say "Aye" and those against will please say "No." I think the "Ayes" have it.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Chairman reported and Mr. Deputy Speaker took the Chair and reported accordingly.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It being now after 2 o'clock, this House now stands adjourned in accordance with the Rules.

ESTIMATES

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment the House was in Committee of Supply.

The House resumed in Committee of Supply, Mr. Smith being in the Chair.

Head XXIX — Cont'd

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, when the adjournment took place I was speaking on Miscellaneous Services. I dealt with various Items under that Head and I was dealing with Item 50 Emigration Expenses. With the greatest respect, although you have not ruled, I know that if I attempt to draw your attention to the particular section of the Act I know I would be told that I am reading law wrong. It seems to affect some people when a few of us try to speak on a matter of importance in the country; but with the greatest respect to you, I feel I am in place to talk on it. I am dealing with it under Item 50 of this Head. If you take time to look through the Act with respect to the point which I was making of where somebody was to get somebody out —

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Perhaps I am too meticulously careful. I said that it would be better if we dealt with emigration under Item 18, Head 31, Labour. Strictly speaking you should speak on that later, but I want to say that no member on the Government's side wants to stop the honourable member from speaking on that question under this Item.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, it is true that you might argue with the Hon. Premier sometimes, but you must pay great regards to him when it comes to a question of the law. However it is impossible to argue that I cannot speak on emigration under this Item because this Item deals with people going out of the island. I feel I have the right to develop the point which I am making now. I think the Hon. Premier knows that I have discussed this question on several occasions. I never agreed with the policy of taking up money and spending it on a wholesale emigration scheme. In this respect you are saying whosoever will can go to England. After some thought, the Government has decided to pay the passages of these girls selected for work in England as nurses, but only for those who have been selected through the Labour Department. I am in a position to speak with some authority when I say that there are a number of girls who are selected as student nurses other than those selected through the Labour Department.

I know that there are a number of girls who have been turned down by the Committee which the Government has for selecting these girls, but these said girls have been selected through another source. I understand that the Committee is comprised of the Director of Medical Services, the Labour Commissioner and a Matron of the General Hospital. I do not know how that Committee selects these girls, but I know that some girls who were turned down because they did not have passes in five subjects in the School Certificate have been selected otherwise and are about to go. I have actually seen some of those girls and I went to the Labour Commissioner and asked him whether in view of their being selected, if Government would give them half of the passage. I

do want the Government to revise its policy with respect to lending money to girls going to England. I feel that those who have been selected outside of the Government's Committee should have equal opportunity as those who are selected by the Government's Committee. Of course I can very well appreciate and can see the point of view of the Government's panel sticking to the strict letter and only selecting those girls with the necessary School Certificates, but I have seen cables and communication where some English hospitals require not a School Certificate with five passes, but a School Certificate or any certificate up to that standard with a pass in English only. Therefore, where some of the girls may have failed in mathematics and in other subjects but have got a certificate in English, they should be allowed to go. As a result of that, a number of girls have been selected through the Principal of the Modern High School. It is true to say that many of the girls selected through that source have not the money to take them to England, and three of the parents of such girls have come to me to see whether they could secure a loan. I feel rather than have the parents going to the expense of actually selling their homes, the Government should enter an agreement to help them with part of the money.

That is one phase of the matter. There is another one in which there are other girls who have been selected not as student nurses, but as Nurses' Assistants. Those girls are not of the standard or the type who go to do nursing, they are what is termed in other countries as Nurses' Assistants. I would like to draw to the attention of the Government that where such persons are willing to sign to pay back a portion of a salary monthly for their passage, Government should assist those persons. Another thing: Government is insisting that persons other than the parents of such girls must sign a bond. I am saying it is not good enough to select nurses in your panel and assist them only; you should assist those other girls who have been selected for nurses and can give you documentary evidence to prove it. I am further suggesting that those girls who have been selected as Nurses' Assistants should also be aided. I am not saying that you should take up money and give it to persons. If you put \$10, the person who has been selected should also pull her pocket and assist in something so that she will realise that when she goes out there, she is going to do some work as well as make a name for Barbados.

I will now leave the question of Nurses and other girls who are going in search of employment in England and deal with the question of those men who are going there in the same respect. Even before I saw the actual notice which appeared in the Press with respect to the need for hotel workers, I saw a cable which came to this country talking about getting people to be trained as hotel workers. Mr. Chairman, you know as well as I do that there are a great number of youngsters leaving school who because of their Barbadian pride and because of the limited channels here, cannot be trained here as hotel workers; but there are dozens of youngsters leaving First and Second Grade Schools as well as Elementary who would be willing at midnight tonight to be trained as hotel workers in the Midlands. I am speaking of boys between the ages of 20 and 24. Someone may raise the question of salaries, but I say that it is sometimes better to die by the sword than by famine. I know of a number of youngsters who would be willing to go and work in England as hotel workers.

You will find a sum in the Estimates to be voted for emigration to the United States. The Hon. Minister of Trade has not yet made his pronouncement as to what Government is going to do in this

respect in England. There is no doubt about it, those of us who have been reading English newspapers and contacting people in England, and even the admission by the Hon. Minister of Trade who has just returned from Great Britain, have said that there is plenty of employment to be had in England. The Hon. Minister has not yet given a pronouncement on his visit to the U.K. There is the old proverb: "While the grass is growing, the horse is starving." I will urge on the Government not to be slow in declaring its policy on this question. Do not say that you will like to see the people go out; you should say that you are going to help by giving some of the passage free, gratis and for nothing, and also a proportion of it will be given by way of a loan. I am sure that every member of this House would appreciate in dealing with emigration what it means to the economy of the island and would readily support anything worthwhile.

I do think that there is any member of this House who would be so stupid as to say that he would not like to see people get out of this island, and therefore I counsel this Government that they should without further delay do something in this matter. We have discussed this matter in every possible angle; we have urged upon the Government the expediency of investigating the matter and of setting up a Department in England where things can be investigated. We are all willing to meet the expenses of a Liaison Officer or Officers; we do not appreciate the difficulty of living accommodation in England but I believe that people can be educated to the fact that they should not actually crowd in big cities; they should go out in the Midlands and the country areas and work would be more readily forthcoming. I have discussed this matter with people who have been to England and in some cases with many Englishmen; I have had discussions with Englishmen who have suggested to me that I should urge on the Government to take up this matter. There is the case of a friend of mine who went to England. He wanted to give his daughter-in-law a holiday there, and she found the most difficult job after six months searching for help in the various organisations of labour; and up to the time he came back here she was unable to get anybody to do the job, although she was willing to pay for it. What I am saying is this: if the Government really wants to do something they should do something. I believe that another 90 or 100 people would be leaving here on Sunday for England; I say that it is not good enough just to go and see how people are getting on and then coming back; Barbadians are always willing to go out and see things for themselves, and I believe that they will make a place for themselves in any part of the globe. The Hon. Minister of Trade has said that he will make a statement as to his findings in England; but that is not sufficient, because what we have seen in the Press gives us an idea of his findings in England. We have seen an indication that the Government should definitely review its policy and I think it should do so immediately.

It is not a question of getting money; and you should not merely say that you will lend money to these girls who have been selected; that is not good enough. I am sure that honourable members will agree with me that the policy of the Government should be reviewed. You should publicise in the Press that you propose to lend money to persons other than those who have been selected, and that you will think of domestics and other people. As long as the Labour Commissioner is satisfied with people who apply, the Government should lend the people money. Just selecting people purely because they have School Certificates and who are physically

fit, and who can secure employment, I do not think that that is the policy which the Government should pursue.

I am glad that you, Sir, have realised that it is the right of an honourable member, so long as he is in order, to speak on any matter and not at the whims and fancies of others. Mr. Chairman, you should not listen to honourable members but you should rule as Chairman.

As regards Item 15 "Expenses under the Apprenticeship Bursaries Act, 1928" I want to make the point that you are spending a tremendous lot of money in this direction; and those who want to take advantage of this provision should be given the opportunity to do so and you should encourage more of it. The Allowance which you give is not sufficient to-day; I think that after these boys are trained they should be given the opportunity to go abroad when it is afforded them.

3.10 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, speaking under Item 19 for which \$1,300 is to be voted for fees to the Queen's Solicitor, I would like to mention that the matter of the Queen's Solicitor is causing grave disquiet throughout the legal profession in Barbados generally. As you know sir, a recent appointment has been made without any advertisement informing members of the profession that the previous holder of the post had resigned; and the appointment was made (entirely contrary to precedent) of a very competent but comparatively junior solicitor. We would be glad if the Government would give a word of explanation as to why one of the junior members of the profession was selected over the heads of such senior and highly esteemed solicitors as Mr. De Courcey Boyce, Mr. Dermott Bynoe and others. It has generally been the practice to appoint a senior practising solicitor to this post which is supposed to be an honour.

From the point of view of Barbados, \$1,300 is no money at all for a solicitor. It is recognized that the solicitor's profession is a wonderful source of income in this island. As regards this matter, people are wondering why Mr. Bynoe and Mr. Boyce were passed over. There is no doubt that Mr. Gill can do the job but he is comparatively junior in the profession.

I would like to speak also on Item 24, Entertainment of Petty Officers and other ratings of ships visiting Barbados. Again there is some worry about the disbursement of this amount, (not the amount itself) but the manner in which it is expended. It is felt that when you entertain these officers you should try to create some goodwill between the members of the crew and all members of the local community; not to try to segregate the young ladies who are to meet these Petty Officers. I have had numerous complaints that the entertainments arranged for these officers exclude almost all of the coloured young women in this island except those who are very fair, and who, in local parlance will pass for white.

In the entertainment of these officers one expects that the opportunity would be taken to allow the English sailors to meet the local lassies, no matter of what complexion. If you pass by the places where there is a dance or picnic you will be surprised to think that you are in Barbados, to look at the majority of young ladies who are selected to meet these officers. It is not that the young ladies who form the majority of this island's population are not willing to meet the officers; I am assured that they are prepared to enjoy the contacts as much as the other young ladies. We want to create goodwill between the U.K. people and the people of this community, and yet when the opportunity arises you do not make use of the opportunity.

I will just mention (because it would seem that I am slipping up if I do not draw it to your attention) Item 28, Government Binding and Printing. I observe that this year again there is another increase under this Head. We are now being called upon to vote \$114,000 which will go to the private capitalistic concern which does the Government's printing, an increase of \$24,000 over last year. Is it not plain that we can afford to purchase printing machinery for a Government printery if we can afford to pay in one year the sum of \$114,000 for Government printing and binding?

We received an assurance sometime ago that the matter was receiving active consideration. I just wanted to make sure by not avoiding reference to this Item, that the Government would realise that this question is still a burning one; and that it is plain now that if they can afford an increase of \$24,000 in one year, what we are spending here within five or ten years could pay for the outlay in acquiring a Government Printery. In addition to that, we will avoid the delays we get now; sometimes we do not get our Order Papers until we come here.

In regard to Item 30, Telephone rentals, transfers and installations, let me point out the urgent necessity of a telephone at District "E" Police Station. If the Government cannot afford an extra one, they can consider transferring one from somewhere else to that station. Great inconvenience is suffered by litigants as well as people who practise at District "E" by not having a telephone at that Police Station. I suggest that steps should be taken to have one installed without further delay.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Perhaps I should refer to one matter and ask the other Ministers to deal with the other points. The day before yesterday I had a Message sent to me which unfortunately did not arrive in time to be laid with the other Messages. I did have in mind asking leave to lay it later in the day, but the way things went I did not do so. It is in respect of the West Indian Conferences. This Government has said, and the Secretary of State for the Colonies has agreed, that inasmuch as we have Ministerial Status, the reason for the Legislatures of West Indian colonies appointing delegates no longer arises in those colonies which have Ministerial Status. That is something which is now to be done by the Executive Committee or Executive Council as the case may be. I got a reply only two days ago. It is a confidential telegram, but I do not think it should be confidential as far as this House is concerned. The telegram advises the Government of this colony that owing to difficulty in getting hotel accommodation in Puerto Rico, this conference will take place on the 10th May instead of the 4th May.

I am speaking about the West Indian Conference. The meeting of the Caribbean Commission takes place just before the West Indian Conference, but the Caribbean Commission may have two or three meetings a year. If I may be personal for a moment, I would say that it is not altogether a bad thing that this postponement will take place because I will be able to see the cricket matches between the Australians and the West Indians.

As I have said, appointments of delegates to this Conference are now to be done by the Executive Committee instead of by the Legislature. The delegate will be one who will be there as a Commissioner instead of sending two people. The Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries will be our delegate, and the advisers to the delegate will be the Deputy Director of Education and the Deputy Director of Agriculture. The Agenda is rather longish; after dealing with the organisation of the Conference, there will be the Report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Commission since the last Conference; an action taken by the Metropolitan Governments

and the Governments of the countries served by the Caribbean Commission on recommendations of previous sessions of the Conference.

The next Item will be education generally and the relation to economic and community development; adaptation of education to the actual needs of the area with particular reference to school programme for present day needs and teacher training; community education and training of leaders, and administration and finance research.

Next follows small scale farming in relation to economic and community development, which is subdivided into Farm Management, Financing, Processing and Marketing, Land Problems, and Research. After that, the Conference will make recommendations for the Agenda of the next Conference. Other Business is the last Item on the Agenda.

I hope before this meeting ends to ask leave to lay the Message which refers to what I have just said. As I have already said, other Ministers will reply to other points raised under this Head.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I will say, that this is a retrograde step and it does not apply to all places with Ministerial Status. It seems to me that Barbados has asked for special permission to deal with the appointment of delegates to this Conference. This is what the Secretary of State said in the Message of 1952 when the last Conference was held: "In accordance with the procedure laid down by the Secretary of State for the Colonies that the Candidate put forward shall be nominated by the elected body of the Legislature, His Excellency invites the Honourable House to nominate the Barbados candidate who need not necessarily be one of its members, for inclusion on the panel from which the election of Commissioners and alternates will be made."

What this Government is now doing seems to be somewhat contrary.
3.20 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am not dealing with that point; I am merely saying that this is the way we appoint delegates to the West Indian Conference. I am not dealing with the election of the unofficial Commissioners. I completely forgot that and I will say it now. I have been elected and re-elected. Under the circumstances I have no desire to stand for election again. There were Mr. Manley and Mr. Gordon and then Mr. Bustamante and myself. Mr. Bustamante and I have been re-elected; and it would be hogging the position to stand for election again; I am not standing. That really covered what the honourable member has raised.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The West Indian Conference as the Hon. Premier knows, is not a Conference of West Indian Governments; it is a Conference of West Indian Legislatures. It is not a Conference in the same sense as that to which the Hon. Premier is going to Trinidad to discuss Federation. Are you suggesting that because you have Ministerial Government that the delegates must be those whom the Government nominates. A Parliamentary delegation from England is not sent out by the British Cabinet, say like a Mission which is sent to Ceylon; the delegates are not selected by the Cabinet; that is done by the House of Commons. The whole idea of the West Indian Conference was to give the elected members in the various Legislatures the opportunity of selecting their own delegates. You have Ministerial Government in Jamaica and Trinidad, and if you take up the *Trinidad Guardian* and read it, you will find that the Legislature of Trinidad is going to select their candidates for this Conference to-morrow. Jamaica has party system in its House of Representatives and when the Jamaica Labour Party was in power, Mr. Manley and Mr. L. Simmonds who is now occupying one of Her Majesty's institutions were selected as the representatives to that Conference. Mr.

Manley was not one of the Government's Party at that time.

I am not quarrelling nor do I feel vexed over the matter; but I want to point out that in the Message which came to this House from His Excellency the Governor, the procedure by which we were to select the delegates was laid down by the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The nomination of the person to be on the panel is a function for this Legislature to perform. The Hon. Premier would remember that when the Government of Barbados selected Mr. Guy Perrin and Mr. Hayden to represent this island at that Conference, the Secretary of State for the Colonies protested against their nomination. He would remember that this was the only colony that had representatives who were not of the local legislature. The late Sir Harold Allan came down here as a representative of Jamaica but Barbados was conspicuous in the absence of a member of the Legislature by having as representatives, Mr. Perrin and Mr. Hayden.

If the Government chooses to say now that it must nominate the candidates to the Conference because the Conference is liable to deal with issues which are for the Government, well I do not know; but I cannot see how the Premier's argument can follow if it is a question of sending to the conference the person nominated to be a commissioner himself as well as to be nominated by the Government. I say again we have no objection to the person who is nominated, but I do not think the Government should claim that it has the right to make the nomination. When I say the Government, I do not mean the majority; I mean the Executive Committee. This House and the Other Place should at least have the right of naming the person who is to represent our Legislature. If the Hon. Premier were controlling the full Cabinet, (that is if they were all Cabinet Ministers on the Executive Committee and none of the Executive were nominated members) and he agreed to send down names that this House of Assembly must accept as its representatives from the panel of Ministers, that would be going back to the position where we were when the Governor was making the nomination.

I do not feel so far as this is concerned, that the Hon. Minister of Social Services is a reasonable alternate as our delegate for the Caribbean Commission. The Hon. Minister has not even shown me any flair for such matters; he is really the deputy of the Hon. Premier, but certainly he cannot be his deputy in everything. I do not know if the Honourable Premier has said he does not want to go back on the Caribbean Commission. I went there for three sessions. Your selection as a Commissioner has to go by votes, and you are not going to get votes for that person unless they are known by someone. It is not a Party vote like in this Assembly. As I have said, this is a conference on which recommendations are going to be made to be submitted to the various Governments concerned. I cannot see how the Hon. Premier's point can be carried out with respect to the person who is to be nominated to the panel, unless what he is doing now is no more than nominating a name. As it appears to me, we have no choice because according to what we read in the newspaper the hon. junior member for St. Thomas has been selected to be the representative from Barbados to be put on the panel to be voted for at the Commission. I cannot see how that can be right. There should be a vote in the Legislature approving of the person who is going to be our nominee. What I have read in the newspaper is that he has been selected. The Hon. Premier must admit that if it were proposed to make a change from what was always the custom the better course for him would have been

to tell the Legislature that on this occasion Government does not propose to do this according to the normal practice. Instead of that, he waited until everything was done to say what was the position. When things are done this way they make some of us feel that you are either afraid or do not care, or do not regard the Legislature; and for that reason I do not agree with the matter as it is adopted.
3.35 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am absolutely sure that if the honourable member who has just sat down was paying me the compliment of listening carefully to what I said, he would have changed his view. I went when Mr. Hayden was the Official Representative of Barbados. In those days the Government and this House could be poles apart, and in many respects they were poles apart. At that Conference I said something which made Mr. Hayden so furious that after the Conference he sent a cable to Sir Grattan Bushe saying that he dissociated himself from what I said at the Conference. As soon as you have a party system, the majority party speaks for Barbados. Trinidad has not got any Party System; five people there can have five different points of view; but where in this island you have a majority Party running the Government, that Party speaks for the House and the House speaks for the people of Barbados. I go further: you have adult suffrage and you must assume that the majority of people have decided who they want to run the Government. They have chosen the 24 of us; but it does not happen that in a democratic institution that you have 24 people thinking alike. You have a majority and a minority, and you must listen to the minority point of view; but the whole system of democratic Government means that when you give a majority vote to a particular party, automatically you say that the leaders of that Party are the people who are to run the Government. When you vote for the Labour Party in England you mean that Mr. Attlee is to run the Government, and when you vote for the Conservative Party you mean that Mr. Churchill is to run the Government. Surely the very reason which compelled us in the old days to demand that the Governor should not nominate both delegates in the very reason which compels us to say that the Governor—The Legislature in those days represented the views of the people; today the Legislature still represents the view of the people, but the Legislature with a Party System says "We want five Ministers."

I am more than surprised at the hon. member saying what he has said; if the Executive Committee were 400 people, only 5 Ministers have any voice in this matter. We do not take votes. If the Chief Secretary or any other human being on that Committee says "A" and we say "B", "B" is carried and we do not even vote. The hon. member just does not seem to know the constitution under which we are working; I hope that Lord Lloyd has relieved their minds. We five Ministers are the voice of the majority party, and therefore what grouse has anybody got? We are the voice of people; therefore just as before it was necessary for the Legislature and not the Governor to appoint people to these Conferences in spite of the sneers raised just now, the very fact that the five of us are the Government, the reason in the old days why no Governor should do it is the reason to-day why the Governor should do it. The Secretary of State for the Colonies has pointed out that "under the recent constitutional changes and under the increased responsibility of Government it would be more appropriate that the Barbados Government Delegates should be chosen by the Executive Committee as you propose rather than by the Legislature." He would

be silly if he did not say so; I will tell this House that the five of us as long as we retain the confidence of the electors, we run these Conferences. I say that this is the system under which we are working; I cannot repeat too often that with the present constitutional set-up, the five Ministers as long as we retain the confidence of this House, have to run this country in purely internal affairs.

I repeat with all the force at my command that in purely internal affairs, except what is retained by the Chief Justice, the Attorney General and the Commissioner of Police and with which I have nothing to do, all other non-operational affairs I control as no other colonial leader control in Nigeria, Gold Coast or anywhere else. Therefore, I invite hon. members to be Barbadians rather than to be members of this group of political parties, and to see that we should try and forget whether we are socialists members of the Labour Party, Congress Party, Conservative Party or anything else. We have a first class constitution and therefore let us work it. In this matter we are not any different from the Cabinet in Great Britain. It is purely for a transitional period that we have retained members of the Executive Committee who are purely advisory; we can look at them and laugh at them.

As regards the honourable junior member for St. Lucy, his method of replying to an argument is to laugh. I repeat, the advice of the five of us has to be taken. If any of the other members of the Executive say anything which causes us to say that we should reconsider the matter, then we defer it to see if there is anything in their argument. If we say "No" there is nothing doing. Whether we do right or wrong, the five Ministers run this Government in purely internal affairs barring what is reserved for the Attorney General, the Chief Justice and the Commissioner of Police. I certainly do not intend to waste any more energy on future occasions to say that; this is the last time that any honourable member would expect to hear me dilate on that.

3.45 p.m.

When we come to this question of the West Indian Conference, we say that constitutionally we represent the greatest majority of votes in this island; and therefore, we say that it is up to us to make the nominations and not to the Legislature, because the Legislature is to legislate and not to administer. Of course in the old days the Barbados Legislature insisted on appointing this Board and the other Board; that could not go on forever. This House exists to be a debating Chamber and to say what laws should be passed. Even the honourable member early yesterday morning had to remind us that when Mr. Eden goes to discuss Formosa, he does not have to wait until the House of Commons discusses it first; he goes and does his best on behalf of the British Government. If Parliament afterwards says that he had no right to do so and so, and makes a vote to that effect, Mr. Eden will resign. It is not that Parliament told him to let Chiang-Kai-Shek remain in Formosa. He goes and uses his brains and says what is best for the U.K. When he goes back and Parliament turns against him he resigns.

If we choose Ding Ding. (I mention him because he is dead). [Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: He is alive.] I thought he was dead. If we choose him the House could pass a vote of censure against us for lowering the dignity of Barbados. [Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: But you will have to decide if the vote of censure is in order or not.] I would be perfectly right. I invite the Opposition to ask the greatest constitutional authority in Great Britain if

I have overstated the case, when I say that it is the Prime Minister alone who decides whether a man should be called on to resign.

I do assure the honourable junior member for St. Peter that what we have done, we have done because we feel we are absolutely right in saying that with the constitutional development which we have today, whatever might have been the position in 1952, it is now the function and duty of the Government to appoint these delegates. I am glad to be able to say that the Secretary of State for the Colonies agrees with us; but with the greatest possible respect to him, I say that if he had said no, we would have said we were sorry but we will not take his advice.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, you have given the honourable member some latitude to go into some of the conventions of the constitution. I will deal with some of the arguments of the honourable member and let him know that they are people other than lawyers who read and study these conventions and some of us pay attention to them. I will use the word that he has used on more than one occasion: we are still a colony. The honourable member has told us in this House last session that we are still a colony; and I will tell you something: that the British Government can take away the constitution that we have in the same way they could take away that of British Guiana. The honourable member should not be too intemperate because in our constitution there are some qualifying words that cannot be lightly passed over. The point I was making is that I agree that so far as the appointment of a delegate is concerned, you have a certain constitutional position. Under that constitution you are the majority party, and therefore you do not want the Opposition to be telling you whom to send to a Conference. I do not feel that the Government should make a treaty with the Opposition not to send a member like the honourable senior member for St. George who will attack the Government too much, or to send someone who is more polite, or who is neither fish, fowl nor good red-herring.

What the honourable member has said I would agree with in theory. But the honourable member never told the House that he wanted to change the system and that he had asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The House is being told today that the West Indian Conference is coming off in May, and that they have chosen the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries as our delegate. I feel that the House should be told by a Message that this Government proposes as a result of the constitutional change to appoint its delegates to the West Indian Conference. The Message that is here, tells us that they have appointed these people, not that they are making a change. They would have made the appointment in the old way unless the Secretary of State for the Colonies had agreed to the change.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I have just said that even if the Secretary of State had not agreed we would have taken no notice of him, because he would have been wrong.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Therefore, the matter was not to be discussed in the Legislature. The final analysis is not between the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Ministers, but between the Secretary of State and the people of Barbados.

It it were not so, we would not have had any change in this island because the people in power would have seen to it that the Secretary of State changed nothing. The Secretary of State is still the boss of the Colonies.

3.55 p.m.

[Hon. G. H. ADAMS: In external affairs only.]

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am not going into the duties of the Secretary of State for the Colonies because that is pointless. That is why I said on a former occasion that the honourable senior member for St. George and the Hon. Premier are cast in the same mould. The Hon. Premier should have given us a statement telling us that they have changed the system, and that they propose to do it in the way they have done. He has treated the Secretary of State for the Colonies with more courtesy than he has treated us; and that is where I say he is making this mistake with the Legislature. Some day he is going to need the support of this Legislature. He treats this Legislature in an off-hand manner and that is not the right way.

So far as the alternate Delegate, why could we not have been told about it before and let us express an opinion on it. This House was asked on a former occasion to nominate a delegate, and this House passed an Address to the Governor stating that we agreed with the nomination and then we received a Message asking us to nominate the member. I go further and say that because you have Party system, it does not deprive Parliament of being treated as Parliament. Because the Hon. Premier may say something to the five Ministers, they cannot get under a sandbox tree and pass laws; they have to go up at Government House and agree to a decision. Do you think that Sir Winston Churchill with his Cabinet can get up in Hyde Park and say this is what we are going to do; they have a certain place to meet. I know the Hon. Premier is going to come to this House and tell us certain things and I am going to ask him: "How soon will the ex-official members of the Executive Committee be removed from that body?" I know if it were a matter for him to decide they would be removed at the beginning of the next session. Under the present Constitution, in grave or exceptional circumstances relating not only to the internal force the Governor still has that note of reserve.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am sorry I have to contradict the honourable member who has just sat down, but that only relates to the Police Force. The Governor has no power nor authority in purely internal affairs except security. I cannot make that too clear. The honourable member said something about he would like to know when we intend to remove the ex-official members from the Executive Committee. I did not catch what he said clearly, but he seemed to indicate that he wanted to know what was my attitude. Perhaps I should not say it, but my attitude is that as quickly as possible as we show a united front we would have a Cabinet with the Governor not sitting in on the Executive.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: It is our united front which caused five Ministers to be sitting there. How did you get there? You got there because the people of Barbados voted for sixteen of us. I will read this to the honourable member. I am reading from the instrument that forms our Constitution and it is what the Secretary of State for the Colonies agreed to in Mr. Turner's despatch:—

"It would seem to be proper that the decisions of the Governor-in-Executive Committee should be taken with due regard to the advanced constitutional position in Barbados, and the fact that all matters which require reference to the Legislature must of necessity in the House of Assembly be the sole responsibility of the Ministers."

[A VOICE: That is changed.] The honourable member says that is changed. I was not dealing with the constitution, I only wanted to point out that this is what was proposed:—

"I propose, therefore, that if a Ministerial System is introduced, the Governor, in arriving at his decision in Executive Committee, should, except where it appears to him that grave or exceptional circumstances compel him to act otherwise, accept, in legislative matters, the advice of the Ministers."

I say that those are the qualifying words, so do not tell me that the Secretary of State for the Colonies does not have any say or if he says anything you can ignore him. I hope you do not act as those stupid boys in British Guiana; they acted so stupidly, that the people took away their constitution. The point I am going to make is that the Hon. Premier should have told us in the House about this matter before the Message was published in the Press. [A VOICE: We did not have to tell you.] The Hon. Minister said, "We did not have to tell you." These things do not mean much to the Hon. Premier. However all that I am saying is, if we were informed that this was the proposed step you were taking, no honourable member would object to the Message but I am objecting to the procedure; that should have been told to us.

4.05 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: I think it would be just as well before I waste my time, to know whether honourable members would be allowed to speak or not, or whether the new procedure will be adopted and the question will be put whether honourable members are on their feet or not. [Laughter]. It seems to be that a new precedent has been established and I do not want to break any procedure. It seems to me that under the new constitutional set up, even the procedure in this House is regulated by the whims and caprice of the Ministers. I say that because of the previous manner in which you, Mr. Chairman, have conducted the debates in Committee and I do not want to offend the Chair. I am more or less fortified in that conviction by the rather extravagant statements made by the Leader of the Government here to-day. One does not know whether he is qualified to speak or not, and I want the procedure clarified.

In many respects I agree with the honourable junior member for St. Peter. I doubt very much whether this session would have ended with members of the public and members of this House being aware of these new developments which have taken place, if the honourable junior member for St. Peter had not asked certain pertinent questions and the senior member for St. Joseph and Leader of the Government decided that he will answer them for once. It seems to me that a discourtesy has been committed either by the Secretary of State for the Colonies or by the Premier himself; because if we believe that we have certain privileges and prerogatives which it is true are being whittled away day by day both by *ex parte* decisions on behalf of the Premier himself and by the rulings which astound our ears from time to time—I know Mr. Chairman, that you are being advised now; but at any time I am on my feet and I am not entitled to speak, I will not continue to speak whether the honourable member is speaking behind his hands or not [Laughter.]

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Stop him from doing it.

Mr. BARROW: These are matters to which I have drawn to your attention Mr. Chairman, and to the attention of the public before. You have got to decide whether you are the Chairman of Committees or whether you will follow the new constitutional

vagaries and be dictated to by the members of the House, which I do not think you honestly want to do. Sometimes we are forced into doing things which are

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It would appear to me as if you want something to be done that I do not want to do. I am asking you to keep to this Item.

Mr. BARROW: I am speaking on Item 35.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Well do that.

Mr. BARROW: This is what I want to know. It was formerly the right and privilege of members of this House to appoint delegates to certain conferences. The first mistake which this House made in my opinion was to have a block vote for conferences, whereby decisions could be made relative to delegates to Conferences and appoint them without the approval and consent of the House. If the House maintained its right to vote on conferences, cumbersome as the machinery might be, it would still safeguard the rights of the members of this House and the people of this country. I think we should realise that there is a reason for reposing the right to do certain things in the interest of this Colony in the Legislature. If that were not so, it would mean that people could draw aside under a tree and make decisions contrary to the wishes (whether expressed or implied) of the people of this country with the voters and taxpayers having no redress whatsoever.

The difficulty under which the Premier labours is one of failing to understand that although certain machinery may be modified whereby action is taken or decisions made, in the last analysis, the whole function and purpose of Government is not to do these things in the dark which you are afraid to do in the open, but only to do in the dark only those things which you are sure if the people are fully seized of the facts they would permit you to do in the open. Coming to the question of conferences, time and time again I have pointed out that I see absolutely no excuse for these hurried journeys and escapades made by these officials and merchants accompanying them at their convenience when the people of this country are never given the courtesy of a report; even when you vote money to send somebody somewhere for a specific purpose, we never hear the result of these conferences from the people who are supposed to enlighten us. Ministerial Government or no Ministerial Government, nobody is going there purely as a delegate from himself or as a fugitive from justice, but as a delegate from Barbados; and therefore one of the elementary principles of a delegation is that a delegate must account to his principals; the principal in this instance being the people of Barbados *via* the members of this House.

4.15 p.m.

I wonder if the Government would care to issue a statement as to the number of conferences and the number of persons who have made journeys overseas quite apart from conferences which they have attended locally, and which have been held in camera during the past three years or even since the inception of Ministerial Status, and the number of times on which the Government has issued a statement either to the public or to the House of Assembly or to both of the outcome of these conferences; and also point out whether the knowledge gained at the conferences would inure to the benefit of the people of this island.

Reporters have met certain Ministers at the Airport on their arrival and they have issued broad and general statements, and certainly in no way disclosing concrete facts from which we in this Chamber could assess the value to the taxpayers in this colony of the Ministers' trips abroad.

I am not going to go into any constitutional issues at this stage. I can only say that I am surprised by all I have heard here to-day. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that there is an undertaking implicit in democratic Government that the decisions which are made, will in the first place be made on a mandate from the people whom you purport to represent, and not only an expressed mandate for the particular occasion, and that the results of those decisions will be communicated back to the people; but the *de facto* position in Barbados is that we neither know before hand what is going to happen nor afterwards what has actually happened at any conference; and if the Premier feels that he only has to go to the people at election time and that he can get there and tell them anything on the spur of the moment, and that that is sufficient for the working of the Ministerial System, I will tell him that that is a direct antithesis of what the Secretary of State for the Colonies felt would take place when he communicated to the Officer Administering the colony that he had approved of the Ministerial System for Barbados.

Someone must have been bamboozling the Colonial Office into believing that all the prerequisites for the smooth working of the system would obtain in this colony. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph often talks about the Party system and decries Trinidad. I wonder how many parties they are in Barbados that have 50 members. The Peoples' National Party has 12 local district parties, not members, in which a census of opinion is taken and sampled by the central body throughout the length and breadth of Jamaica. We managed to get Ministerial Status without having anything like a real party system in Barbados. We were very lucky.

When we come to the actual manner in which this appointment of delegates to conferences is being handled, we get an entirely different picture. Let us leave aside the Ministers. When you get other conferences, (in fact nearly every conference that is held in which the Barbados Government participates) you will find that far from being a continuation of the party system it is a direct antithesis, because you find three or four members of the Opposition's party going along advising a single Minister.

When there is conference of R.E.C. you find Mr. H. F. Alkins, Hon. K. R. Hunte and Hon. H. A. Cuke as advisers. Do you find any retired School Teachers who belong to the Labour Party, or any back-benchers, or let us say a Pan-boiler from Bulkeley Factory? You will find people who are active members of the Opposition's party taking part in conferences and making decisions on behalf of the people of Barbados which is supposed to have a Party system.

I know that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph will say that they go as delegates too. When they go as advisers, what is the point of having an adviser who will only tell not what he feels to be the case, but what you want him to tell you? He should be able to advise on what is the established policy of the majority of people in Barbados as represented by the Party which the honourable senior member for St. Joseph is saying that he is the head of. But is that the position?

Is this large vote for conferences justified? No one knows exactly how much money is spent on these conferences or by what system the delegates or their advisers are chosen. It seems to me that the only recommendation which urges itself on the Government is a large bank account. The only qualifica-

tions which you need to have to say that you represent the people of Barbados is to be successful in business in the City of Bridgetown.

I challenge any honourable member to go through a list of delegates who have been chosen to go to conferences and those who were taken as advisers, and then to say that what I am saying is not the case. Of course we know that the Premier can justify two completely opposite situations on the same reasons; he has done it here today. He can take one set of facts and make it justify two different points of view; depending on how prepared he is to answer any given question. He has said for exactly the same reason when he wanted something done, that the House should appoint the delegates; for the same reason he is saying now, the opposite of that.

4.25 p.m.

Their whole failure is due to they not understanding fully the British meaning of democracy; and that is what has got this country in this state today. It is patent that from time to time the Hon. Premier must hold out to the Secretary of State for the Colonies whom he so much despises when he has to take advice, that certain things operate in the constitutional set-up of Barbados. Those constitutional safeguards, such as the integrity of Ministers and the impartiality of people who have to control the destinies of other persons as well as other specific factors which I have already enumerated operate in this island. We do not expect that everything will be known by people in the House of Commons who up to quite recently, showed quite a lot of ignorance of the colonies; and who even did not know anything of the history of these colonies and what is going on from day to day; and not only those people but even people in the colonial department really do not understand what goes on in the colonies. Therefore their views must always be tempered and prejudicated by those who attempt to mislead them; and it is a great pity that now we have Ministerial Government, there is no political machinery existing whereby a check is made to see whether the constitutional factors are always in operation and functioning smoothly. The whole trouble is that the British Government waits until a crisis arises to do something about it; and I would not like to see that state of affairs arise in Barbados. I would say you will never get this Government openly defying the Colonial Office as certain members of the Ministerial Bench used to do a few years ago because that was the popular thing to do; I am saying, Mr. Chairman, you will not get any open hostility towards democracy in Barbados. What you will get is responsible persons in Barbados standing up and telling the Colonial Office how democratic we are and how much we have advanced constitutionally, as if the rest of the universe has not advanced at all. They will also say how we do not need to have these checks and plans which even the United Kingdom have because we are so democratic, and all the time they are saying so we are gradually drifting into a state of dictatorship which is unknown in any part of the world outside of the Soviet Union. When they go home at night they sit up and read *Mien Kamph*, *Lenin on Imperialism*, Machiavelli Rasputin, Pontius Pilate and all the dictators who have once lived in history. They are doing the same thing as Mussolini and Hitler did when they used to have conferences at the Brenner Pass and tell the people how they were safeguarding Europe and White civilisation against semitic hordes and Imperialists War-mongers, while all the time they were preparing to take away from the people bit by bit those very checks and plans which would ensure the retention of the

rights of the people to express themselves and to see that those things are done which they want done.

What I am saying I am saying very seriously. I am talking from my personal experience of those within and outside of this colony; and I see the danger arising in this colony. The only thing we do not have in Barbados is gas chambers. We do not have gas chambers yet but we have tear gas. We have just voted for that in the Estimates and if they thought that they would have got away with a vote for gas chambers, we would have them. And anybody who says that we do not have the greatest constitution in the whole of the British Empire, and like my colleague calls the Premier Jesus Christ himself, anybody who did not do that would go to the gas chamber. Members on the other side know what I am saying is true. My colleague look down on his own father in the grave because his father did not call the Premier Jesus Christ.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of Order. The statement by my colleague is not true and is without foundation. It is the customary lies which we hear from time to time.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, you know as well as I do that two weeks before they mentioned the names of the Ministers—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not called for.

Mr. BARROW: What I said I have heard with my own ears. What I am saying about this conference is that far from the continuation of the policy which we heard today, no statement or Message as the honourable junior member for St Peter has said, was made to this House. Far from a continuation of the democratic process, the present method by which Barbados is being represented at that conference ensures that the people are denied the right of knowing what is going on and what is said ostensibly in their interest—I challenge any member of the public or any member of the House to say that they know what takes place at any of these conferences through a member of the Government. I challenge any newspaper editor to say that apart from getting his news from a member of the Opposition who may be fortunate to attend, he would know anything. Even when it comes to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association which is non-party, we get another extension of the principle and the Generalissimo decides who should go to the Parliamentary Conference. I would like to ask the Leader of the Opposition whether that is not true.

4.35 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, while we are on the subject of conferences, I would like to mention this: a Conference is being held in Trinidad shortly on a matter which vitally affects the destiny of these colonies in Barbados and the West Indies as a whole—the Federal Conference. We talk about a Party System and it would be nonsense in these days of the Party System to have the members appointed in any way other than the one which the Generalissimo has recommended. What do we find? We went for someone (who had said that not in his lifetime would he like to see Federation in the West Indies) as the plenipotentiary of Barbados. The gentleman is entitled to his private views and he can express them inside and outside of the Legislative Council, and I will say that nobody could prevent him from expressing those views; but I would not expect him within eight days of his having expressed those views, to be boarding a Plane to go up to London on a Federation Conference. It was not an Anti-Federation Conference, but we found an Anti-Federationist representing Barbados! The same thing obtains today; the Officer

administering the colony has announced that he is going to represent Barbados, and are his views representative of Barbados or of his own? It cannot be both. There is another substitution which seems to underlie this appointment; it is only the rich merchant or planter of a certain complexion who can go outside to represent Barbados apart from the Ministers. Are we to tell you that although on paper you can make out a very good case for helping the Executive Committee to make these appointments, *de facto* the position is that there is a retrograde step constitutionally? This House should always be zealous about its rights and privileges as you well know.

I do not like the manner in which this particular issue raised by the honourable junior member for St. Peter has been handled; a private letter or a semi-private letter going from the Premier to the Secretary of State for the Colonies and a letter coming back down from the Secretary of State for the Colonies without members of the House or the people of Barbados knowing that such a transformation was going to take place. As I said right at the beginning, it is a discourtesy on somebody's part; discourtesies can be overlooked, but it goes deeper than that. This is a taking away of a right which existed, without any previous consultation or without any subsequent information; I would prefer it to be the first, Ministerial Government or no Ministerial Government. In this matter of Ministerial Status, Mr. Attlee does not think that you should pay any price for constitutional advancement; and socialist people think that even if people run themselves badly, you have to let them run themselves because if you never give them political experience, they will never run themselves because nobody will sit the examination for self Government. I regard Ministerial Status from a broader point of view than the more depositing of power in the hands of one man or in the hands of five men. They regard that the millenium has arrived because they have power to do certain things which other people in Barbados have not got the power to do. I am an active supporter of Ministerial Status, but I do not agree that long steps should be taken in the short run; I do not anticipate that the short run would be so long; and have we already arrived at a status in which this Chamber is denied all its constitutional rights within so short a time? You have to let people learn by experience; but these experiences which we are now enacting, are experiences which I feel should not be an attempt to disturb the constitutional peace of Barbados but to enlighten the people and to foster interest in the democratic machinery and organisation instead of the opposite taking place. This is the sort of contradiction of all the organs of Government, a contradiction not only of responsibility, but a contradiction in the responsibility of Government itself. It has gone so far that the Premier has said that the House is now relegated to the position of a debating society. I say that we are relegated to that position because he said that it is their decision as to what laws should be passed, who should go to a Conference, how the money in the Treasury should be spent, and how it should be raised; and there are certain statutory powers which people like the Hon. Minister of Communications try to take away from us. Let honourable members read the Water Works Act and they will know what I mean; I make short shrift of the Hon. Minister in that way.

It is implicit, the Hon. Premier says, that under Ministerial Status the powers of this House should

be taken away from us. In many ways attempts are made to whittle down further the few privileges which we have; how can we have democracy and Ministerial Government in that way? But the Millenium has arrived and all we can do is to debate things. These matters are worthy of serious consideration not because I have said it, but I have been studying the trends for a long time and I do not like what I have seen; therefore, I would like in future to be informed as a member of this House when decisions are going to be made, decisions which may take away powers which now reside in the discretion of members of this House.

I would like to know that for personal reasons and for public reasons. For personal reasons because we may never know whether we are acting constitutionally or not if this conspiratorial method of government continues. The truth is that we do not have government by consent, but government by conspiracy, and government by conspiracy is the shortest road to dictatorship.

4.45 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I think it should be drawn to the attention of the Government's leaders that their power is derived in the final analysis from this House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On which Item is the honourable member speaking?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am speaking on Item 35. As I was saying, it needs to be drawn to their attention that their power in the final analysis is derived from this House, and therefore when they attempt either directly or indirectly to undermine that power, they will find sooner or later that they are undermining their own.

With reference to the change in the method of appointing delegates to conferences the House should have been notified in the same manner in which we were notified previously that such and such a procedure would be adopted. I am not saying much more on that matter, because the ground has been fairly well covered by the honourable senior member for St. George. It is more than discourtesy; it is contempt on the part of the Government not to say one single word to the Legislature about this important change, and merely to provide the information in reply to a question posed on the floor of the House at a time when we are asked to vote money for conferences in general. One only has to wait and see in what other important matters the House will be treated with such studied contempt.

I emphasise, Sir, that if the Government's party are of the opinion that the Ministries are bodies separate and distinct from the House, (a kind of extra legislative body superimposed on the Legislature) that one fine morning they will wake up to discover that any strength or power they possess is derived from the members of the elected Chamber, and when they undermine it, they are undermining the power which they possessed as Ministers.

I was very surprised to notice that the amount we are asked to vote for Conferences has been increased this year from \$12,000 to \$18,000. In the 1952-53 Estimates the vote was \$91,600. In 1953-54 it was \$10,000, now we are asked to vote \$18,600 more. One would have thought that the emphasis would have been on retrenchment. With so many things to be done, and when we are emptying the bucket in order to get money for the Deep Water Harbour, we should retrench wherever we can; and especially in the matter of conferences, since the advantages to be derived from many of these conferences are very doubtful.

Since hearing the remarks used by the Premier today as regards our constitutional position, I am not surprised that he wants more money for conferences. Since we are this high and independent nation, one can well understand that the Premier and the Minister of the Navy and the other Minister will be attending the N.A.T.O. Conference, or that their Foreign Minister will be going to Bangkok for the Asiatic Conference, and that the Premier will be attending the U.N.O. as a statesman of the great Barbadian nation. Since we have such an improved national status nowadays, it is to be wondered that we are not asked to vote \$75,000 for Conferences; because at every international conference attended by the big powers Barbados will have to send its representative. Whereas there used to be the Big Four, there will now be the Big Five; Barbados making the fifth, and the \$18,000 more we are asked for this year will turn out to be insufficient.

To be serious, Mr. Chairman, can you think that it is reasonable to contemplate the expenditure of \$18,000 more on conferences in a single year? The conferences will be attended by Ministers and of course by their advisers. It seems to be that the Government could well cut down on the advisers. When a conference is to take place the delegates are provided with the Agenda and much of the documentary matter for discussion. It seems to me that the Government would be well advised to endeavour to obtain before the conference takes place, some of the advice to be given by the advisers so that we will not be saddled with the expenses of sending both delegates and advisers to every single conference. 5.55 p.m.

Sooner or later, if what we hear is true, the Ministers themselves will sit on the Cabinet without either the official element or the nominated advisers and therefore one is safe in assuming if one wants advice from this section of the community, they will get this advice, therefore I see no reason why the delegates to the Caribbean Conference or the West Indian Conference cannot acquaint themselves before hand with any special information they want from the special section of the community so that when they go off to these conference from Bangkok to Berlin they would know all that they want to know; and the most it would cost the country is the expenses of the delegate himself. I am saying that you should cut down on the advisers; you should get the advice before you go away. Do not let us spend \$1,000 in defraying the cost of delegates to conferences. We have no reason for assuming that this year the number of conferences will be so many and therefore the expenses must be so high. Why should there be this extra increase in the vote under this Head? It does appear as if the Government attaches undue importance to the sending of delegates and advisers to these conferences. If they are so important we are yet to see the advantage.

One further point and it is this: I should be the last person to decry or disparage the constitutional status reached by any particular Caribbean Colony, least of all Barbados. One should like to think that we are reaching the stage where we shall be as independent as possible within the shortest possible time, and it seems to me that it is a good thing that the honourable junior member for St. Peter and the honourable senior member for St. George drew attention to the precise paragraph in the despatch governing the new constitution now effected in Barbados. It is manifestly absurd for any Government leader in a colony such as this to get up in public especially at a time like this, and state if the Secretary of State for the Colonies say so and so on any given matter we intend to ignore it. Why it is true that we have

got to the spectacle of things where the Legislature is supposedly responsible, what we have to speak against in the very near future is people taking these things for granted, people who really do not know any better and acting openly and perhaps in such a way as to carry the colony to the position which British Guiana now finds itself. What is the point of the Hon. Premier saying that in a colony like this which is not completely self-governing, that the opinions of the Secretary of State for the Colonies may be ignored when the very despatch under which we are operating says that in any grave or exceptional matter, the Governor should have certain powers and the Governor still has the power to refuse to give assent to legislation, and when we know the Governor still has the power to dismiss a Minister and suspend a constitution. If you really want to put to the test how much power have we, let us attempt to do or say something which is contrary to Imperial policy. You will then see where we are.

Sir, all that the Hon. Premier said means this, and it is well that the public understands it: so long as I am Premier, I will do nothing contrary to Imperial policy. Do not run away with the idea that what he says is true that under the constitution you can flout British Imperialism, because if that is so, then you will see at once how much British you are. All of us know what can happen in any democracy at any given time. I say that with conditions as they are in Barbados, it is not completely outside of the realm of possibility that after the next general election two or three of us in here will be outside; because if the people of this country ever become infuriated as they have become in other colonies, then it is their duty to make a clean sweep; and when that is done somebody might come in here believing what the Premier said was true and attempt to put it into practice. That is why I say it is worthwhile and advantageous that we should have heard today honourable members viewing the position somewhat dispassionately and assessing the value of the constitution in the light of what it is really worth.

I repeat that there is no case for gratification or satisfaction, instead of retrenching on the vote for conferences every year and this year most of all, you are increasing it.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Mr. LEWIS: I beg to second that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER assumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave to lay a Message which has now come to my hand. It came too late to be laid at the regular time.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

MESSAGE LAID

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Message reads as follows:—

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR TO THE HONOURABLE THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly

that the Government of Barbados has been invited to nominate delegates at the Sixth Session of the West Indian Conference, which is to be held in Puerto Rico from the 4th to 13th May 1955, and also to submit the name of a candidate for the panel from which the British delegates at the West Indian Conference will elect, at a special meeting convened for the purpose, the two unofficial Commissioners on the British Section of the Caribbean Commission and their alternates for the next two year period of the Commission.

2. In view of the changed constitutional position of the Island since the last invitations were issued in 1952 it is considered that it would be appropriate for Executive Committee to make the nominations. Executive Committee has accordingly—

(1) nominated the Honourable C. E. Talma, Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries, as the delegate of Barbados at the Sixth Session of the West Indian Conference a copy of whose Agenda is attached for the information of the Honourable House. The Honourable C. E. Talma will be accompanied by the Deputy Director of Agriculture and the Deputy Director of Education as Advisers. The Honourable Premier, whose portfolio includes Education, will also be present in his capacity as one of the present unofficial members of the British Section of the Caribbean Commission;

(2) submitted the name of the Honourable Dr. H. G. H. Cummins, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., Minister of Social Services, for inclusion in the panel of names from which the unofficial Commissioners and alternates will be elected to serve on the British Section of the Caribbean Commission.

R. D. H. ARUNDELL.
Governor.

AGENDA

West Indian Conference (Sixth Session)

I. Approval of Agenda.

II. Organisation of Conference:

- (i) Conference Procedure.
- (ii) Election of Members of General Committee.
- (iii) Election of Members of Drafting Committee.
- (iv) Election of Members of Other Committees.

III. Report of the Secretary General on—

- (i) The Work of the Commission since the Fifth Session of the West Indian Conference; and
- (ii) Action taken by the Metropolitan Governments and the Governments of the Countries served by the Caribbean Commission on recommendations of previous Sessions of the Conference.

IV. Education Generally and in Relation to Economic and Community Development:

Adaptation of Education to the actual needs of the Area with particular reference to:

- (i) School programme for present day needs and teacher training.
- (ii) Community education and training of leaders.
- (iii) Administration and Finance.
- (iv) Research.

V. Small Scale Farming in Relation to Economic and Community Development:

- (i) Farm Management.
- (ii) Financing.

(iii) Processing and Marketing.

(iv) Land Problems.

(v) Research.

VI. Recommendations for Agenda of West Indian Conference (Seventh Session).

VIII. Other Business.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to ask leave to give notice of the following Resolution.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am going to ask the honourable member to put that matter before Mr. Speaker as I am only occupying the Chair for a particular reason. And again, Mr. Speaker has not communicated that matter to me.

Mr. CRAWFORD: As Your Honour pleases.

The question that the House do now adjourn for half an hour was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
5.10 p.m.

On re-assembling,

RESOLUTION RE G.A.T.T. REVIEW

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to give notice of a Resolution expressing the gratification of this House over the achievements of the R.E.C. Delegation on the G.A.A.T. review.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: The Resolution reads as follows:—

Resolved that this House place on record its deep appreciation of the significant achievements of the Regional Economic Committee's delegation at the G.A.T.T., review just concluded in Geneva, and further that an expression of its gratification be conveyed to the Chairman of the delegation, Hon. Albert Gomes, and the other members for their untiring and successful efforts in the cause of B.W.I. economic advancement.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Despite the consideration of Budget, it might serve a useful purpose apart from the fact that the normal conventions of courtesy demand that if anybody gives you anything you should say "Thanks" for it, it might serve a useful purpose if we spend 10 or 15 minutes later on this afternoon to pass this Resolution. I am therefore giving notice of my intention to ask for leave later in the afternoon to proceed with this Resolution.

ESTIMATES—Cont'd.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment, the House was in Committee on the Estimates 1955-56.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair, and the House resumed Committee on the Estimates, Mr. Smith being in the Chair.

Head XXIX—Cont'd.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the adjournment Head XXIX was under consideration.

Mr. GODDARD: There were some queries which we made of the Premier. We would like to know what stage the Public Utilities Board has reached; and I am asking for information in respect of Item 60, "Advice on Local Government." I understand that a Commission will be coming out to advise the Government on this matter, and I am wondering

if at this stage we can be given any further information on this matter.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: In answer to the last question asked by the hon. member I should like to say that we are trying to get down somebody from England who has experience in Local Government Administration, preferably a retired person for about six months or a year to advise us on the institution of Local Government. We are told that a person of the type we would like to get, earns in the vicinity of £4,000 and prerequisites per year. He would be a high-powered person and we would have to pay passages (probably for himself and his wife) travelling locally, Incidentals, Clerical Assistance etc., which will total \$16,356, say \$17,000. We are now in communication with the Colonial Office and we expect to hear definitely in a very short time whether a suitable person is obtainable.

As regards the matter of the Speightstown Assembly Hall, I have no figures as to the number of engagements and activities that have taken place at that Hall during the year, but I am advised that the usual activities, lectures etc., are being carried on. The matter is in the hands of a local committee; we are assured that the institution is working admirably and there is not that dissension which we had formerly.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: So far as the question of the Public Utilities Board is concerned, I think the hon. member for Christ Church will probably be aware that this Board has only recently been set up and it is now in its first stages of operation. There are certain preliminary functions which must be got through before this Board can function as quickly as all of us would like to see it functioning. Of one thing we can be certain, and it is that this Board is about to function; the Secretary of my Ministry has been performing the duties of Secretary but those duties are very onerous, and we are taking steps to appoint a Secretary to the Board. However, good progress is being made.

On the question of Bursaries I should like to say that the whole matter is being reviewed; and the House will soon know the policy of the Government as regards Apprentices. The whole idea is to bring the present position into line with more modern arrangements abroad.

In so far as the Nurses going abroad are concerned, we have the matter in mind especially since we visited the hospitals in the United Kingdom. The girls are well spoken of and they are happy in their work; they are liked by their Matrons. [cheers.]. We were praised for insisting on a high standard of education, because they found that these girls have passed the exams; but I can tell the hon. senior member for the City that we also discussed the matter of those girls whose qualifications were not as high as the previous selectees; and that matter is being gone into at the present time. We will lower the previous standards which have been set.

5.55 p.m.

In the near future we will learn more about the new standard and we will inform the House as well as the public as to what we intend to do about the whole matter. The Hon. member pleaded that we should help girls as far as passages are concerned who are selected outside Government's panel, if they go on their own. We met a girl who had gone on her own and was about to return. She had paid her own passage. If we assist by a loan, we have to consider that some girls may not stay in England when they reached there. So we have to consider what will be the position when we advance loans. It is a difficult question; but we have given the matter

sympathetic consideration and we will see whether we can expand our plans.

As far as the wider question of emigration is concerned, I will just tell the hon. member that I hope to lay very soon a statement on this matter as I told the hon. member; and I think he will agree that it will be better to discuss the various aspects of the question then.

The hon. junior member for St. Peter enquired the recommendations of Professor Richardson on Workmen's Compensation. The whole matter of Workmen's Compensation is being gone into; and that aspect of it, as well as other recommendations are receiving our attention. The hon. member will soon know what decisions we have arrived at.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am told that the hon. senior member for St. Lucy questioned about the appointment of the Queen's Solicitor. I think we all agreed on that. We did not advertise for it. It is, however, not a matter for the Ministry. I can only say that I know that certain considerations operated in the mind of the Head of the Administration and his constitutional advisers which it is impossible to make public, and that as a result of those considerations, we decided to make the present appointment. It is not a political matter, nor a matter of Government's policy, but in view of the fact that I knew that it might be questioned, I raised the matter with the Head of the Executive.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour with reference to the question of nurses going to the U.K., said that some girls had been admitted into hospitals because of the satisfaction of their educational attainments. I think he said that we have been praised on the high standard of educational qualifications of these girls. I think the Minister then added that they would attempt to consider the possibility of finding places for girls with lower educational qualifications. I am wondering, Sir, if in view of what he said at first, it does not occur to him and his Government that the correct solution would be to provide more educational facilities for bringing a greater number of girls up to the desired high standard, rather than bringing the qualifications down. The present high qualifications reflect credit on the country, and that is what we want.

I am not for a moment considering that we do not have to look after the people who have not got these high qualifications; but as a long term policy, it appears to me that we should bear in mind what will happen later on when our diminishing facilities for providing secondary education begin to manifest in results. In the first place we will have a smaller number of qualified girls later on, and we will also have a lower standard in those girls which will reflect little or no credit on the country from which they come.

Therefore, sir, it appears to me that there is everything to be gained by providing more facilities to enable to the maximum number of girls to get high qualifications; but that is exactly what the Government refuses to do. For entry into the local Civil Service the Government themselves require high standards to which the Minister referred; and yet they make absolutely no attempt to help people to attain those standards by providing more educational opportunities and facilities.

6.05 p.m.

Another West Indian Colony wanted some policemen and the attempt was made to recruit them from here. Do you know that the standard set for those recruits was the same as the standard for entry into the Civil Service? I think about 600

made applications and they comprised of boys from Harrison College, Combermere and the Lodge School. There were 30 places and the forty five selectees were all boys with secondary and First Grade education. If you are insisting on this high standard of education in governmental and semi-governmental posts both inside and outside of the island, one would think that the Government is mindful of its obligation that is to enable every boy or girl who wants to take advantage of it to get a secondary education. I rose to ask the Hon. Minister if from his experience in this matter of selecting nurses for the United Kingdom and the credit which he saves is reflected on the colony has inspired him to the conviction that every effort should be made to provide more chances for the greatest possible number of people to acquire these high educational standards.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Minister in attempting to reply to me said something about the difficulty of having girls other than those in the Government's quota and those who have a lower standard of education, because they might not come up to standard and would have to be sent back. Let me say that while you are lending people half of that money to go to the United Kingdom, you are demanding that the police and some person of substance sign a bond, so the question of your losing any money would never arise. There are more girls selected for hospitals in England outside of the Government's panel than are better selected by the Government. If you use your better judgment you should also assist them by lending them part of their passage money and giving them also a part.

The answer which the Hon. Minister gave me just now shows me that he has hardly given the matter careful consideration. He said something about a girl who was not one of those selected by the Government's panel who is likely to come back. There is nothing in the Agreement which says she cannot come back, if she comes back it simply means she would have to pay the bond. There is no logic in his argument for not helping these girls. However that is all I would say on that point now. It would be infinitely better to wait on the statement which the Hon. Minister promises to give to discuss the particular aspect of the matter.

Dealing with the specific case, I think it would be better if the Government were to revise its policy for lending money to the nurses or those persons who are selected for training. If you really want to help them and you are lending between 6 to 10 people a month who now go from the Government's panel, you should also help the other 20 people a month who are going otherwise; and it is brought home to you that this number is going otherwise. I can hardly believe that this has not been drawn to the notice of the Hon. Minister of Labour, because a delegation which was appealing for help for these girls met at the Labour Commissioner's office recently. Your Selection Committee has been insisting upon a very high standard of education from those people whom they selected, but the people in England themselves are not insisting upon that high standard of education and I have proof for that. They are saying while we appreciate the School Certificate in all the phases, what we definitely would like and would also accept, are those girls who reach the School Certificate standard; and believe me those girls are making a success. You should revise your policy. I do not think there is one member of this Chamber who can say that he has not been approached by people who are not

selected by the Government and who tell them that they can find half of the passage money but will like to help with the other half. You have dozens and dozens of girls leaving High School not acquiring the School Certificate that would be glad of the opportunity to go to England as Student Nurses. I know of two Englishwomen who have married Barbadians and this is what they told me. Of course your School Certificate girl would be very admirable, but from our experience in Barbados any of your girls who have been superannuated in the fourth form at any of your Secondary Schools are competent and capable of becoming proper nurses, and their passes in the examinations as compared with the Irish girls show their ability to absorb as much or more.

I will appeal to the Hon. Minister. While I congratulate you on the high standard that you are asking of your selectees, there are other girls who are superannuated and who have not the School Certificate but who are quite capable of becoming proper nurses. Give them a chance also.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I assure the honourable member, following our visit and our talk with the Matron, we are considering lowering the previous standards. Let me say that the Matron has congratulated us on the high standard of the girls we have sent; and the very fact that they have done so well in their exams and have adapted themselves and commended themselves to the Matron will prove an asset to the further success of this scheme. What the honourable member said just now is perfectly true. We are giving consideration to the lowering of the standard; but the honourable member must also bear in mind that if we send girls over there and they fail an examination it is more serious than if an English girl fails hers. I rose on a point of Order.

6.15 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I can see that the hon. member is really considering the matter, but it has been suggested that if they did so and so it may be the Government's duty to bring back these people. Let us debate the matter in this way; you tell us that you will revise the scheme; I said that it was the considered opinion that they are those in the panel who are doing every possible thing to hinder our girls from going abroad. If you make an enquiry into this matter you will find that there are those of us who will give evidence that they are trying to prohibit people from going out because of the questions which are asked. The three girls whom they have turned down have gone to England; they have passed the exams and they have been accepted. The Modern High School has accepted children who have been turned down in Government Schools. There is a system under which the Matron and Director of Medical Services are employing—You hear that they are insisting on people having School Certificates; I want to say this; many girls who hold School Certificates are totally unsuitable to be nurses. I say it has been brought to my notice what the Principal of the Modern High School is doing; many of these girls are drawn from the homes of carpenters, masons, and the like, and at the age of 18 or 19 years they reach a certain standard; they have not got any School Certificates, and more of these girls are being employed in England than those who have School Certificates. It is time that they should have revised this scheme. You read in the newspapers that these girls are going abroad; everyday they ask people to lend them money. It is not good enough to say "we will revise this scheme?" This has been going on for the last 8 or 9 months and anybody with sense can see that they are really not looking

into the matter although they may be discussing something. You cannot take any isolated case; it is reasonable that you change your policy in this matter. If it is represented to you by a person that she is going into this or that Hospital in England, I suggest to you that it is your duty to give consideration to that case in the same way as you give consideration to those girls who have been selected by the Labour Commissioner, the Director of Medical Services or anybody else. Some of these girls are asked embarrassing questions, and if you do not answer them they do not like the look on your face. I believe that you should investigate the case of the Matron actually telling one of these girls "Why don't you remain here and nurse your own people?" Let that statement be denied. The broad principle of emigration we can discuss. On Sunday a tremendous lot of girls are going up; one is a Sunday School Teacher and another has sold a house. Mr. Louis Lynch has said these are the facts: "I pledge that these girls went to the fifth form of my school." He is doing the country a service; he is a Barbadian and he will pledge to help his children; but a girl wants to borrow money and she is told that the Director of Medical Services or Mr. Pickwood or the Matron did not select her. Look at some of us in here; if we had to get School Certificates where would we be? You talk about Birth Control and Family Planning, but why don't you try and get these girls out of the island? You represent to the world that we have the highest illegitimacy rate in the world, throwing stones and forgetting that you have glass windows.

Do not forget that I am no extremist. I have sat on a Select Committee with the Premier when we were discussing the question of the post of Messenger of this House. What I am saying here I will say anywhere, because I am not one to say one thing in here and another thing outside. I told the Premier that I did not agree that the Government should pick up a sum of money and give it to everyone who wants to go to England; you should be prepared to help those who will go and uphold the name of Barbados. If such people are prepared to go, the Government, I say could find half of the passage money. A scheme could be worked out. People are willing to work and they will be willing to pay back. I appeal to the Minister of Labour to take this thing more seriously.

6.25 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The honourable member seems to be insinuating that I am not taking this matter seriously. After all I have told him already that we have helped girls who had School Certificates, and he got up and repeated that School Certificates have not put us here.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Minister is trying to draw a red herring across the trail. I did not say that you only helped girls who had School Certificates; I said you should help girls other than those selected by the Government's panel. Widen your scheme. You know as a fact that there is a scheme going on here in Barbados by which dozens of people are going to England, girls are going who have been selected by the Principal of the Modern High School; and the majority of those girls have no School Certificates. Are you going to say that the hospitals to which they are going are no good?

All I am saying is that from your panel may be 100 a year are going, and outside your panel may be 150 or 200 are going. Help those too; they are all going out of Barbados in search of work; do not catch at trifles. I know that it has been done since some of the criticisms that have been made here, although a good lady and some of these gentlemen

always say, "We do not care what anyone in the House says; we do as we like." I do not care what they say. As long as I am elected here I will talk as I like.

Revise your scheme and widen it. If a girl can represent to you that she has been accepted by a hospital and you check up and find that the facts are straight, say to your Labour Commissioner, "This case is not in our panel, but she is a child of a taxpayer. This is a case where you should lend half of the passage money."

I hope that before the Minister presents his statement on the general policy as to emigration to the U.K. the scheme will be widened in the manner that I have indicated.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I would like the Hon. Minister to tell us why there is now all this difficulty with the issuance of passports by the Police to people who want to go away. No British subject without a criminal record or certain physical disabilities should be refused a passport. I am sure that the Minister must know about the difficulty which now confronts people who try to get passports from the Police. What is the source of these new regulations against the issuance of passports? And why are these Regulations being enforced?

I am not blaming the Police Officers who work in the Passport Department because they are only carrying out instructions. I think that the Minister in charge of Police owes it to the House and to the public to say why these instructions have been issued and to give the authority of the instructions.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is—

Mr. CRAWFORD: I want an answer. [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I do not know anything about it.] The Minister says he knows nothing about it. The Police say they are acting on authority from outside; in other words, as a result of external pressure.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am speaking the absolute truth when I say I have not heard of it. What orders could there be to prevent people from getting passports? [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: He really does not know] You fill out a form, carry a photograph and you get a passport.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Every day people come to my office about it. People who want to go to England and America encounter the utmost difficulty in getting a passport at the Police Department.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I must interrupt the Honourable member. From the time that passports began all that you had to do was to fill in a form signed by certain people, carry it to the Police Department and pay—[Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: It is not so now.] If the honourable member will tell me what people are told by the Police I will enquire. I am prepared to phone the Police Commissioner as soon as possible.

6.35 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I want to make it perfectly clear. So far as I am concerned, the Police are not acting in an arbitrary manner. I go as far as to say that I have been told from people not unconnected with the Police, that these instructions come from the British Government themselves. I have been made to understand that the British Government has asked them to tighten up on these passports. The facts roughly are that they are giving these people who want to go to England the greatest difficulty to get passports, and it is a matter which needs investigation. If the people can get the money to go to England there is no earthly reason

why the Government should put any obstacle in the way of any person.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I mentioned this matter in this House while speaking on some supplementary Resolution. Of course I had to go to the Police about the matter and I did some correspondence with the Commissioner of Police on it. There is no doubt about it; the Police have refused to issue passports to applicants unless the person can produce evidence that he is able to pay a portion of the passage money. They will not issue a passport until that is done.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am sorry to interrupt the honourable member. I am going to tell them quite frankly that Police have to do this. There are some countries where unless you can show a return ticket you will not be allowed to go; but I cannot conceive that it is done to those persons who want to go to England. If that is so I will tell the Police to stop it; I consider it is the height of absurdity. There can be no regulation in Great Britain prohibiting any British subject from going there. You can go there even as a pauper or with infectious disease. Of course, if you go there so, you will have to report to the nearest doctor; but there is no prohibition. The only way you cannot get a passport to get there is if you cannot get anybody to sign your form. Somebody is using his imagination; it cannot be true. It may be true as regards Trinidad in certain categories of labourers and in Brazil. [A VOICE: What is that to do with passports according to the emigration regulations; if you are going to a job somebody has to sign the form?] I am saying it is wrong.

Mr. BRANCKER: It is not a question as to this not being done; it is a fact that it is being done. I have entered into correspondence with the Commissioner of Police and he attempted to justify it in his correspondence on the matter. What I have heard off the record from a policeman, is that they are doing it so as to discourage and make it as difficult as possible for people to get to the United Kingdom. They say that if a person wants to get to the United Kingdom before he can get a passport he must produce the ticket. They say if those people get a passport first, they may get the passport and then stowaway and arriving in England they would go to a manufacturing centre and then be permitted to organise there. That is what they tell me is the underlying reason for the prohibition. It is a fact that the average person cannot get a passport until they produce their ticket.

Now I am on my feet, I will make a comment in reply to what the Hon. Premier said just now; on my comments on Item 19. I did not quite hear all that he said owing to the acoustics, but my point is that nowadays you advertise when a magistracy is vacant or a Deputy Registrar, so I see no reason why you should not advertise for a Queen's Solicitor when the office is vacant. It would seem to be in keeping with the modern trend likewise to advertise the post for a Queen's Solicitor. I say that for the reason that people cannot understand why the four senior practitioners were overlooked and the fifth was appointed to that post; and it will be recalled that the immediate predecessor of the person appointed was also a member of the firm of Messrs. Cottle, Catford & Company, Mr. G. B. Evelyn. I am not suggesting it has anything to do with the Minister but it is a matter which is worthy of airing. The question of the fees for a Queen's Solicitor comes within the Estimates and the amount to be voted is \$1,300. I am saying that no Minister is to be blamed for it, but it is a matter which should be ventilated;

because it is causing a great deal of heartburning, and people cannot understand why certain people who have been passed over have been passed over. The appointment has naturally caused a reflection on the most senior and most capable and painstaking of the junior branch of the legal profession.

Mr. LEWIS: As far as that matter is concerned, I have always understood that a person should choose their own solicitor and lawyer so I do not expect that post to be advertised. However if you have a tradition even if you did not give it to the oldest solicitor, you should have offered it to him; you should not make more of Mr. A than Mr. B. However, I think the Queen should choose her own solicitor. It is just like if I wanted a lawyer; I would have to choose one whom I thought had a reputation to suit me.

I am raising a new point. Let us take Item 38 "Training Fund" the sum of \$65,000 is to be voted to that fund, and there is an asterisk which says that the sum is authorised by law. I should like somebody to tell me on what grounds is that fund authorised by law. The authorisation of the Act on which that fund is based is that any funds furnished from time to time must be paid into that fund. That is the process by which this money is taken out of the Treasury but the \$65,000 as we have here is not mentioned in there. This \$65,000 is not authorised by law at all. You need not give anything at all; the rate is not authorised by law. This is nonsense; there is an Act governing anything you provide for the purpose. You do not have to go to the Treasury with 10 or 15 vouchers.

6.45 p.m.

Hon G. H. ADAMS: I am sorry to interrupt the honourable member but I hope that Section 3 of the Act would satisfy the honourable member it says:—

"There shall be established a Training Scheme Fund (hereinafter referred to as the Fund) to which the Accountant General shall credit —

- (a) all balances of the moneys provided by the Legislature for the training of nurses in the United Kingdom and of Government Officers Unexpended on the 31st March, 1953;
- (b) all moneys which may be provided from time to time by the Legislature for payment into the Fund.

How can the honourable member say there is no provision?

Mr. LEWIS: That means that the Note is authorised by law but not the amount; the Note says that it is to be paid into the fund and there is no amount or rate. If you do not put one cent there it would mean that nothing would be paid into the fund. If you agree to pay ten cents a mile for travelling, that is authorised by law; it is not the amount that you pay, it is the rate which is fixed by law. There cannot be any authorisation for this amount. There is a method for dealing with this amount in a different way; the Act does not say that you should provide money every year; it says it may be provided from time to time.

The question that the sum of \$530,281 be voted under this Head was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XXX—Income Tax and Death Duties

Head XXX — Income Tax and Death Duties was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of \$217,750 be voted under this Head.

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

The question that the sum of \$217,750 be voted under this Head was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XXI—Labour

Head XXXI — Labour — was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of \$134,303 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: In connection with Item 16, "Trade Disputes" for some years now the amount provided under that Item has been \$240. The hon. senior member for St. Philip has made this matter the subject of an Address in this Chamber. Under the Trade Disputes (Arbitration and Enquiry) Act the Government contributes money and then forces one to accept the arbitrator or arbitrators which you can find in Barbados, because you cannot bring anybody from outside with \$240. The Government will have to review this amount here because there is this unfortunate practice that if the Government is required to bring in somebody from the United Kingdom or British Guiana, the subject of the dispute would be debated in this House because we will have to vote the additional amount. I am warning this Committee that you will get more disputed matters in trade circles because some of these pioneer industries and utility companies which the Government want to be protected are not playing the game fair, and they will have some very serious trade disputes in this island; and no Trade Union will accept the sort of water-wash arbitrators which have been put up here in this island in the last couple of years. This vote seems to be somewhat low; if hon. members are aware of what this matter means, I think the Government will be wise to make early provision for this sort of thing.

Sometime in 1944 the Government had to get somebody from Trinidad, (I think it was Professor Shepherd) to investigate this matter, and before you get a trade dispute with grave discontent, I think the Government will be well advised to look into that aspect of the matter.

As regards Item 18, "Emigration," so much has been spoken about emigration to the United Kingdom that I would like to hear something as to the expenditure of this \$100,000 which has been put down here. I see that the sum of \$99,000 was spent in 1953—54; let us know what this money which has been spent really reflect. I want to know if in truth and in fact we have spent \$99,000 and \$118,000 in the year before to emigrate people to the United States of America. There are a number of people who have gone to the United States of America and under the system under which they are going, I cannot see this Government spending \$100,000. It is nice to reflect the idea that you are emigrating people, but I would really like to know how this money is going to be spent. What are the employment prospects in the United States of America in the next period? Are they brighter than before? The Hon. Minister of Labour has been in Jamaica on his way back here; why did he not stop on his way up? I will like to know if they propose to find out if they will be able to get people to British Honduras and other places.

Under Item 20, "Furniture and Office Equipment," I do not know what office this item is in

connection with, but in the Labour Department there is not sufficient convenience for people attending there in respect of trade disputes and conciliations. There is one Conference Room, and when you are asked to go outside there is no kind of privacy where you can discuss your application. I think that better accommodation should be provided in this office. You have a lot of people who frequent the office and they are called upon to eavesdrop when you are discussing a matter. I hope the points I have raised will be remembered and answered.

6.55 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I do not want to trespass on the province of the Hon. Minister of Labour, but I quite agree with the honourable member. I quite agree with what he has said about the \$240 because it is advisable from my own experience to get people from outside in respect of these trade disputes. I could not have been in office when the Estimates Committee reached that part of the Estimates, otherwise I would have suggested that that amount be raised.

I say that because it is really my fault. The Hon. Minister was in England. I entirely agree with him for the reasons that he has given that the sum should be more than \$240.00.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking under Item 21, Unemployment Survey, \$4,000. I see that there is a decrease of \$1,000 this year. I would like to know if the need for this survey is less or if there is less unemployment. [MEMBERS: This is a revote] I would like to know if the \$1,000 was spent inside the island or outside.

In September last year I asked a question drawing the attention of the Government to the plight of those displaced factory workers and engineers from factories that discontinued operations last year. I am referring to Pool Factory, Spencers Factory etc. In my question, I asked about the possibility of instituting eight-hour shifts in factories so that some of these men could be used. Up to now I have not got an answer. The same old system is going on and these displaced people are out in the cold shifting for a livelihood. If this surveyor investigates that avenue, I feel that something could be done for those people. If it is too late for this crop perhaps it could be done for the coming crop.

I hold, Mr. Chairman, that with the grim spectacle of unemployment and over-population which we have in this island, attention should be paid to the possibilities of employment in every direction. I hope that the Hon. Minister responsible for this portfolio will investigate. I do not know how this survey is being carried out; but I think the person carrying it out could use a little more energy, because I can tell him that in the country districts, in spite of the fact that the crop is at its peak, they are many men and women who cannot find employment. I hope that he will be able to find a remedy.

The condition confronting us in this island is a serious one. I believe it is a lot more serious than the Hon. Minister understands.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, like the honourable member who has just spoken I myself am rather worried about the Unemployment Survey, but on rather different grounds from the honourable member. I take it that all honourable members agree that an unemployment survey in this island is necessary. I am wondering, however, if this survey is as wide and deep as it should be.

From my understanding of the problem, I would say that obviously the Minister should have at his disposal a variety of statistics and informa-

tion all kept up to date. Of course when he gets up to reply I hope that he will tell us what the equipment at his disposal is like; equipment for finding out to the last possible unit, if necessary, what the unemployment situation is like.

It is not enough to know for instance, Mr. Chairman, how many thousands in round figures are unemployed at the particular time; but a careful check should always be made of unemployment figures. I do not think that the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Labour could do its job properly unless it kept from time to time the proper statistics necessary in that respect.

The Government has set up certain organisations which do offer some help in this matter, but only from the point of view of registration. It does not always follow that the figures passing through the registration books are necessarily figures of unemployment. They may be people who just want to change their jobs.

The Government still seems to be unable to get a statistician. I hope, and this House hopes that the Government will soon get one. He is a most necessary officer in the administration of any government. When a statistician is appointed one hopes that things like an unemployment survey will not only be done, but will be done in such a way that the figures will be kept up-to-date almost from week to week.

Quite a lot has been said about emigration, and there was a point raised by the honourable junior member for St. Peter which I think has not been stressed enough. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, we have been treated to quite a long discourse on the problem of the nurses. I think that that matter has been almost exhaustively dealt with. What we have not heard so much about is the general emigration problem, especially emigration to the U.K.

I am a bit distressed that since the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour has returned from the U.K., we have not yet been treated to a statement. I am not suggesting that there will not be one; I am not even suggesting that when it does come to us it will not be comprehensive. But after all, we did send him away on urgent business. He was sent away on urgent business. It is true that we could do nothing about it, but he went with our goodwill, a vicarious goodwill given on behalf of the people.

7.05 p.m.

He did stay away for quite a long time and from the various things which we read in the Press, in his own paper, and with interviews he made led us to believe that he not only roamed over England but roamed over England with telling effect. I do not know Mr. Chairman, whether his colleagues agreed (even if he were speaking of the record) that he was laying down the policy of the Government. I would have thought the first thing he would have done was to come before the House with a personal statement, (I do not mean that he should give us an account of his own exploits personally) but of what relates to Ministerial matters. It is true that he has promised us a statement but that is not enough. You see, all of us who sit around this table have our constituents coming to us from time to time; that has been my experience. They all are asking us what is the Government doing about emigration. You yourself Mr. Chairman, must have had persons coming to you from time to time asking you this question; but luckily for you, you have a colleague who knows more of this matter than the rest of us. The rest of us are not in that honoured position and it is very embarrassing to us

not to be able to say anything to any of our constituents on this important matter.

While I am on this point, I wish to draw the attention of the Premier to something with respect to people who wish to go to the United Kingdom but who find it difficult not to get the passage money but with respect to getting a passport. I have had three of my constituents bringing that complaint to me. They have told me that the Police have refused to give them passports until they bought tickets. I have made it my business to investigate the matter to know whether it was a fact, and I have found out that it is a fact; and I have been told by two Police Officers (I would not mention their names in this House) that they received instructions from Government House on that matter and those instructions were passed on from the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Hon. Premier may of course say, as he has said, that he knows nothing of this, but if this House brings it to his attention he must ascertain whether the facts as laid before him are true. I know he would find that they are true. What is disquieting to me is to discover that in this island under this constitution and with the powers which the Hon. Premier has in respect of the police that he knows nothing of the matter. Whether it is a fact that the Police have received orders from the Head of the Administration or the Chief Secretary or some such person to carry out a certain line of policy which has been withheld from the elected Minister, I do not know. If that happens to be true, we will have to square that fact with the outline of the constitution as has been given us by the Hon. Premier; and we will have to come to the conclusion that in matters of this sort where the Secretary of State has the say, there is just one thing he can do and that is, he can prevent the people of Barbados from getting passports. Of course it does not reflect much credit on the Ministers of this Government to have a thing like that being brought to their notice on the floor of this House. I wonder where they have been all this time, because that question has been the burden of complaint of the people all this time. You have been discouraging them from getting a passport until they have secured a ticket, and I cannot understand how it is that nobody from the parish of St. Michael, St. Thomas, St. Joseph or Christ Church has seen either of those Ministers to let them know what is their complaint; it is a fact that in the other parishes people have laid that complaint to their representatives. It is very serious and it would need fuller explanation later.

It is a fact that the Police have been so acting, but they are defending themselves when a protest is made to them on that ground that they are acting on orders which have come through to them from the United Kingdom. If that is the case, this is at least one aspect of Government's policy which is not only hidden from the Hon. Premier and the other Ministers, but actually going on in this country despite the power and the equality which the Premier of this Government holds with the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom.

I will now turn the attention of this Committee to Item 16 "Trade Disputes" for which the sum of \$240 is to be voted. The Note states that it is to meet expenses in connection with the investigation of disputes under the Trade Disputes (Arbitration and Enquiry) Act, 1939. I have extracted from the Hon. Premier that this sum is at a low level. I want to draw his attention to something else. It may be Mr. Chairman, that the relatively small sum of \$240 was put in here because the present scope of

Trade Disputes Arbitration and Administration is rather small at the moment.

I have had complaints made even from my constituency about people who have had quarrels with their employers of a long standing nature, longer standing than even the length of my campaign; going back to last year and the year before, and they claim that those quarrels have not yet been settled. I know of one case in particular which it appears has been engaging the attention of the Labour Commissioner for about two years. From what I have gathered, it appears that there is not enough machinery or personnel to work on these matters and therefore people are constantly being held up before complaints can be heard properly and disposed of. It would be well therefore, in addition to increasing the vote, on some subsequent occasion to overhaul the whole machinery and make it possible for complaints and disputes of whatever nature they be to be dealt with properly and save people who live in the outlying districts coming to the Labour Commissioner unnecessarily, and more often than the state of their pocket and often the state of their health can afford.

Mr. BRYAN: Under Item 15, "Remuneration to Members of the Wages Council," the Note says that there is an increase due to the repeal and replacement of Wages Boards Act, 1943." Honourable members will recall that under the Wages Council Act, the minimum scale of wages set out is \$10 a week for a male assistant and \$7 a week for a female assistant. I want to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister of Labour the fact that in spite of this there are still employers to-day paying employees less than that minimum. I have come across several of these cases and I find that employees are very reluctant to take up the matter with the Labour Department because they are afraid of victimisation; they feel that the ultimate result will be dismissal and that they will be among the number swelling the ranks of the unemployed. I hope that some effort will be made to remedy this state of affairs, and I suggest an increase in the visits paid by the inspectors to business houses and more rigid examinations of salary scales be conducted in the interest of these unfortunate employees.

Mr. TUDOR: There was an additional point which I wanted to make in connection with emigration. You will recall that in the statement issued by the Government before the Hon. Minister of Labour left for the U.K., the following words were mentioned:—

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

That was telling us that the delegation was going for two specific reasons. So far as I remember, the Government did lay quite a lot of emphasis on the two things which the Hon. Minister was going to do. First of all it was stated that he would look into the practical issues with respect to emigration and when that had been done, other matters arising out of the Barbados case would be looked into. I am just asking the Hon. Minister that whenever he lays his statement to let us have a clear bit of information on each point. We want to know thoroughly what Barbadians whom he met and who went up without Government assistance are actually doing, and what is being done to settle them in work and look after their future welfare generally and let us know what prospects there are

for other Barbadians who want to go up this year or later on.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The honourable member who has just sat down does not live up to the reputation which he had before he came into this House. Mr. Turner despatch was like the preliminary haggling between two people who were selling a mule or anything in the real estate business, and eventually they agreed on something. At any rate this is what we agreed to eventually. Mr. Turner suggested four Ministers and a Minister without portfolio and we did not agree with that. We set out that "the Principal Minister should have special responsibility for those non-operational aspects of Police Administration, which under the Police Act 1908, are the concern of the Governor-in-Executive Committee." The Governor-in-Executive Committee has to approve the Traffic Regulations; we discussed all these things under the Police Act at the Colonial Office. In connection with the Police the Governor-in-Executive Committee has to do certain things; when it comes to immigration matters the Chief of Police is the Chief Immigration Officer; he and the Governor are responsible for, (I regret to say,) the exclusion of people and so on. The House will remember how long it was before we came in with an amendment to the Immigration Act which gave the local Immigration Authorities the sort of general right in respect of economic grounds; that is why I say I regret. The honourable senior member for St. Thomas suggested the passing of an Address relative to the matter of Immigration in respect of Trinidad, and I asked him not to press that Address because I was soon going up to London and we would discuss the matter there.
7.25 p.m.

I made it very clear at the Colonial Office that we felt very strongly about emigration matters, and we also felt that we were not going to put up with what was done in other parts of the Empire: the idea that you bring Asiatic officers from Palestine and make them Commissioners and natives must not have anything to do with the Police.

Our point of view was that the Police should be kept free from political influence. I need not call names, but there have been instances in the Caribbean area where the Police have taken sides in political rows. I have been told by people that in one Caribbean territory if Mr. A's followers clash with Mr. B's followers, all of Mr. B's followers go into jail while the Police would have not seen Mr. A's followers do anything.

Hon. members have drawn to my attention that the Police are supposed to have orders about this question of passports. I must point out what are my functions as regards the Police. My functions are, "The Principal Minister should have special responsibility for those non-operational aspects of Police Administration, which under the Police Act, 1908, are the concern of the Governor-in-Executive Committee."

I find it difficult to believe that what hon. members have been told about this matter is true; I do not see how it can be so. I am not saying that the honourable members may not have been told that the Police have orders from Great Britain, but I find it difficult to believe that that could be so; because if it is so it would be a profound secret. For the British Government to say something for the public of Barbados to know that they are indirectly stopping coloured immigrants from coming to the U.K., would be inconceivably stupid. Even if it is conceivable that the U.K. Government in a secret despatch could have said, "Do not encourage those people," I cannot

conceive that that would be passed on to the Police to be told to the public. All of us would get up and protest; and every Labour member of the House of Commons would do the same.

Now that I have heard it, I will speak out as loudly as anyone else that all that has got to stop. Of course we realise that we must act unitedly and firmly in the Caribbean area. This is by the way, sir; but if we are going to Trinidad to discuss freedom of movement we will have to have freedom of movement into Barbados too.

The only point I wish to make is that if what the hon. member says is true, (I do not mean that what he is saying is not true) but if someone has been saying what he says is being said, I will make it my business early the morning after tomorrow to go to Government House and say clearly and plainly that if the Police are doing that it must stop. But I repeat, that it is not within my portfolio.

We have to get rid of our people; we have to do all that we can to help them to go to the U.K. The honourable senior member for the City sat down with me when we were interviewing people who had applied for the post of Messenger of the House. We asked all of them if they were willing to go to England in case they did not get the job; only one of them said no. We both reminded them that the Government could not give or loan them all the money necessary, and we asked them how much they could put up. We made it clear that both the Government and the Opposition were willing to help people go to England.

That, sir, is still my attitude; and it must be the attitude of every single Barbadian who wants to find work for our people. I again assure hon. members that if this thing about the passports is really happening, it is something surreptitious and should be stopped. It is my duty if something is going wrong and it is brought to my attention especially during an Estimates Debate to bring it to the attention of the Head of the Administration and suggest to him that he should exercise his discretion.

Mr. ALLDER: The attitude of the Premier on this matter of emigration has changed.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I have said in this House, and I repeat that it is not every Tom, Dick and Harry that applies for help that the Government can help. If a man who has been 20 years a drunkard comes along and asks for money to go to the U.K. should we lend him? Or a man who has been in Glendairy off and on for 20 years and has never done a stroke of work?

Mr. ALLDER: The honourable member is saying today that the Government will lend money to people who deserves help. The hon. member did not say that when the question was first raised; but I appreciate it very much.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am waiting to hear the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour tell the House something about what has happened since he went to England, and about the Government's policy of assisting people to get there. The honourable senior member for St. John has been mild, very mild; because the hon. senior member for St. Joseph got up here today and tried to give the impression that he was in favour of sending people to England. He was hostile to the idea. In St. Lucy during the election campaign he said that no one wanted to go to England in the cold weather, and the remarks of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas as well as the remarks of the hon senior member for St. Joseph are all there in the official record to be quoted if anyone wants to quote them.

7.35 p.m.

We had to go to Queen's Park and agitate the people of this island to force the Government into action, else the Minister would not have gone anywhere at all. Talking about Government House, as far as we are concerned, you would have thought that we were asking him to put his hands into his pockets to get people to go away. Now, bowing to the force of public opinion, they are sounding a new tune as if that were their original tune. We told them that they would have to change their tune and we have lived to see them do so.

The Hon. Minister said something in his attempt to explain why they were not lending every Tom, Dick and Harry money to go away to England. It will be remembered that he said that the British Government and everybody know that we need every single cent for the Deep Water Harbour, therefore, how can you expect us to get money to lend those people who want to go away to England. We are anxiously awaiting to see what scheme would come before the Legislature to help people to go away to England. The Hon. Minister of Trade has been back here for some time now. He has spent over a month in England and certainly by now some proper scheme should be put before the public in respect of this matter. We read where a thousand people are leaving Jamaica to go to England this week. Everyone is waiting to see what the Barbados Government is going to do. Since they have had to change their opinion about the matter and to make some sort of gesture, we will wait and see how far it will go.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Premier has expressed a view which we can hardly believe. Rather than let it appear as if the honourable senior member for St. Lucy is singing a solo, I too would let the Hon. Premier know that the matter was also brought to my notice. I appreciate that it is not his duty to give orders to the Police and that he is going to the Governor about it. Let me tell him that it is an absolute fact that the Police were telling people who want to go to England that if they want a form they must show that they actually paid a deposit on their ticket for the passage. I say a form because you cannot get a passport until you actually get a form. A form is not the passport. You must apply to the Emigration Office for a form which you have to take to a Justice of the Peace or a clergyman to get filled out.

As I have said a few weeks ago, the Police have instituted a new idea by charging a dollar for a certificate of character; I think that is a hard thing to do. You must get this certificate of character before you can go away.

With respect to the Police not giving you a form until you have shown that you actually paid a deposit on your passage to England, I have not actually heard anyone saying that the instruction came from England; but I am wise enough to observe that they are certain people in this country who are doing everything possible to dissuade people from going to England; therefore, I have every reason to believe that those instructions have trickled down the line from somebody at the top. I would say that I do not believe that any member of the Government has anything to do with it; but I am sure all of us are conscious enough to appreciate that the Police themselves would not be so stupid as to refuse to give a form to any one who asked for it unless they had got that instruction.

Sir, I am saying that any member of this House would suffer the same fate. By what stretch of the imagination can you say that it is fair to give a form for a passport on those conditions. Because a section of coloured people is going to England that

is done as a means of stopping them. I do not believe that the Commissioner of Police has done it; he would be stupid if he told the Police not to do it because those were the instructions he got from England. However, I have no doubt that these instructions which were given to the ordinary policemen came from a way up the line. I doubt that they came from the Secretary of State for the Colonies; but you have some bourbons here who come from England who would do anything like that. I am taking what the Hon. Premier said very seriously and I am counselling him that it is his solemn duty now that he has heard it to investigate it.

I am saying that it is your duty to give anybody a form if the person makes representation that he wants to go to England. When he comes back with the form and you see by the form that he is not a suitable person, or that he has a criminal record, it is a matter for the Government to withhold the application for a form. Let the Government decide whether the applicant is a fit person for a passport. The Hon. Premier has given us an undertaking. My office is next door to the Central Police Station and I am the first person in this House to be found by those people when they run in and out of the Emigration Office. I will know what is going on. I hope when the Hon. Premier comes back in here, he will make a statement about it.

7.45 p.m.

That alone will not prevent them from going; the thing which prevents people from going is that the Government's interest at the moment is not sufficient actually to set the ball rolling by using the Youth Employment Officer. I have already suggested that to the Premier. I see that in your Estimates you have the Youth Employment Officer and his emoluments have been increased. This young man has connection with a Sunday School, the Boy's Scouts and the like, and I suggest that he should be set up in a Department and let him present the Government with a few thousand people and get things going. The way to hell is paved with good intentions; and that is the way with the Government. They will wait until all the work in England is finished and they would have done nothing. This matter is of such prime importance to the Government that a statement of policy should have been made already. I do not believe that the Hon. Minister would not try to hold his seat; he knows that it would be difficult to hold his seat and be opposed to emigration. I say that if the Hon. Minister of Trade has any ideas, he would not wait until he came back here and ask the Premier "Please, Sir, may I do this or that?" I believe that the Hon. Premier is bound to support a scheme for emigration. While the people are suffering you are planning a scheme, and I suggest that you should use the Youth Employment Officer in this matter. We have the Hon. Minister going to England and coming back here and saying nothing; but you see in the *Beacon* and in the *Advocate* that there is work for people in England. We pay the passage for you to go to England and you come back here and tell us what we already know. What we want is action. While the Hon. Minister is waiting to bring forward his statement I repeat, let them use the Youth Employment Officer. If the Conservative Party were in power do you know what hon. members on that side would say? They would say this: "The reason why they do not want to do this is because they want to get cheap labour in this country." You send away a Minister and he is bankrupt of ideas because I could put up better any scheme which he is putting up; you have agreed with us, but it is not

a practical suggestion to take up money and take whomsoever will and send out.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but there is a difference between whomsoever will and Tom, Dick and Harry.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am not a lawyer, but I am as good a politician as you are. You say Tom, Dick and Harry and I say whomsoever will.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let the hon. member address the Chair.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: If you hammer things often at them they will get a change of heart. I wish the Hon. Premier would be a little more serious on this question of emigration; he would have to agree with me that since the Hon. Minister of Labour came back here he should have said what the policy of emigration is. By now he could have sent out a thousand people. Let the Hon. Minister laugh; when some people bellies are full they do not remember anybody else.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When you are addressing the Chair you are looking all over the Gallery.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: It is not always a happy thing to look at people's faces; I am taking a leaf out of your book. Sometimes you are addressing the Chair and you are looking at the Gallery. However, I do not think the difficulties are insurmountable.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member. A whisper in the ear of a person who matters is infinitely more important than making a long speech in the House.

7.55 p. m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I quite agree with the Hon. Premier; but with some people you have to use a sledge hammer. This is the last point I am making: nobody is asking you to find any work or houses for them. What happens in England today has happened in America immediately after the last war. Of course you have housing conditions to such an extent that when some people went to work in the day other people occupied the houses. However, if you set up a scheme of emigration, you will find that they are a lot of people who will be willing to go on that scheme.

Even with these bad conditions in England, the conditions are still better than some of those which people from say, Bull's Alley exist. When you find five and ten people living in a room in England it is compensated for by the fact that they are getting work. A man will be contented to put up with certain conditions as long as he can work for a dollar and save too. I have never been to England yet, but I know what it is to live in a northern country; and I know that the conditions are better than some of those under which unemployed people are living here.

We are asking the Government to formulate a plan. Some people can write good English and put it on paper; but ask them to formulate a plan and their general standard of intelligence is so low that they cannot do it. Ask them to do that and they are in the backwoods. These people are suffering.

Mr. LEWIS: I certainly agree that a certain amount of planning is necessary to get a scheme like this started. I would say that if the Government at this stage say they cannot assist everyone, they could certainly assist those who have proved that they are going for training. Because one or two might return before they are trained does not mean that you should refuse to send people. You have a scheme by which you send people to the U.S.A. If some of the people whom you send to the U.S.A. come back the next day you would lose money; but

that does not mean that you will discontinue that scheme.

This can be made part and parcel of the Government's training scheme. I believe you should give half of the passage money free and advance the other half to be repaid from the results of the training. It has become very difficult for those people to raise the money. I have heard that on some of the boats the passage will not mean more than \$300.00. If you discover that even with a lower educational standard some of the girls can still get into hospitals, give them half of the passage money and lend them the other half. You will be combining a form of emigration with your training scheme. I know there will be certain difficulties, but a certain amount of investigation will assist.

I would like to support the honourable junior member for St. Peter in his asking the Government to increase the amount of \$240.00 to which he referred. He knows that I have been a victim of what he has asked the House to provide against. If you have this money in the Estimates you can use it. The money was in the Estimates and someone forgot it was there and brought down a Resolution. The result was that some honourable members, at least one I know, took the opportunity to say things in here, and I could not stay in the Chamber and say a word for myself on it although it was not money that was going into my pocket. Members of the Other Place took opportunity to say things of which they should be ashamed.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, there is an aspect of this matter which is very disquieting. When I looked across a few moments ago and saw the complacent smiles on the faces of the Ministers, I got the impression that they were trying to take credit for the emigration policy of this island. I would like to say that if credit is due to anyone at all for making emigration a burning question in this island, it is certainly not due to them.

I cannot of course speak of the individual attitudes of the various Ministers towards it. The Premier's pronouncement on it as far as emigration to England is concerned was made before I entered this Chamber. I cannot recall having heard any of them speak about it during the recent by-election campaign in St. Lucy, although I was told that they were hostile to the idea. I can, however, speak of my knowledge of the Ministers' attitude when two other honourable members of this House and a gentleman who is not a member of this House sought and obtained an interview with the Head of the Administration.

8.05 p.m.

I wish to state here and now that on that occasion when we went to Government House, the Minister whether speaking for himself or reflecting the policy of the Government of which he is a member, was definitely hostile to the question. I go further by saying that it should be put on record that all the information such as it was when we attended on that occasion came from His Excellency the Governor himself. [A VOICE: But not from you.] Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to answer the Minister of Communications because I do not recognise his right to sit in the office which he holds. I will say that it is on record and was indelibly impressed on all of us who took part in that delegation, that judging from the attitude of the Minister of Labour in this Chamber that the Government was hostile to the matter.

The Hon. Premier a moment ago, in answering a point I put to him about the Police said something about disappointment in my reputation. It is a

reputation which he has completely misconstrued with such effectiveness that it has landed me in this House.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The hon. member must not misquote me. I never said anything about disappointment.

Mr. TUDOR: When I put the point to him, which I think was something brought to his attention by other honourable members, instead of answering me directly or giving the House some assurance, he persisted not only to belittle our efforts on the issue but to attack my reputation as if that was the issue in this debate. I say that this Government should not be allowed to take any credit for this matter. They were pressed to do what they did by members of the Opposition on the floor of this House and by the appeal of public opinion over their heads, and it was only after that appeal was so successful that they felt something should be done.

Sir, speaking for myself, judging the attitude of the Government and the Hon. Minister of Trade on the occasion that I did discuss the matter with the Governor, the Government's attitude was hostile towards a delegation going to the United Kingdom; and all the information on the matter was given not by the Minister of Trade, but by His Excellency the Governor himself. I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, that if you had been there you would have got the impression that what you were asking the Minister of Trade to do was not to help some unfortunate unemployed people to get to England, but that you were asking him to take boarders into his house to render him uncomfortable owing to the resentment he showed and his not answering questions. We should not allow them to claim any credit which they do not deserve.

Sir, you must have read in the Press only yesterday or this morning that the Principal of the Modern High School has been told in a cablegram that there is the possibility that men from here can be trained as hotel workers in the Midlands of England. That is, of course, if they go to England. We are glad to hear of it, but why it should have taken us all this time to learn that. The Hon. Minister of Trade has been to the Midlands; he made an exhaustive tour; he has completely explored every possibility of emigration, or so we would imagine; would it not be better if that information were given to the people by him? That is the sort of information we sent him to discover. Or, are we going to wait and in the course of every week or every other hear in reply to a response by some private person that some new facilities are made available to our people when such information should have been given us through the Hon. Minister of Trade, particularly if it is welcomed information.

Sir, no matter what they say about us, we want Government to show an awareness in the matter even if it is a matter of taking credit for themselves. I personally feel when we get people out in numbers sufficient, it will not greatly matter which side of the House takes the credit; but until we have succeeded in relieving unemployment, the Minister must not be allowed to take the credit.

One other matter I have in mind and which I want to make very clear not only to the Hon. Premier but to all of the Ministers over on the other side. In this House, I shall make contributions to the debates as and when I feel like; and I say without boasting, at any time they wish to engage me in any battle of words they may do so. I do not think they will find me an underling to be arguing with them especially on matters where I find that they are making the point other than the one I am arguing. I also say to them

that no amount of abuse or invective or sneering can deter me. It will surprise hon. members to know that only today as I passed around that side of the House by the Ministers, that it pleased the Minister of Communications to call me a nasty little fellow and that I want a licking! [Laughter] [VOICES: Shame! Shame!]

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I am completely unaware of what the hon. member said.
8.15 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: He said it; he does not deny it; he is only saying that he is unaware of it.

On an important matter like this where the fortunes and welfare of large families are concerned you get this vulgar attitude adopted on the part of members of the Government.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: A politician cannot be so hyper-sensitive; I said that I thought he would bring his ability here to help us, but he does not help us. The Governor was advised as to the constitutional point of view; he must not see people without his Ministers, which he readily knows. He would see things as quickly as we would see them; it cannot be true that the Governor took one view and the Minister took another.

Mr. TUDOR: I never said that. I said that they were certain concessions made with respect to the sending of a delegation, but in answering other questions the problems were met by His Excellency and not by the Minister.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I withdraw that. I only want to make the point that the Governor would not have given an impression which was not the impression of a Minister; I know that the Governor was advised. As regards the spending of money, the Estimates are there; but we had very strong views that we were not going to agree to sending any Parliamentary delegation to England.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The Governor is completely in favour of sending people to England; the Ministers are also in favour of that; we are discussing the Estimates for this year and the sum of \$100,000 is included for emigration; could you think of a more appropriate time for the Government to go to the country and say what they are going to do? The Hon. Minister of Labour went away and has come back a fortnight; as a matter of fact his duty was at the opening of the Budget to get up and say what the Government's policy is with regard to emigration; but he is there looking like a Cheshire cat which has stolen cheese, smiling with that innocuous look which springs from having nothing to say. He is running up and down doing nothing. Mr. Louis Lynch has not gone anywhere and he can tell you that he has made places for work in the Midlands; and what have we wasted our money for? To tell people that up to the tenth day of March we are still waiting for a policy? The Hon. Minister of Labour came back here and since then he should have had some cut and dried policy as to what they are doing. What did he go to Jamaica for? To have a couple of whiskeys with Mr. Manley? The Hon. Minister of Labour has been back here a fortnight and apart from running around Bridgetown, he must be able to appreciate what they were planning to do and to tell the public what they were doing in this matter of emigration. But all they can do is what they are doing now—sitting down and grinning! [Laughter] I personally and confidently thought that during the consideration of the Estimate we would have been told by the Government what is their programme with regard to this matter of emigration.
8.25 p.m.

As a matter of fact, those of us who are interested in the necessity of quick action in this matter waited patiently, because we expected that the time of the discussion of the Budget would be the time when some explanation would be made to the country. If the matter had not been raised by the Opposition tonight, we would not have heard one word about emigration to the U.K., nor one word from the Government's Bench about what the Government intended to do about it, because they had no intention of saying anything about their present or future intentions unless driven to it by the Opposition and the public outside.

The honourable senior member for the City said earlier that more young women were going to England as a result of the initiative of a private individual to be trained as nurses, than are being sent through the Government's channel. For three years the Minister of Trade and Labour of Trinidad has been running backwards and forwards to England, and it is almost impossible to enumerate the advantages that Trinidad has derived—new industries and new avenues of practical employment. You can see what Trinidad is spending money on; but when you send our Minister of Trade and Labour to England or anywhere else it is a waste of money. He can go fifteen times and we will not see any other industry as a result of his initiative, because he has none to display. Do you think you will ever get an industry brought here as a result of his going to England? That applies to the entire Government. The Premier has been to England more often than any other Minister in the British Caribbean and the island benefits not one single iota. It would therefore be more than passing strange if he had anyone in his team who would be different.

When you read what the occasional trips of other Ministers mean to these other colonies, you are sorry you cannot erect a barbed wire enclosure and keep our Ministers in it; because whether they go outside or not it means absolutely nothing to the country. Every time that the Trinidad Minister of Trade goes to England and comes back you hear that some new industrial venture, some new enterprise, some new company has been invited to go to Trinidad and start a new industry there. All that we get from the Minister of Trade here is a grin showing all of his teeth! Not even on the specific matter on which he has just gone away and come back can he say after two weeks what the Government or what he intends to do.

Not a single one of them had any intention of saying a word about this thing tonight. We are paying that Minister a good salary to be a Minister, and he should have come here with a proper plan to put before the country. He did not go alone; he went with the Labour Commissioner; do you mean that the two of them together could not do anything? He should have come back here with a list of the firms likely to need Barbadian workers; with a list of the concerns in which men and women are likely to get work. He is not expected to spend his time jolly riding. All that you get is a grin and you cannot understand what he is saying.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question—

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: No, Sir. You must give the Minister a chance to reply.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: If the honourable members opposite would stop neighing like horses or like something—

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: What did the Minister say? If he is saying something about neighing like a horse I would like to tell him that that is better than braying like an ass! At least you have got

horse sense. It is our duty to make you answer. If you do not answer it is your business.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member will please address the Chair.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I refuse to sink to the level of the honourable members. As far as the honourable senior member for St. Philip is concerned, I always ignore him when it comes to serious matters of this kind. He cannot help making mis-statements. I remember that on this question he accused me in his newspaper and in this House of hindering emigration to the U.S.A. through making a remark to American employers about comparative wages gained by our workers in the Sugar Industry here. I challenged him to say where and when, and he called the names of two or three honourable members whom he said had heard this story along with him. He said they were present with him. I asked those honourable members about it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is this something that happened today?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: It is quite relevant to what we are discussing; but it did not happen today. I will soon finish.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will not entertain it. Reply to what the honourable member has said today.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of Order. The Minister has said that I said that two honourable members could substantiate me. The honourable senior member for the City—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister did not call any names and I do not want to hear any. The hon. member will take his seat.
8.35 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The hon. member is incapable of speaking the truth in matters of this sort; I will not refer to him any more. As regards the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, he spoke rather reasonably at first and asked questions; but the second time he followed the hon. senior member for the City and indulged in a mere rhetorical display. He said that I had an exhaustive tour. I must have done some good because I showed up that we would not solve our unemployment problem here by ourselves.

I just would like to correct a little wrong impression which he may have given. It is this: not all the emigrants in England were unemployed when they left here; many of them including Jamaicans were previously employed in their country. Some of them actually gave up their jobs and went to England. I can give an example. One day I happened to visit the Welfare Department to which emigrants go to receive advice and I met there the last batch of emigrants who came from the West Indies. I met two who were Barbadians and in an interview with them I asked them if they were unemployed when they left here. One of them said he was a carpenter and the other said he was employed in the business of the father of the same hon. junior member for St. Lucy. Apparently, that fellow was not paid sufficient to keep him and he had to emigrate to England. Those are the facts. [A VOICE: How many people the Hon. Minister employs] Mr. Chairman, the hon. member should not get there making personal remarks. [A VOICE: Who is more personal than you? You are a Minister and you are paying a servant \$8 a month]. I hope the hon. member will soon correct that state of affairs so as to keep his employees here. One would have realised that this subject was such a serious one that Government could not afford to come down here with any hotch-potch scheme to put before the House. I have never heard such stupidities as that which comes from the other side of the House; especially

from the hon. senior member for the City, particularly in the matter where he thought that we could just pick up money to give or lend to those people.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, have you heard me saying anything like that? The hon. member is suffering from insanity. That goes to show how we wasted the money of the people of this country by sending him to England.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. senior member for the City to take his seat. He is out of order.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Is that all the criticism he can offer? Cannot he offer something proper? I particularly said that I did not agree with that policy of the Government giving money to the people to go to England.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Sir, let us see what he said. The hon. member said: do not come back and tell us you cannot lend them this or that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I never said any such thing.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Tell us what you said.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I said I did not agree with that policy of giving the people money to go to England. The Hon. Minister knows that I did not say what he is saying.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The hon. member got up and made this statement; because it is emigration, he got on this horse and rode it. He said: "Members of this Government, they have no purpose."

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Get on with giving your reply.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Sir, I was in Jamaica a short time before my return and I discussed the matter with the Chief Minister. One other member from the other side of this House said that thousands of Jamaicans are leaving for England. Yes, many Jamaicans are leaving for England but the Government of Jamaica is not lending them any money. Mr. Manley has emphasised, even during the election campaign, that he hoped they did not think that the Government of Jamaica was going to pick up the money of the taxpayers and lend people to go to England.

Sir, one of the objects of our mission to England was to investigate the possibility of setting up an organisation to deal with this thing. The first thing which you have to do is to strengthen the organisation in Great Britain so that it would be able to deal with this thing efficiently. In reply to the hon. junior member for St. Peter, I said that was one of the objects of my visit to England. It is very obvious if you lend people money as the hon. member advocated, that you must have some organisation where those persons can go and pay it back. What is more important is that in order not to aggravate the housing problem in Great Britain it is necessary to have this organisation.

A VOICE: We are paying this Minister \$600 a month and he is telling us not to aggravate the housing problem in England. You ought to be ashamed.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I am not saying so with any sympathy for the British Government; I am thinking of the emigrants themselves. I am not thinking of the British Minister of Housing; but in order that the emigrants themselves can be guided to areas where accommodation is available, you must have a proper organisation in England to deal with the matter. I am glad that the honourable senior member for St. Philip said that we should concern ourselves with the matter. I may say that that was the object of my going to Jamaica. It was my be-

lief that it was far better to have a West Indian organisation rather than to have the Jamaicans running an organisation and Barbados having another one for emigrants, which can be very expensive acting on its own; so we are making use of the existing facilities and will expand on them.

Mr. Chairman, I appealed to honourable members earlier not to debate this matter tonight because we are going to have a full-fledged debate on it soon; but it is obvious why honourable members want to force two debates on this question. I pointed out to honourable members that my statement on emigration would be made at an early date. Does the honourable junior member for St. Lucy want to convince people that he really thinks of the emigrants and that he really wants to help Barbadians more than anybody else? Can you want more propaganda than what happened at Government House? He said I was hostile to sending any delegation. I was hostile to sending a Parliamentary delegation; that was what they said they wanted. Could any reasonable member of this House imagine that this Government could afford to offer such concessions as what the honourable member said we should offer? Could the Government venture to state a policy before it found out something for itself? When that delegation went to Government House, His Excellency the Governor gave the bare facts. He said that everything that they were asking for was done.

He said that the proposal to send a delegation was already considered. How can you make loans without any consideration by the British Government?

How can we make loans without taking into account the position in the United Kingdom? This question is a big question in the United Kingdom; it concerns the Trade Union position and the position in the community; and there is much pressure in the community itself. I am going to lay a statement on this matter in the near future and hon. members will have the opportunity of debating it then. If hon. members cannot wait they can debate it to-night.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I do not think I heard all that the hon. member said. I have—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not entertaining any more of this. I am asking the Hon. Premier to let me report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Very well, Mr. Chairman, I will make that motion.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: You are asking me to take my seat, but you are going to hear the Hon. Minister of Communications.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I take it that the hon. member is going to make the motion for reporting progress.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I can make that motion. I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to.

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

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: 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 question was put and agreed to and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House for three quarters of an hour.
8.55 p.m.

ESTIMATES CONTINUED

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment the House was in Committee on the Estimates for 1955-56.

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

Head XXIX Continued

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

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If the hon. member will give way to me, I should just like to say that only a few minutes ago my copy of the Report in connection with emigration reached me; that Report has only been circulated to-day. The Executive Committee is meeting on Saturday morning; this Report has 27 pages in connection with the mission to England and as I said, I have only had it in my possession a few minutes ago. I did not know about this Report until the dinner hour. In addition to the 27 pages there are 9 appendices. Inasmuch as the Executive Committee is meeting on Saturday morning and I have to go to Trinidad on Sunday morning, I have suggested that the Executive deal with the Report on Saturday morning, and the House can deal with it later on. If I had gone to my office and had seen this Report, I would have said what I have just said earlier. I would be completely at sea not having read a line of the Report to say anything about it; however, it has been signed by the Hon. Minister of Labour and the Labour Commissioner, and the appendices have the number of places which have been visited, the number of people etc. I will naturally spend sometime on it and see that it is discussed by the Executive Committee on Saturday morning. In view of that aspect of the question, no useful purpose will be served by urging this matter.
9.45 p.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The hon. member was associating me with other hon. members. I asked three questions of which the Hon. Premier has answered one, but the other two have not been answered. I am not dealing with the individual field which the hon. member anticipated; I am not optimistic as to what the Report will reveal. I know what it will reveal; it has 9 pages of appendices and you will have another document like that on the series of meetings and so on, and you will not have one paragraph of any importance on the question of emigration. We will have to wait until the Premier comes back to discuss this matter, because you find that an answer has been given out about emigration other than by the Hon. Minister of Labour.

What I am dealing with now is not the U.K. so much but how you propose to spend this \$100,000. The other point I made was that at the Labour Office there is not enough accommodation for people who go there in connection with matters of dispute.

Now I will say, (I do not think that anyone has mentioned it yet) I do not know what progress the Committee is making which is going into the question of domestic servants. It may be a very worthwhile thing it is true. However the hon. senior member for St. Andrew is Chairman and we are looking forward to the Report of that Committee very much.

I did not hear the Minister reply to the question on Item No. 20. The Premier need not be worried about his U.N. Mission. After these Estimates we will adjourn for two weeks and give him an opportunity to attend the conference in Trinidad. I would advise the Minister of Trade and Labour to let us have his report at once, because if there are employers in the U.K. who want our people to work, the Government will have to help them in some way or other.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Nothing in that document to which the hon. senior member for St. Joseph referred could be more important or more revealing than what the Minister of Trade and Labour himself said on this matter not so long ago. Therefore we have not got to concern ourselves so much with what the document contains now that we have got before us his dictum on the question before us.

Among other things, he said just now that numbers of the people who are now in England working were employed when they were here; they were employed here and they gave up their work to go to England. When we say that members of the Government's Bench are unable to understand the harm they do this country, they take objection. Nothing could substantiate what we say in that respect more than what the Minister has said to-day; and he has also said it in England, giving the Colonial Office the impression that there is not this rampant unemployment that we are talking about, but that people are leaving their work here to go to England.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Where did I ever make any reference to that? I am sure that if the hon. member refers to the statement that I made in England he will see that the exact opposite is the truth.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The Minister said he asked two people who were working before they left here and they said they had left because of insufficient wages, and he hoped that the hon. junior member for St. Lucy who was now President of a Union would rectify those low wages. Why I refer to that is because just a few days ago a prominent official of the Colonial Office told me something; he said to me that their impression was that a lot of the Jamaicans and Barbadians who were going to England were not unemployed; because if they were, where would they get the money to pay their passages. In other words, the Minister by his obtuse statements is beclouding the opinion and the attitude of the Colonial Office on this matter, and once they get the impression that it is not unemployed people who are going to England but people who are giving up their work, naturally their sympathy and their approach to this problem will be entirely different.

It is a dangerous thing for a man occupying the position that the Minister holds to get up here and repeat what he has no doubt said in England: that the people who are going there were not unemployed, but were receiving insufficient wages. I will not answer the cheap jibe that he made to the hon. junior member for St. Lucy; but I will say that it is unkind, ignorant and worse than that for the Minister to get up in this House and cast a reflection like that on the industry and initiative of a gentleman like the hon. member's father,—a man who by his industry in Barbados has employed and still employs hundreds of people; and a man, the fruits of whose labours have been enjoyed by more than one member of the Government's Bench; and to be told that by a man who has never employed anyone. Before he was a Minister he could not even employ a boot black. He cannot even run the business which he is now put to run; but he can criticise someone who is employing people in this country for paying

low wages, and especially to artisans like carpenters and masons who have to be paid by a regular standard.

What I am concerned about is that he says that the people who are leaving here for England are people who are not unemployed. The Colonial Office has the same opinion; the Colonial Office claims that the people who are going to England are working, saving up their money and running to England, perhaps because they want to go to Europe.

9.55 p.m.

I can tell you that in so far as Barbados is concerned, mothers and fathers, brothers and sisters, and relatives and friends are subscribing money, raising money on loans, mortgaging their houses, selling their animals and furniture, to get money for their families to get to England. The Hon. Minister objects to what I am saying, but I wonder if he considers seriously that his remarks prejudiced people from going to America and the hon. senior member for the City and the hon. senior member for St. John can corroborate my statement. We were told here by one of the American officials who came here that if we paid such high wages here in the sugar industry, why should our people want to emigrate to the U.S.A. Whether they told him so or not, that was their reaction that if Barbadians can get the money which the Hon. Minister claims that they were getting here what were they going to America for? Of course there may be a few outstanding cases in which people of this country have given up their jobs to go to England, but that is because of the opportunities prevailing in England to learn trades and for general training. But by and large, if he is not over conceited with his own importance he will know that the majority of people who are going to England are unemployed boys of the ages of 24 and 25 years who have left school, and have never got a job or never had any hope of getting a job here. The Hon. Minister of Trade said he is going to ignore whatever the hon. senior member for St. Philip says; but he cannot ignore what I say because of what I said before he had to go to England. He can ignore me when I am dead; but I will bury all of them. [Laughter].

I say his Ministry has now offered new concessions to trade and industry; and that is not what I said to-day but what I said a year ago. Read the Resolution which I brought in here and you will see that he is doing what I said. What I say to-day he and his colleagues will decide to do 30 months afterwards; and because it is in the interest of the colony they will have to do it. When he talks about Jamaica do not let him think of what Jamaica is doing or is not doing for emigration; he said that I said that people are going from Jamaica in the thousands to England. What I did say was that this week one thousand people from Jamaica were leaving for England. It is not my business whether the Jamaican Government is sending them or not, neither is it his business. What I can tell him is that the Government of Jamaica under Mr. Bustamante less than a year ago refused to put up Ministerial Buildings, and said that they were going to put up a hospital first. This Government is putting up Ministerial Buildings first. If they want to follow Jamaica in one thing why not follow Jamaica in this case.

I am suggesting to the Hon. Minister of Labour that he should exercise every possible caution and every possible effort even although it may be difficult for him, and try to state clearly what he intends to say. Do try and see while speaking on important matters that you say nothing to prejudice the possibilities of the people who leave these shores, from

obtaining a livelihood because that is all you are doing. I imagine in his speaking to the various people in England the way in which he spoke. He must have said that the circumstances under which our people are coming there are that they are leaving comfortable jobs; but that saying will bring grief to the people who are there. Certainly by no stretch of the imagination will it help the unemployment situation or the people who want to get there. I realise the origin of this misconception on the part of the Colonial Office who is responsible for these people from the West Indian Islands. It is because we send people like the Hon. Minister of Labour to negotiate on their behalf. Instead of his clarifying the situation and making the way clear, he has obscured it so as to create a wrong impression and to make the position far worse than what it has been; that is what he is doing for this country. Apparently he is too simple minded to realise the harm that can be done by saying what he says. His visit to England reminded me of Moses at the fair when he swapped his father's horse and carriage and what-not for a small pair of old spectacles. I sincerely hope that hon. members have appreciated from the Ministers performance on this matter, what it means in the future to entrust the destinies of this country in his incapable hands.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, ordinarily when attacks are made it is not perhaps the best thing to apply them in the manner occasioned by the making of them. I rise only to correct an impression which may have been made by the Hon. Minister of Trade in his general remarks which he made in reply to certain questions put to him and to certain criticisms made on his policy. It appears from his reply that he spent his time in England on this emigration matter by just going around. With all that wide range of activity before him, with so many pressing problems to look into, it appears that all he could discover was that one or possibly two people originally employed by some relative of mine have found themselves in England, because they have been paid insufficient wages. I want to say to this Committee that so far as that story goes, I know of three people who might have been intimately connected with my father's business and who he might have possibly seen in the United Kingdom.

10.05 p.m.

One of them was a customer who left us as he had a perfect right to do owing us nothing so far as I know, and went out to change his livelihood and seek his fortune elsewhere. The second was a carpenter who was employed for many years and who has been paid the rates which are usually paid to artisans of his class and skill. The third person was an employee who managed one of my father's private businesses very well and who left us to go to the United Kingdom without any dissatisfaction on her part with one-half of the profits to which she was entitled. I do not know therefore which employee he could have met who had vouchsafed to him the information that he or she left there merely because of insufficient wages. But this matter is rather more important than that; it has been the fashion of Ministers of the Government to disparage people who are of far more value to this community among all kinds of people than they themselves intend to be. It is not like the matter of a relative who cannot answer in this House; but a principle should be established among them that they ought to behave themselves better in this House, not withholding praise where praise is due but to give credit to those who relieve unemployment in a manner which the Government does not.

The Hon. Minister, instead of dealing with his policy, took the opportunity to launch an attack. Of course I have just emerged from a campaign where all of them have attacked me and I am not the worse for it; and the overflow seems to be in here. I want to express my profound disappointment over the way in which this whole question of emigration to the United Kingdom has been handled. I am quite willing to agree that until we read the Report which has been prepared, we do not know what has happened, but we have seen from the Minister's action that very little is contemplated. In connection with the particular Minister, I remember that Joanna of Spain in the 16th century used to carry the corpse of her husband in a leaden casket and when asked by her courtiers why she did so, Her Majesty replied, "Because he seems no different now dead from when he was alive!" [Laughter.]

I beg to move that the amount under this Head be reduced by \$1; and I intend that to be a vote of censure on the Minister in order to record my dissatisfaction over this matter.

Mr. BARROW: I fortunately did not have the misfortune of hearing the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, the Minister of Labour, when he was making his important disclosure on the question of emigration. I am well acquainted with the previous statement which the Minister made on the subject; and therefore members of the House look forward to the document which has been waved in our faces with interest. But I think it would have been a far more manly thing to do to have that document put before the House before the Estimates were discussed; that is why I think the statement made by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy is a bit premature. The hon. member should have treated us with the courtesy of his research on the question of opportunities of employment for Barbadians, and therefore he has put us in a rather unfortunate position. I hope that as and when he chooses to do so, he will be good enough to bring in a statement and not merely tell us how many pages there are in it and wave it in the faces of members of the House; because if the Minister can make disclosures to members of the Press at Seawell Airport, surely the members of this House would be entitled to some sort of a statement at the first meeting of this House which the Minister attended after his return to this colony. I know what is the Hon. Minister's attitude towards this question of emigration.

10.15 p.m.

He was not prepared to do anything to embarrass the British Government; there were no avenues of employment for skilled workers in the U.K.; and the type of workers (he is now being informed by the Minister of Communications that he did not say so) which were needed were in the skilled trades for which Barbadians by training and education would not be suitable applicants.

At one time I was under the impression that he wanted us to believe that there was no real shortage of labour on the English and Scottish markets; but he has probably learned better since. On the 15th November when issuing his statement (I doubt whether he has this information in it, and if it is it would probably be through research done by Civil Servants and not his own investigations) there were 383,000 registered vacancies at the Ministry of Labour in England.

From my limited experience in these matters, purely in the scientific realm, (and I would like to say that there is also a certain amount of empiricism involved) for every one vacancy registered with the Ministry of Labour there are three jobs outside which employers have not taken the trouble to register; and

those registered are nearly all in those avenues of employment which call for no special aptitude. The reasons for the failure of the employers to register with the Ministry of Labour are several, but the chief reason is that the small employers always hope in the short run to find someone turning up and asking for a job, or someone who is willing to change one job for another on the inducement of a higher wage.

On the calculation alone, Mr. Chairman, I would assess whatever figures he brings. There were, he said, 383,000 jobs that they could not get people to fill. I do not think that 33 per cent. of them were in the skilled trades and that it would take any length of time to bring people to the required standard to fill them. There are over one million jobs in the U.K. to be filled but the Minister was giving this House the impression because they had never even thought of it, that the spontaneous movement of people from Barbados was only the mobility of labour from a region where there is a glut on the labour market to one of a scarcity of labour.

Bearing in mind the deprivation which is the lot of nearly every West Indian born into this world, I would like to say, (and there is a greater issue involved in it) that people do not leave a situation in which they are suffering want and starvation to go to an alien land to starve there; and you may be reasonably sure that if Barbadian workers were not finding employment in England, the exodus of workers from this country and other colonies of the West Indies would cease.

From 1945 right on the level of employment in this island has not substantially increased. If anything the level of unemployment has increased somewhat in this country, but there has been no large scale migration of West Indians to the U.K. because the conditions in which migrants could satisfy their wants did not exist. The industrial machinery of England had not gone into high gear. There was still a low level of production, and various hardships were the lot of the West Indians who went up to England. Some still went, and a good few turned back; but no large scale migration took place.

Now side by side with the propaganda which the British Press encouraged by some politicians and newspapers in the West Indies have put out about West Indians creating a problem in England, this is the situation: there are many more Germans and Italians, who fought against Great Britain from 1939 to 1945, there are far more of them in England today than West Indians. If the West Indian migration kept up at the rate of 15,000 a year which is a rough estimate, (I think it is more in the vicinity of 11,000) if this migration kept up for the next ten years, British industry would still be short of workers at the level of the vacancies which existed on the 15th November, 1954.

I fail to see how West Indian workers can create a problem in that context. If the rate of migration doubled to 30,000 a year it would take something like 12 years before the registered vacancies are filled by West Indian labour.

I will come now to the barriers which the Minister has erected in his own mind, the insurmountable obstacles that he saw confronting him on every side; West Indian workers were unskilled and they needed skilled labour in England. I wonder if in any of the multitude of places that the Minister visited he took the trouble to watch the operations performed in factories and industrial concerns. There is no such thing in an industrial factory as skilled labour. Skill is a question of training. There is only unskilled labour in the short run, and what we discover (and I am talking from experience) is that a course of eight

weeks at one of the Government's training centres like Three Forest and other places, (I will mention them in another context later on) in basic engineering is sufficient for the average West Indian with an elementary education to put him into an aircraft factory or a motor-car factory at the same level as the British worker working there for eight years. I know, because I have channelled 800 West Indians out of the Armed Forces into these training centres. But at the end of the war British factories were short of machinery; there were not enough jobs for those West Indians and about 70 to 80 per cent of them came back to the West Indies. But they still acquired the skills.
10.25 p.m.

In industry, I cannot repeat it too often, there is no shibboleth of skill; skill is only an acquisition of skill. It is a question of being turned to work in a factory because all the operations carried out are done almost entirely in an automatic manner. It is only a question of orienting yourself to the productive line methods and adapting your mind to the kind of work.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the next objection was with regard to housing which I have read both in the English and local Press, and the statements which have been issued from time to time to discourage West Indians from seeking work in England.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I rise on a point of Order, Mr. Chairman. I would not like the hon. member to continue to tell downright untruths. I said that there are opportunities for West Indian workers in England. In the report which came before the House in black and white, we have openly stated that there are thousands of opportunities for skilled and unskilled workers. I am defending my policy.

Mr. BARROW: I am stating what the Hon. Minister said before he went to England. Of course he would be averse if he did not state the true position now. I am talking of the barriers which he put in the minds of the public before he left. [A VOICE: Name them]. How can you tell something which he did not have the decency to give to the House. I am making his statement for him: I have only stated what he said on the floor of the House about the shortage of skilled and unskilled labour.

What I am saying is, that the Hon. Minister of Labour started off with prejudice in his mind because he was not sure of what the British attitude would be. Let me say that the British Nationality Act of 1948 states that we are citizens of Great Britain, and we have a perfect right to go to England so long as we can get a Passport. We have a perfect right to go to England as much as any Englishman, and I would go as far as to say that I would be surprised at the day when the British Parliament would enact any legislation to restrict the flow of West Indians in England, when West Indians are suffering so badly in these colonies. What may happen is, that you may find the apologists for the Colonial Office suggesting to West Indian leaders in the colony a certain course of action; then armed with that authority, the British Cabinet would have a free and open licence to say that what they are doing they are doing at the instigation of the Colonial leaders; they will always find people in the colonies to do it for them and that has slowly developed in Barbados before the matter was raised on the floor of this House. It is not incomprehensible that if members of this House did not make their attitude clear on this matter that the Hon. Minister of Labour might have been one of the potential colonists.

Mr. Chairman, it has been openly said that Puerto Rico is a special place because that country is part of the American economy; that is one of the

excuses we hear for not establishing industries in the West Indies or for giving us a subvention for our duties. I have heard it raised by the Steele Commission which came down here on the Federation of British Industries. That Commission which comprised of three or four industrialists, was pleased to report on the possibilities of West Indian industries and on the question of industrialisation; and with regards having a planned emigration of West Indian workers to those areas in England where there was a dearth of labour in the same way as Americans have encouraged Puerto Ricans, they said Puerto Rico was a special case. Without digressing too much to explain that argument, they said that Puerto Rico is part of the American economy. I would like to know, part of whose economy is Barbados? Although the Hon. Premier would say that we are self-sufficient economically, as far as I know, we are part of the sterling area; and what is worse is that we have absolutely no control in the way we should spend the dollars which we earn. We have a certain amount of control in the way which we allocate the dollars which they allow us to have back, but we have no control as regards the American commodity; because we are limited with the dollars which they allow us. Although we have this advanced constitution the day is yet to dawn when we will have unrestricted control over our dealings in foreign currency and foreign markets.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, Puerto Ricans are citizens of the United States of America; we are citizens of Great Britain as can be seen by the 1948 British Nationality Act; I would like the Hon. Minister of Trade to look up the figures for the export of Barbados rum to the United Kingdom.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Has that anything to do with emigration?

10.35 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: Yes, it is intimately bound up with the question of emigration economically. You will see my reason in a moment. Emigration is bound up with jobs and I am talking about jobs.

I think the myth has got to be exploded at some time. The last excuse which is given for the failure of the West Indian Governments and the British Government to get together on this question of industrialisation and emigration and providing work for the workers of the impoverished West Indian area is that the American Government can give Puerto Rico elbow room and you cannot expect the British Government to do that. I believe that the American Government gave Puerto Rico something like \$33 million, and if the British Government in one year gave us one-half of the duty which they charge on our rum in the United Kingdom, we would be in a much better position than Puerto Rico. The duty on each gallon of Barbados rum is something like 25 B.W.I. dollars; one gallon of rum costing \$3.10 is \$25 by the time it reaches the distributor. It is simply a question of multiplication; if the Hon. Minister can multiply by 25 the total number of wine gallons which we ship to London, and if we were given that money we would have more money than what the American Government gave Puerto Rico. I would also like to draw this matter to the attention of the Hon. Minister of Trade: the reason why we did not have any disturbances in the West Indies of any major importance in 1937 was that the United States of America had been settling the British problems in the West Indies for the whole of the first period of the 20th century. More Barbadians resided in the United States of America than Barbadians go to England; and the American people did not say that they were any problem; and now every week you get British newspapers, you get statements issued on West Indian labourers, and you hear that the West Indians are a

problem. The trouble is that they regard our people as a problem but the real problem is this: (you read the newspapers and you will see) the West Indians were in America about 1944 or 1945 and Mayor La Guardia pointed out that the Puerto Ricans were living in overcrowded conditions and it was time that the American Government should look into the matter. Now that the slack in England has been taken up, West Indians are competing with the British worker for housing accommodation. West Indians go into the lower costs housing units and it is true that you might get two or three West Indians living together in a room; but ask anyone sitting around this table who had the good fortune to be educated in England, whether West Indian students did not have to live two and three in a room. The average West Indian worker does not mind sharing a room with somebody else. When I was a student there I had to share rooms (three and four in one room) for economy in the first instance, and in the second instance because it was difficult to get accommodation. Even the people who drive about in expensive cars and who were not accustomed to living three and four in a room had to put up with that. You could cable to London and see how many people live in a room in certain districts; they are those who live in circumstances in which there is no stand-pipe or bath or convenience, and if they can put up with that, all workers can put up with it too for the sake of getting a job.

That is the matter which I want to bring to the notice of the Hon. Minister of Labour. He should have gone to the places which had accommodation for between eight thousand and ten thousand trainees and workers who are being trained to get jobs. 10.45 p.m.

There are several centres (perhaps 80 with housing accommodation) to which West Indian workers if there was a planned scheme of emigration, could go and live and be trained to be channelled into jobs, and which have generally all the amenities which one could want to have under the circumstances. I wonder if the Minister of Labour has investigated that. I want to hear no argument about camp life, because right now we have a large number of West Indian workers in the U.S.A. living in camps in which accommodation is not as good as in those places which I have mentioned.

If the Colonial Office, the Ministry of Labour and this Government wanted to get down to the crux of this problem they would ask themselves a simple question—if our scheme of emigration of workers to the U.S.A. is a question of private agreement between employers and the territorial Governments of the Caribbean, now that there is a shortage of labour in England which West Indians would be well qualified to fill or partly fill, how is it that up to now we have not been able to evolve any similar scheme of getting West Indian workers up to the U.K. and letting them pay us back when they find work; putting them straight into jobs, or putting them into dispersal points where they can be channelled into jobs when their aptitudes and skills are assessed and discovered?

If we can do that in respect of America, a place that is outside the sterling area and which is outside our national set up, which is a completely foreign country with the most severe immigration laws practically in the whole civilised world, how is it that the West Indian Government who for the most part profess to be interested in getting West Indian workers in England have failed to come to grips with the problem along with the British Government and British employers?

The West Indian workers who have gone to England have done so as a result of initiative on the part of the workers themselves; and it is because the West Indian Governments only pay lip service to, and have no real interest in the working classes. In the case of the U.S.A. the initiative came from the private American employers themselves. There must be some reason underlying the psychological inertia which now paralyses people like the Minister of Labour. They are still subservient to the outworn concept of the Mother Country being a place where only retired Civil Servants when they are going out to pasture, and ex-Ministers when they are turned out of office, should have recourse. That is purely speculation on my part, but I would not be surprised if there was a great amount of truth in what I have said.

So I am inviting the Minister of Labour to start thinking of this problem in a serious way, and to start getting to grips with it instead of issuing statements when they apply to the Australian Government and the latter is not willing to take West Indians, and statements of that kind that are already well known to all who take any interest in public affairs.

I will now go further. The time has surely come, Mr. Chairman, for all men of goodwill in the West Indies to challenge the whole basis of commonwealth which recognises differences between colours and creeds; because when you get down to the heart of it those are the fears that paralyse people like the Minister of Labour. They have just made a statement about Australia and Canada not wanting West Indian workers, and West Indians creating a problem in England. It is surely time that West Indians began to challenge these outworn ideas of supremacy on the part of one race and the existing state of affairs within the Brotherhood of Nations of distinction and discrimination based on race and creed.

The 90,000 Italians and Germans who went to England last year were no problem; why should 11,000 or 15,000 West Indians become a problem? You can only be a problem if you go to a man's country and try to blow him out of it by atom bombs, you can only be a problem if you break into a man's house or if you are a juvenile delinquent. But I cannot appreciate and subscribe to the view held by him that you are a problem because you go and ask for a job.

Now sir, I would like to make an interesting disclosure. The Minister of Labour has just said that I am maintaining that there is no colour bar in England. The whole burden of my speech is that the Minister is paralysed by the fact that he feels that he has to accept the colour bar and therefore like the statements that he issued on Australia, Canada and other places, he has to see that people will find when they go to England that the English people do not accept them as readily as they should. He can go to the Colonial Office and the Ministry of Labour and challenge that.

I guarantee that when the issues are put broadly before the people of the U.K., they would be the first to believe that colour bar or no colour bar, the two Governments, British and West Indian should foster the idea that the colour bar is one of the reasons for inaction on their part. Despite the fact that there may be a colour bar in England, there is a worse one in Barbados than in any other part of the British Empire; but people are still working here. If you ask an Englishman he will tell you that Barbados has the greatest colour bar in any part of the world. 10.55 p.m.

Barbados is the only country in the world which will employ South Africans in the Government Ser-

vice. When I say the only country in the world, I mean the only island in the West Indies that would consciously employ South Africans in the Government; and we have more than one in the Government now and they are intimate friends of the Ministerial Bench and the Hon. Minister of Labour. I am not pretending that there is no colour bar. As a matter of fact I should know about that better than him because I have lived in England for eleven years; I did not take a trip for eleven days. You will find prejudice among some uninformed people in the United Kingdom and they will use that as an excuse for not relieving the sufferings of our unemployed people in this country. I have seen numerous statements made by Trade Unionists in the United Kingdom saying that we are not tolerating a colour bar. Birmingham City Council was the last public body despite what anybody said, that would employ workers from the West Indies so long as they were suitable. I am sorry that the Hon. Minister of Labour is not in his place at the moment. It is time that we wake up and realise that right here in Barbados we have a worse situation in that respect than anywhere else in the British Empire.

I am going to tell you something now which will probably surprise you: in South Africa it is difficult to find a coloured man who is unemployed; and I am going to say this unadvisedly because I got this direct from a member of the South African Parliament who represented native affairs before Dr. Malan changed the setup. He said that the African Bantu or Zulu easily worked for an average wage which is five times that which the average Barbadian workers can hope to get. On top of that, it is almost impossible to find other than voluntary unemployed in the Union of South Africa, and there are eight million of them. I am trying to get the Hon. Minister of Labour to see that he should re-orientate his views on this question altogether, because when they are using the coloured bar in England as an excuse, I would suggest that they put their house in order first. I will give you one example: the Hon. Premier would not be seen any day at a Conference with a coloured man as his adviser; the Hon. Premier of Barbados seems to feel that they are no coloured men in the community in which we have 93% who can be an adviser to the Government. If that happened in South Africa you would see the *Advocate* and all the English newspapers saying, here it is in a country that has 93% of its population of one racial group, they do not allow the people to go outside and it does not have one person capable of advising them. The Hon. Premier actually practises a coloured grouping and he aspires to it. I do not aspire to it; I treat every man according to his own merits.

Mr. Chairman, leaving that aside I just want to re-emphasise that this Government can charter aeroplanes to send West Indian workers to the United States which is a foreign country. It is not too much to expect that some planned system of emigration should take place between Barbados and the U.K. because of the conditions existing for the successful conclusion of such a venture in favour of West Indian workers; except of course, those obstacles which exist in the mind of the Hon. Minister of Labour. As I have said before, the State Department in the U.S.A. had to waive certain formalities in order to get West Indian workers to the United States to assist in the harvesting of their crops and the canning of their vegetables; no similar obstacles exist between the West Indian colonies and Great Britain. The door is wide opened, and instead of the Minister of Labour getting on the other side and

trying to shut the door, I suggest to him to get on the right side and push it open wider.

Mr. GODDARD: It is indeed unfortunate that the Hon. Minister of Labour who has returned to this island over the last two weeks has only got so far in his report as to submit it to the Executive Committee level. He knew that this debate would be coming up to-day or during the week, and it must have come across his mind that members who are so concerned with this problem would like to know something of his visit to England. We are still looking forward and hoping that some means will be found for sending these people of both sexes from this country to England, because we know that there are ample opportunities awaiting them there; and those opportunities are not in any one category, but they are ranging from semi-skilled work back down to domestic work. The pressure on the unemployment problem in Barbados is such and has been so for so long, and is growing daily worse, that unless something is done and done immediately we will face a disaster.

One of the most important subjects discussed during the bye-election in St. Lucy was emigration. It is so recent and it is ringing so much in our ears today, that the Minister who has just returned from England should have given us his report already; and I may say that it is very difficult to debate this question without knowing what is in that report. We are denied voicing our feelings on the question of unemployment by not having that report; I therefore hope, that there is something in that report which will be a solution to this problem.

I do not wish to join those members who fear that there is nothing in it, and who have said that probably it is just a report of figures and statistics telling us of the situation in other countries. We do know, because we have been told by the newspapers and by those returning from England, that there are thousands of jobs to be had there, but the big problem so far is housing; but that is not worse than it is in Barbados. When our people went to the U.S.A. and to Panama in the earlier part of this century the problem of housing was just as bad then as it is in England to-day. Jamaicans are going there every day and they have created (if you would call it so,) a problem of housing, but they are still going there and are finding work and are sending back for others. We know that when Barbadians go abroad in search of work they go with the intention to improve their lot, and they send back money for their families. I know of many instances. It is true to say that some are leaving their work to go to England, but the majority have never had a job in their lives. I have had a case today of a youngster of 23 years of age who has the General Certificate of Education, and he told me he has been searching for work since he left school and has never yet had one job. He went on to say that his father is so disgusted with him that he has turned him out of the house. I questioned him and asked him how many more are they in the family and he told me that he has two brothers, one 20 years of age, and the other 19 years of age. They have been just as fortunate as he was in having a secondary education but neither one of them has a job and never had one. There you have a case of three youngsters in a home who should have been working for years, but who have not yet been successful in getting a job. This is not the only case; I have heard of thousands like that. When the report is studied at the Executive Committee level and then brought to this House, we hope to find something in it to help the unemployment of this island.

11.15 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am sure the Hon. Premier in his most sane moments would say, what a pity he has selected the hon. senior member for St. Thomas to fill the office of Minister of Labour. He is obliged to say so because much of this debate would never have taken place if the Hon. Minister of Trade had initiative and foresight instead of getting over there and just grunting in his usual style, or saying what the Hon. Premier had already said. He could have said that we have just come back and our report is being considered at Executive Committee level and will soon be brought here. If he had said so, I think hon. members would be most unreasonable to start to make criticisms whether justifiable or otherwise. You would appreciate that the Hon. Minister of Trade instead of just trying to show off, should have assured hon. members that he is interested. Sir, his very presence aggravates the situation; may be it is not his fault.

Sir, I would be very stupid to attempt to make criticisms now on this question after the Hon. Premier has assured us that the report has been handed in by the Labour Commissioner and the Hon. Minister of Trade, and is signed by them and is now being considered at Executive Committee level before being submitted to this House. I am hoping that it contains some measure of comfort and hope; something which is attractive and something which can be put into operation for the people of this country who would like to get some work to do outside of Barbados. One cannot help feeling already that if the views expressed and the attitude adopted by the Hon. Minister of Labour is an index of what is going to be in the report, that there is very little comfort for us. However, let us hope that it is to the contrary.

What was very amusing to me was when the Hon. Minister in reply to the hon. junior member for St. Lucy was trying to tell us of the situation in England. It was the same way as we know it; that is, we acknowledge that there is a question of housing shortage; but the Minister of Labour went on to say that one must be careful not to aggravate the housing situation in England. Which Minister over there, except the Hon. Minister of Trade, would have made such a statement? Not one of them would have made such a statement. Do you mean to tell me that you pick up the people's money to send to England a Minister who is supposed to be a Socialist to investigate something; a man who should know something of the history of the people in the West Indies; a man who should know that "King Sugar" from the West Indies helped to build up Great Britain; and he goes there and comes back and tells you in this twentieth century that you must be very careful not to aggravate the housing situation in England!

As I said, sir, the Premier in his saner moments must reflect in his saner moments on what it is to have the Ministry of Labour in the hands of so incompetent a person; a person whose very manner and approach (not only in this House, but one can clearly see what was the Minister's approach in England) is obnoxious. It repels. Then to come here speaking as a Minister of Labour in a Socialist Government and tell us that we must be careful not to aggravate the housing situation in England. If the Labour Commissioner had said so I would have understood; it would be as normal for him to say so as for me to get up and say the opposite.

You want someone to fight with you for democracy. How can the situation be aggravated if Britain takes our workers as against taking the people who fought against them yesterday? Should a Socialist Minister drawing \$650.00 a month of the taxpayers' money tell us this? Let the British be honest with you. I have come to the irresistible conclusion that one redeemable feature is if you can aggravate the

whole situation and let the British people know that it is their responsibility. The British cannot be trustees for us in one breath and then in another get up and tell us to look to America. America owes us nothing; Britain owes us all.

Until the Minister's report comes before us I will not try to criticise it; but the only thing the Minister could do today was to sink to the depths of depravity in criticising the father of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. He talks about two men who were working as artisans and who left because of insufficient wages; it is to their credit if they were working here as artisans and they leave and go to England to better themselves; and in any case when they left here, they left room for two more artisans to get work. Everytime that I see a white boy in a place, despite what a member of the Other Place said, ignorant as he is, I say to him, "try to get to Canada. You have the natural passport." Every time one of them goes out another boy gets a job.

We want Ministers who are interested in their work; we do not want people who are only interested in going to England and getting a few suits off the line and coming back and talking like an Englishman. We do not want people who will come back and tell us not to aggravate the housing situation in England.

I agree with the hon. member who said that this should be handled on a West Indian level. The Premier tries to impress upon the English people that the only people who are loyal are his Ministers and himself. I am not loyal to ignorance, I am not a slave to patriotism. We have not yet got the Minister's report so I will not criticise it. But he could have written that report coming down in the plane. If I were he, I would have made the notes when I was in England and I would have dictated them to the Labour Officer.

You can see the attitude of both of them. You must be careful; do not worry to send the boys up there; you will aggravate the housing situation. I would aggravate any kind of situation in England to help the starving people out here. I hope that the report will bring out something beneficial; I hope it will be a report which will encourage and improve the lot of the people of this country. I am not one who wants to say that this or that Minister is diametrically opposed to sending people to England; I am here to say that you should not send a Minister who is so lacking in interest or so incompetent that he cannot give up a report yet. All that he said to the newspapers we knew already. We are hoping that his report will be more than just paper.

Now, sir, I hope that when the Government sets up its machinery it will consider first of all, the unemployed; and above all those who will go to England and make a good name for Barbados. To send people who are unemployable or who just want to go on a trip will do Barbados no good. There are some with families who, if they select the right jobs, will so break down prejudice in England that the employers will call for more and more Barbadians. Secondly you should consider the women. I have spoken to a number of English people in this colony and they have assured me that there will be no difficulty in absorbing a tremendous lot of domestics in the U.K. While it is true that the wages will be nothing compared with what one would get in America, they will be much better than those one would get here. That will be of benefit to many who under local conditions would not work as domestics.

Mr. Chairman, I end where I began: had the Hon. Minister told us earlier tonight that the report had been made and had been laid for the Hon. Premier to go through it at Executive level, a lot of

this debate would have been avoided and possibly the Head would have been passed.

11.25 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: I have a few questions which I want the Hon. Minister of Labour to answer. He is not in here at present, but I hope the Minister deputising for him will be able to answer them.

My questions are based on Items 11 and 12 which deal with Stationery and Incidentals and also Item 5 which deals with the Youth Employment Officer. I would like to know exactly how many young people have been able to get jobs since this particular department for the Youth Employment Officer has been set up. It is sometime now since we voted money for the establishment of the Youth Employment Officer, and up to now I am not aware as to the numbers, if any, of youths who have been able to get any employment through that service.

I would like, Mr. Chairman, to deal with the unemployment survey. I think it is absolutely shocking when we have a large department like the Labour Commissioner's office, and after all these years, no machinery has been set up to attempt to discover the number of Barbadians who want jobs and have been unable to obtain any. I think that the failure to discover or to even setup the machinery to attempt to discover the level of unemployment in this colony springs from the fear that the figures when obtained would be so shocking, that it would focus the attention to the real economic problems of this country to the detriment of the office holders in the colony. It is only now in this year of grace that we have talked about setting up an Industrial Development Corporation. Over three years ago, we were trying to find out how many Barbadians are abroad and so on. I do not see how you can make out a Development Plan if you do not record the whole rationality of the Plan and the creation of its state of affairs in that you should have as full employment as human ingenuity can devise. I have spoken on this matter not only this year but three years ago; I have warned, I have spoken inside and outside of this Chamber, and I have done everything that I could to draw to the administration of the Government that they were being mislead and were tackling the problems from the wrong angles all the time. Even problems like the Deep Water Harbour scheme were being tackled from the wrong angle. I make mention of the Deep Water Harbour because that question is bound up with the unemployment problem. The attitude of the Government to this problem is not one of development or permanently relieving unemployment, but is just an *ad hoc* sort of way of going about the scheme; just as the Hon. Minister of Communications said when he brought down a Resolution sometime late last year that it was to provide a few jobs for a few people at Christmas time. It does appear as if those jobs were to be given as political stunts.

I am going to make a very serious statement now, and because I regard this as the most pressing problem facing this island at present, and in view of the fact that I am completely dissatisfied not only with the Hon. Minister of Labour but with the whole attitude of the Ministers of this Government and their complete disregard of the suffering of the people and of the party: because of that, I no longer want to be associated with them politically or otherwise. I am not going to move a vote of 'no confidence' in the Minister of Labour or the other Ministers of the Government, because we all know the qualifications which they have for the

jobs which they now hold. Largely through the blandishments of the present Minister of Social Services, I was inveigled into associating myself with past records of certain members of the Government because of my socialist views from birth; but my association with them has been one of bitter disappointment from beginning to end. The charges which I would like to lay at their heads are: a lack of political and personal morality, also a lack of sincerity and their insisting always to use the public funds of this island for vote-catching purposes and other personal reasons.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Has that anything to do with the Head with which we are dealing?

Mr. BARROW: I am dealing with the failure of this Government to come to grips with the question of unemployment in this island.
11.35 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the honourable member to keep to the Item.

Mr. BARROW: I am dealing with the question of unemployment and of how the Government has failed to do anything about unemployment in this country. I am speaking on Item 21 whether it pleases you or not. If you look at page 108 you will see the Item I am speaking on. It is Item 21, "Unemployment Survey." When the workers of this country were struggling for higher wages the present Minister of Finance, (the hon. senior member for St. Joseph) a bitter opponent of Trade Unions in those days, said that the very idea of a strike was the antithesis of democracy; and perhaps that is the reason why the workers are still subsisting at low level at which they are. I have seen school children fainting on the roads and that is why I said what I said last night. They are concerned about erecting monuments and not in making provision for the children when they leave school. I have tried to set them on the right road economically and otherwise, but they preferred to have South Africans advising them (people who do not have the welfare and interest of this community at heart) rather than the concerted opinions and the cries of the masses of this country to guide them in the step they should take in spending the Government's revenue in this colony. Mr. Chairman, I am accustomed to the personal abuse and vilifications even from the Minister of Labour tonight when I offered to send him a document which was sent to me from the United Kingdom to assist him in his deliberations on the question of emigration, a document which he should be glad to have. The Minister made an offensive remark in saying that he would not have anything from me, and he went on to make a remark which I would not repeat but which the hon. senior member for Christ Church can very well tell you in private. The remark is not worthy of being repeated.

I would like to say this: the Hon. Minister of Social Services is nothing to do with this. It was largely because I believe that anything with which he was associated could not be completely without honour that I decided to come along on his side; also because of his past history with my family, and thinking that this was a democratic organisation and that it really had the interest of this community at heart. Our problem is not that we were going to wrestle on the floors of Ministerial Offices; our problem is a problem of providing jobs to every man and woman who wants a job. I am fed up with the Ministers telling me on occasions when they should be making responsible statements, that "you cannot do anything about this because there is a colour bar, and you cannot do anything about that because you would be embarrassing somebody." I could take the Hon. Minister to the New Orleans and show him the conditions there. They have the people of this

island believing that it is the normal state of affairs for a person to grow up in a room with all the windows shut up at night, to go to the elementary school until he is 13 years of age and not have a job until he is 35. They pour propaganda down the throats and the ears of the people at election time. I have discovered from my personal contact with most of them (and the two who are expected will know who I mean) that in truth and in fact they despise the people of Barbados because they can say anything to them. They can sit down and do nothing but put up monuments and they feel that they can do that forever. If that is what the people of Barbados want then they are welcomed to it; I will not be a party to any dishonour of that kind.

Mr. LEWIS: I must really and truly describe this Head of the Estimates as Labour and I do not know if it is producing very much; but I have heard a statement to the effect that the people going from here to the United Kingdom are not people who are unemployed in Barbados. That is nothing against Barbadians; it is not a Government sponsored and assisted scheme; therefore only people who have been working and saving money can go up to England. I hope nothing will be said against Barbadians because of the fact that the ones who are going to the United Kingdom were not unemployed. If it were a question of the Government paying the passages of people and sending them up to the U.K. as is done in the case of the United States of America, that is a case where you would expect only unemployed people to go because the passages are being paid; but these are people who intend to better their conditions and therefore they would be normally working here; and those who are out of work and who are taking advantage of this boon in England will be those who want to get there and make good.

As far as this Youth Employment Officer is concerned, what I would like to see in this country is an Employment Officer who would busy himself in getting some employment for those who have done a good day's work, and who have been thrown out of employment at an age when it was very difficult for them to find new employment. A youth always has his father or mother or somebody going around to enquire whether one would take him in his business even if you do not pay him.

I know how difficult it is to find employment for some older people who have passed the age at which they can do their best work, especially when employers can employ younger persons for the same money and get more work out of them even if they do not have as much experience as older people would have. I would say that the fact that employed Barbadians may be going on this scheme to England should not prejudice Britain against Barbadian workers. If the Government is willing to assist, those who are unemployed can take the risk; but at present it must be an expensive game to play.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I think that going to England and seeking employment is something that West Indians will benefit from. It is a blessing in disguise, because it will cause a certain amount of embarrassment to the Mother Country and they will have to turn their attention to assisting us at home so as to keep us out of England. I am very glad that Barbadians are playing their part in causing some attention to be paid to our needs, if for no other reason than the one I have just mentioned. For this reason, no matter what it is we stand to benefit from it, because we are making a direct impression on those who can assist us, if they have refused to take our plight seriously to heart in the past and to give us the assistance to which we are entitled as a dependent country, and one of the places they might regard as under-developed—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is—

Mr. LEWIS: I feel that the Minister of Labour owes it—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the sum of \$134,303 be voted under Head 31. Hon. members in favour will please say "aye" and those against will please say "no". I think the "ayes" have it.

Head XXXII — Highways & Transport

Head XXXII — Highways and Transport was called.

Hon. M. E. Cox moved, seconded by Hon Dr H. G. CUMMINS that the sum of \$998,510 be voted under this Head.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to give a little advice at this stage. Surely when we come to Heads like these, especially where there is something new, it is not good enough to say "I beg to move that Head so and so stand part." The person in charge should say something about it especially if there is something in the Head that was not there before. If the Ministers are responsible for their departments—

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of stifling debate. It is customary for members to ask questions on the various Heads.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me—

Mr. LEWIS: I had something else to say. I think that if we adopted the system of sending in some of these questions to the Ministers it would be a good idea. [VOICES: Hear! Hear!] The Estimates are usually rushed, and if a member had a lot of questions to ask and no time to ask them, he could send them in. The Ministers would have to take the consequences if they did not answer them.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I know that you are in the habit of pushing through a motion before a Minister replies. Certain specific questions that I asked have not been answered yet.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Under what Item is the hon. member speaking?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: This is a question that I am putting to the Minister. The Minister of Communications has paid a visit to my constituency without me to investigate the repairing of the Whim Road. I am not asking for any invitations. I want to know what progress his department intends to make now with the Whim Road.

Hon. M. E. COX: Even at the risk of being censured, Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the honourable member that the Whim Road is in this programme.

11.55 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, there are one or two questions that I wish to ask. On this question of Unestablished Staff, under Item 25 the sum of \$245,500 is to be voted.

This is a matter which comes under Item 25, Unestablished Staff and which perhaps might more fittingly be referred to the Hon. Minister of Labour for a statement of policy. The Hon. Minister would recollect that I have more than once pressed that in connection with the unestablished staff, those people who are not paid monthly or weekly salaries, should be given time off without deduction from their pay and given half days as private employers do with their subordinate staff for races and cricket. It is a matter of policy and it is time that we get a statement from the Government on the matter. The Australian Cricket Tour is approach-

ing and I can assure the Hon. Minister that the employees of Government who work on the roads, (that is the Cantoneers and Casual labourers,) are saying that private business houses are closing half days for the cricket tour and we are wondering whether the Government will be equally magnanimous with us. If the Hon Minister does not want at this moment to commit himself, I would not insist on him but I hope that he makes up his mind before the Australian tour commences here. As I have said, this is a matter which it is time for a decision to be arrived at.

Under Item 65, Repairing and surfacing Parish Roads, (Parish of St. Lucy) the sum of \$12,000 is to be voted and a similar sum is also voted for the parish roads of St. Andrew. I was one of those honourable members who were very happy that the Central Government took over the roads of St. Joseph, not only because I know the Central Government is better able to handle them; but now that the St. Joseph roads are taken over I realise that St. Lucy would get the same good treatment as St. Joseph gets in every possible phase of Government's activities. I am happy to notice that for the repairing and resurfacing of the parish roads in St. Joseph there is the sum of \$18,000 to be voted, which is 50% more than that of St. Andrew or St. Lucy. I say that not because I do not want St. Joseph to get that amount, but I maintain that St. Andrew and St. Lucy are entitled to more than what they are getting. If that parish which has such distinguished representatives as yourself and the Hon. Premier, whose roads are certainly not worse than those of St. Andrew or St. Lucy is entitled to \$18,000, there is no reason why a similar amount should not be proposed in respect of these other parishes.

There should not be any favourite parish. In the past when it came to the question of water supply the parish of St. Michael always received more favourable consideration with standpipes than the rural parishes. I feel that the parishes of St. Lucy and St. Andrew should be given the same amount for the repair of their roads as St. Joseph. We realise that the Department of Highways & Transport is being supervised efficiently nowadays; we get value for our money, and that is why I must urge that the parishes of St. Lucy and St. Andrew should get the same treatment as St. Joseph. They should not get inferior treatment to that parish. To say that the St. Joseph roads have been recently taken over and that they must have some leeway is not our fault; nor is it our fault that somebody was delinquent in turning over those roads to the Central Government.

Mr. Chairman, I venture to query the failure of the Government to employ a former Chief Road Inspector of St. Joseph. I understand that there was an assurance given at the time of the taking over of those roads that every one who was in the old setup would be employed; and I think that impression was quite wide-spread. I would like to know if it is a fact that he is still unemployed, and if it is the intention of the Central Government to re-employ him. If it is not their intention, would they tell us if he is guilty of any fault or they had any reason to doubt his ability and integrity. Is he above the age or below the standard of efficiency which one normally expects of any Government servant? I would be glad if the Hon. Minister would assist in the answering of these questions. They were also a couple of men under him and I do not know what is the position with them. Are they now in the employ of the Central Government? Have

they been promoted? What is their standing in this new setup? I would be glad for some information.

I am glad to see that the amount of leave-pay to casual employees under Item 32, has been increased, and I wish it were more than \$6,500. I say so, because it should have been the policy of the department to make as many of their employees regular casuals, so that they would be entitled to weekly wages and holidays. As you know sir, if anyone gets a holiday and does not get paid for it, that holiday would not be so much of a blessing, because it means time off with no money.

Item 37, deals with marking and maintenance of traffic lines and signs and bus stops. That is a matter of Government's policy and the Minister in charge is responsible and no longer is the Head of the Department responsible. He is a technical man. I am wondering what is the declared or avowed policy of the Ministry in connection with the marking and maintenance of bus stops. I hope that I am not anticipating the honourable senior member for St. James, when I asked that question. Between Prospect and Paynes Bay, people have been asking for years and years for bus stops and they have been so promised but the promise has never been implemented.

12.05 a.m.

Anybody who is generally interested in labour would realise the benefit which would accrue to a driver if he does not have to stop every 5 or 6 yards on a suburban route; and people are waiting to have the promise redeemed to them as to the provision of these bus stops. I think that the Department is much better off now—I understand that from last month it was relieved of one of its biggest impediments. [A MEMBER: Mr. Ward?] Yes. It is a great relief to the department and the Civil Establishment as a whole that Mr. Ward is now on the pension list of this colony. He belongs to a different era and to a different point of view; whatever he wanted done had to be done as he thought, and he had his pet company. However, I will be glad to hear a pronouncement by the Hon. Minister of Communications on the question of the erection of bus stops on the suburban routes in order to relieve the bus drivers of the constant stopping which they have to do; also on the question of time off for employees of the unestablished staff.

Mr. TUDOR: Before the Hon. Minister replies to my colleague, I should like to join my voice to his in the comment which he has made on the roads of the parish which we have the honour to represent, and the regret that he sees less money being allocated to these roads having regard to the roads of St. Andrew. I think that the honourable senior member for St. Andrew is quite able to speak for this parish, but it does get a lot of money to keep it in order. I do not like to withhold praise from those to whom it is due, and it is a fact that why the roads in St. Lucy are being kept as they are is I think a credit to the Vestry of St. Lucy. That is something to be proud of. I think I can say that the Vestry of St. Lucy has brought the Gilkes Road to their attention and they have given an undertaking to see that it is done. Therefore, I would implore the Hon. Minister if and when the matter is brought to their attention they would have it done as quickly as possible. It does not need any big shower to make it difficult to get in and out of this particular district.

There is another question I wanted to ask the Hon. Minister with regard to Item 54 "Road Rolling Equipment". The Note said this: "Increase due

to increased cost of spare parts. Rolling stock increased by one unit taken over from St. Joseph." I wish to know from the Hon. Minister if this increase of \$2,000 is as a result of the taking over of those Roads in St. Joseph.

With regard to the question of leave pay to the casual employees there is still some uncertainty as to their right in this matter; a lot of these employees appear not to know that this House has made provision for them to have leave pay.

There is another matter which has been exercising my mind. I do not know if the question can be asked under Item 55 "Transport" but it is this: some of the people who work on the Road Rollers have from time to time, complained that the amounts given to them to cover their transportation is not sufficient, and that those who work in the far out parishes have to get there every day and they find themselves out of pocket with the allowance which is given to them. It is not nearly enough to cover the distance between their homes and the hilly districts. I wonder what can be done for them; I do not think that any employee should be out of pocket through getting to his work. I do not know what the regulations are with respect to the half holiday, but I do think they should have their full pay when there is a half holiday or when they are given time off. I hope that something will be told us about that and what the Ministry and the Department will do to remedy it.

I hope that they will be able to tell the House that the Ministry and the Department will do all they can to remedy it if there is a substantial ground for complaint.

12.15 a.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I want to draw to the Ministers' attention one or two things of a general character. Under Item 25 we see that there are 425 members on the unestablished staff and the sum of \$245,000 is to be voted. That is the same as it was last year. It seems to me that all these people are at the same point.

What I want to point out at this stage: I am not interested in the point about letting people off for cricket and things like that; I want something of a more tangible nature. I feel that public employment should take the lead in providing proper conditions of service for employees. In this respect I feel that if a man is employed for a day, the Government should undertake to pay the man for a day if he turns out to work. I am told that sometimes the rain falls early in the morning and when a man comes out to work he is sent back home and told that there is no money for him. I want the Minister to go into this matter and to say if he agrees with the policy of paying a man for a day's work, and for any part of a day that he comes out to work.

Another thing I would like to point out is the matter raised by the honourable senior member for St. Lucy. When a man works, and a Bank holiday comes within the week he should not lose by the accident of a Bank Holiday. I say that in favour of the workers; I am now going to say something in favour of the community. I do not know if the Minister is satisfied; but a man who wants to work for the Government and who sits down under the first standpipe he gets to and gets bad feels everyday should be fired. A man who is prepared to work for the Government's money or the taxpayers' money in that way is not entitled to the other conditions which I talked about. You may spend a lot of money but if your supervision is not good enough

to see that the community is getting work for the money you are spending, you are doing nothing.

I am pointing out that the Minister should see to it that we get production for the money we are spending. I am not making a second reading speech, but I will point out that this is not a man with a gigpooh. [A MEMBER: What is that?]

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would be glad if the honourable member define that word.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The honourable senior member for St. John was one of those who asked what is a gigpooh. He knows as well as the world how a gigpooh nearly killed both of us on one occasion. It is one of those traps that you see on the road and which remain on the roads because the roads are well done. To-day the life of a motor car and a bus tyre is twice as long as it was some years ago. Today people are getting 26,000 and 27,000 miles to a motor car tyre. At this stage I am going to point out that when the report comes down recommending an increase in bus fares, he may pigeon hole it; I am anticipating that. Whenever we see Government set up a Committee like that, you can be sure it is a fare-raising Committee. Whenever Government sets up a Committee to go into the question of raising anything you can be sure that the Government is in favour of the raise.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What Item is that?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The Item that is to be voted. I would not like to do anything that would embarrass you. When it comes to taxation or raising money I am satisfied in my mind that if the Government wants to set up a Committee to do something, it should set up one to go into the rates that you now pay for motor vehicles in this island. I am referring to the rates of taxation that have been in existence for many years. When those rates were established the conditions of the roads were not anything like what they are to-day. The rates should be increased. Motor car owners cannot complain for the life they are getting out of their cars. People who do not do a lot of driving can get 30,000 miles out of a tyre, and it will last them for more or less five years. If a man can buy a motor car for \$2,000 or \$3,000 there is nothing wrong in increasing these rates.

I want to see you give these people a day's work whenever you employ them; I want to see you paying them for a day. Stop this half day and three-quarter day's work; stop taking out for bank-holidays. If a man works a week in which there is a bank-holiday, pay him for the bank-holiday. Sir, I feel that the Hon. Minister should go into this question of seeing that the Government is receiving sufficient satisfaction for the money which it is paying out. I know, that certain members of this House are afraid of telling employees of the Government to stop idling on the job. I say do not mind the votes, mind that the money has to be found.

12.25 a.m.
Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on Items 42 & 68, which deal with Parish roads, and Kensington New Road respectively. On the last occasion we had a Resolution for Tenantry Roads, I asked the Hon. Minister a question and he gave me an assurance.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard a lot of talk about the St. Joseph, St. Lucy and St. Andrew parish roads and I want to know something about Carrington's Village and New Orleans Tenantry Roads. I am asking the Hon. Premier to tell me something about it.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am sorry if the honourable member overheard an aside of mine, but

that is a matter for the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I drew to his attention that it could not be a true statement that Kensington New Road had been done; but I see it is a question of \$4,000 for the drainage of Kensington New Road. I say again that that is not a private tenantry; it has been a tenantry for the last ten years with small house owners like Carrington's Village. I am asking the Hon. Minister what Government proposes to do with Carrington's Village and the New Orleans. There are 400 houses in Carrington's Village and the Hon. Minister promised that New Orleans and Carrington's Village would be taken into consideration for repairs this year. Of course he knows that one road in the Carrington's Village area and one road in the Kensington area have been done. I am asking the Hon. Minister to say whether during the Estimates as was promised, he would give consideration to these areas. I am sure his colleague the hon. junior member for St. Michael would remember that statement. I do not want to anticipate anything which that hon. member might say, therefore I shall await the reply of the Hon. Minister of Communications on this matter.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, before the Hon. Minister replies, I have one or two observations to make. The first is with respect to Item 27, Travelling Expenses for which the sum of \$27,000 is to be voted. That Item has been increased by \$2,000 and I do not know if that is the result of the taking over of the roads in St. Joseph. If that is so, I wonder if that amount would cover it. At any rate, I do hope Government will not come during the year for a substantial increase to that amount.

With respect to Item 47, Work undertaken for Utility Companies and Government Departments, I see the sum of \$50,000 is to be voted. On the last occasion I spoke on this matter, and I hope that the point has been driven home that the Government should revise its rates which the Public Utilities pay for work undertaken by Government for them. I hope we are getting back this money which we are spending; I hope that the full amount put down is revenue; but there are a number of other Items which do not come under this Head which should be taken into consideration. Sir, if you actually pay out \$50,000 and get it back you still lose on it; there should be a little margin of profits for those people who are doing that work and whom you have to pension. There is also technical staff which does not come under this vote at all, but which should be taken into consideration.

12.35 a.m.

Under Item 42 "Parish Roads" I see that there is an increase of only \$11½ thousand; I do not know about the revenue which is collected in respect of these roads, but it seems to me that if you are undertaking the Parish Roads of St. Joseph to which you give an allocation of \$24,000, this increase is not sufficient. Perhaps there is an explanation and you may have something under tenantry roads also. I wonder if there is an amount which they were unable to spend in the past and they are now figuring to put it in in this way. There is a considerable increase in the matter of transport; and as to this dredging of rivers, if there is one thing that the Department needs to pay attention to it is the question of drainage. The people of Christ Church are complaining about a lake up there; that is a serious aspect of the matter. Without having proper drains you may be making good roads and just leaving them to be washed away.

There is a decrease of \$37,000 in respect of the item "Plant, Tools, Spares and Equipment." I know that this vote is always supplementary and I am continually asking about it. Perhaps the Department is getting some equipment from St. Joseph and if they are getting that, the expenditure in this direction will be cut down. I have always questioned this matter; some of the plant in that Department is not getting fair treatment and I hope that this is a true reflection of what the position is. I hope that proper use is being made of that equipment. There are certain officers in that Department who do a lot of overtime work and they do not get any overtime pay for it. In view of the fact that they have taken on new responsibility the amount they want for Parish Roads does not seem to be equal to the past, and I am glad to see a reduction in the amount for "Plant, Tools, Spares and Equipment". But whenever you move into a new place you will always want some new things. I hope they will continue to give the satisfaction which they are giving, but, I would like to hear in due course something about these matters to which I have drawn the attention of the Hon. Minister.

Mr. BRYAN: There is just one little point of which I would like my colleague to make a note and it is in connection with Item 44 "Repair and Cleaning of suck Wells." In the Bush Hall and Syndicate Road area there is an old suck well which does not function properly; it does not take off the water during the rainy season with the result that the area is flooded and the residents suffer the inconvenience of the mosquito nuisance and so on. A little cleaning and sinking of that well would remedy that state of affairs and I would be glad if the Hon. Minister would see that that inconvenience be remedied this year.

In connection with Item 69 "Rivers Diversion and Goodland Drainage Scheme" I want to know if this drainage scheme includes the large waterway which comes from Black Rock through Bridge Gap and passes along before the old manager's house in Goodland. I would like to know if it is their intention to build a sort of culvert so that the road can be kept clear during the rain season.

Hon. M. E. COX: First of all, I should like to thank the hon. junior member for St. Lucy for the kind remarks he has made. We all know that the roads of St. Lucy with the exception of a few tenantry roads are in good order. The parish of St. Lucy is a poor parish and all of us are satisfied with the progress which has been made since Mr. Skinner has gone away.

The hon. senior member for St. Lucy asked a question about the unestablished staff being given time off during certain occasions; I am in favour of that, and as far as arrangements can be made I will see that some of these employees enjoy treatment which is afforded to other members of the staff. I quite agree with the hon. member that where a casual worker is concerned he goes to work in the hope of working a whole week, and there is work for him; and where a bank holiday comes in he should not suffer the loss of that day's pay through no fault of his own. I will take up that proposal in the proper quarters and see that something is done about it as soon as possible.

12.45 a.m.
A point was made as to the allocation of funds to parish roads, and the hon. senior member for St. Lucy questioned the giving of \$18,000 in St. Joseph as against \$12,000 for St. Lucy. Of course, if he look at the list he will see that St. Michael with many more miles of road than St. Lucy has also got \$12,000. So has St. Andrew. I think there is justifi-

cation for increasing the amount for St. Joseph. Anyone who takes a run through that parish will see the condition of the roads and must agree that something should be done to expedite the repairs of those roads. It is no use to drive across one parish and find good roads and then find bad roads as soon as you reach another parish, because you will still have to change your car springs more rapidly.

As regards the question of stop poles for buses, for a few years it has been drawn to my attention that some poles should be removed and some put up. I have discussed it with the Director of Highways and Transport, but there is no general policy or decision taken as to whether these poles should go beyond a certain limit. I do not think that anyone feels that these poles should be throughout the island, but perhaps we could extend them beyond the area which they now cover. I will discuss the matter again with the Director in the near future. I think those are all the questions asked by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy.

The hon. junior member for St. Lucy asked about road-rolling equipment. You will remember that in addition to the stock we had, we took over some from St. Joseph. Concerning the plant that we had which was of no use, we sold it by auction recently.

The hon. member expressed the view that casual workers of this Department are not well acquainted with the fact that they are entitled to leave. I would like to assure the hon. member that that point was raised sometime ago in the House by the hon. junior member for the City, and on the following day I gave instructions to the Department to post up a notice pointing out that every individual who worked for an average of 250 days a year was entitled to leave like everyone else. I do not think there is any doubt in the minds of those workers that they are entitled to leave.

The question of travelling allowances was also raised by the hon. member. That is a point that was represented recently to me, and I myself feel that the amount is inadequate because I know that it is difficult to get a bus at times. I do not think it is good enough, and I promised the hon. member that I will do something about it as soon as I can.

The hon. senior member for the City raised a point about promises made in connection with Kensington Roads. I have never known of any promises that I made in that connection. Whatever I promise my constituents I live up to if it is humanly possible to do so. As far as these roads are concerned I cannot tell him how many will be done in this financial year, but I would like to assure him that some will be done. Two of the Carrington's Village roads have already been repaired. I do not want to carry on the debate about the Kensington roads, but I knew the very day the Petition came in in respect of the Kensington's New Road. I think Mr. Hutson was interested. We put a pipe there and the road was repaired afterwards. I know the Petition for that road came in separately, because I had to deal with it.

I will say now that in 1953 I suggested to the then Executive Engineer of the Highways and Transport Department that in his programme of construction of tenantry roads he should start from Kensington, go around Jackson and through Robert's Tenantry, back to Lother's Village.

The hon. junior member for the City raised the question about Travelling Allowance. I purposely suggested a reduction because I want to see that Item kept as low as possible. I want to see officers who travel put in exactly the number of miles they do and no more. I think the amount in the Estimates should adequately cover the period.

I would like to assure the hon. member that in addition to the cost of the repairs they charge something like 5% for expenses of the department.
12.55 a.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I thank the hon. member for his reply. I am sure, he has learnt a lesson.

Hon. M. E. COX: I have learnt no lesson.

Mr. BRANCKER: I have not heard the reply to the question put by me about the Chief Road Inspector of St. Joseph.

Hon. M. E. COX: I would like to assure the hon. senior member for St. Lucy that a Bill will be coming to the House very soon to pension that particular officer. It has been found difficult to integrate him into the Service; and very soon a Bill will be coming to this House to provide a pension not only for that gentleman, but also for Mr. King the Parochial Treasurer who has resigned.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I am glad to know that something is being done. As far as I can see, that gentleman is in the middle of the forties and it is remarkable that a pension is given to him. I think in fairness to him we should know the real reason why he has not been integrated into the Service. We want to know if the Department has good grounds for not integrating him and if so whether they could be stated.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Hon. Minister of Transport would look into work of the drainage of the Kensington area which I see is costing \$12,000. I understand that work has not been successful as it might be.

Hon. M. E. COX: With respect to the point about the drainage of the Kensington area, I should like to inform the hon. member that \$10,000 has already been spent and we only need this amount to finish the job. I also want to tell the hon. junior member for St. Michael that as regards the point about suck-wells, I read something about it in the newspapers and I do not know if the Director has looked into the matter already. If he has not, I would get something done about it.

The question that the sum of \$998,510 be voted under Head XXXII., was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that Head XXXIII—stand part.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Did we not promise to finish this Head (Head XXXII) and come on Tuesday next? We will be coming prepared to finish the Estimates then.

On motion of Hon. Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Hon. M. E. COX Mr. Chairman reported progress and asked for leave to sit again.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 15th instant, at 12 (noon).

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, when we come next Tuesday, I hope we will give consideration to the filling of the post of Messenger of this House. I think it is too unbusinesslike for us to be without a Messenger for such a long time.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a suggestion that you put that matter above Government Business. I do not like that item appearing in Government Business because I think it is entirely out of place there; it will give members of the Government now that it is there, the impression that they can appoint Officers of this House. That matter could be decided by either one of them on the other side or it could be put under Private Members' Business. We have taken that post away from the Civil Service. You had better put it above Government Business.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday 15th March, 1955 at 12 o'clock (noon) was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

1.05 a.m.