

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1954—55

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 1st November, 1955.

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*); His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS, (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Chairman of Committees*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); Mr. F. C. GODDARD, (*Leader of the Opposition*); Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. J. A. HAYNES, B.A.; Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc., and Mr. J. C. TUDOR, M.A.

Prayers were read.

Mrs. BOURNE entered the House and took her seat.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 18th October, 1955 having been printed and circulated were taken as read and confirmed.

MESSAGES FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following from the Honourable the Legislative Council:—

(a) Message returning to the Honourable House of Assembly the Bill intituled an Act to amend the Representation of the People which has been passed with amendments which are shown written on the Bill, signed by the President.

(b) Message returning to the Honourable House of Assembly the Bill intituled an Act to consolidate and amend the laws of the island relating to the People which has been passed with amendments which are shown written on the Bill, signed by the President.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am once again enquiring whether it is your opinion that these amendments should be printed and circulated among hon-

ourable members if they are extensive enough and important enough for that to be done.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not yet had time to look at these amendments; they were received just about an hour ago.

Mr. LEWIS: Then they will not be dealt with to-day.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should not recommend that. They are several amendments which have been made to both these Bills and I would not advise that the amendments to either of these Bills be dealt with to-day.

LEAVE TO THE DEPUTY CLERK

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Deputy Clerk the following:—

1st November, 1955.

His Honour,
The Speaker,
House of Assembly.
Sir,

I am unable to attend the meeting of the House to-day and I would be grateful if your honourable House would grant me leave of absence.

Mr. D. A. Banfield (Solicitor) has kindly consented to act for me.

I am,
Sir,

Your obedient servant,
Sgd. H. LISLE THOMAS,
Deputy Clerk, House of Assembly.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the Deputy Clerk be granted leave of absence for to-day's meeting.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Mr. D. A. Banfield be appointed to act as Deputy Clerk for to-day.

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

Mr. ALLDER entered the House and took his seat.
3.25 p.m.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded by His Excellency to lay the Report on the Treatment of offenders for the year 1954.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I am commanded to lay the following:—

The Protection of Wages (Notice of Claim) Regulations, 1955.

REPLIES

Reply to Question No. 62 asked by Mr. J. E. T. Brancker re loans to emigrants to the U.K. towards passage expenses.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice on behalf of the Hon. Premier of the following:—

Resolution to place the sum of \$4,900 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955-56, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1955-56, No. 43, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to place the sum of \$250,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955-56, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1955-56, No. 45, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to place the sum of \$4,879 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955-56, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1955-56, No. 46 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 9 Order, 1955.

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 10 Order, 1955.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give Notice of a:—

Resolution to place the sum of \$1,800 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955-56, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1955-56, No. 44 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, in connection with the foregoing Resolutions I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply in order to deal with the four money Resolutions already given notice of.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

On the Order being called for Private Members' Notices,

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Philip.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, he is absent.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 60

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with the Order Paper I should like to ask leave to move the Suspension of Rule No. 60 in order to deal with Order 29 as the first Order of the Day, Order No. 29 deals with the Emergency Powers Orders and I shall like to deal with this first.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to suspend—

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am not objecting, but if you want a single Order taken as the first Order of the Day all you have to do is to make a motion to that effect.

Mr. SPEAKER: You never can tell.

Mr. LEWIS: If you suspend Rule 60 for to-day's sitting in order to deal with Order No. 29 you can go on from there to No. 71 and never do No. 4. If you want to do that say so.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member knows what he wishes to do.

Mr. LEWIS: If he intends to trick the House by moving up one Order—

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I object to that word "trick". I am not of that suspicious nature. I am not out to trick anybody.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that word. But I did not expect such an attitude from the Hon. Minister. The Hon. Minister hinted that he wanted the Rule suspended for one Item. If that is so, then let us make a motion for the suspension and let us get that carried out.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to suspend Rule 60.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am objecting to that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that Rule 60 be now suspended, hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

EMERGENCY ORDERS

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution to approve the continuance in force of the Emergency Powers (Hurricane) Order No. 2, 1955, was introduced last Tuesday. To-day the Order is in its seventh day and the Other Place is waiting on us to deal with it. I think copies of the Resolution has been circulated. There are certain Emergency Orders which it is though advisable to maintain during the present emergency. The reason for that is that there may be still some more supplies and gifts coming to Barbados from abroad, and naturally we would want them to come duty free. It is therefore considered advisable to retain the necessary power for at least another month.

3.35 p.m.

Then there is the Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Requisitioning of Supplies) Order; then there is again Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Requisitioning of Lands and Buildings) Order; then there is Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Right of Entry) Order; then there is Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Damage to Property) Order; and then there is Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (False Information and Alarming Reports) Order.

As I have said, it was thought that these Orders should be retained for another month, hence they are here for you to sanction. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I take it that the Orders of which we are approving the continuance are the indential orders that we approved on the previous occasion. I have not seen them but I understand that they were laid at the last meeting of the House. Many of them were thought to be unnecessary, therefore they were not re-made. As I have said, no cyclo-styled copies of these Orders came to this House on this occasion, nor do I think they were actually printed, however, they have been laid.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: These Orders are the same Orders which were previously laid: but it is deemed advisable that they should be continued for a further period. There are ten of these Orders which, it is intended, should be renewed.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I ask leave to revert to Order No. 1.

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

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply and that it be an instruction to the Committee when the House is in Committee that I take charge of the Resolution standing in the name of the Hon. Premier.

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

Mr. LEWIS: I do not think that that instruction is necessary because the House has deemed it that way. What I am wondering is this: what about the Resolution standing in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands & Fisheries? If we go on to that Resolution, who is going to take charge of it?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: When we get to that Resolution, we can say that we do not intend to proceed with it or postpone it. To my way of thinking that matter is not before the House now.

The question that His Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply and that it be an instruction to the Committee when the House is in Committee that the Hon. Minister of Social Services will deal with the Resolution standing in the name of the Premier, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I ask leave to postpone the first Resolution.

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

Visit Of Delegation From The United Kingdom Branch Of The Commonwealth Parliamentary Association

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution for the sum of \$120 in connection with the visit of the delegation from the United Kingdom Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. Hon. members will remember that just a short while ago a delegation paid a visit to Barbados. When the visit was first proposed, it was said that there would be three members of the delegation coming to Barbados; hence provision was made for three members. It has eventually turned out that there were four members instead of three. This Resolution for \$120 is required to pay the expenses of the fourth delegate. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Sir, the Addendum to this Resolution explains to some extent the reason for the

increased cost of the visit of this delegation; but I think it should be added that not only was our own delegation increased in number but that we had to be hosts to both parts of the delegation at one time or another. For one week-end, we had that part of the delegation which was to visit the other islands officially. Perhaps the Committee would like to know that members of both parts of the delegation have written back to say that they were very pleased with the arrangements which were made for them by the Barbados Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

Mr. BARROW: The present Resolution calls for the sum of \$120 to meet the expenses of the additional member of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association which visited this colony some time during the current year. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record as saying that while we consider this amount of money to be very reasonable and well spent in the light of the interest which the Parliamentarians took in the working of the constitution here in Barbados and the interest which they took generally in the economic plight of the suffering masses of this colony, I would not like this occasion to pass without once more registering my protest against the way in which the local Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association is being run or engineered. From time to time invitations are sent out to other member Branches and the Local Association appoint delegates to visit either the mother country or some other part of the Commonwealth.

3.55 p.m.

The Association is not supposed to be a partisan body. We are not members of the Association because we belong to a particular party, or because we have sworn the oath of allegiance to any individual mortal, other than Her Majesty the Queen or the Sovereign Lady; yet we find the Government of Barbados—when I say the Government there is a certain amount of confusion because of the novelty of constitutional institutions to-day and I use the term "novelty" in its widest sense; a lot of people do not appreciate that the Government is not the 24 members sitting in this Chamber, but the Executive Committee of this island and in particular, the Hon. Ministers and those who have sworn allegiance to them, consider that the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association is an institution for political patronage, and that only those persons who have sworn allegiance to the Leaders of the Government Party and are prepared to make obeisance to them, should represent the aggregate of the individual members of both Houses of Parliament in this country on such occasions as when we receive the invitation which I have just mentioned. While we on this side of the House are prepared to support any Resolution of this kind in relation to the visit of British or any other Commonwealth Parliamentarians to this island, especially when the Resolution is of a reasonable nature such as the one now before us, I think that I ought to serve notice here and now that we are not prepared to underwrite joyrides for members of the Government Party under the guise of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in future; and only at such time as the members of the Other Place and the Government Party realise that the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association is not a political Body will we be prepared to vote for any sum for these excursions which are now indulged in. I believe that the last time we sent one delegate away it cost the Taxpayers of this colony over £1,500, and up to now neither the members of this House nor the general public nor the members of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (Local Branch) have

been vouchsafed the courtesy of a lecture on the tour which was made to Africa. That may not be the fault of the particular individual; but at the same time, we must bear in mind that we are calling on the taxpayers to support excursions which have no relevance to the economic realities which exist in Barbados to-day or to the day to day life of the people themselves. I feel that it is very important if we are to spend such a large amount of money as we did on the occasion when the Minister of Communications went away, we could be able, at least, either by contact of the parties or by public information, to assess the advantage of the expenditure of the sum of money. Those persons, Mr. Chairman, who have never before taken an interest in broadening their horizon or had the necessary ability to take advantage of trips overseas regard the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association as a travel agency and I hope, Mr. Chairman, that on the next occasion on which we have a meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association we will be given reports which can be published in the Press and which would tend to convince us of the efficacy of these occasions. I hope too, Sir, that on the next occasion we would not be treated to the ignominious display which I have previously witnessed of members of the Other Place being cajoled not to interfere with or take any part in the selection of delegates on the grounds that it is a matter which the Government regards as a Party matter. That has actually taken place and the particular display did not, in any way, enhance the prestige of the nominated members of the Other Place in the eyes of right-thinking members of this Chamber. It is rather regrettable also, Mr. Chairman, that the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, which meets with such great alacrity at the behest of the Government to appoint a delegate to go abroad, does not meet with similar alacrity in order to hear other Parliamentarians or other members of the local Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in their impressions of other Parliamentary Institutions or to give us an opportunity to hear some of the analogies drawn between our constitutional practices and their own; which all seems to give weight to the suspicion that the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association is a matter of grace and favour, and not a question of in anyway furthering the aims and objects of that Association.

4.05 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, the other aspect of this recent visit to which I would like to draw your attention is this: some members of the Government seem to think that there was nothing to get out of this particular visit—and when I say nothing, I do not mean that they were convinced that they had nothing to learn, but nothing in the pecuniary sense. It was, I think, because of this fact that the Government did not receive the delegation in the manner which we feel that the delegation deserved. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, it is well known that certain members declined to do anything to assist the delegation, and it was only at the very last moment that an official gesture was made to entertain the members of the delegation on one specific occasion. The brunt of responsibility was borne by His Honour the Deputy Speaker, not only in meeting the delegation, but as one of the members of the British Parliament has gone on record as saying, to act as guide, philosopher and friend. The question of grace, Mr. Chairman, is not something which you can imbue into people such as those who now grace the Government Benches, but I do feel that the very people who benefit in the votes are they; and there

is not a single Minister with the exception of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture who has not benefited at some time or the other with a trip sponsored by the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. We do feel that their omissions are a sad reflection not only on the Local Branch of the Association, but on the morale of Barbados itself.

You can rest assured, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion that as long as we have that kind of attitude of "take all" and "give nothing", so far as the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association is concerned, we will not be prepared to subscribe to the extravagances of persons who have no intention of making any contribution to the principles and ideas behind the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association or any contribution to the people of Barbados themselves.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, with reference to what the honourable member had to say, about the visit of the member of the Local Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, I take it that he is referring to the visit to Kenya. On that occasion we were represented by a member of the Other Place. It is true that he is not a son of the soil, but the representative turned out to be a very distinguished one; and as testified by other delegates from other places, I think it is correct to say that on the return to this island of our delegate some public talk was given over the Rediffusion Service, and I think that it would be also right to say that that delegate brought back at his own expense lantern slides that were of interest and enlightenment to local audiences. Perhaps the honourable senior member for St. George was not aware of that. If he were, I am sure he would have mentioned it.

I share his view that we should get some form of report from those who go on such trips because it has been done in the past; and I myself have pressed for because it is courteous. I also think that members of the Local Branch would cherish that official Report from a delegate. Especially is this the case when a member is being sent at the taxpayers' expense. As far as the recent visit to our shores of the delegation from the United Kingdom Branch, as you know, Sir, we arranged a programme for them and there were many members of the House who felt it was a full programme; so much so, that some of them clamoured for the giving of more time to the members of the United Kingdom Branch themselves. That was the impression I got. As far as anything which I did on that occasion is concerned it is well known that it is an established fact that the moment anybody goes forward to do anything, the bulk of the work falls on him. While perhaps it is to be regretted, it is traditional and I am well aware of it. If the honourable senior member for St. George is offering me sympathy, I would like to thank him for it; and if he is offering me congratulations, I would like to thank him too. It may fall to his lot some day and as he may discover that it is always the responsibility of one person when these things take place; and in future I do hope that some other member would be prepared to take that responsibility.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I think what has been said on this matter of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association by the honourable senior member for St. George had long wanted saying. I myself who have only recently become a member of the Local Branch of the Association have only recently ascertained at first hand the working of this Branch, and I was appalled and astonished at the casualness with which the whole idea of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association was treated in

this island by the Government members of this Assembly.

4.15 p.m.

And I was also astonished to discover that when it came to voting money for its uses, one could always discover the nature and the purpose to which the money was going to be put from the attitude of the Government on the several occasions.

There is something more than that. The impression which the honourable senior member for St. George and other honourable members have gathered from the handling of these matters would not recommend this Branch of the Association to other Branches or to the rest of the world. I think that some attempt ought to be made in future to settle that attitude once and for all. In the first place, it ought to be emphasised—and it cannot be too strongly emphasised—that the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association is only a political body in the sense that its members are members of Legislative Bodies. It has as you may imagine, a very remote connection in politics. Apart from that, it is first and foremost an assembly of persons with similar interests. It is a world wide assembly of Parliamentarians who have problems to discuss and information to exchange with each other which are not necessarily problems of Party Politics. Therefore, it has at once a standing and scope far wider than if it were merely an Association of like-minded persons of the same political party or parties. The only way to keep that conception of it alive, to keep alive that dis-sociation from Party politics which ought to be foremost in our minds, is to cease the practice having its affairs or the affairs of any Branch of it attended to by Government or Government members as such.

When, for instance, a delegation from any Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association visits this Branch, such a delegation is essentially coming here as the guest of this Branch of the Association and not as the guests of the Government. Therefore the Legislature which makes up the Commonwealth Parliamentary Branch in this island is, as you can see, the hosts of that delegation. When you once grasp that, you will see how necessary it is to dis-sociate from the Government something which is essentially non-government; and in so far as the spending of money is concerned, this House which has the power to authorise the spending of money should always deal with these matters as if they are dealing with their own affairs.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of Order. It might save us a little debate if I make a remark at this point. If I understand what the honourable member is driving at, it really beats me—

Mr. TUDOR: I do object. The honourable member is not raising any point of Order.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I should just like to enquire of the honourable member if the arrangements of the visit of the Parliamentary Association Delegates were made by the Parliamentary Association of the Island or by the Government, and if it was looked upon as a Government matter as distinct from the Parliamentary Association of which this Legislature is a Branch. I am only asking the honourable member that question.

Mr. TUDOR: I really did not get the sense of the Hon. Minister's question [A MEMBER: I know you would not get it.] The fact that the honourable member has risen strengthens what I have been saying. Apparently he rises to defend what he thinks is the Government's point of view. I am saying that these matters concerning the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, so far as they effect this Branch, are matters for the House as a House and it

requires no defence on his part. If he is speaking as a member of this House to the House, he is entitled to be heard; but if he is speaking as a Minister, of course there is nothing which can be said to him.

Mr. Chairman, what I am trying to emphasise is this: if you watch carefully and listen carefully whenever we are discussing matters dealing with the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, Government members not infrequently give us the impression that they regard it as their area of influence especially when it involves not so much a trip in as a trip out. I wish therefore to emphasise that they would help themselves and the whole Branch of this island if they would look at the matter from the Association's point of view and not so much from the Government's Party's point of view. That raises a line of thought which I throw out to the Committee. It is in connection with the spending of money on various occasions. To me it is silly to come to this House and point out that you had provided an amount of \$600 in the Estimates because you thought that three people were coming and lo and behold four are coming and you want more money.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I did not say "lo! and behold! four are coming;" I distinctly said that three were coming, and when he talks about silliness, it would be only silly from his mentality.

4.25 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: I think my mentality can stand the light of day with any amount of scrutiny, which cannot be said of the Hon. Minister of Health. I was not here; I did not know he was responsible for it. I now see whence the muddling has come.

The point is, Mr. Chairman, when we are serious about these matters, you do not do things in the sort of way which makes it necessary for you to come to the House because a person wants \$120. I hold that these matters ought to be treated on a certain level. In a Legislature like this, the Speaker of the House, by virtue of his dignity, ought to have a sum of money put at his disposal to look after all these things. It need not be essentially under his control, but it certainly should be at his disposal, in co-operation with a sizeable number of the members of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association of this Island. It is a matter of dignity, and the idea that you could waste time and energy asking for \$120 because of a miscalculation as to the number of persons which you thought you had, is ludicrous in the extreme. That gives further emphasis to what I have already had to say about this not being at any time a Government matter; and that if you wish to raise the status of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, you should do everything to show that it is not a Government Body but an Association; and that if you want to spend money for its uses, you should take the money out of the control of the Government. If you did that, they would not be so keen in manoeuvring trips, because they would know that the responsibility of getting money to run hither and thither is largely theirs and that a good part of the price of that particular journey is necessarily their own. Such a procedure would stop for the future any idea of members of the majority party being promised plums on good behaviour by being sent out from time to time.

I notice that within the last few years that practice has ceased, either because they have run the whole gamut of persons to be sent out or because those who were sent out on trips have got what was to be had. But it is to be emphasised that it is not a political matter and ways and means have got to be

found to take it out of the control of whatever Government is in power and vest it within the hands of the local branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I think I should say that I have already explained that this Addendum is not a full explanation of what took place. The Addendum states that the sum of \$600 provided by Supplementary Estimate No. 10, was based on a visit by three members of the United Kingdom Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. Later, information was received that the delegation would consist of four members instead of three. . . . But we actually received the entire delegation that came to the West Indies. I agree that the dignity of this local Branch of the Association should be raised by the Government endeavouring to be as generous as the House is generous to them in the Estimates. We should provide about a thousand dollars in the Estimates to be spent by the joint Presidents of the Association. I think that the spending of any money should be safely left in their hands. It must be remembered, too, that the officials of the Association are unpaid, and it has been suggested that the members of the local Branch of the Association should pay some subscription. Now that at least, this branch of the Legislature are paid it might be easier to get this started. The Clerk of this House is recorded as the Secretary of the local Branch; but it is an honorary post; and the very evening that the first part of the Delegation left here, the then Clerk of the House died; so that we were without the services of our experienced officer during the visit of our own party.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the plea which I made before was of a general nature. Arising out of the remarks which were addressed to you by the hon. junior member for the City, and the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, I entirely agree with them that in order to get around the disgraceful kind of exhibitions which we have witnessed at meetings of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association here in Barbados, there should be a block amount or lump sum given every year to the Association. As a matter of fact, the failure of the Government to do so can only be susceptible to explain in the hypothesis that they do not have any confidence, either in the Speaker of this Chamber, or the President of the Other Place. I feel that a sum normally under £500 per annum should be placed at the joint disposal of the Presidents of the Local Branch until it is proved otherwise inadequate for this purpose. We do at present, under the Estimates, give \$1,200 to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association; but not one penny if this \$1,200 is given to the Local Branch. That money is sent out to England and they employ typists. They also pay for printing of debates or extracts from debates and matters of that kind, and the \$1,200 is merely to assist them to circulate members with copies of these extracts of debates, which, few members of this Chamber read, judging from my discussions with some members, and in order to help them to pay for stationery, clerical assistance etc. However, it has been shown that we have so little confidence in the Speaker of this Chamber and the President of the Other Place that we cannot give our own Branch one penny. What is our own experience? Our own experience is this: that the Leader of the Government in Barbados has, on occasion, been into a meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association when two delegates were to go to the United Kingdom and as the Head or biggest voice in the Executive Committee, has stated to all the members present that he

was not going to guarantee that the Executive Committee would vote the money to send these people; and at that particular stage when that statement was made it was only made because he had been unable to inform the members of the Association that his particular "blue-eyed boys" should be the particular delegates. Thus it was that the joint Presidents had been placed in the awkward position of not knowing whether to go on or to wait until the money was voted. 4.35 p.m.

There were suggestions made when the money was voted first. The Leader of the Government said, that even if the money was voted first, the Government could not subscribe to any delegates that were subsequently appointed or words to that effect, but the main indication given at that stage was that the Government was not prepared to put it to the Executive Committee, and what the Ministers say in Executive Committee is automatically the law. This is the kind of manoeuvring to which we have referred in this debate and to which we have referred on previous occasions. You must send A or B or the Executive Committee is not giving you money and that is the stage to which the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association is reduced. You know from your own experience, Mr. Chairman, that that procedure was followed with the results that turned out to be disastrous both to members of the Government and to members of the public.

On another occasion, at the time of the visit of Her Majesty the Queen to Jamaica—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Now, now; what has that to do with the Resolution?

Mr. BARROW: I am allowed to refer to the general principle. The public does not get an opportunity to know how this money is spent unless members speak on it. We are not here in our own right; we are put here by the taxpayers and the public should know how this money is spent.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But, you should keep to the Resolution.

Mr. BARROW: I am speaking on the principle. I am referring to votes for the Parliamentary Association. It may be personally embarrassing to you and for that no one is more regretful than I am, because I know you have been caused embarrassment on a previous occasion, and I have no intention of causing embarrassment now.

Your Honour, I will continue to submit an illustration of the visit to Jamaica on the occasion of Her Majesty the Queen when members of the Other Places were told, "well, do not interfere with us. This matter is strictly one for us. We will take your candidate if you take our candidate."

That is the kind of tactic and tick tack that is going on in our Commonwealth Parliamentary Association and it is not good enough. I say that quite seriously because I remember vividly on the last occasion when they were taking a vote, signals were given similar to the kind given by bookmakers on an English race course. Those signals were given to members of the Other Place, to people who are supposed to be above reproach and people who are selected and nominated to sit in the Other Place because of their impartiality. Because of the particular manner for which funds are voted they found themselves in the position of allowing their better judgment to succumb to the blandishments of people who want to use the Association for political opportunity. That is the state of affairs to-day and because of that I have a suggestion to make which is entirely in keeping with the one made by the honourable junior member for the City. Not only has he suggested that

Government should allocate a particular sum every year for the use of the Association, and which would be at the disposal of members of the Association and of the joint Presidents, but I am suggesting that since it is an association that comprises of both Houses of the Legislature (this Chamber and the Other Place) members should make their subscription to it. This association is one of the most exclusive Clubs in Barbados because you do not become a member by your ability, neither do you become a member because of your racial origin or because of your financial success; you become a member only when you have been elected to this Chamber or nominated a member of the Other Place. You are a member of an exclusive club when you are a member of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. This is what it amounts to. It is the only exclusive club in Barbados that I know about in which you have all privileges without having to pay any kind of contribution to cover the retention of those privileges. Therefore, I suggest seriously that members of both Houses of the Legislature make a substantial contribution *pro rata*, not a contribution which would be collected from them but which would be stopped out of our salaries, yours and mine and the Ministers'.

In other words, members of the public cannot join our associations; my constituents cannot enjoy the benefits of these trips. It is not an association which impinges itself upon the consciousness of the working class of this community. This Association up to now is one which is used exclusively for political patronage by the present Government; and if that is the case, I do not see how we can condone levying tribute upon the taxpayers to gratify personal ambitions of members of the Government or any other member of this Chamber or of the Other Place.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, in my submission, our Branch has plenty of time between now and the introduction of the Estimates for next year to make a definite contribution to the fund of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, and the question of subscription will have to be discussed in a democratic way as a domestic matter in the Association itself; and the outcome of such discussion will indicate clearly to the public of Barbados the self interest or public interest, as the case may be, of the persons who profess to be their representatives.

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

4.45 p.m.

Supplementary Estimate No. 42

Emigration to U.K.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution to place the sum of \$250,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955-56, Part I, Current, as shown in Supplementary Estimate 1955-56, No. 42, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

The Addendum clearly sets out that the amount which was voted in the Estimates under this Head has almost been spent. Hon. members are aware that the sum of \$100,000 was put in the Estimates and passed by this House; but there is very little left now to finance the Emigration Schemes and therefore we are asking for this additional amount of \$250,000 to be voted for the financing of further schemes up to the end of the Current Financial year.

The Addendum to the Resolution shows the amount actually spent under Head XXXI—Labour Department of the Estimates from the 1st April, to the 30th September: Expenses of Employment Exchange, \$4,496.37; Advances to 191 workers recruited to the United States of America plus repatriation costs, so that expenses under the United States Farm Workers' Scheme amount to \$41,168.65. Visits overseas to seek opportunities of employment amount to \$962.94. Loans to emigrants for whom employment was secured by the Government amount to \$22,776.00 and loans to emigrants securing employment on their own account amount to \$16,436.00. I might inform the House that up to the 30th September 200 loans have been made to emigrants since the 1st April, 1955. These loans total \$38,301 and \$5,683 of this amount has been repaid. No repayments are overdue and that speaks very well for the workers who have been loaned money and have acted according to agreement.

I should also like to give the House statistics as to the numbers recruited this year from April to September. We have sent away 53 nurses, 66 seamen, 33 hotel workers, 14 domestics and 6 building trade workers. The number of persons who obtained employment on their own were assisted financially by the Government were 62. It is estimated that the number of emigrants who have gone on their own since April is 1,320 making a total of 1,544 who have left this Island. The House would be interested to know that these hotel workers are just a small fraction of workers whom we hope to assist in the very near future. We have actually had requests for 254 hotel workers so far. The Committee would appreciate that this is on a trial basis; if the scheme is successful we will be asked for many more workers in the future. Therefore, during next year we can expect many more workers to leave this colony—an estimated total of 625 workers in all to April. Twenty-five domestics will be sent to Canada, and it is to meet the additional number of people which we hope to place in response to these requests that we are asking for this additional \$250,000.

If the House wants a further breakdown of this \$250,000, I shall be very pleased to give them. We are making provision for 200 workers for the United States, 300 hotel workers, 150 hospital workers and 50 other categories of workers, besides domestics, to go to Canada. As to those candidates sponsored by the Government, we are making provision for 250 to the U.K. 25 workers to Canada and 56 seamen. Those are the workers for whom we are making provision for this \$250,000.

As honourable members will see from the Addendum, between the 1st April, 1955 (not 1954, that is a mistake) to the 30th September, 1955, the cumulative total of loans made to emigrants was \$36,975. It is hoped to maintain and increase the volume of assisted emigration of persons for whom employment is found by the Government or who have found employment on their own account. It is expected that about four-fifths of this money will be applied to emigration loans and that it will provide about 600 such loans, the breakdown of which I have just given in the category of workers. This money will be wholly recoverable and it will be a good investment, apart from being funds which provide employment. The money will not be lost.

I may say this and I think it should be of interest to the Committee. It is incorrect to say that the Labour Commissioner, who is now in England, has only placed a few workers in the Building Trade and nothing else. I think it is unfair to him and I

hope that honourable members were not impressed that that was a fact.

4.55 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman I should like to ask the Hon. Minister of Trade this question:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What are you speaking on?

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this is a personal explanation which I should like to give. I should like to know whether or not it is a fact that the Labour Commissioner had arranged with Messrs. Lawrence Weaver to send a group of workers consisting of one mason, one carpenter and three unskilled labourers.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member said that all the Labour Commissioner was responsible for are these men for the Building Trade firm. I will give hon. members an instance of what a week is like in the life of the Labour Commissioner. He is actually on holiday; but he is at the same time really helping and has placed many workers.

On Monday he went to make investigations at a certain hotel where a complaint was made against a certain girl for whom he afterwards found accommodation at the Church Army. On the following day, he got a job for the same girl and found accommodation for her at the Y. W.C.A. He also spent the afternoon with the Directors of a certain shipping line enquiring into the possibilities of employing Barbadian seamen on their ships. On Thursday he interviewed members of the London Transport Executive with a view to the employment of workers from Barbados, and the possibilities (I do not want to say much at this stage because talks are still going on) of employment for Barbadians are very great. On Friday he interviewed staff officers of another Transport Authority, and other employers. He also went to Plymouth and met emigrants arriving that day, and spent the remainder of the day with other officials. He also met some nurses.

I think that the Committee will appreciate that a good job is being done and it is not fair to say that all that has been done is that we have placed six workers with a building firm, and nothing more. From the correspondence which we have had and from other sources, we realise that the job of placing workers in England is being well done by the Labour Commissioner, and we take this opportunity to tell that to the Committee, in order to save any unnecessary debate upon the matter. I give the facts to the Committee as I know them. Up to last week I received a letter from Mr. C. W. Greenidge who is very, very interested in this question. He is one of the persons who has worked in England to get all these problems connected with emigration to England smoothed over and to disperse any idea of the British Government or any party talking about restricting the influx of workers there. He himself has stated that the Labour Commissioner is doing a splendid job, and observes that his greatest difficulty is in getting suitable accommodation for a lot of people. He went on to tell of other schemes which were in hand and to these will be added many more during the coming months.

It is not true to say that the Labour Commissioner is doing nothing. Mr. Greenidge, in connection with that matter, paid a compliment to the good work which he is doing, and I think that that should be said in fairness to him.

I beg to move that this Item stand part.

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

Mr. BARROW: I should like, Mr. Chairman, to ask the member for St. Thomas who has just sat down and who goes under the title of Minister of

Labour, whether it is not a fact that to-day, being the 1st day of November, he did not say exactly what the hon. junior member for St. Lucy said; that is, that six building workers were assisted with jobs at Messrs. Lawrence Weaver. Now, if that is not correct, and our Note here is inaccurate, I should like him to tell the House exactly how many building workers were actually placed, either by the Labour Commissioner or by anyone else. When he has answered that, I should like to ask him to find out from the Labour Commissioner whether it is not true that these six building workers were placed as a result of correspondence involving offers for jobs through our Secretary, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy and not through the Government at all [*Loud Laughter*]. Is that true or is it not? Is the Hon. Minister or the Labour Commissioner himself prepared to give evidence on oath that it is not true that the junior member for St. Lucy gave him the first invitation to send six workers to that particular place after the Minister of Labour had said on the floor of this House that they were no employment possibilities which the Government could encourage.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I should like to have the opportunity to be able to explain to the hon. member, on a point of order of course. If the hon. member is so unaware of his responsibility as a legislator as to make an erroneous and lying statement like that when I can bring chapter and verse for my report—

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I must ask the Hon. Minister to withdraw those words.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: So long as he is able to prove it—

Mr. BARROW: He has made an allegation that what I have said is a lying statement; and I am asking you as a member of this Chamber to withdraw that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But if he can prove it! [*Loud Laughter*].

Mr. BARROW: That has nothing to do with it. The question of what is and what is not parliamentary language is not a question of proof, Mr. Chairman. If that were so, one could call a member whatever one felt like calling him.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I am on my feet on a point of Order. How many members can be on a point of Order at the same time?

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member sit? The hon. senior member for St. George is asking the Hon. Minister of Labour to withdraw the statement.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The hon. member has asked to withdraw; but I will withdraw that statement after I have said this: I have actually made the report to the public saying, that there are vast opportunities for employment. It is clear in the Report. The hon. member has got up and said that I have said there are no opportunities for employment in England. What is that, Sir?

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I am asking you to ask the hon. member to withdraw the statement that what I have said is a lying statement.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. member for St. George. The Hon. Minister has withdrawn. I have heard that he has withdrawn.

Mr. BARROW: Nobody here has heard him. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the words be taken down.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has withdrawn. When the Hon. Minister sat, he withdrew them.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the word "lying" and say "deliberate untruth".

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I am insisting that you ask the member to withdraw. Mr. Chairman, I am also asking that the words be taken down.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is asking that those words be withdrawn or taken down.

Mr. BARROW: I ask that those words be taken down and that the Speaker be sent for and the pleasure of the House ascertained.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will read Rule 131. Will the hon. senior member for St. George sit? Rule 131 reads as follows:—

“In a Committee of the whole House, the Chairman, if it appear to be the pleasure of the Committee, will direct words objected to, to be taken down, in order that the same may be reported to the House.”

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, there is no way in which you can get out of it, no matter how many times you read it. There is absolutely no possible way that you can escape doing your duty on this occasion.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member take his seat?

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I am making an explanation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not want any explanation. 5.05 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will it be the pleasure of the House that those words be taken down?

Hon. M. E. COX: If I may be permitted to speak, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BARROW: No hon. member can speak at this stage. I have asked that the words be taken down.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, the hon. junior member for the City on the right of the hon. senior member for St. George can tell him if I can speak at this stage. I just want to say a few words. I want to appeal to the Hon. Minister of Trade to withdraw the remarks. I am appealing to him to do so because I am satisfied that the words are unparliamentary.

However, I want to draw to the House that it has gone on record by members on the Other Side that the words “lie” and “dishonest lie” are parliamentary. You cannot at one time vote that the words be parliamentary and then at another time insist that they are unparliamentary. However, I am appealing to the Hon. Minister to withdraw the remarks which he made, because they are unparliamentary.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is—

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, it would not be right for the last speaker to sit unless someone gives an explanation, because on the two occasions to which he may be referring I had taken part in the debate, and as usual, all that I said on both occasions fell on deaf ears. On no occasion have I substantiated or acquiesced in the use of unparliamentary language. On one of these occasions, the Committee decided that the words were not to be taken down.

Hon. M. E. COX: Therefore, they were parliamentary.

Mr. LEWIS: No, I do not take it in that way.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the remarks about “deliberate untruth”. But his remarks are not true.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I am asking that the words be taken down. I am relentless and uncompromising when I have to deal with people like the senior member for St. Thomas; and since the member is placing reservations on his withdrawals, he will have to withdraw each and every specific word without any qualifications whatsoever, and that is exactly what I mean. He cannot be allowed to ease out of a difficult situation. In the same way as I do not compromise with my principles, I will not compromise

in matters like this. Until the Minister withdraw those words unqualifiedly I am asking that those words be taken down. He should not be allowed to shelter in parliamentary immunity. I am asking that he withdraw the words that “my remarks are not true and the words I am speaking are deliberate untruths”.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: He has already withdrawn that.

Mr. BARROW: I am still asking that those words be taken down.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what grounds?

Mr. BARROW: It is very simple. All you have to point out to the Minister is to stop making an exhibition of himself and to withdraw the words unqualifiedly.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for St. George is objecting to your using the words “his remarks are not true.”

Hon. R. G. MAPP: What does he want me to do? If the remarks he made are not true, must I say that they are true? If parliament descends to the level of each member telling the other he is a liar and he is telling lies, obviously you can well understand that that is unparliamentary. I said I withdraw the words “deliberate lie” and I continued by saying, that what he said was not true. What he said, is not true and the hon. member knows that, but he is only relying on numbers; I can bring chapter and verse to prove what he said is not true. His remarks are not true and I say they are not in accordance with the facts. The hon. member knew before he used those remarks that they were not in accordance with the facts. 5.15 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, when the honourable member says he knew that something was not in accordance with the facts and the words are not true, I am submitting that he is reverting to his previous position in saying that it was a deliberate untruth. If he had any sense of shame he would say “I withdraw the words” and leave it at that. I am asking the honourable member for St. Thomas simply to do this: I am not relying on any numbers, just withdraw the words and leave it at that; but if he wants to make an exhibition of himself I will let him do that and I will make an example of him. I will show him that for the first time in the last four years we did not have to rely on numbers when it comes to a question such as this. I think your intervention would assist this particular situation. The Minister makes his reservations and qualifications and I cannot accept that.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I do not mind the honourable senior member for St. Thomas saying something about the people over this side, because the jaundiced will always be jaundiced. However, some of us are trying to prevent the debate from degenerating. I would like to draw to the attention of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas that when he withdraws the words “deliberate lie” and says “That is not true”, he was quite in order; but he must not go back to the use of the words “deliberate untruth” and paraphrase them by saying “he knew it was untrue when the member said it”, because he is going back to the same thing. The honourable member could effectively deal with the point by saying that it was not in accordance with the facts, and for that reason he claims the right to call it false and erroneous.

Any honourable member would feel resentment when it is said that he has deliberately told an untruth; the use of that statement is bound to lead to a display of temper. If you were on oath before the Court you would be committing perjury; and if you are in the Assembly, it would be unparliamentary.

I think that we are all quite willing to accept the honourable member's statement that he withdraws the words "deliberate untruth" and simply says that the statement was not in accordance with the facts. The moment the honourable member adds on the other piece "You know it was not in accordance with the facts" you are going back to what was previously said.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is—

Mr. BARROW: The only question is that the words be taken down and reported to Mr. Speaker. One cannot be like an ostrich hiding one's head in the sand. All these things will be read a hundred years from now. The only question now is that the words be taken and reported to Mr. Speaker and I will stick to that until such time as the honourable Minister elects to withdraw the words.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Minister has withdrawn the words, and he has substituted for them that the words "were not in accordance with the facts".

Mr. BARROW: And he said that I knew when I was speaking that what I was saying was not in accordance with the facts. I am asking that all the words be taken down and reported to Mr. Speaker. If you want a ruling from the honourable senior member for St. Michael I can sit down and wait. [After a pause] Do we have to wait until you send your car for other honourable members? Are we to wait until heralds are sent all over the country in order to ensure that the words be not taken down?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Don't you see that I was speaking with the Marshal?

Mr. BARROW: I do not know that the Marshal has priority over members of this House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the Hon. Minister going to withdraw the words?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I have withdrawn them.

Mr. BARROW: Sir, I will accept that. But I want him to know that we had the right to have the words taken down and reported to Mr. Speaker. However I hope the dilatoriness displayed on this occasion will not be displayed on such occasions.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Mr. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

The motion was put and agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX. The House adjourned for half an hour.

5.27 p.m.

On re-assembling.

Committee of Supply C'td.

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

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

Emigration C'td.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, it is a pity, in some respects, that the Committee was so disturbed when last we met; because I think that in the heat and turmoil of argument we lose sight of some very important things. I am never tired of pointing out that whenever we speak in this House in Committee

on this question of emigration, the Minister of Labour in particular, and the Government in general, always assume at each succeeding stage of the debate that whatever has been done is due entirely to them; and I wish whenever I speak on emigration to make an additional attempt to set the records clear, and to emphasise that if we have reached this stage at which more and more unemployed people from this island are going off to the United Kingdom, almost all of the credit must go to certain honourable members of this House, and not the members of the Government. It is due to those members who almost more than a year ago started to press this issue on the Government—and to press it in the teeth of the most bitter and determined opposition from the Government members themselves. I should like to say that, not so much to argue the point of who did what, but in order that there might be no mistake by members of this House or by members of the general public as to how things started.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, rising on a point of Order, I should like the honourable member to explain when, at any time of my life I objected to sending people to England.

Mr. TUDOR: All of these members, Mr. Chairman, have had opportunity to speak and in Committee they can speak as often as they like. This silly horse play is out of the question. The debates are there for you to see; from the present Leader of the Government down to the other members. I should have thought that they had had enough of St. Lucy to know what they like or do not like. [Hon. M. E. COX: What, red herrings and beef] I do not mind how annoyed they are. I want to get the records straight; and everytime I speak on emigration I am going to point out that they, of all people, can lay little claim to getting anybody out of this island. They have said it before and if their consciences are not dead they will keep a silent tongue in these matters. The figures are not known to all of us, but I am prepared to say that if there was one person responsible for getting anybody out of this country, that person is Mr. Louis Lynch. (Loud cheers)—Whom they tried to lock-up.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, on a point of Order. I should like to know who tried to lock-up whom. Let him come clear.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I am rising on a point of Order. I should like to say this: we are in Committee and you cannot jump and ask questions like that. Every member can have his opportunity to reply to this debate. If you care to ask a question and the member cares to answer at the time, that is alright; but this is going too far.

Mr. TUDOR: I was saying, Mr. Chairman, the shouts have come from the people who disliked being caught out; but the point is this: they must not be allowed to come in here (whenever we have to vote money for the very wholesome purpose of getting people away to be employed) and say that they are only doing as the Addendum shows. There is always room for other members of this House to tell him that more can be done and to ask them whether more could be done or whether they are doing as much as they should do.

Listening to the Hon. Minister of Labour this afternoon I was struck by the marked change in Government pronouncement on emigration between what he was able to tell us this afternoon and previous speeches from that side of the House on emigration. They are now spending large sums of money. Concerning the same people to whom they are lending money, he is pleased to tell us that the people are taking their responsibility in the best way and are paying back their money. Eleven months ago when the honourable senior member for St. Philip moved the adjournment of the House to press them

to lend people money, the Head of the Government, the Hon. Premier himself, buckled and burked at the issue and did not then show enough faith in the confidence of his own people as to be able to guarantee that there will be no trouble in receiving back the money; but the position has changed. The people whom they doubted are the people to-day who have paid.

6.10 p.m.

The controversial matter which rose in Committee earlier had to do, Mr. Chairman, with the Labour Commissioner's activities, alleged or otherwise, in the United Kingdom; and the Minister, mistakenly as usual wanted to give the Committee the impression that I had said last week (or whenever it was) that all the Labour Commissioner had even done since he was in the United Kingdom was to get a pilot party sent up to a British firm. Now, sir, I know the English Language, at least as well as the Minister, and I think I speak it with an equal facility. Without in any way boasting, I will go so far as to say I understand the meaning of words, and it would have been very silly of me to have contended that all the Labour Commissioner had done was to find a place for six people. What I did say, was that the known limit of his activities was to find a place of employment for six artisans. If he had done anything more then it is the duty of the Minister instead of smearing in the way he did, to tell this Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I do not care what he thinks of me or his reaction to what I said, but this is a Committee of the House and he had the right to give it information; and if he is in possession of all the facts instead of towering above everybody else and nursing the secrets to himself; he should disclose them. He has only himself to blame; he cannot blame anybody else.

Let us get the facts themselves. Sometime, Mr. Chairman, in the month of June, I think it was, I wrote to a firm of building contractors known to me for some years. They are contractors to the Air Ministry and from my memory of the work they did, they carried out building in the traditional style of bricks and mortar. It did occur to me that it would be a good thing if we asked that firm what prospects there were for the employment of Barbadian masons and possibly carpenters with their firm. Accordingly, I wrote to them. [A VOICE: What is the name of the firm?] The name of the firm is Messrs. Lawrence Weaver & Sons, Ltd., 45, Sedgers Road, Slough, Bucks, England. Instead of cross-questioning me the Minister might hound out the firm and see if he can put people in employment. I happen to be one of his constituents and he will want my vote. (Laughter).

Be that as it may, I wrote to that firm and I received a very courteous reply. They acknowledged my letter and said that they were glad to hear from me and they were interested in the enquiries I was making. But this is the interesting point. They said that a little time after they received my letter, the Labour Commissioner of Barbados, Mr. Pickwood (and they spelt his name Pickward) came to them and they mentioned the same thing to him and that he had undertaken to advise this Government to send them a pilot scheme.

I received that letter about three weeks or a month before any mention was made by the Government or any notice appeared in the Press about that particular project. I showed the letter to the honourable junior member for the City, the honourable senior member for St. John and the leader of my party, the honourable senior member for St. George. I myself had the idea of acting perhaps on my own responsibility in the matter, but my opinion was over-borne and the three honourable members whom

I just mentioned counselled me to wait and see what the Government was going to do about it.

What was puzzling us, Mr. Chairman, was that the Government was only getting six people—two masons, two carpenters, and two labourers—to go up on the scheme, when they knew, first of all the unemployment situation in the island; and, secondly, the high technical skill of our carpenters and masons. You would not have thought that the Government, in possession of those two facts, would undertake to send or allow to be sent only one carpenter and one mason. What we did feel was that the least the Government would do, would be to instruct the Labour Commissioner to notify all firms in the United Kingdom that the technical skill of Barbadian carpenters and masons was of such a high order that instead of offering one carpenter and one mason, we could send fifty or a hundred of each, which number we feel would show the skill of our people. We feel that allowing only one of each category to go would be letting down the skill of Barbadian workmanship.

However, Sir, we said nothing of the correspondence between ourselves and that firm. We did not disclose it to the public nor did we even bring it to the notice of other members of the Executive of our party, because we felt that it was an important matter and that nothing should be done to hinder the chances of as many carpenters and masons going to the United Kingdom as could possibly go.

Government seems not only to be lax about this matter but even their difference in approach to the matter emphasises how they feel about it. I could no more solemnly allow only one carpenter and one mason to leave here than I could jump into the sea without pants. This is not a matter to which you can have any doubts.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I must interrupt the honourable member in his reckless mis-statements. Government has only sent what was requested of it. I must submit that the honourable member is making a mis-statement. Will the honourable member ask questions first?

Mr. TUDOR: I am too old a hand at debate to mind the Minister with that statement. That is an attempt to stand in a white sheet. The issue is simple, Mr. Chairman. They are the Government of a country which can boast of the skill of its artisans and there is no doubt about it. They have the Labour Commissioner on a roving mission; only they can tell you what he is doing. He tells them he went to a firm which employs carpenters and masons and the firm wrote him and asked him to send a pilot scheme. Nobody would say that they should send two or three people more than what was asked for, but I wish to know from them if they made it their business to point out to the people in the United Kingdom, not only those of that particular firm, but all other firms, that they can offer much more than one or two, but any number of skilled carpenters and masons they will want.

6.20 p.m.

The point therefore is that because they have tamely accepted the pilot Scheme, as they call it, they have given the impression that it is a difficult thing for them to get hold of skilled carpenters and masons to find employment in the United Kingdom. I may disclose this to the House: that firm of building contractors is only one firm of a whole ring of building firms which call themselves, I think, the Federated Building trade something or other, but it has about 300 building firms spread out all over England. Therefore I am wondering whether this miraculous Labour Commissioner could not have got us a pilot party for each firm, in which case we

may have got out 300 masons and 300 painters if we could have spared them. That is why I have my doubts as to whether they are really pressing these matters as seriously as they might press them. I do not mind the sneers from Ministers; I can hold my own with them and they have no doubt about that either. What I am anxious about is to see that Barbadian men and women get work in the United Kingdom. The Ministers can say whatever they like and they have the time to do things even if they extend the life of the House as I understand they are doing. [A MINISTER: Oh! Oh!] Oh! Oh! I know that somebody would bite.

This is what I wish to emphasise. Of course we are glad to see that they are putting more money at the disposal of the Labour Commissioner for loans to persons who wish work. That is what we have been asking for and we will be more than hypocrites not to be in favour of it; but at every turn of events we discover that they are still sleeping and do not seem to have a positive awareness of what is called for. On the Minister's own admission there is no trouble in collecting the loans. The borrowers are acting with full responsibility and are repaying their loans. The Minister gave us the period of time between April and September when loans were advanced and another period in which loans were advanced and repayment have been made without any arrears. Out of their own mouths they have paid tribute to the honesty and integrity of the Barbadian working class folk; but that should not be a matter for surprise. The fact that people are borrowing money and paying it back so nicely is an indication that they can expand these schemes not merely by asking for more money to meet the applications currently being made but expansion in the sense that they should be finding more ways and means of getting employment for more and more people. What is wrong with them is not so much that they have not got intelligence. [A MEMBER: Don't credit them with that.] I credit them with as much of that as I think they should have. Their difficulty is in their patriotism; that is what is wrong with them. They are not West Indian in that they are loyal to the English people and therefore they are not prepared on any terms to make a row with the people in the United Kingdom to get more and more Barbadians there. [Hon. R. G. MAPP: We have already made a row with them.] It might not even be necessary to quarrel with them; the facts are there for all to see. Whenever you approach the British Government or any British organisation about this matter it must be made clear to them that you are not asking for charity, and you are telling them that in fact if they can make preparation to employ any number of Italians who ten or twelve years ago were their enemies—and they want to employ 96,000 of them without any prompting at all—they can extend the same facilities to West Indians. If they are prepared to open up their doors to Germans, Italians and Rumanians, refugees from the Iron Curtain, to allow these people some of whom were their enemies in the last War to enter the welfare state and enjoy the free things which the West Indians supply, then the West Indians have a greater claim on the bounty of the British Treasury because British prosperity was built upon West Indian slave labour. Therefore, when they have to plead our cause in the United Kingdom, they should have nothing to fear.

It is not that you feel that the British Government is our enemy; they are rather our friends with whom you are not on good terms and therefore you have to emphasise that it is not charity which we seek and that every advantage we gain in any

struggle with them for more and more opportunities for people is just our attitude of saying that whatever we are getting from you now will not be sufficient to pay us back for what our ancestors have suffered. He who can take that line in negotiations with United Kingdom authorities is a patriot; he who cannot take that line is unpatriotic and is just dodging the issue. I therefore congratulate the Minister on what little he tells us he has been able to achieve; because even according to the figures published by him or his department—this is a conservative estimate—there are half million jobs still going in the United Kingdom. There may be more than that number. My attitude to that is this: so long as there are no legal barriers to emigration and in the circumstances there cannot be any, the Government of Barbados has a duty laid upon it to push every other Barbadian into the United Kingdom. You cannot allow this Government to congratulate itself on anything it has done because it is the kind of Government which not only likes to rest on its oars but to take the oars and beat down the opponents who are trying to pull the ship into port. 6.30 p.m.

I, therefore, do not congratulate them. They must be harried and prodded. They must be made to understand that none of us on this side of the House is satisfied until we hear that, here in Barbados, there is actually a shortage of labour. There may be a shortage of labour in the Executive; but that is not a labour shortage. There is redundancy there. It is uneconomic. What they want is some rationalisation. But when we hear employers say or prospective employers in this Island going to Mr. Jack and saying: I want some people; not I want to get rid of some people, that is the time for you to consider calling a halt; and it will be a long time before that happens. I, therefore, do not think, Mr. Chairman, that we have any objections to the Government using another quarter million dollars to lend people in order to help them to get to England. If the Government had asked for half a million dollars we would gladly have given it. But we are only telling them that they need not come into this House smirking and grinning and patting themselves on the back; because we wish them to remember, that of all people who have a fair claim for any credit in connection with this matter, they have the last. We want them to understand that they will get what ever they want in the interest of the people.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Sir, I want to say this: I am very glad to see that we are progressing somewhat on this question of emigration. We have been going slowly, but we are making some headway. I am glad to see that there has been some change in the policy of the Government, especially in respect of one of the items in the Addendum which reads as follows:—

“(d) Loans to Emigrants (Employment secured by the Government) \$22,776,00”.

We, on this side of the House have had occasion to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that the Scheme for merely sending people selected by the Government was not good enough, and we suggested that they should broaden the scope and bring in other people. I am glad to see Note (e) in the Addendum; but there must have been some doubt in the beginning as to whether persons should be allowed to go to England or not. I would say that it was not due to a lack of confidence in the Barbadians, but that it was due to a lack of knowledge of our own people by some members of the Government: when doubt was expressed as to whether

some people would be able to withstand the climate of England, and whether they were prepared to sell their possessions etc. That is something which I will not go into again. But upon the entire question I believe that what some of us have said on this side of the Table has caused the Government to broaden its policy. That statement cannot be denied.

The statement under Note (e) is a rather welcome feature; but the Hon. Minister must appreciate that it is a very small amount. "Loans to Emigrants (Employment secured by the Government) \$22,776.00". I am going to make a statement at this stage: why is this so? For what reason? I will quote (d) and (e) :—

"D" reads: "Loans to Emigrants (Employment secured by the Government \$22,776.00)" and "E" reads as follows: "Loans to Emigrants securing employment on their own account \$16,436.00".

Why should this difference be made? The Amount of the Loans under (d) must necessarily cover a greater number of people than the amount under (e) which covers "Emigrants securing employment on their own account." But it is a known fact that more people have been securing employment on their own than those who have been securing employment by the Government. There is nothing wrong with that. When people are out of work they will go all out to secure it. I believe that the only occasion I have had to speak to the Minister of Labour since he took up office is the occasion when we discussed this matter of Emigration, and I know that he has acted upon some of my suggestions. Whether he has considered that or not, I am not prepared to say; but the question has been engaging my mind and the mind of members of the Government.

We, on this side of the Table, would like to see a broader scheme of emigration. I am not one of those who believe that you can merely say: let us set up an office and leave it at that. I am not the type of person who would get up and say: get a passport and go to England. I am not advocating that at all. What I am thinking of is this: you are sending people to England. (I am not referring to the Scheme for Nurses). I severely criticise the Government on the idea of giving a Press Release or News Bulletin stating that the Government will be willing to lend so much money to anybody securing employment in Canada, England etc. To me that part of it was purely intended to hoodwink the people. Besides the Government Scheme, the only other Scheme of Emigration I want to see in the Island is that which concerns the Modern High School, of which Mr. L. A. Lynch is the Principal.

Well, at first, the only people who received money under this Scheme were the nurses under the management of Mr. Lynch. But what I am worrying about is this: I am worrying about the people who have not actually secured employment before hand, but who can find the necessary one hundred or two hundred dollars, who have friends and relatives in England, and who perhaps, have been told "Well: look, my man, if you can get to Manchester or Liverpool, I will get you a job". Will a person in any one of those particular circumstances be considered for a loan? The Hon. Minister of Labour who has had the privilege of going to England should be able to say whether that statement about the availability of jobs in Manchester and Liverpool is a fact or not. I have no doubt that it is a fact. Let me repeat myself.

You have the people who have been going under the Government Scheme; nurses, domestics and so on. Then you have the other Scheme, the one con-

cerning the Modern High School. Then you have one or two individuals who can say: here is a letter; I have taken it upon myself or I have been given an address of a factory or firm and they say: if you can manage to get up here you can find employment. 6.40 p.m.

From the figures released recently which were given to the Press, of those who have gone this year, does it not appear to the Minister that they are a lot more people who are going to England who have actually no knowledge of what employment they will get or that they would be employed by a particular firm? Those are some of the people who contribute to taxation of the colony; so actually to say, that you will lend money to anyone who goes on the Government's scheme or who can show proof that he has got a job, but that you have not made any provision for those who are willing to go and seek employment and who are willing to pay a portion of the passage money; and further, who are willing to pay a business man in Barbados a percentage for lending them the other portion of money is not fair.

I will put it this way. About a year ago, agitation was started in this colony by the people and the representatives of this colony about the formation of some scheme to England when it was known to be a fact that they wanted workers in England and that this island could supply some. It is also a fact that those of us who are responsible would always try to see that the best workers go so that they can set an example and create an impression which would make employers in England demand Barbadians. I will now ask you this question. Is it not time for you to decide to lend money to the people who wish to go to England, not to spree, but to work; and that you do not put up any provisos such as "I will lend you money, if you go on my scheme," or "I will lend you money, if you show me proof that you have a job."

It is not fair that you should try out another scheme after ten months. Why cannot you also say, "I will lend you money, because I am satisfied that there is work in England for you to do and you will get it." You must admit that now that there is work there for them to do.

Mr. Chairman, let me say this: it does not matter to me who gets the credit; what I am interested in is that our people are going out and getting work, because I know that when that happens they will be in a position to send back money to assist their relatives. With all this money which the Hon. Minister comes for today, I hope that in the not too distant future he will be coming back for more money to assist these people who want to go to England; but I am appealing to him to broaden this scheme.

I am not suggesting that you set up a bureau and just say, "Look here, this is \$360; I am giving you it to go to England". What I am suggesting is that when you come across a man who is unemployed and is suffering and is prepared to find \$200 or even \$100 as part of the passage money, or a man who is prepared to sacrifice his house and his clothing (and I have seen some pawning their clothes) you should lend him the other part to go to England. I will say that the Government is very disinterested if it cannot formulate a scheme whereby it could help that type of man. Bear in mind that his money is being taken to lend two other types of people—people who have been fortunate to secure a position in England, because they have been in the fortunate position of having been to some secondary school or to secure a job as a domestic.

One can well understand that when this scheme was first started, there was need to go very cautiously. Now that Mr. Pickwood has been set up in England, and Government has been working ten months (nearly a year), I submit that having worked for all that time and having satisfied yourself that of all the people who have gone to England in search of work less than 1% have come back, and despite the fact that some officials in this country have been trying their best to dissuade them from going, you can very well now enlarge your scheme. When I say despite the fact that some officials in this country have been trying their best to dissuade them from going I say so with a full sense of my responsibility. I will also say it is a fact that there are some English officials in this colony who have been doing their best to see that Barbadians secure employment in England. But there are equally some English officials who have been doing everything they can to dissuade them; they have even gone to the extent of insulting some. When I say these things I will be accused of not liking somebody or I will be told that I am rude or crude because I cannot bow and scrape to somebody. Nevertheless, you have started a Government scheme; you have so to speak, broadened your scheme to include persons other than those persons who get employment under the Government scheme; therefore, I am suggesting to you that you should now broaden your scheme yet further to include those whom I have mentioned. I am suggesting that to you tonight in all seriousness.

You will remember that I said from this side of the table on a previous occasion that your success in this country will not come from what you do with respect to the Deep Water Harbour; it will not come from what you do with respect to those who have suffered in the hurricane; it will depend on how well you can handle this scheme of emigration in this country. You cannot cause the British Government any embarrassment. [A VOICE: Who said that?] Those words were uttered from that side of the table. [A VOICE: Those words came from the honourable senior member for St. Philip.] Did you say that those words came from the honourable senior member for St. Philip? Sir, I remember distinctly in my reply to the Premier on that occasion, I asked him what he meant by embarrassment and he went on to say that the embarrassment he meant was in respect of the housing situation. The Hon. Minister of Labour himself has said that it was a question of housing. Sir, I do not want to take a leaf out of the book of Government members. It is a matter of indifference to me who gets credit for this scheme. I know that the public will be able to judge correctly who contributed in any way to this scheme.

6.50 p.m.

When the time comes the public will be able to judge and see who has contributed. Don't fool yourself that the public feel it is any Government money; it is felt that you are taking money from the public and helping one class of people. Is it not a fact — and the Minister of Trade Industry and Labour knows — that there must be more people who interview him or his secretary to get assistance in going to England, people who have not actually secured employment. I said just now that I do not like this idea of putting a notice in the news paper and giving a Press release. Imagine an agricultural labourer's son from Porey Spring who has just left school and starts to work; in the crop time he raises a sum of money and can you imagine a Minister saying to him "satisfy me that you have a job before you can go to England"? When people left here

for the United States of America they did not satisfy anybody that they had a job; they had the spirit and the brawn to go out. I agree with the Minister when he pointed out the difficulties obtaining in England, the cold weather and the difficult conditions which they had to undergo. You must let people know that they have to make up their minds to work hard; you have to tell the people all that; but it is still true today that people would rather die by the sword than by the famine. You tell a man that if he goes to England he has to get winter clothes, he has to work in snow; that is better than remaining in St. Lucy and starving to death. I remember that during the campaign in St. Lucy a fisherman said to me "my boy has left the Coleridge-Parry four years ago and he has reached the stage where he tells his mother that he would not eat any meals in the house; he said he was just fed up." He had \$200 and he wanted to borrow the remainder. I would not say that any member of this House would be so rash as to say that he would oppose the idea of people going out of this country to England or any other country to work for a living; however it is not good enough just to say "we have lent \$38,000 or \$40,000 on a Government scheme and we have loaned this money to people who can satisfy us that they have a job." That scope must be broadened. Are you not lending money to people who can get work in England? Are you not asking them to have people here responsible for the repayment of the money? You are lending money on security so to speak. Somebody back here in Barbados must be responsible for that portion of money to get people going out. If you can lend people money because they have got jobs under the Government Scheme, can you not lend people who are in search of work in the same way seeing they are going to produce bondsmen? I get these enquiries everyday of my life; I have sent several people to the Hon. Minister of Trade.

I see that no mention has been made here as to the scheme to Canada; I do not know if the Minister will tell us why that has been omitted. [Hon. R. G. MAPP: That is coming from this vote.] Although it has not been mentioned in the Addendum I do not say it is the fault of the Government; but I suggest to them that nothing should be done to stand in the way of those young women who are attempting to get out of the island. I appreciate that in a pilot scheme such as that, you must select and train people, so that those who have been sent out in the first batch will be a shining example for others; and the Canadians will so appreciate their work that they will ask for more girls. It has been drawn to my attention that a Department has been set up not only to teach girls in domestic work, in the making of custards and what not, but also to take the examinations; and that the examinations have been held and girls have been turned down. I call that utter nonsense and stupidity; I have not seen anything more stupid than that. I say this: some of the people whom you are putting to examine the girls need to be examined themselves. It would be infinitely better if you got some of the experienced cooks, waiters, and chefs from these big liners; and got them to teach these girls how they must equip themselves in Canada. How can you explain that you are bringing forward girls, you select them and then have somebody to say that they must sit an examination? They can read and write; they are healthy. Whom do you expect to get? And then somebody sets an examination at the Housecraft Centre and turns down the people and says that they are not fit! I do not think the Government should use this red tape to stand in the

way of girls who want to go to Canada to earn their livelihood.

May I enquire of the Minister of Trade what is being done in connection with a scheme for training nurses to go to Canada? What is being done about that? Is it within the Minister's knowledge that hotels in Canada will take for training certain persons such as those who possess certain educational qualifications for the purpose of studying Nursing?
7.00 p.m.

What I mean by that is this: [A VOICE: Mr. Lynch is doing that]. Do not talk about Mr. Lynch's doing that; he cannot do everything. Of course Mr. Lynch is doing that. I have taken the opportunity to visit the School and see those classes in Biology in progress; and I am wondering whether the Government has been making investigation along these lines, seeing that we have the large number of young women here. If they do not have the necessary qualifications, are you prepared to help them to get them? Whether it is at the Barbados Evening Institute or at some other educational institution, you should not wait until you have to send them out, to start training them; you should start now. In the United States, Canada, and England, there is a tremendous shortage of nurses. We are working upon a system for the United Kingdom. You have a tremendous lot of red-tape to get over in going to the United States; but it is an established fact that in Canada they will take girls, provided that they possess certain qualifications. It is not good enough for the Government to say that those girls do not have those qualifications, therefore they cannot send them. I am saying that there should have been put into this Resolution, just as you have put forward a scheme of emigration for domestics to go to Canada, provision for some scheme whereby you should be training girls to take up certain posts in Canada. As it stands to-day, it does appear that this shortage will continue for a considerable time. I therefore, suggest that the Government embark upon such a scheme now.

There is one last point I should like to make. It is the point which I suggested to the Hon. Minister of Labour about helping those persons who are out of work, but who are willing and can actually produce documentary evidence to the Minister of Labour, I am suggesting that just as you are prepared to give a percentage of the passage money to farm workers, that you give people who are willing to put up some of the money, a percentage of that money. I hope that the Government will come back to this House for money to embark upon a real emigration scheme, one which will take about 10,000 people. That statement may sound a bit far fetched to some people; but I want to say that it is not possible when you take into consideration the number of children going up every year to take the School Certificate. At one time the number was only 100 or 200. To-day the Minister is aware that they are nearly a thousand; and that if 1,000 pass the examination, another 4,000 or 5,000 go home without a certificate and these are flooding this labour market. By that, hon. members will see that the idea of a scheme of emigration for 10,000 is not far-fetched. We are producing people (God help my people to produce them). It is the only thing that has caused them to get respect. This is not an industrial community; but in any industrial community such as England youth plays a great part. We have young people of this country and I am proud to say they compare favourably with those of other West Indian colonies and with people in similar walks of life in European countries; and in many cases their intelligence is superior. Some people seem to think

that it will take a young Barbadian boy 3 years to go into a factory and work. If you should ever travel to the United States you will see that it would not take any three years to go into a factory and work. It took the Barbadian man who went there during the War two to three weeks to do factory work efficiently.

Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support any scheme of emigration which the Government brings forward. This is an occasion which calls for constructive criticism and suggestions and the Government cannot say that we have not made suggestions which have caused them to broaden their outlook. Finally, I hope that the Hon. Minister of Labour will be able to tell us that he has got, not only Mr. Pickwood, but that he has also got three other officers. I know that they are occasions when the interest of the Colonial Office must clash with West Indian interest but I accept this in good faith and I hope that there will be no clash in this particular case.

7.10 p.m.

We have seen another occasion where the interest of the English official has clashed with the interest of the Barbadian. It was when a Resolution was brought to this House for \$6,000 to bring back emigrants more or less from England who had gone there to be trained as student nurses and domestics. This English official was trying to convince the Government that the girls wanted to come back when at the same time (you can almost say the next morning) they wanted more girls. I am not saying that is so of Mr. Pickwood, yet he will come in for his due share of criticism if it is brought home to me that he is not playing his part in the interest of Barbadians.

Sir, I hope you will come here in the very near future for three or four Liaison Officers so that you will be able to mix them with some Barbadians. As I see it, to begin with your Labour Commissioner as a Liaison Officer is a wise step. I have been turning the matter over in my mind but it will be for the better if you can mix the posts with some "watchmen."

I have listened to the speech of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy when he referred to the scheme of sending one carpenter and one mason and said it was not good enough. On face value it would have looked better if we could have tried six. Again, I say that I appreciate the appointment as Liaison Officer of the Labour Commissioner and I shall do nothing to hamper it. When I first spoke in here on this matter of emigration to England and that talk of embarrassment arose, some members of this Chamber felt that the British Government would have soon enacted legislation to prohibit colonials from coming in. I am one of those persons who are fully conscious of their limitations. Personally, I have been able to do a little reading and am fully appreciative of the fact that least of all people would you get a Conservative Government in England playing into the hands of powers of a different ideology by doing anything to hinder colonials from going there. That would not happen to-day; may be 30 or 40 years ago. If you read your World Affairs, you will see that there are some things which just cannot be done to-day.

Sir, I am appealing to the Hon. Minister of Labour that not only should Government spend \$39,000 by way of loans on assisting those emigrants who are going on the Government Scheme and who have gained employment before they leave, but it should also consider those persons who are going to England without first having gained employment. Is it not a fact that persons are going to England without first gaining employment? You have to admit if that is a

fact, you get in England tonight, and you can get work tomorrow morning. If you admit that as a fact, then the first step for this Government is to say "Let us see what we can do to get some of our people there." You have already told them about the bad housing conditions and of the weather. I think I am unique in the respect that I have been in every house in the City of Bridgetown, I have also been in the worst slums in the world, in New York City, and I know that it has been put up to you that they are 8, 10 and 12 people occupying a room in England. I am not saying it was put up to dissuade people; but in pointing out the situation you dissuaded people. What I am going to say is that living under those conditions in England is still far better than living under some of the conditions that "Janet" has exposed here in the last couple of weeks. It is a fact that the hurricane did not carry away their belongings; they just did not have any. I am submitting that if we did not go all out in trying to put some of our able-bodied young men and women to get work in the United Kingdom we would be traitors to the people of this colony. It is not good enough to come and ask for \$39,000 for only those emigrants who have got work there. I feel we can send 10,000 people to England and I feel that less than 40 people per month emigrating there is not good enough. I am not thinking of those who are going as student nurses; I am thinking of the lot of those youngsters who have just left School and who are asking me to give them a \$20 or \$30 a month job. A lot of them would be glad to go to England, but the most they can do about it is to tell you that their father has some land which he would be willing to mortgage to get them there. One Solicitor has told me the other day that on his desk he could hardly recognise anything else save applications from people who are applying for loans. Sir, if the people are prepared to sacrifice their homes and everything else to get to England, let the Government lend them part of the money to get there. Are you not now lending people money to go to America? You may say, that you are satisfied when a man goes to Florida that there is employment there for him, but my answer to that is that you cannot make him work. A man leaves here for Florida; he is too soft for the kind of work he has to do and he comes back home. Well, the Government loses the money which they took up to get him there. If that is so, why cannot you take a similar chance with a man who is going to England and who is prepared to put up part of the money to get there. Let me say again, that of all your portfolios, emigration is the one which is of the greatest importance to the people of this community; and I am appealing to you to give consideration to these people whom I am asking you to consider. Come back soon for an amount of money to broaden your scheme in the manner I have mentioned to you.

You have stated in the Addendum to the Resolution that the cumulative total of loans made to emigrants between 1st April, 1952 and 30th September, 1955 was \$36,975, and of that amount \$3,106 had been repaid at 30th September, 1955 and that no repayment were in arrears. I am saying that we have voted you more money for visits; get more people interested in going to England; get more people as Liaison Officers. You have in your midst a lot of people who have served in the 1914-18 war and the last war. Pick up some of them and make them Liaison Officers.

Sir, I feel that you should have come here for \$500,000 instead of \$250,000. Emigration is a big scheme and it pays. You can see that it pays.

I am in a position to tell you that the people are sending back their money; they are sending back money and helping their families. I hope the Minister will come down here and show us that they are willing to broaden their policy; that they have reached the stage that they have done such a wonderful job that they are prepared to lend people money to pay their passage out so as to relieve this situation in Barbados.

7.20 p.m.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I too want to add my quota to this debate and I will paraphrase my remarks by saying that wherever the river floweth there is life. The river is flowing from Barbados to England; that means that there is life there and not death: so that we can be assured that this seed of help which we are about to sow will bear fruit. I want to say that there is no other honourable member of this House who has played a greater part in this Emigration Scheme from this island for the past 20 years than my colleague and myself. I take exception to anybody in that matter. From the inception in my political life it has always been my policy to seek to improve the condition of the people. I say that there is no other honourable member in this Chamber within the last 20 years who has played a greater part in emigration schemes from this island than James Christopher Mottley [*Cheers!*] and W. A. Crawford. A lot of people are now basking in the sunshine of it.

I must indeed congratulate the Government on having taken this step; it will not be enough to fulfil the aims and aspirations of all who want to go to England and we need enlightened criticism in this matter.

The Addendum to this Resolution says that 600 unemployed people will be granted loans. That is not so big, but it is a step in the right direction. I hope that before this year is out the greater part of these 600 people will be assisted in going out. If they suffer, the risk is theirs; the people who are going to the United States of America get there and therefore let these people go out. I know what I have suffered in the outside world so as to make my mark; I went to the War, in the burning sun in Egypt and from there I went to Cuba in the canefields.

I am sorry that my colleague is not present this afternoon. However I know that when he reads of this small effort to-morrow he will feel grateful. I know that the emigration of my people from this island is laid on his heart. I helped to get that emigration scheme to America in 1943. [A MEMBER: Who is opposing it?] I am not saying who is opposing it; I only want to know that results were obtained.

Mr. Chairman, with those few remarks I hope that this Government will go on, with the necessary enlightened opinion which it has received, to improve the scope of this emigration scheme. We learn as we go along; everyone of us has to start from A B C and go up, and if the Government is learning from honourable members here, this is what the Government is here for. We want to improve the lot of our people. I hope the few remarks I have made, in an effort to support this measure, will stimulate greater ideas in honourable members who have been elected by the suffering public to try and improve the efforts of the people and help them to go forward.

It is ridiculous when you come to think of it, that 20 coloured members are in this House and we cannot improve and amalgamate our intellectual

powers to make this Government one to be remembered in many years to come. Here we have only a record of hungry pigs trying to struggle; it is not a record of people who are trying to work for the good of the people [Mr. ALLDER: All right, get back to the Resolution; don't stray all over the place.] This effort will rank with all the schemes but we want to bring all our efforts into fruition for the benefit of the people. I sit down now and the Government can rest assured of my sympathy in this effort.

7.30 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, two or three months ago I remarked in this Chamber that I was looking forward to not less than 1,000 emigrants a month going from this Island to the United Kingdom. There is no doubt that work is there and it is only a matter of the people getting there and collecting the job. Now, it is gratifying to see that there is a Note here which states that in respect of the amount of loans which have been repaid by the 30th September no repayments at all were in arrears. That should lead the Government to see that they should give to other men and women who are seeking to go to the United Kingdom the maximum amount of help for their passage and provide them with some warm clothing and a small amount of money to carry on in England before they are gainfully employed. There is no reason why that money should not be lent to those people who want to go. The only ones who should not be allowed to go are persons with criminal records.

Now, as to the bond: it has been made with very meticulous care and it is the type of bond out of which nobody could easily escape because the two sureties remain in the island. The Government is absolutely safe. No solicitor would be prepared to sign a tidy bond unless it was perfectly safe. Therefore, I repeat that the Government's money is very safe.

We must face the fact that a considerable amount of British officialdom does not welcome this exodus of West Indian emigrants into the United Kingdom, although these are Her Majesty's coloured subjects. They would welcome, however, with open arms, persons from the European countries many of whom fought against England during the last war. As a matter of fact, after the Parliamentary Delegation had left the West Indies, I remember reading that one of them have deprecated the fact that the Government of Barbados was lending money to people seeking entry into the United Kingdom. I have no doubt at all that attempts will eventually be made to enact legislation to prevent people from going there. But they are many reasons as to why they will not succeed: because the Tory Government is afraid of the views of the people who were once the British Labour Government; because they are afraid of the repercussions and reactions of India and Africa, and because, Mr. Chairman, they are also afraid of the powerful West Indian voice in the person of Mr. Greenidge. For all those reasons you will have no legislation enacted in the United Kingdom debarring at least the most of them.

Our passport department is still giving as much trouble as they can, refusing to give application forms to persons unless they can give a ticket from a Steamship Company to show that they have been able to pay the money in advance for their passage. People are being turned back whenever they go to the Police Department unless they produce a ticket from the Steamship Company or unless they pay down some part of the money. I will not

desist until something is done to ensure that this *ultra vires* practice is stopped. You will remember that the Premier expressed surprise to hear that this was happening and he mentioned that he would take the matter up with the authorities next morning; but whether the officials or members of the Government objected or whether or not it was due to some deficiency of the Premier preventing him from having a word with the Commissioner, the practice continues.

Now, we talked about bad housing; but the worst housing conditions in the United Kingdom could never be as bad as those under which Barbadians who have left these shores have been living in. The worst cases of housing over there are not comparable with the worst cases here. That, therefore, is no reason and they will not deter people from going to the United Kingdom in search of work. To everyone whom I have met and whose prospects seem fair I say: go and borrow the money and get somebody to sign the surety for you because the work is still there available in England.

I think we have been given a most ungenerous amount; and I am referring to the number of people who have been assisted with loans. Of course, speaking as a West Indian, the quota should be \$36,000 a year. We will send enough to England for England to realise that those people who have served her in time of war are coming also to their rescue in time of peace. Now this Resolution is one which we will support; although whenever we have an opportunity like this we will not fail to comment. From the standpoint of the Minister of Finance their repayments are all absolutely on time. That is the unprecedented case, of Barbadians paying back their money in time. Let us encourage that policy by allowing as many as possible to go. Of course, this amount according to the Addendum "will provide about 600 loans" but the amount is too small. On the other hand we are quite prepared to sit here at least one Tuesday in every month and vote a similar amount to assist 600 more.

I am dealing with officials. The firm which got those workers were happy to get them. If only members of the Cabinet would be equally unconcerned with what British officialdom feels, then they will be doing West Indians a service by giving the maximum amount of assistance to everyone who wants to go to England whether or not those persons before leaving actually get a job or not.

7.40 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a short contribution to this debate and it is to the effect that in Parliament (at least the Parliament as we know it) the method of assisting the Government is in criticising it. That is the only method by which you can guarantee that the Government would do its best. In any Democratic form of Government that is how Parliament works; and any member who thinks that whatever is good for the people—even if it is done piecemeal and not fully—is alright, has not fully grasped the facts about a democratic form of Government. I have just said that because some honourable members feel that whatever Government does, whether it is done only half way, is good.

It is a known fact that members of this Chamber other than those of the Government Party have had to urge upon the Government that it should investigate and exploit all avenues of emigration to the United Kingdom. It must also be borne in mind that these avenues for emigration to the United Kingdom were presenting themselves when members of the Government and the Ministers were

making trips to England, and they did not know anything about them. Their most loyal supporters would have to admit that. It is now a year since this matter was brought forcibly to the attention of the Government; yet up to the present, according to the figures given, only 200 people have been helped by the Government to get there, out of the many that have gone there. It is also a fact that the island of Jamaica had established a welfare service in England for their emigrants there a long time before we thought of it and all that was happening when our own Prime Minister was going up there and seeing that there was such an organisation; but perhaps he was not interested at that time. That is a regrettable fact. This Government has been urged to do it, and it has taken steps and I commend them for setting it up.

When it comes to the 200 people who have been aided by the Government to get there, I consider that is not good enough. I think something is radically wrong about it. Already we are allowing other West Indian islands to get too great a lead on us in this matter of emigration to England. [A VOICE: Jamaica can lend the people more money than we can.] It is not only a case of lending money to go there. The figures given are that over 1,500 people have gone to England during the last ten months and the Government has assisted 200 of them. The figures show that the others have gone and their exodus shows that this Government was not exploiting the idea of getting them there. It must also be borne in mind that the English Government is not foreign to us. We have had in England sometimes two or three Ministers. It is not a country which none of the Ministers had visited; it is a country with which they are very familiar. However, I highly commend Government for what it is doing now.

There is another matter which I have noticed recently. When the Government first looked into this question of granting loans to people to emigrate its Ministers never promised to lend the people money to go to the United Kingdom. They said, they were willing to lend people money to go to other West Indian islands. It is not becoming a fact that the exodus of people to the United Kingdom is depleting the workers in the other West Indian colonies to the extent that they want people to fill places even in the Government service, and I think some Barbadians will be willing to go to these other West Indian islands. I hinted that because I think now is the opportunity to put that into effect alongside of this scheme. I think some of our people would like to go to these West Indian colonies where they need people and they would make a success of the work there on the lands that those other people have run and left. We had organised a scheme of emigration to another West Indian colony, but we were never able to tell whether it would have proved a success because the scheme was cut short on account of the last war.

I think Government should give attention to this matter and I mention it because I have not heard anybody saying that it is being exploited.

Mr. BARROW: There is one regrettable and significant point which has emerged in this debate—quite apart from the ineptitude of the Government—and it is that the flow of emigration to the United Kingdom is nothing which at any stage of our history ever has been initiated by the present Government in power. I would like to make it clear that far from initiating any flow of emigrants or exodus of unemployed people from Barbados to those parts of the British Empire which can absorb our unemployed masses, the present Government

has done the opposite. The flow of emigration which we are getting to the Mother Country where there now exists a shortage of labour is a spontaneous and natural gravitation of the masses. I remember well that on the 10th May last, I informed the Minister of Labour that there were 383,000 registered jobs in the United Kingdom as on the 13th November, 1954. I went on to say that in every 100 firms registering their vacancies for workers, we have got to calculate that there are about three employers who do not take the trouble to register their vacancies because they have given up hopes of getting people to fill those jobs.

7.50 p.m.

Let me give you an example. Let us take statisticians. No employer would register with the Ministry of Labour a vacancy for a statistician because all the statisticians who want jobs are already absorbed in industry and Government. With regard to television workers the same thing applies, and we can come down the scale to people like domestic workers. I told the Minister that they were 250,000 jobs vacant in England and he gave one of his hyenish giggles and said that that was ridiculous. He wanted to know where I got those figures from. Apparently the honourable member has now discovered that the Ministry of Labour Gazette prints periodically their statistics relating to the unemployment situation. I do not know whether the Labour Commissioner of Barbados has discovered that there is a Ministry of Labour Gazette, but the position is now that on the table of this House there was laid a Reply to a question which was raised by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, speaking under correction, and the Ministry of Labour, Industry and Commerce has now discovered that there are 480,000 jobs vacant in the United Kingdom. That was the same debate in which the hon. senior member for St. John challenged the Premier on shifting his position *vis-a-vis* emigration; the leader was in advance of the thinking of his satellites and he realised that he could not retain his recalcitrant attitude as regards emigration—an attitude which he had adopted for the past ten years.

We do not have to go back to 1943 when the minesweepers and the War prevented emigration, but the honourable senior member for St. John challenged the Leader of the Government on that point and the Leader of the Government used these particular words on page 773 of the debate of the 10th March this year. He said that he had not changed his attitude towards emigration and that it is not every Tom, Dick and Harry that applies for help that the Government can help. Let the honourable senior member for St. Thomas get up and tell me that that is not correct. Is he going to suggest that he, as Minister of Labour, deputy or otherwise was not in possession of that statement made by his leader? And he disagrees with his leader on that statement because it will make a whole nonsense of responsibility on the part of the Government. I believe in giving the Devil his due. It was not in that debate when he talked about embarrassing the British Government; that was done previously; but in that debate he talked about aggravating the housing situation in the United Kingdom.

It is a well known fact, Mr. Chairman, that the debates are supervised by the honourable senior member for St. Thomas, and I believe he would like to claim a salary for doing so. I do not know where he got that authority from, but it is known that he modifies the debates to suit his own predilections and expunges matters which do not entirely suit him. But he forget to expunge that statement which he made about aggravating the housing position in

England. It was then that I felt constrained to point out to the Minister of Labour that he was rather facetious when he talked about aggravating the housing situation. Apparently he felt that while the 90,000 Italians and Germans which the British people imported into the United Kingdom did not aggravate the housing situation, the 11,000 West Indians would aggravate the housing situation. That is all there. I am not here at the present moment to indulge in recrimination or to try to bring home to the Government the burden and gravity of their sins of omission and commission—which are legion; but what I am here to do now at this particular juncture is to throw an entirely new consideration into this question of emigration. It is this: the efforts of the Government are puny when taken alongside the spontaneous sacrifices which have been made by the people of Barbados themselves, in their effort to flee before the spectre of unemployment and starvation. I would like the Minister to discover this: if 1,310 people left Barbados voluntarily to go to the United Kingdom in the six months ending on Sunday night at 12 o'clock, it would mean that the actual expenditure on voluntary emigration alone would be \$812,000 and all of this money is going to overseas firms quite apart from insurance monies which are spured overseas from time to time. That will have a severe effect on the economy of Barbados.

I would like to give some gratuitous advice to the Minister, which he does not deserve, and it is this: we all want to see our people employed and happy, but do not let us adopt the attitude of the Leader of the Government and consider that our people are a nuisance and that we must get rid of them. If honourable members want the authority for that, these are his precise words used to Mr. Morgan Jones at the Royal Commission one afternoon in Queen's Park in 1939. On the 10th March, 1955 he uses almost the same words in this Chamber. Whether it is legal abortion, birth control, or anything like that, we should get rid of them; but any Government should be prepared to consider that its first duty is to provide employment for the people of this country.

8.00 p.m.

With respect to the emigration case, there has been such a long catalogue of neglect on the part of the people who should build up the economic prosperity of the country, including the present Government, that in the short run it is the only way to prevent the people from dying of starvation. But let us not forget that everytime we send a skilled artisan out of this country it is probably, 25 years of skill that we are throwing away, thereby making the economic stability of the country smaller and smaller. It is a social and financial expenditure which we have to look at in the future; therefore, do not let us think that we can go on indefinitely neglecting to build up the economy of all because the people of Barbados have decided to go out of the country rather than die of starvation. I feel that our trouble is that we are prepared to provide a living for a non-Barbadian so long as he provides the necessary prerequisite.

Are we merely going to be a breeding ground? This is a problem which every body is going to have to face. Are we going to go on just exporting people or are we going to be able to have our own rights? We cannot go on indefinitely exporting all that is best and honest in the Barbadian setup. We cannot go on exporting our best artisans. Therefore, all that we are talking tonight on emigration (and we are going to encourage it) . . . as a matter of fact we are encouraging it because we are not preventing

people from going. Are we going to regard ourselves merely as a stud farm for Great Britain who will take them and then within five or seven years time this place might not have an artisan. Therefore, we have to get right down to the problem and do not pretend to believe that people are merely chattels. It is a million dollars alone that is going out of this country and we have not given our people their birth right; that is, the right to a job. That is really the problem. Voting \$250,000 is not imaginative enough. If as the Premier said, you must get rid of 60,000 at short notice a million is a lot more than \$250,000; because if \$250,000 is for 600 people over a hundred times that amount—speaking subject to correction, Mr. Chairman, it would be something like \$25 million that we would need in order to get rid of (in italics) the number of people that the Leader of the Government has decided on and is on record as having said.

Now, that approach to the economic problems of Barbados is the approach of the ostrich. They feel that as long as you can go to the people and say that you have spent \$50,000 on emigration, forgetting that the people themselves have spent \$88,000 that everything will be alright. That is all that they are worried about. They are not really concerned about the welfare or well being of Barbados.

There is one other thing about emigration I want to say before sitting. We have got to stop thinking of our people in terms of hewers of wood and drawers of water. Everytime that an English Official sends twelve or fifteen people up to the United Kingdom to be domestic servants they make a big splash in the Newspapers; they get an increase of salary and a pat on the back and they feel that they have brought to Barbados a goal to which they have to look forward all their lives. But we have people right here in this colony, and some of those same people who are going up to the United Kingdom to work as domestic servants are of a very much higher intelligence than some of the people in the United Kingdom themselves, to say nothing of the Ministers in Barbados. However, there is this superstition that because you are black, you must only think in terms of jobs in the domestic sphere; that the people in England enjoy such a high standard of education, or that there are no people in England who have been to elementary schools; and therefore, you must go into England because you are of a lower intellectual status than the average Englishman seeking only for jobs in that sphere.

I have had the unfortunate experience of a Civil Servant coming up to England and expressing surprise that there were people in jail in England. I wondered if he thought that only black people go to jail. This comes from among the very people who are trying to impede the natural eagerness of the people in Barbados to live in England. But to live in England is not their prime anxiety; their prime anxiety is to earn a living. Therefore, to end on the note on which I started let us not think that because the senior member for St. Thomas and the Commissioner of Labour have been up to England and tell us that they have seen the holy of holies that all the hopes and aspirations of the people of Barbados have achieved fulfilment. We can claim to have achieved fulfilment for these people whom we represent when we have given every boy and girl a living at fourteen or fifteen not only the right to a job but to the choosing of a job right here in Barbados; and, in the final analysis, the type of job for which his abilities and inclinations suit him.

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

8.10 p.m.

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply and the postponement of one.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair, and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, in each case, the Resolutions passed in Committee were read a first and second time and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

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

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

On re-assembling,

8.15 p.m.

SEAWELL AIRPORT BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Seawell Airport Act, 1950.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to amend the Seawell Airport Act, 1950. Honourable members will remember that some time ago, when I brought a Resolution to this House dealing with the fencing of the Airport, I informed the House at the time that the Government contemplated bringing a Bill to this House for greater protection to aircraft landing at Seawell. As honourable members know, we have had at the Seawell runway a very great difficulty in keeping the runway clear from stray animals. On a few occasions, accidents have almost occurred as a result of stray sheep and goats on the runway when planes were about to land. Hon. members are aware that from time to time the fencing has been cut by persons seeking access to grazing pastures around or outside of the runway and as a result, we have been faced with considerable expenditure in replacing the fencing cut by those people.

Recently, not only have we replaced the fencing, but we have also employed two watchmen to prevent persons from not only cutting the fence but also taking animals across the runway, which as I have said, is a very risky thing to do and might, if allowed to continue, cause considerable damage to life and property at the Seawell Airport.

The Government feels, and rightly so, that in so far as the runway is concerned, that at no time should there be any obstacles, more particularly in the nature of animals, because of the fact that there is very great risk involved if such is allowed. One can very well imagine, if a plane were landing and an animal of any sort was on the runway and the plane collided with it, the plane would eventually be overturned and would be lost as a result. The Government has therefore come to the conclusion that steps must be taken in the matter. I say 'must' because Government must provide for the safety of planes with passengers when they are landing or taking off the Seawell runway; hence this Bill is before the House.

As the Objects and Reasons explain, Government has been advised that the hazard caused to aircraft making use of Seawell Airport by straying animals is a matter of grave concern to all persons responsible for the safety of such aircraft. This Bill accordingly seeks to amend the Seawell Airport Act, 1950, so as to give to the authorities concerned power to rid the Airport of this peril.

I am sure each and every hon. member would agree that unlike a motor car, it is a greater risk with a plane when it is landing or taking off if there is any obstruction in its way. As is done throughout the world, runways are constructed with the greatest measure of precaution against obstacles so as to avoid accidents. I think hon. members would agree that it is necessary to pass a Bill of this sort so as to give power to anyone who is in control to destroy any animal which strays on the runway.

I think I have outlined to hon. members the contents of this Bill. As I have already said, legislation to prohibit and also to prevent unauthorised persons as well as animals from going on runways exists in other territories and we are keeping in line in providing a greater measure of safety to aircraft by passing this Bill. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

9.10 p.m.

Mr. ALLDER: I have often heard that in handling matters of this sort, justice should be tempered with mercy. In this case I do not see any mercy whatsoever intended to be practised by the Government. There is the absence of mercy in respect of those peasants who own such animals in that area and also the absence of mercy towards the animals themselves. I feel it is unnecessary for us to pass a Bill like this; I know that sometime ago we voted money for the appointment of watchmen to make sure that stock are not permitted to invade the runway and that people in the area would not get an opportunity to destroy the fencing which has been erected. If you have a fencing there which costs us money and it is replaced every now and again, I do not see how animals could get on to the runway unless something is going wrong up there as far as the protection of the fencing is concerned.

If we employ watchmen to see that the animals of peasants in that area are not permitted to stray on to the runway, well then, I cannot see the necessity of having legislation passed which would permit the destruction of such animals. There are other alternatives; one of them is that you could make a law prohibiting the presence of any animal within a given number of yards of the line which borders the Airport. You can see that the Hon. Minister will sneer at suggestions; that is why they will always make mistakes. All I am saying is that this is a bit of hard and fast legislation which permits the killing of the animals of poor peasants in the area. I am saying again that if the Minister of Communications wants to be efficient and sympathetic as a Minister a Bill should be brought here which would compel the owners of stock to keep them so many yards, say 100 yards or 200 yards away from the boundary of the Airport.

The Hon. Minister in introducing the Bill has suggested that what is proposed to be done here is done all over the world. He supposed that by making that statement it might influence the minds of some hon. members, but it certainly does not appeal to me and I cannot see why we should practice this method because it is done elsewhere. I prefer to agree to the spending of more money to put more

substantial protection so as to keep out the animal going on the runway rather than know that the animals would be destroyed if they accidentally pass over on the runway. That is my feeling, more especially since this proposal here is going to cause a lot of unpleasantness because the people who own these animals are poor people and they are permitted to keep such animals on lands leased to them by the same Government adjacent to the runway. Government has encouraged and suggested that animals should be kept and they know it is not always possible for the owners of animals to keep them tethered [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Therefore 40 people must die.] The hon. member should really be one of those people; a couple of broken limbs would make him more tolerant.

9.20 p.m.

As I was saying, the Government leased land up there to tenants and they were encouraged to keep animals. The land which they occupied is not far removed from the runway. We all know that it is not always possible for a peasant to be able to keep his animals well under control. In case the animal gets away and strays over the runway (it may be a cow which is the man's only livelihood) because the law legalises the destruction of that animal, its actual destruction will mean the loss of the lifelong saving of that peasant. Now, I do not like that. I feel it is wrong not only to the owner but, to me, it is hard on the animals themselves irrespective of how other members may view it.

As I said before, we have watchmen for whom provision was made sometime ago and if it is necessary to increase the number of watchmen we now have, I should prefer to do that. I am sure that if the watchmen would do their jobs satisfactorily, they could prevent any peasant proprietor from tying his animal too near to the runway; or even if they were permitted to tie animals there, they could see to it that they were chased off when they got loose. It would be a waste of time and money to put back the fencing of the runway along with voting money to keep the animals off the runway, and also to pass legislation which would permit the wanton killing of animals that might stray on the runway. We can overdo things sometimes. I am quite aware of the necessity for protection of the runway for planes and passengers; but I repeat that we can carry it too far. If the Hon. Minister, who claims to know everything about it, would notice the waste of money which has been going on up there and the huge cracks which appear occasionally, he would consider that that is a greater hazard to the incoming aeroplanes and passengers. I am told that after spending under two million dollars on that Airport very large sums have had to be utilised again and even now much overtime is paid in order for work to be carried on at night.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, rising on a point of order. I should like to draw the honourable member's attention to this — I wish the honourable senior member for St. John would sit.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, I have not heard the honourable member rise on a point of order and I do not intend to give way.

Hon. M. E. COX: It is not a question of constructing a runway or whether the runway is good or bad; it is a question of passing a Bill which has to do with the straying of animals on the runway.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. John is straying a bit.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is suggesting that I am straying and you

have ruled that such is a parliamentary practice to some extent. We are discussing Seawell Airport and the point which I have raised in relating to the Airport.

Mr. SPEAKER: There has grown up a parliamentary practice in this House in which I think much latitude is given when we are considering some measures in Committee. However, the honourable member should restrict himself as closely as he can to the subject matter.

Mr. ALLDER: In that case, I can record my vote against the Bill because I feel it is not sufficiently expedient for us to pass legislation of this sort. I feel that it savors of a measure of cruelty in many respects.

The honourable junior member for St. George and the honourable senior member for St. George rose to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member for St. George. The honourable senior member for St. George first caught my eye, but when I say the honourable member for St. George I am referring to the junior member in this instance.

9.30 p.m.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the Bill now before the House seeks to remove a hazard from the Airport. At all Airports all over the world there are stringent regulations for the preservation of life and I believe that similar progress must be felt and observed by the present Government.

I agree, Mr. Speaker, that the Government must have some concern over what has taken place as regards the safety of the passengers coming to and leaving the island by plane. There is no denying of the fact that stray animals on the Seawell runway are a hazard and I believe the Government will have to go a long way in making regulations strong enough to remove what is a very ugly hazard at the Airport. But I believe it is possible to make regulations strong enough to control animals from straying across the Airport. It can be done by Regulations where you can prosecute the owners of such animals. If you are seeking to remove the hazard, you must bear in mind that the one responsible for the hazard is the owner, not the animal, and I hope the Hon. Minister would appreciate my feelings on the matter. If that is the case, then the concern of the Government must of necessity be directed to the question of how best to deal with the matter from the point of view of the owner.

Now, Sir, I do not care whom for a marksman you may have at the Seawell Airport. I know he cannot be sure that when he shoots at an animal he will strike it in its head to kill it instantly. If that is not done, that poor brute will be left struggling and writhing in agony, and that cuts across the whole idea of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. I only give that as a reason why you should decide against shooting. When you go to kill an animal for human consumption, care is taken under the watchful eye of a veterinarian to see that the stunning of the animal is done in such a manner as to bring the animal to a painless end. I think you are creating a very ugly condition when you arm someone in authority at the Airport to shoot these animals. Let us assume that you authorise the Director of Civil Aviation at the Airport to shoot these animals and for one reason or the other, one of the pellets go astray and shoot a human being. No matter that he is responsible for the care and safety of planes on the runway against stray animals — there could be one hundred — you will never be able to justify his mistake.

I think there must yet be another way in handling this hazard rather than to shoot the animal. You are creating a very unfortunate condition in our country by arming someone to shoot at these animals and I do not agree that that is the answer to the hazard. It is the natural tendency for animals to which you have referred to go in search of fodder for itself. That is what he is born to do and nature is so careful about its preservation that if you neglect to cultivate the land, it is going to slip back into grass land so as to provide something for the upkeep of the animals.

Nobody should take it upon himself to shoot an animal when there is an owner who is responsible. You cannot be sure when you shoot at the animal that you are going to kill it mercifully; you cannot be sure that nobody would be hurt as a result of your shooting. How would you answer should such a thing happen? If you fire a shot and it goes astray and you find a man lying dead, how would you handle the situation?

I am going to ask you to make the Regulations as stringently as you like. You can make it a term of imprisonment without a fine on the owner of an animal that strays across the runway. Make the regulations as strong as you like: but do not authorise anybody to shoot any animal. In the first place, you will not be sure that the animal will be brought to a peaceful end; and in the second place, in a big open area like the Seawell Airport, you are attempting something for which this Government will be held responsible. I repeat that in the interest of the safety of the Airport against that hazard, regulations can be made to prosecute the owners of stray animals. You can make the penalty for the first offence a term of imprisonment for six months without the option of a fine: but it is a dangerous thing in our community to give the right to anyone to shoot at an animal. For the reasons which I have mentioned, I am going to vote against this Bill. I agree that we must give authority to someone to remove this hazard because it is a fact that straying of animals across the runway may cause a quick end of passengers by plane. You must preserve all that is desirable at an Airport but it is my firm opinion that regulations can be brought into this House to bring to justice the owner of such straying animals and I am sure they will get complete and unanimous acceptance, however stringent you may make them.

I regard those who are responsible for this Bill today as persons who are working against the best interests of the community. In this age, would you be willing to give sanction to the right of a marksman to shoot at animals straying across the runway? I object to it because it cuts across the direct principle man seeks to regulate. I regret that the Hon. Minister in charge of this Bill did not search his heart for a better way to prevent this peril than what is contained in this Bill. I say again, that you should not punish the animal which knows no better and is just following his natural instinct. The owner of it is responsible for its existence. Having in mind that it is a matter of dealing with lives at the Airport, I will be willing to vote for any Regulation to send the owner of an animal to prison on the first offence, should his animal stray across the runway.

9.40 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: Sir, at this particular stage I find myself for the first time for a very long time in the same boat as my colleague; that is, provided that before this particular Bill comes to be voted on, my colleague does not indicate that he will be prepared to vote for the Bill provided that the Director of

Civil Aviation promises to shoot carefully any sheep, goat or hog found trespassing on the Airport. Although I find myself making common ground with my colleague in this particular case, I am afraid that we are like two housewives who are quarrelling with each other across the street. I am prepared without qualifying my statement in any way as to the carefulness of the order to the Director of Civil Aviation or the imprisonment which should be imposed on the owners of animals, to vote against this Bill in case I consider, like my colleague, that the Director of Civil Aviation may not be careful enough in his aim. In the first place, this Bill is unnecessary and in the second place, in a community like Barbados, we cannot be granting to persons, without some justification, the power to destroy the very wealth of the country.

Let me deal with the first point first. I want the members of the Government to listen very carefully to what I want to say now, because it is a very important disclosure. The presentation of this Bill is an indication that the members of the Government could not have consulted the other members of their Party before this Bill was introduced. Had they done so, one of the members of the Government Party would have been able to indicate to the Ministers that there is already a Bill on the Statute Book under which the Director of Civil Aviation or any other person in charge could not only shoot but cause to be shot, any animal found on Seawell Airport to the detriment of the safety of passengers. The reason why I say that is this: only this year a relative of the honourable senior member for St. Andrew shot 31 goats and pigs in St. Andrew under the Petty Trespass Act. I am positive about that; I will say that it is the brother of the honourable senior member for St. Andrew, and some of those animals were in young. It was once in diminution of the capital wealth of this country. It was the relative of the honourable senior member for St. this Chamber, the brother of a member of the Government Party. That was done under the authority of Section 2 subsection 1 of the Petty Trespass Act, 1903. In other words, they are 52 years behind hand in their thinking, because a former Government had this Act on the Statute Book. I do not see the Deputy Minister of Labour writing now; but I am drawing—

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no such individual member of this House known as the Deputy Minister of Labour.

Mr. BARROW: I mean the *de facto* Minister of Labour. I do not see him writing now with the same eagerness with which he was willing to write the Editorials for the Weekly Rag of which he is supposed to be Editor. If he turns to the honourable member on his left, he would have found out by name whose brother sometime in February this year was responsible for killing 31 sheep, pigs and goats under Section 2 of the Petty Trespass Act. That is found on page 405 of the Laws of Barbados, just in case a certain amount of confusion may have been created, I am not reading it out in detail. [A MEMBER: Name him.] Unless the honourable senior member for St. Andrew is disputing the paternity of her own relative I do think it is necessary for me to delve into that.

This Act seeks to give the Director of Civil Aviation, the Assistant Director of Civil Aviation or any control Officer—a restricted group of persons—the authority to kill or cause to be killed any animal or feathered stock when found trespassing on Seawell Airport or when in his opinion the presence of the same on Seawell Airport constitutes a peril to

aircraft. I would like the Minister of Communications to mention a single instance in which any feathered stock or animal came within any proximity of causing an accident to aircraft which may have been taxiing or taking off at the Airport. I would like to know if no Crown Law Officer has told him that the Petty Trespass Act was passed by the Legislature in 1903-4. I would like to ask the Minister of Communications whether he did not come here this year for authority to fence around Seawell Airport and to pay a watchman to take care of the situation.

I would also like to ask the honourable junior member for St. Thomas whether he did not tell this Chamber that this provision in the particular money Resolution which came down to this House earlier this year would adequately cope with the situation of straying animals which was developing at Seawell Airport. The honourable member for St. Thomas replied to the honourable junior member for Christ Church, the Leader of the Opposition, and even described the mesh and the gauge of the wire which would be used at Seawell and that a watchman plus the wire would adequately cope with the situation. If that is not true, I hope the honourable member will correct me. I know that Your Honour cannot keep all the law in your head but you should know where to look for it.

9.50 p.m.

I am surprised that his Crown Law Officers could not tell him that the Bill which he is introducing now will only cause a lot of bad feeling and is completely unnecessary. I will now refresh your memory by reading Section (2) Subsection (1) of the Petty Trespass Act, 1903. While I am reading this Section Your Honour could glance at the Bill now before this House which, compared with the Petty Trespass Act, is somewhat different.

2. (1) "It shall be lawful for the owner, proprietor, attorney, overseer, or other person in charge of any plantation or place, to cause any sheep, goat, hog, or feathered, stock when found trespassing on the lands of such plantation or place, either to be killed or impounded on such plantation or place; and for every sheep, goat, or hog impounded, the owner or proprietor of such plantation or place shall be entitled to one shilling," . . .

Honourable members will notice that Subsection (1) of Section (2) says, ". . . or other person in charge of any plantation or place, to cause," not that he himself is to shoot as this Bill seems to say. This Bill merely states that "the Director of Civil Aviation, the Assistant Director of Civil Aviation or any Control Officer" can shoot; but not that the men in charge of the fire engine can do it. But the Petty Trespass Act states that any person can "cause any sheep, goat, hog or feathered stock when found trespassing on the lands of such plantation or place; either to be killed or impounded on such planning or place; and for every sheep, goat, or hog impounded, the owner or proprietor of such plantation or place shall be entitled to one shilling. . ."

Subsection (2) when it comes to "any horse, mare, gelding, mule, ass, bull, ox, cow, calf, or other living chattels not provided for in the preceding subsection" when found trespassing on such plantation they can be impounded, . . . and the owner or proprietor or person possessed of such plantation shall be entitled to two shillings."

Now, Mr. Speaker, you see how wide the general terms of the Petty Trespass Act happen to be. There is a legitimate restriction drawn in the Petty Trespass Act between sheep, goats, hogs, cows and horses; it is because the animals are different in nature; and whereas a sheep, goat or hog may be difficult

capture, a cow would not be so difficult to capture; a cow would not need the elaborate precautions and the bastion which we have erected to preserve the sanctity of the runway. A horse, cow, mule, ass or ox by its size would not be able to elude capture in as agile a manner as a smaller animal such as a pig, sheep or goat. That is why in its wisdom this Legislature drew a legitimate distinction between the two types of animals. The type of man who has a cow probably has his interest in that investment.

Now, when we add together the natural propensities of the animals — and although they are not animals *feri naturae*, the fact that it is an investment and probably the source of livelihood of some poor peasant, and that they are not fleet of foot, being animals not difficult of capture, and animals which would not be able to break down the barracks erected by the Minister of Communications against the hordes of unemployed — when you take all those factors into consideration, you will see that the legislature was entirely wise when they drew this distinction between animals. But it is a fact that a member of the Government Party had first hand information within the ambit of her family. As a matter of fact, on the particular occasion to which I refer I noted everything, not because any of my sheep were involved, but because other people's sheep were involved. It was made illegal to capture animals not because they were there, but because they were on rab land. Nevertheless, persons who profess to represent the people of this community are bringing in something which, in more ways than one, is certainly an encroachment on the ambitions of every peasant in Barbados who invests his savings in some kind of stock so that he can get money to send his children to school or to send his sons away from Barbados because he cannot get jobs for them.

They of the Government have not quoted one single instance, apart from the blandishments of the people at Seawell Airport who are of a militaristic disposition, to prove that one sheep has been in danger, or any pig, cow, mare, gelding or any other kind of stock. Yet they are asking us to give a group of persons power to have a restriction all the year round. That is to say, at any time that they are feeling dull they can go and shoot down the people's animals. Far from voting for it, it is my avowed intention to introduce a Bill into this Chamber, seriously to curtail the powers of such persons in whom they are now vested by virtue of the Petty Trespass Act. It is true that we have not got to wait for an aircraft to crash. I should know a little bit more about it than they do; and I do not see, even in a case where Seawell is completely surrounded by the fortifications which it possesses, that there would be any danger of the animals from the surrounding districts. There are many airports all over the world which have no embattlements and we have never heard of a single accident on airfields of that nature. I do not have to repeat my experience; it is an experience which they will not enjoy.

They will have to set out an open season for the stock of the people of this Country whom we regard as the backbone of the Country.

Mrs. BOURNE: Mr. Speaker, in reference to Section (2) I am wondering if the hon. member would amend it to read differently, for this reason: the flesh of any animal which is shot can be of some use. Section (2) reads: "It shall be the duty of the Director of Civil Aviation to cause the carcass or other remains of any animal or feathered stock killed. . . . to be buried, burnt, or taken to sea and sunk".

I am wondering whether that Subsection could not be amended to read to the effect that authority

is given to the Director of Civil Aviation to dispose of the carcass *as he thinks fit*. [VOICES: No; he cannot sell the people's animals.] I said "dispose of it as he thinks fit". I did not say *Sell*.

However, that is just the point which struck me and I thought I would bring it to the notice of the Hon. Minister.

As regards the remarks of the hon. senior member for St. George, I thought that the Seawell Airport was in Christ Church; but it seems to me that it is in St. Andrew. I can tell the hon. member that I am not responsible for any actions of my family; and as regards asking me about that incident, I must say that I am not in a position even to refer to it.

10.00 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I was not suggesting that the hon. senior member for St. Andrew connived or condoned with the offence. I mentioned that she knowing of the offence, not *ex ante* but *ex post facto* would be able to advise the Minister on such a provision in the Petty Trespass Act. I was not trying to accuse her of any condoning with any party to this offence. I would like to apologise to the hon. member if she thought I was voicing that opinion. I do know that the hon. senior member for St. Andrew was a school teacher and as a school teacher she is better informed than the Minister, and in this respect she would be better able to advise the Minister than the Crown Law Officers.

Mrs. BOURNE: Whatever be his apology, I would be very glad if he would tell me which one of my brothers was guilty of shooting one animal or of shooting pigs and goats and if he said I was informed or that I knew of it before, I can assure him that he can speak for himself but he cannot speak for me. [There is one thing I would like to ask the hon. senior member for St. George. Did my brother act within the limits of the law or did he act illegally?]

Mr. BARROW: That is exactly the point I wanted to make. He acted legally.

Mrs. BOURNE: I do not know if it is true. I have heard it from the hon. senior member for St. George for the first time now. If my brother acted illegally, then the hon. member, who is a member of the legal profession, perhaps would have made his living out of the person who would have appeared before the Police Magistrate. Let the hon. member make that platform speech in St. Andrew but not before the House. Let the hon. member get down to the business of the House representing the people of this island instead of getting in here and being personal and wasting the valuable time of this House. But the day of reckoning will come! [VOICES: Hear! Hear!] I will tell those who are saying "Hear! Hear!" now, that they will say later on "there! there!"

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, when I first got this Bill I remembered that we had on a previous occasion a similar subject for another form of protection. The first paragraph of the Objects and Reasons of this Bill reads as follows:—

"Government has been advised that the hazard caused to aircraft making use of Seawell Airport by straying animals is a matter of grave concern to all persons responsible for the safety of such aircraft."

It might interest hon. members to know that the Resolution introduced on the last occasion for a similar protection reads thus:—

The hazard caused to aircraft by stock straying on to the airport is a matter of grave concern, and to remove this hazard, funds are needed for the following:—

(a) to strengthen and replace the airport fence at certain points \$3,800

(b) to employ two watchmen on temporary basis to patrol the airport night and day 1,100
\$4,900

[Laughter]. Well, sir, this is not a laughing matter. That is what the Government felt in August. It may be that this measure of shooting these animals was probably in addition to having the fence; but the way the Resolution was worded is rather surprising.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to cross the hon. member, but I said in introducing this Resolution when it was before the House, that the Government was coming down with a Bill for greater correction and I am surprised to hear the hon. member saying that what we are doing now is rather surprising.

Mr. LEWIS: I am saying that if you had in mind then the addition of shooting these animals, all you had to do was to say so on that occasion. I have seen the Hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce with the debates on that occasion and I have asked him to lend me it to see what was said on that occasion. There is no sense in your saying at that time we are coming down with a Bill for greater protection; you should say that we are coming down with a Bill which would have as its object the shooting of those animals for greater protection. Why were you afraid to say so?

Hon. M. E. COX: It is not a question of being afraid.

Mr. LEWIS: Why could you not tell us then what further protection you were offering? The Note to the Resolution on that occasion stated that the funds are needed for the following: (a) to strengthen and replace the Airport fence at certain points; and (b) to employ two watchmen on temporary basis to patrol the airport night and day.

Now, the next thing is this: if you are going to destroy those animals, why cannot some use be made of them? Another thing you should also consider is the hazard of shooting across the runway. I am going to warn that if we are giving the authorities permission to shoot, we will have to be very careful with the very crack shots into whose hands you are putting these firearms.

Mr. Speaker, I am saying, that a dead animal on a runway is just as dangerous as a live one; and if a plane is coming in and you see an animal across the runway and you shoot it down, it is just as dangerous. I do agree that it is a real danger at the airport. A sheep or goat tethered up there would be very afraid of the scream of a plane when it is landing or overhead; and even if you have it properly tethered when that animal hears that noise, the strength given to it through fright will cause it to pull up the stake or shrub to which it might be tethered.

According to the Bill, your plan is to shoot any horse, sheep, goat or ass which goes across the runway. Are you going to shoot it and let it stand on the runway, if a plane is coming in? Or are you going to send someone out to pick it up? Do you not agree that something better than this could be advised? You have taken the land at Seawell and let it out on a pilot scheme to encourage peasantry. It should have been seen at that time that that type of pilot scheme by which you were settling people on the land to raise stock and to till it might have been a dangerous thing to do in the proximity of the Seawell Airport. Instead of doing that, it seems to me that you should have put a proper paling from the

roadway going to the airbase so as to protect it against this thing.

10.10 p.m.

And then a proper paling should have been put right out to the roadway and go around the Airport to protect it from this hazard; but in my opinion if they have decided to kill the animals can they not be disposed of in such a way as to compensate the owner? Do you mean to tell me that you have to shoot these animals and then take them out to sea? Have you got to go to all this trouble. And is it not dangerous to a plane to have a dead animal on the runway? Those are the things about which I would have to be satisfied before I vote for this Bill. We must give people who are sending their planes here some guarantee and we must guarantee as regards the passengers they bring here that everything is being done for the safety of passengers landing at the Airport. That comes first if we want an airport at all. I want to say that to put a statement in the Resolution that a Bill was coming forward is not good enough.

I have tried to prevent the Minister from replying because I wanted to hear him on these points. Has the fencing utterly failed? Or has the hurricane prevented it from being put up at all? We were told that they were going to get a fencing which would not rust; that was said and I wonder if they have found some fencing which is durable enough for the purpose. We have given you everything you have asked for and you never warned us that this was the type of further protection you are bringing forward.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I shall attempt to reply to the honourable senior member for St. John first. Before doing so I would like to assure honourable members that the destruction of animals will not be done out of the blue by the person in charge shooting a sheep or goat and killing it. You have to give people a greater sense of mentality than that of the honourable senior member for St. John who thinks that if a sheep or goat goes across the runway it will be shot. I presume that these persons who are responsible and who will be in charge will only destroy the animal as a last resort, in order to avoid an accident which would militate against the interest of Barbados for many years. As the honourable junior member for the City has said, there is no doubt that we have to make our Airport as secure as possible in order to encourage people to come here with their planes and in order to assure them that it is safe to continue to land here.

The honourable senior member for St. John talked about employing enough watchmen to prevent these animals from straying, but I am sure that no honourable member would take that seriously. Nobody mentioned it. You employ watchmen to prevent people from cutting the fencing as they have been doing on many occasions; that would not prevent sheep or other animals from straying on the runway. I do not claim to understand sheep sense or sheep language, and if the honourable member can bring forward a Bill or law which would say that the sheep or goats would not go across the runway——

Mr. ALLDER: On a point of Order. My suggestion was that if legislation were enacted which would prohibit the owners of these animals from tethering their stock within a given area of the boundary of the Airport, that would be a means of controlling them.

Hon. M. E. COX: I have no means of letting the sheep or goats know that they should not cross the runway. If the honourable member knows sheep language——

Mr. ALLDER: On a point of explanation. The honourable member insists on expressing himself ignorantly. I do not think that the honourable member has given any thought or he is so dumb as not to understand my explanation. If he indulges in sheep language that in his business. [Laughter] What I was trying to suggest is this: if the Airport land is there and you are stipulating that stock should not be tethered within a certain boundary——

10.20 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: The honourable member is making a speech. If he will remember, there is in existence to-day a law which prohibits people, vehicles and so on from going within so many yards of the runway.

What I am trying to say in this: no one, as I said before, would attempt to shoot an animal because they have a gun. That would only be done as a last resort.

Now, this is an old question. The position, as I pointed out earlier, is that for years we have had quite a lot of trouble on this runway in keeping people from destroying the fencing. As the honourable junior member for the City has just said, only recently we came to the House with a Resolution for fencing. There is a law, but it is nevertheless, violated. There is a law stating that a man should pay taxes for his motor car every year, but there are people who are known not to have paid for a year or two. The law is broken by ordinary people as well as legislators. Because the law is there, it does not mean that it will always be observed. That is why we employ watchmen although there is a law governing such things in connection with the Airport. This is what was written by Commander Wynne, as far back as 1943.

"I have recently received a complaint from British West Indian Airways in this respect. A number of sheep and goats were on the runway when one of their planes was about to land. Presumably, this Government would be held responsible had an accident occurred. The Officer Commanding the troops informed me through his Adjutant, that on the occasion of his departure for Trinidad recently by air there were a number of animals on the runway about the time he was about to leave. I understand that he was prepared to station one of his men on the runway with a rifle to shoot any animal that might endanger the aircraft."

We have to be very serious, because the honourable senior member for St. George has asked if we have ever had an accident up there. What is the point in saying you have not had an accident yesterday, therefore, you would not have an accident today? We cannot wait until a Strato-cruiser comes down. As a friend of mine told me, a sheep crossed the path of a plane and the plane crashed as a result.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, on a point of Order. I did not say that he was to wait until an accident happened. I said: it is true that we have not got to wait for an aircraft to crash. Further more, as to his talking about his friends, I should like him to name the friends of his.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is beside the point. The honourable member is out of order.

Hon. M. E. COX: Anybody would understand. You do not have to wait till something happens. You have to provide against it, and that is what we are doing. We have been told by people in charge of the Airport that this is a hazard. Well, if we do not prepare against it, what will happen? An accident will take place, and then they will come to the House

and say: there has been an accident because you refused to provide against it, and now all these people have been involved. The quotation continues:—

"Should it be decided to take action, no doubt the Police would assist by bringing to the notice of the stock owners that fact that they may lose their animals unless they keep them at all times under control."

As I said before, we are not here to kill anybody's stock wilfully as has been suggested. What we want to do is to provide against—

At this stage the certain hon. members left the House.

Hon. M. E. COX: The time will come when they will not have to walk out. Elections will redress that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I think that the Hon. Minister has already spoken and I too have spoken already; but when the honourable member spoke on the Resolution in connection with fencing required for the Airport he said then that a Bill would be coming down to this Chamber. I did not have the debate with me at the time; but I referred to the debate and it seems to me as though stronger measures will have to be taken. I am not in favour of this Bill tonight.

At this stage another member left the House.

Hon. M. E. COX: The time will come when they will not have to walk out.

Mr. Speaker observed that there was no quorum of the House and on his instruction the bell was rung.

Mr. Miller entered the House and took his seat. 10.30 p.m.

The question that the Bill be read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. SMITH, Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY.—7.

Noes: Mr. MILLER.—1.

On motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clause 1 — was called and passed.

Clause 2 — was called, it reads as follows:—

2. The Seawell Airport Act, 1950 is hereby amended by adding thereto the following new section to be numbered "4"—

4. (1) It shall be lawful for the Director of Civil Aviation, the Assistant Director of Civil Aviation or any Control Officer to kill or cause to be killed any animal or feathered stock when found trespassing on Seawell Airport or when in his opinion the presence of the same on Seawell Airport constitutes a peril to aircraft

(2) It shall be the duty of the Director of Civil Aviation or any person appointed by him to cause the carcass or other remains of any animal or feathered stock killed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (1) of this section either to be buried, burnt, or taken to sea and sunk.

(3) For the purposes of this section the expression "animal" includes any horse, ox, mule, ass, sheep, swine, goat, dog or cat."

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, the honourable senior member for St. Andrew hinted during the course of the debate that there should be some amendment to the Bill to give the Director of Civil Aviation authority to dispose of the animals so destroyed in a manner other than described in this Clause. I appreciate the suggestion made by the honourable member and if the member makes a suitable amendment I will accept it.

Mrs. BOURNE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the word "or" appearing in line 7 of sub-clause

2 be deleted and that the words "or otherwise disposed of" be added at the end of the clause.

Hon. M. E. COX: I accept that amendment.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I would really like to know how the sub-clause reads now.

Mr. Clerk read the sub-clause as follows:—

"(2) It shall be the duty of the Director of Civil Aviation or any person appointed by him to cause the carcass or other remains of any animal or feathered stock killed pursuant to the provisions of of sub-section (1) of this section either to be buried, burnt, taken to sea and sunk, or otherwise disposed of."

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, the words "otherwise disposed of" might mean that you can dispose of it by selling. Would it be in order for the Director of Civil Aviation to sell the carcass and keep the money, or would the amendment enable you to pay the owner of the dead animal for it?

We have to remember that the fencing of the Airport has always been a headache to the people in charge of it. Up to this year, after we passed the Estimates, the fencing needed repairs and a special resolution was brought in here for it. There is no provision for keeping the fencing in order and it appears to me as if you will have to vote money every year to keep the fencing in order. As honourable members know, this fencing is in a place where corrosion takes place quickly; therefore, there should be some provision for it. There is no provision for maintaining it in the Estimates for 1955-56. If, perchance, you allow the fencing to get into such a state of disrepair so that stray sheep or other animals can get into the Airport and on to the runway, you are not offering the necessary protection for yourself; therefore, I say, do not penalise the owner of a stray animal for it. I would like to know that the owner gets back something.

Hon. M. E. COX: Somehow, I do not like the amendment at the end.

Mrs. BOURNE: Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to speeches made on this Bill, and it strikes me that members of the Opposition seem to be placing a greater premium on the animal than on the life of the individual. As the honourable senior member for St. Michael has mentioned in his reply, it would be foolhardy to wait until an accident actually takes place with the consequent loss of life or perhaps both passengers and crew than to take measures to prevent these accidents.

I propose to make an amendment to this section. I too have been struck with the waste which this subsection would imply if the animals were either to be buried, burnt, or taken to sea and sunk. In view of the fact that the honourable senior member for St. Andrew has withdrawn her motion, I am making the motion that you substitute in place of the word "either" appearing in line six for the words "to be returned to the owner or else".

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I accept that amendment. 10.40 p.m.

The question that Clause 2 as amended stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee with amendments.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. M. E. COX seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

LEAVE TO TAKE ORDERS

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, there are a few Orders which have been hanging fire for some time. They are Orders No. 5, 6 and 7 and I am asking leave to take those Orders as the Next Orders of the Day and I am also asking leave to take charge of them.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) NO. 5 ORDER

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day now stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services:—To move the passing of the following Resolution: A Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 5 Order, 1955."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The object of this Order is to appoint an Officer to be attached to the Department of Science and Agriculture. The post of Chief Agricultural Extension Officer was created since 1954 and the salary offered was \$2,280 x 120 — 3,000. It was advertised since October, 1954 and nobody has answered the advertisement. It was intended that the holder of this post should possess the minimum qualification of the Diploma of the Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture or its equivalent together with about ten years' practical experience. This post has a bearing on the island and the Government has found it necessary to increase the salary in the hope of getting a suitably qualified officer. The salary attached to the post is now \$3,120 x 144 — 4,128 x 192 — 4,896. I am quite sure that honourable members will see the necessity of increasing this salary so as to get a suitably qualified officer to fill this post. This officer will be asked to undertake the supervision and training of junior field officers engaged in agricultural extension in all its aspects among small scale agriculturalists. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. LEWIS: We have been doing without this officer for so long that we wonder what is happening. I would not like to lose this opportunity of drawing to the attention of the House that we are now offering a salary which will be eventually \$1,896 per year more than the maximum prescribed in the previous Order and we are passing it in the House only, whereas in order to vote the sum of \$120 today we had to go into Committee of Supply in order to pass it. I will never tire of drawing that distinction to members of this House because in my humble opinion it is wrong. You are taking money out of the Treasury and we are not even going into Committee of the whole House in doing so. If it is a controversial matter affecting the people of this colony, an hon. member has to speak, sit down and he may not even get his question answered. That is something which the Minister has to ponder. It is not right; it is getting across the Constitution of this colony.

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

PENSION (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services:—To move the passing of the following Resolution: A Resolution to approve the Regulations entitled "The Pensions (Amendment) Regulations, 1955."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: In connection with this Order there are certain places like Rhodesia, Nyasaland and Nigeria which have asked that reciprocal arrangements be made in respect of pensions, that we have officers from those places coming here. The idea is to amend the schedule in order that these places be included in the schedule as regards pensions.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.
10.50 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I may be wrong but I have tried to get a copy of this Resolution and I cannot get it.

I do not know if any other hon. member of the House has a printed copy but I was told that it has not been printed yet. It has been here for a long time. I have had two copies of an Order but not of a Resolution to approve the Order. Mr. Speaker, I suppose they will find eventually that what I said is right. I have been trying my best for a long time to impress upon them how very important it is to get the date when the Regulations and Orders were laid put on them.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I was really reading from my file when I introduced the Resolution being under the impression that it had been printed and circulated; but I notice now that I have not the printed Resolution myself.

Mr. LEWIS: The fact remains that something has happened to it. For the sake of regularity I think it better to postpone this matter. Frankly, I do not understand what it means, although I have no objection to supporting its passing.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: If it has not been circulated, it ought to have been circulated, as it has been here since the 8th August.

Mr. SPEAKER: It has not been circulated.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: All right, Mr. Speaker, I will ask leave to postpone that and to take the next Order which is Order No. 6.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: to move the passing of the Civil Establishment Order No. 6.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Order No. 6 is to increase the staff at the General Hospital. As regards the post of Assistant Dispenser, I think somebody has been acting temporarily but this Amendment Order seeks to regularise the position and make the post pensionable. The post of Physiotherapist is now being created. Physiotherapy has now become a science and is also a part of the curriculum of medical colleges. No longer are we satisfied with the simple massage. Physiotherapy is now a recognised science, and in connection with it we are going to have a three or four years' course. This Resolution is to create the post of Physiotherapist and a little later on you will see that the post of masseur will be abolished. We next come to the Addendum which reads as follows:—

The Order also seeks to create a new post of Physiotherapist (\$2,400 x 120 — \$2,880) in consequence of the adoption of the recommendation of the Hospital Planning Committee for the establishment of a Physiotherapy Department. The time is long passed when the services of a part-time Masseuse (\$360 per annum) are adequate to meet the needs of the Hospital and a Civil Establishment (Part Time) (Amendment) Order providing for the abolition of this post has also been laid in the Legislature.

These were provided for in the Estimates; but the Resolution now seeks to regularise it and make it pensionable.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.
Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am going to take this opportunity to comment extensively upon something upon which I have commented from time to time. Now, we started to-night with Order No. 5. We had before this Legislature Order No. 10 laid to-day. No. 5 and No. 10 between 20th September, and to-day. I am continually asking the Government sometime before the Estimates to bring in an Order to repeal all these Orders. You should bring in a comprehensive Order to say what the Civil Establishment is. I am appealing to them. Imagine five Orders before us and also these separate Acts to deal with. You have to send an Act up to have it signed or have it disallowed by the Sovereign. Are you going to do nothing but sit down and draft Orders? Even among the General Orders, we have five before the House. That is not good enough. You cannot follow them when they are dealt with in that way. This is not an Act. You cannot pick it up and say: let us help the hon. member; you cannot do anything. I dare suppose they have a Clerk who does nothing but draft Orders. He cannot keep all this in his head. Imagine 10 amendments in the course of two months. I hope that with these increased salaries the Government is not going to find itself in the ugly position of overpaying somebody.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (PART TIME OFFICERS) AMENDMENT ORDERS

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, as I said just now when dealing with Order No. 6, we will be abolishing the post of Masseuse, and this Resolution is for that purpose. You delete the Masseuse who now does the work at the General Hospital.

I beg to move that the Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Part Time Officers) (Amendment) No. 6 Order, 1955, do now pass.

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

The question that this Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Part Time Officers) (Amendment) No. 7 Order, 1955, do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
11.00 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, the last Order which we are asking leave to take is No. 18.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to take Order No. 18 as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE WATERWORKS PLAN

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications; to move the passing of the following Resolution to approve the Book of Reference and Plan of the proposed extension of the Waterworks in the parish of St. Michael.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, Order No. 18 is formal. It is just a Resolution to approve the

Book of Reference of the Water service in the parish of St. Michael. The proposal is to lay a 4" diameter cast iron main from the existing main of the Waterworks Department at Cave Hill Public Road and under the Cave Hill Housing Estate for a distance of 546 yards and fix thereon seven (7) standpipes and fire hydrants as may be determined by the Fire Officer.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

THE ORDER PAPER having been fixed,

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 8th November, 1955 at 3 o'clock p.m.

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

Meetings of the House

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I have one or two things to say which I think are appropriate to say under this motion. I had intended to have a word with you about them but I forgot. First of all, I think, we should have made some arrangement for the swearing in of our Clerk and perhaps of other officers of this House.

Secondly, I am going to suggest to the Honourable Leader of the House that he try out a meeting of the House beginning at 10 o'clock in the morning so as to see if it would not be possible to get through with some more work. I may say, sir, that there is a very full Order Paper now, and amongst the Items are many things which appear to me to be things that should be done at once. If I may give an example there are amendments to Bills from the Other Place, some progress should be made as regards them.

The next thing is, I feel, that a meeting of this House is just like a meeting of all the other Legislatures in the other islands where the sun is hot. Members of this Chamber have to do a day's work and then come here perhaps with frail nerves. It cannot be wrong for those other Legislatures to meet at 10 o'clock in the morning and in Barbados it is not so. Let us try it out and see if it is not conducive to better work. I think it should be tried out. Some honourable members might feel that by our coming at 10 o'clock, they might have more vigour and consequently they would be tempted to make longer speeches, but I think at least we could give the matter a try out. Personally I think it would be a good thing to meet at 10 o'clock in the morning because honourable members might be able to get home earlier in the evening. We should not regard this House as something to tire us out. I feel my suggestion is worthy of trial; therefore, I am throwing it out. Actually, I would make a motion now, if the Honourable Leader of the House would accept it. I do know that Ministers give up a day every week for meetings of the Executive; we have quite a lot of work to do, and I think if we do it in the daytime we would get through with it better and much better work would be done.

I now formally move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 8th November, 1955 at 10 o'clock a.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: In reply to the honourable member, I would like to tell him that this

House can adjourn to meet at any time it decides on, whether 10 o'clock a.m., or 12 o'clock (noon) or 3 o'clock p.m. is a matter for the House to decide. I would not accept the motion of the honourable member now, because of the paucity of members; so I am going to appeal to the honourable member to postpone such argument until next Tuesday when

more members would be present and would be able to express an opinion on the matter.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next 8th November, 1955, at 3 o'clock p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division; and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

11.10 p.m.