THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT).

SESSION 1946—1948

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 12th August, 1947.

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. G. B. EVELYN (*Speaker*), His Honour Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER (*Deputy Speaker*) Mr. J. T. C. RAMSAY (*Chairman of Committees*) Dr. J. A. LEVY. WILSON, Messrs. A. E. S. LEWIS, M.E. COX, L. E. SMITH, F. L. WALCOTT, H. W. SPRINGER, M.A., D. A. FOSTER, H. D. BLACKMAN, C. E. TALMA, V. C. GALE, J. A. HAYNES, B.A., and S. A. WALCOTT.

After prayers, Messrs. MAPP, ADAMS, and CRAWFORD enter the House and take their seats.

MINUTES.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 19th July, 1947, have been printed and circulated. If there is no objection those Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed. There being no objection, those Minutes are taken as read and confirmed. I have also made a record of what took place at the meeting of this House on the 5th instant.

DOCUMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Report of the Auditor of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank to the 30th June, 1947.

Mr. Garner enters the House and takes his seat.

PAPER LAID

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I have the honour to lay on the table of the House the following Paper:—

Despatch No. 33 of the 29th of April from His Excellency the Governor on the subject of the Ten Year Plan and telegram No. 222 of the 24th of July from the Secretary of State in reply thereto.

Mr. WILKINSON enters the House and takes his seat.

NOTICES

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Mr. SPRINGER: Special Resolution under the Provisions of Section 2 of the Education (Amendment) Act, 1943 (1943-3) as amended by the Education (Amendment) Act, 1947 (1947-15).

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of twenty- one thousand pounds at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to pay a cost of living allowance to persons in receipt of pensions from the Government with effect from the 1st of April, 1946, and until the 31st day of March, 1948.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution for the sum of seven hundred and fifty pounds to supplement the provision in the Estimates under Head XXIX, Miscellaneous Services, Item 40, Conferences.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Resolution that His Excellency the Governor be authorised in accordance with the provisions of Section 3 (2) of the Clerical Service Act, 1944 as amended by Section 2 of the Clerical Service (Amendment) Act, 1947 to appoint four additional clerks to the Clerical Staff of the Clerical Service.

Mr. ADAMS: Bill to amend the Apprenticeship Bursaries Act, 1928.

Mr. SPRINGER: Bill to amend the Chief Judge and Crown Law Officers Act, 1907 (1907-3) as amended by the Chief Judge and Crown Law Officers (Amendment) Act, 1946, No. 2 (1946-19).

Mr. SPRINGER: Bill to amend the Department of Science and Agriculture Act, 1925 (1925-5) as amended by the Department of Science and Agriculture (Amendment) Act, 1946 (1946-32).

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

Other Notices are as follows:—

Mr. RAMSAY: Of the following Address:—

The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor

The House of Assembly beg to draw to Your Excellency's attention the recent decrease in Dairy Farming in this Island as well as the ever increasing

scarcity and the continual destruction of Dairy cattle. The House feel that the following circumstances are responsible for the above state of affairs in this industry:—

(1) The fact that too much tinned milk is allowed to be imported and put on the market at one time, thereby precluding the Dairy Keepers from being able to sell all of their milk.

(2) The price at which this imported tinned milk can be sold forces Dairy Keepers to sell their milk at prices which are too little above, and in some cases below, the actual cost of its production.

(3) The quality of the standard feed supplied has decreased by about at least one-third the quantity of milk formerly obtained from the same cattle, thereby necessitating the outlay of much larger capital, and also correspondingly increasing the concentrated feed, fodder, and labour expenses.

(4) The increased cost of maintaining a Dairy due to (a) the recent introduction of Regulations and (b) the increased cost of feed, fodder, labour and all the equipment necessary to permit the functioning of the Dairy business and the upkeep of transport.

The House feel that the further decrease of this industry must be detrimental to the welfare of the Island by (a) depriving many of their means of sustenance; (b) closing avenues of employment for employees in Dairies, milk vendors and others; (c) destroying the means for peasants and others of manuring their crops; (d) further limiting the supply of fresh meat from aged cattle as well as (e) placing the Public at some future date in the position of being unable to refuse to pay any price demanded for imported tinned milk.

The House therefore respectfully ask that Your Excellency will appreciate the seriousness of the present situation and take immediate steps to stop the further decline or total destruction of the Dairy industry of this Island.

Mr. FOSTER: Of the following Address:—

The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor

The House of Assembly are of the opinion that a representative of those parishes for whose roads the Department of Highways and Transport are responsible for the repair of their highways should have a member of their body appointed on the Advisory Board to the Director of Highways and Transport.

Mr. MAPP: Of the following Address:—

The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor

The House of Assembly are of the opinion that, in order to give effect to the will of the people as expressed by their elected representatives it is necessary that the power of the Legislative Council to alter or reject bills passed by this House should be so restricted by law as to secure the undivided authority of the House of Assembly over finance and its predominance in legislation in general, and ensure that within the limit of a single Parliament the final decision of the General Assembly shall prevail.

The House are further of the opinion that the attainment of this end is a matter of urgency and therefore request Your Excellency to take appropriate steps to achieve this result in the shortest possible time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the honourable member can give notice of that Address, he has to ask leave to withdraw the Bill standing in his name under Private Members' Business on the Order Paper—Order No. 2—because it deals with the same subject matter.

Mr. MAPP: I ask leave, Mr. Speaker, to withdraw Order No. 2 standing in my name under Private Members' Business.

There being no objection, the honourable member is granted leave to withdraw Order No. 2 under Private Members' Business and he withdraws it.

Mr. TALMA: Of the following Address:—

The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor

The House of Assembly are of the opinion that wooden cribs or seats for the convenience of the public should be placed at convenient places around the Garrison Savannah.

2. The House therefore respectfully suggest that this should be one of the proposals to be included in the scheme for the relief of unemployment; and that Your Excellency might see fit to secure the implementation of same without undue delay.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Of the following Address:—

The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor

The House of Assembly feel that in view of the visit of the Commission from Surinam exploring possibilities of recruiting Barbadians for work and settlement in that country, the Government should take immediate steps to send a small delegation to Surinam to investigate and report on the conditions of living and work to which Barbadians are being invited to go.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Of my intention to ask leave later in the day that this Address be the first Order to be dealt with under Private Members' Business.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. Cox, a Bill to amend the Apprenticeship Bursaries Act, 1928, is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. SPRINGER, seconded by Mr. RAMSAY, a Bill to amend the Chief Judge and Crown Law Officers Act, as amended by the Chief Judge and Crown Law Officers (Amendment) Act, 1946, No. 2 (1946-19) is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. SPRINGER, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, a Bill to amend the Department of Science and Agriculture Act, 1925, (1925-5), as amended by the Department of Science and Agriculture (Amendment) Act, 1946 (1946-32) is read a first time.

EXTENSION OF LEAVE TO MR. DOWDING

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Speaker,—Before we proceed to the Orders of the Day I beg to ask for two months' extension leave for the junior member for St. George who unfortunately had to undergo an operation towards the end of last month. Although he is getting on well, yet he cannot get back before his leave expires and, therefore, I am asking

on his behalf for an extension of his leave for two months.

There being no objection, the extended leave asked for is granted to the junior member for St George.

THE DIPLOMATIC PRIVILEGES BILL.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order is to resume Committee on the Bill to make provisions as to the immunities, privileges, and capacites of international organizations of which His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom and foreign governments are members.

Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House resumes Committee on the Bill, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

The schedule of the Bill is read and agreed to.

Dr. CUMMINS enters the House during the reading of the schedule and takes his seat.

On the motion of Mr. SPRINGER, seconded by Mr. ADAMS, the Chairman reports the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. MOTTLEY enters the House and takes his seat.

The House resumes and on the motions of Mr. SPRINGER, seconded by Mr. ADAMS in each case, the Bill is read a third time and is passed.

SUSPENSION OF RULES 88 AND 89

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to move the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 in order that Order No. 3—Committee of Supply—may be taken as the next Order of the day.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 in order that Order No. 3 may be taken as the next Order of the day.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that.

The question that Rules 88 and 89 be suspended is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to take Order No. 3 as the next Order of the day.

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

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. RAMSAY, Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee of Supply, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

REFUND OF CUSTOMS IMPORT DUTY TO ST. JOHN'S COMMISSIONERS OF HIGHWAYS

Mr. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman,—The first Resolution is for £195. 1. 1. as a refund of the Customs import duty and package tax paid by the Commissioners of Highways of St. John on five packages of road roller. According to the addendum, this road roller was imported from the United Kingdom for the use of the Commissioners of Highways, St. John, and duty and package tax amounting to £195. 1. 1. was paid. It is proposed to refund the Commissioners this amount and this Resolution is to enable the refund to be made. I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

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

REFUND OF CUSTOMS IMPORT DUTY TO DR. L. K. NICHOLLS

Mr. BLACKMAN: The next Resolution is for the sum of £67. 2. as a refund of the Customs import duty and package tax paid by Dr. L. K. Nicholls on professional apparatus imported for his use. The addendum says that Dr. L. K. Nicholls arrived in the Colony to practise dentistry. He had served in the Royal Navy during the War and before leaving the United Kingdom placed orders there for such dental equipment as was available. A considerable quantity of essential equipment was, however, unobtainable in the United Kingdom and he obtained permission to purchase it from the United States. Under the second Schedule to the Customs Tariff Act, 1921-3 "personal baggage of passengers containing apparel and articles for personal use, and professional apparatus" is exempt from Customs duty and package tax. If Dr. Nicholls had been able to travel *via* the United States and bring the equipment which he had ordered with him no duty would have been payable; but as he was repatriated by the Admiralty direct to Barbados the equipment was liable to duty on arrival. It is considered equitable by the Government that this duty should be refunded, and this Resolution is accordingly put forward. I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I should like to commend the Government for granting this concession. I understand the circumstances from the addendum and I commend it but I would like at this stage to throw out the hint to the junior member for St. John that the Government may profitably pay some attention to the importation free of duty of other medical equipment for, let us say, a clinic which a doctor may be establishing in this island. I understand that such equipment is subject to duty and I think it would be a good thing if the Government considers whether it would not be an advantage to patients in this island if doctors were allowed and encouraged to import such apparatus free of duty. After all, the apparatus at the General Hospital is imported free of duty and certain doctors go there, use it and charge patients for the use of it while other doctors who import equipment for the treatment of patients and the relief of suffering—as far as my information goes—have to pay duty on that equipment. I mention the Hospital so that honourable members will see that certain doctors are allowed to charge fees for the use of the public's own instruments and I, therefore, think that the Government would be right in going farther and encouraging doctors to import up-to-date apparatus free of duty for the relief of suffering.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am going to associate myself with the remarks of the junior member for the City. I go further. I understand that in other colonies medical practitioners are allowed to import instruments free of duty and I further understand that representation was made to the Colonial Secretary to have various instruments imported here free of duty. Now, I suppose it is well known that the present hospital set-up cannot really cater to the needs of all the people in this colony who are ill and who really need medical attention and I, like

the junior member for the City, feel that if it is a fact that such legislation exists in the neighbouring colonies this Government would do well to have similar legislation introduced in this House very soon. I know that quite recently, with the establishment of new clinics in this colony, there has been quite a lot of instruments imported and I feel that the inhabitants of this island would benefit very much if medical practitioners were encouraged to import and were allowed to import these instruments free of duty. If it is a fact that legislation exists to this effect in other colonies then the Government should see to it that similar legislation is enacted here for the benefit not necessarily of the doctors but of those of us who cannot get the necessary attention at the Hospital.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Before other honourable members express their opinions on this matter I should like to say that I cannot agree to the principle enunciated by the two previous speakers. When the junior member for the City draws the analogy between the General Hospital and a private medical practitioner he has to bear in mind that though some doctors have the privilege of going to the hospital, using the instruments there and charging fees for so doing there are a number of people who go to the hospital and get the services of the hospital free; so that the hospital and a private doctor are not on the same footing. Again, a doctor practises his profession for gain and we cannot assume that if we open this door to him the patients are going to benefit, as far as the fees charged are concerned. You have to look at the matter from the point of view of various people in various walks of life in the community and you will have to allow every professional man who uses instruments to import them duty free; so that the argument of the senior member for the City should not be allowed to go unnoticed.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to assure the senior member for St. Peter that I appreciate his argument but at least if we hear a complaint we will have a very good argument in saying that the apparatus came in free of duty.

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

REFUND OF CUSTOMS IMPORT DUTY TO D. M. SIMPSON & CO.

Mr. BLACKMAN: The next Resolution is for the sum of £873. 13s. 5d. as a refund of the Customs import duty and package tax paid by Messrs. D. M. Simpson & Co., on machinery and accessories imported for the manufacture of fuel from megasse. According to the addendum, a Stoker Fuel Machine and accessories were imported by Messrs. D. M Simpson & Co., for Spring Hall Co. Ltd., for the manufacture of fuel from megasse. Import duty and package tax amounting to £873. 13. 5. was paid. Under the Customs Tariff Act, 1921 (1921—3) no provision is made for the free entry of machinery for the above purpose but in view of the fact that Spring Hall Co. Ltd., is undertaking the manufacture of fuel from megasse on an experimental basis, it is considered that a refund of the import duty and package tax should be made and this Resolution is to provide for such refund. I will mention that in this island we have imported fuel—charcoal and wood—of the value of £70,000 during the year 1945 and if it is possible for us to be able to manufacture fuel here, we will save having to import that quantity of fuel. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that.

Mr. GARNER: Mr. Chairman,—I am going to oppose this Resolution. After all, this is a business company and when they import machinery they expect to make a profit from that machinery. If the Government goes on doing this sort of thing, where will we get money from to run this country? This is a business enterprise not a charitable undertaking and when this company manufactures fuel they are not going to give it to the inhabitants of this island for nothing but are going to sell it for profit. I hope honourable members will reject this Resolution and as a matter of fact I beg now to move that this Resolution be rejected.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—The situation is even a little worse than what the honourable member has made it out to be.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable member seconding the motion for the rejection of the Resolution?

Mr. LEWIS: With all due respect, Mr. Chairman, I will decide that during the course of my speech. I do not know if the junior member for St. Philip was a member of the House at the time when we voted £1,500, I think, to carry out experiments in the manufacture of fuel from megass and molasses at Searles Plantation. If it has been successful——

The CHAIRMAN: Does the honourable member mean Searles Plantation or Searles Factory?

Mr. LEWIS: At Searles. If the experiment has been successful, then the Government should have exploited it or it should have invited private enterprise to do so and we should have been made acquainted with it beforehand, so that we could come to some decision, although perhaps not binding on a future House but we would be apprised of the fact that private enterprise is going to exploit this experiment of ours and that they want to bring in machinery free of duty to enable them to do so. This is an entirely wrong procedure. This Government has spent £1,500 to experiment in the manufacture of fuel and I do not know if that experiment was successful or otherwise but it is now said that machinery on which duty to the amount of £800 has been paid is being used for experimenting in the manufacture of fuel. I doubt very much if the owners of this machinery would import some on which duty amounted to over £800 for experimental purposes. I do not believe it. I believe that it is an experiment for which the Government paid and which they are now exploiting and that is the attitude that I dislike. There was a time when we really needed fuel and the Government came forward and stated that we should stump up £1,500 to experiment in the manufacture of fuel. This House never even had a report on the spending of the £1,500. I asked a question about it because I thought that everything about the matter was forgotten. If you will look up the debates you will see that I reminded the Government about it. I do not remember its answer but, at least, it saw that somebody in the House is keeping an eye on the spending of that £1,500 and it should have come back and told us what results were obtained, whether they were favourable or whether it was going to invite its friends to exploit the experiment. If I knew beforehand that this machinery was to be imported for this purpose I would have agreed to let it come in free of duty but I do not like the way in which it has been done and I am going to second the motion for the rejection of this Resolution.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Chairman,—I wish, first of all, to remove from the mind of the junior member for the City that this venture in St. Lucy is in

connection with the experiment in making fuel from megass and molasses for which the House voted £1,500 two years ago. At that time molasses was cheap and in the interest of the industry as well as of the fuel position,. the Government started an experiment at Searles to produce on a commercial scale fuel made from a combination of megass and molasses. The money was voted and the plant was produced but almost immediately after, the cost of molasses rose enormously owing to the expanded trade in alcohol and rum. The distilleries expanded their production, paid a higher price for molasses and consequently it became difficult to obtain the necessary materials to keep the experiment going. During the same period of the War when our fuel position was very difficult indeed, the Spring Hall Co., Ltd., I understand with the approval and encouragement of the Government officials concerned, began experiments of this nature, that is, making megass into fuel by compression with the addition of other materials and, again, with the encouragement of the Government officials during the War they ordered this machinery. As everyone knows, the gap between ordering machinery during the War—even to-day—and the arrival of that machinery was usually very considerable and that is the reason why nothing has been heard of this before. It was ordered in war conditions at a time when, as the honourable member says, this House would certainly have given its approval and it has just come. But, as it has been pointed out by the junior member for St. John, conditions of supply are not much more favourable today than they were during the war years; we are much more critical of expenditure now than we were then but our needs are hardly less. This country has scarcely any fuel resources of its own and we import considerable quantities of wood and charcoal and I think it needs no argument if we can, with a material in the island which is to a large extent wasted, produce a fuel which can take the place of imported fuel or some of the imported fuel even if at no lower price, although I believe that it is expected that the price will be lower. That, in itself, will be an economy because it will be providing more employment and keeping money in the country. So that from an economic point of view I do not think that anyone will dispute the value of the scheme. The Government's advisers have advised that the scheme deserves support in view of its potential benefit to the people of the island and, therefore, the Government has taken this course of introducing this Resolution as a matter of principle. I am going to ask the Committee to take a long view. Honourable members are well aware that some of us are very keen to have industries, other than the sugar industry, started in this country. We cannot take the narrow view that Spring Hall Co., Ltd. is a substantial concern well able to pay this £800 of duty and, therefore, we are not going to exempt them, nor should we take the view that they are going to make profit out of it; therefore, they should not be given exemption of duty. Under the system which operates in all branches of economy up to now, the profit motive is the incentive and, therefore, no new venture would be started if there was not the prospect of profit to the people who start it. Our question must be: Is it going to be of advantage to the community, the people whom we represent? I personally am persuaded that if cheaper fuel can be produced, if fuel can be produced out of local material which at present is not put to an economic use, thereby employing a certain number of people and keeping some of the earnings in the island to be spread among ourselves, that is of considerable advantage to the people of this community and, therefore, I ignore the fact that the persons who are proposing this project happen to be wealthy capitalists because when we weigh our advantages with theirs, they are not the only gainers. There is another aspect of the matter. There are people who are less off financially than the Spring Hall Co., Ltd. but who, I happen to know, are interested in venturing into the manufacture of articles in this island. I have in mind now a small company of poor men who are handicapped because of lack of capital to make the necessary importations of raw material in order to commence on an adequate scale an industry which they are proposing to undertake. To those poor men, an amount of £800 would mean a considerable saving because it means a saving of interest. It may not apply with any force to the Spring Hall Co. that they ought to be exempted. I have no doubt that whether we exempt them or not, they are well able to afford to pay this duty but if we are going to establish the principle that anybody who is undertaking an economic enterprise which will be of advantage to the people of this island is to be given exemption of duty, which is, I think, one form of encouragement which could be given, we shall have to apply that principle to all, if we are going to be fair and judicious in the matter. We cannot say "If a poor man comes forward with a venture which we believe has a chance of succeeding and will be of benefit to the community, let us help him with exemption of duty or with any other assistance we can give but if a rich corporation comes forward with an identical claim we will reject it." We will find it very difficult to discriminate on grounds of policy. I, therefore, recommend to the Committee that we take a long view in respect of this matter. It is really in effect nothing new. Let me point out that under the present law—the second schedule of the Customs Tariff Act—machinery which is imported for the manufacture of certain commodities is exempted from the payment of duty, for example, apparatus imported for the purpose of manufacturing sugar, rum, ice, tools, cements, bricks and a number of other items which do not happen to include fuel. If anybody thought of fuel when this Act was being framed, has anyone any doubt that it would have been added to the list of exemptions in this schedule? It is now a desirable project standing on an equal footing with those others I have mentioned and I think it is more than fair and reasonable, taking the long view, the broad view, to pass this Resolution, not because it is Spring Hall Co., Ltd. which is asking for it but because it is just another example of the sound assistance this Government has been giving and ought to be giving to the establishment of any productive industries in this country.

Mr. COX: Mr. Chairman,—I am prepared to move that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed in order to get some more information as to the usefulness of this industry to the community. I am not voting against it at this moment because I feel it would be unfair and wrong to do anything that will hinder the improvement of the country. But, Sir, for all these years we have been saying that enterprises like the sugar industry and the Electric Company should be given the privilege of importing their machinery free of duty and what have been the results? On one side we see a superabundance of wealth and on the other side, extreme poverty, hunger, nakedness and every-

thing that is deplorable. That is what the extension of this privilege has done for us. Well, I am one of those who will oppose at any time anything that will tend to push more money into the pockets of the rich at the expense of the poor. I am here to assist in wiping out all of these injustices and malpractices. I am going to fight against them every moment of my life and it is for that reason that I am speaking as I am. But if the Government can assure me or the House or this Committee that this undertaking will benefit the people of the country rather than a handful of rich merchants and planters, well, Sir, I shall await that information and I will support it if I am convinced that the undertaking will benefit the people. I hope that in its attempt to convince me the Government will do everything possible to give all the necessary information—if possible statistics—to prove that this undertaking will be of benefit to the people. I now formally beg to move that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before ony other honourable member speaks, the Chairman is desirous of making a few observations. In order to obviate the likelihood of any mistake or misunderstanding by the Chair, the Chair will appreciate, in no inconsiderable way, if honourable members will in future make their motions of amendments by saying "I beg to move or I now move; I beg to second or I now second the various motions they intend to be carried." I say that because this is an important Chamber and the Chair has not all the brains. When an honourable members says: "I intend to move," I do not understand and I want honourable members to state exactly what they mean.

Mr. TALMA: I listened very carefully and attentively to the remarks made by the previous speakers but if this project happens to be sound and profitable and has proved as beneficial as the senior member for St. George stated, why did not the government itself undertake the investment? Why did the Government not undertake it in the war years when fuel was in great demand? Why did it not commandeer all the megasse when people could not get fuel to use for domestic purposes? If this is an experiment I take it that the Department of Agriculture is properly staffed with experts and failing that, Colonial Development and Welfare are supposed to have experts too out here. Could they not try and look into an issue like this? By having to refund money by way of package tax and customs duty to a private undertaking which, in time, provided that their experiment is successful, will probably charge, as other capitalist firms around here charge, a fictitious price for this commodity, Government is helping them to create what one may call a monopoly because if they succeed, it means that a monopoly will be created and a fictitious price will be charged. Will the Government give some assurance that some control will be exercised over the sale of this fuel? Why ask this House to relieve this particular firm of £873 unless you also give us some definite assurance that this experiment if successful—and probably by this it has been successful—will be controlled? You cannot have it both ways. You cannot put them into a position to make money and then not control the sale of the particular commodity. If this thing becomes a monopoly—as it eventually might; as has happened in other cases—it means that without government control you will be feathering the nest of this particular firm and its partners.

Mr. MAPP: This question is an important question and in view of the fact that the House is divided on it I want to second the motion of the senior member for St. Michael. A Labour Government must move very carefully when it comes to any form of private enterprise. It must be very careful that it is not subsidizing directly or indirectly the rich capitalists' pockets. We have no assurance that this scheme will be an undoubted success. It is stated in the addendum that it is in the nature of an experiment; for all we know it might fail and that will mean that £873 will have gone down the drain. That certainly is unbusinesslike. I feel that in matters like this, private companies should take all the risks that are necessary in establishing any private enterprise. They have to risk that the project will be a failure and they have to risk that it will be a success and if it is a success they, I know, will make sure that the bulk of the profits will go into their pockets. Therefore, as I said before, we have to be very careful, when it comes to matters of this sort, as to whether we are subsidizing directly or indirectly capitalists' pockets. It is true that, as the senior member for St. George has pointed out, it would be establishing a precedent which may help the poor but on the other hand there may be very rich capitalists in the outside world now looking to the British Empire to allow them to establish industries in order to bolster Great Britain and help her save dollars. Are they to be allowed to import machinery free of duty for the establishment of industries in this island? Are they not supposed to bear risks that go with the investment of private capital? I say that this is a dangerous precedent. We have very good examples of what private enterprise can do and what shameful conditions they can bring to bear on the people of a colony or the State. I myself spoke to a sort of industrial expert who told me that he has no hopes of a scheme like this developing into any big enterprise and providing much work for the unemployed; that he would rather see a scheme for making sweets, chocolates which could be sold in a vast market like the United Kingdom. We have the sugar and we can use some of it to establish and develop a subsidiary industry like that. Why can't an industry like that be established, —an industry which will provide employment for many more people in this island than the manufacture of megass into fuel will provide and which will be more profitable? How do I know that this scheme will not be a failure? It is a risk which should be borne by the company, not by this Government, because they share principally in the profits. This government does not share and the people of this colony do not share in these profits generally. It is a matter that should be carefully considered because we all realize that the industrialisation of this island looms largely in our minds. We must realize that it is a sound principle to keep capital in the island and, therefore, I do not want to do anything that might tie the government's hands in matters of this sort. I feel that the Government should consider how far such a scheme will go towards solving our main problem of unemployment and keeping more capital and more money in circulation in this island. I feel that the Government should be able to give us the assurance that the price of this fuel is going to be controlled and that, if profitable, everything will be done to keep the price of it lower than that at which fuel can be obtained outside, otherwise it will not redound to the benefit of the people of this island. This assurance has not yet been forthcoming from the Government and in the hope that it will give it in the near future I beg to second the motion for the postponement of the further consideration of this Resolution.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: We are at a stage now, Mr. Chairman, when we should view matters of this sort from the point of view of the future. The question to my mind is: what should occupy our attention in respect of this Resolution? I hear honourable members express their views with regard to the

economic system we have in this island. Be that as it may, we know we have a capitalist democracy but we must be realistic and realise that while the Government must itself embark upon every desirable economic project, in a democracy individuals should be given some measure of encouragement too. Now each member who has spoken so far, spoke about the necessity for development, the necessity for encouragement and with those sentiments in our minds, Mr. Chairman, we should view this Resolution if it involves the principle of encouraging industrial development. We in ourselves cannot say for certainty that any particular industry, any particular experiment will prove as successful as we would like it to be. The junior member for St. Thomas spoke about the manufacture of sweets but when he speaks about manufacturing sweets he has to take many other factors into consideration. Our chief consideration to-day should be whether, if we pass this Resolution, we shall be encouraging a desirable project in the country as a whole or whether we are throwing away, as some honourable members say, the taxpayers' money. I am not at this moment, Mr. Chairman, particularly concerned with the company in question because, as you know, my stand in political life is one which is contrary to the political ideology of the owners of Spring Hall Co., Ltd.; but I am looking at this matter from the economic point of view. Barbados is a poor community definitely. Barbados is a community with great deal of unemployment and when we think of instances in which they are to be exemptions from the payment of Customs Duty on materials and machinery which are imported into this island, we must ask ourselves "Are we encouraging people in this island to invest their money in things that will eventually bring a measure of improvement to the community?" We cannot blind our eyes to the fact that to make this country more prosperous it means more money and unfortunately it is the rich people who have the money now. Many rich people have more money than the Government and, as I said, we cannot blind our eyes to the fact that whether you ask local people or strangers from outside, Barbados is the place, at this time, to attract people to invest their money. The junior member for St. Thomas asks whether we would give foreign investors the facility of a rebate of Duty on materials imported by them. For myself, I will say "yes" at this moment. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof and I feel that when that evil day comes, any legislature should be able to take the bold step to control its financial resources. Barbados is not one of those countries of the world—the U.S.A. for example—that can boast of a fully developed industrial area and that, therefore, we can impose all the necessary restrictions at this time. Those of us who have socialist tendencies must realize that a man may be a socialist but may be hungry and still be without bread and I do not believe that we can allow our socialist ideology to prevent us from seeing hard economic facts. Mr. Chairman, whilst I am not against the postponement of this Resolution I will say that I will vote for it with reservation because I feel, as some other speakers have expressed, that some of these companies do get on and act in a way contrary to that in which we would like them to act. Nevertheless, we must bear in mind the fact that we have a redundant population and if we really want to develop this area and help the people we must at some stage encourage those who have the means and the wherewithal to do so. I look upon this debate as a means of encouraging in this country at this time industrial development of which we are sadly in need. We should not argue at this stage about how much fuel this project will produce; that is a question for the experts; we should be prepared now to establish a principle that would make this country a richer and not a poorer country. Let me put it bluntly. Is it not better for everybody concerned, if we give this company this exemption from the payment of customs duty and have a number of people employed than stick out for the payment of this customs duty and have a large number of people unemployed? Wherever you walk in this island you find people who are asking for letters and to be helped with jobs; that is a condition of affairs that obtains day in and day out. If we can formulate a policy that would redound to the benefit of the people, we should do so and some fifty years hence, posterity will praise us for having done something which might not have appeared to us at the time as crystal clear as it appears to them. With those remarks I feel that I would not be betraying the trust which my constituents reposed in me if I accepted the principle of this Resolution.

Mr. GARNER: I have listened with rapt attention to the speakers, particularly the senior member for St. George who spoke at length and tried his best to give us a picture of the economic advantages which will accrue from this undertaking. But if this was a co-operative movement, one could readily understand why this duty should be refunded. These are hard headed business people who are out to do business and make money; that is what this amounts to. They have not promised that they will supply the people with cheap fuel, and as a matter of fact, this will be a subsidiary to their sugar factories. These are not poor people who want money and I do not think they really believe that we would refund this duty; they are only trying us out. This is a Limited Liability Company, all of whose owners are wealthy people and they are investing some of their reserve funds to make more money. If this was a co-operative movement, well that would be all right but this is a business concern with thousands and thousands of pounds in reserve and you are asking me to take the people's money and refund this amount to them. I say one thousand times "No"; they do not deserve it. I do not think they expect to get it back. Deep down in their heart of hearts I do not believe they think it will pass this House. When I hear Labour members talk about starting new industries I should like to point out that this is not a new industry. These people want to make more money and they are looking for avenues in which they can invest some of their reserve funds. Searles tried out this experiment and up to now we have no guarantee that these people are going to supply the people with cheap fuel. I repeat that this is not a co-operative movement. This is a money-making scheme and I say that it would be well if this House rejected this Resoluton. We are establishing a bad precedent if we pass this vote. If a small man starts to manufacture sweets, are you going to give him a rebate on the machinery which he imports for the purpose? If you do this for this company to-day you will have to continue and do it for everybody. (A MEMBER: And why not?) We cannot afford to take the revenue of the island and give it back to private industrialists when in truth and in fact their only motive in starting these industries is to make profit. We cannot do things by sentiment. For all the years, the sugar manufacturers have been making heaps of money and now that they have a reserve and want to invest some of it we are saying that we are going to give them a rebate on machinery which they bring in here, especially for subsidiary purposes. It is a wrong precedent and I am counselling honourable members to reject this Resolution. If we pass this, we will get hundreds of such Resolutions in future.

Mr. LEWIS: I should like to make my position crystal clear. I am not against this Resolution because the parties concerned happen to be rich people. I would take the same stand if they were poor people, in view of the method which has been adopted. I should like all the circumstances in connection with the whole matter to be taken into consideration. The Government has been voted money to experiment in the manufacture of fuel from megasse and molasses; that is what is in the ordinary layman's mind. The Government does not report on the process. It has not treated us with the courtesy of a report on the spending of the £1,500 which we voted for that purpose, and the next thing we hear is that somebody has imported machinery to make fuel from megasse only. The conclusion to which the layman comes is that this company has watched the improvements which have been made in the experiment to such an extent that they can now experiment in the manufacture of fuel from megass only. I do not think anybody can throw it at me that these two projects are not co-related. The owners only. I do not think anybody can throw it at me that these two projects are obviously not related. The owner of Spring Hall Co., Ltd., know that the Government has been experimenting in the manufacture of fuel from megass and molasses. They do not say to the Government, "We are willing to import machinery to produce fuel for the people and start a secondary industry as well. Let us import this machinery free of duty." No; they go ahead and import this machinery with the understanding that they were going to pay duty on it. They have got it here and now that everybody knows their secret, they say, "We will go to the Government, tell it that the people are unemployed; that we are about to start a new industry and see if the Labourites are going to prevent us from doing so." What sort of industry is it? It is an industry to use up the megass from their sugar factories. If the Government wanted to establish a distillery for the manufacture of rum, would Spring Hall give them the molasses for the purpose? Would it not have to buy a sugar factory first? When you talk about the Electric Company you should bear in mind that you cannot have five or six electric companies in Barbados; it has to be one electric company run by the Government or one run private enterprise. The Electric Company imports its machinery free of duty but I understand that there is law to control the price charged by them for a supply of current. I believe the same thing applies to the Gas Company. But what guarantee have we that this rebate of duty is going to be passed on to the people? When the War was on, a certain Vestryman complained that the schooners had been trading in wood and coals on the Wharf without a licence and had not been paying any trade tax; and where did the wood and coals eventually go? They went into the business premises of people who are interested in this same company and had to be bought from them. I am against this proposal to-day, purely on account of the method that has been adopted in bringing this machinery into the island and of the fact that somebody must have known about it. If they had come to this House and played decently with the representatives of the people I am convinced that we would not have given them something like a monopoly. I certainly would have allowed them to bring in their machinery free of duty to start this secondary industry. There is another point. I know that to manufacture your own article even at a slightly higher price may be better than importing, but we must remember that manufacturing fuel away out at St. Lucy or St. Peter means that it will have to be transported to Bridgetown to reach the people and that will increase the cost considerably. Then, the local product will be sold from one place only, and that may mean putting out of work many people who now sell wood and coals. I do not say this because I represent the City Constituency. I am surprised that this matter should have been paid such great attention by the Government, as there are good reasons why the Government should keep out of it. The Government owes this House a full report on the spending of the £1,500 which was voted for the experiment in making fuel from megass and molasses. The Government should tell me whether its experiment has failed and that it wants somebody else to exploit the experiment in another way. This is something that has to do with sugar factories. We have given the sugar factories a great concession,—a concession that no other colony in the Caribbean has given them in the recent increase in the price of sugar, that is, we have included the locally consumed sugar in the recent Sugar Cess Legislation. Are we going to increase the price of sugar to the people and give the sugar factories the opportunity of selling fuel at whatever price they like? Until I have an explanation as to why this machinery was imported, after the experiment carried out by the Government, without some previous knowledge of this House I am suspicious of the undertaking, no matter what good may result from it. I am willing, if further information is given me, now that my point of view has been clearly put, to vote for the postponement of this Resolution but in the absence of that information I feel that the Resolution should be rejected.

The question that the further consideration of this Resolution be now postponed is put and resolved in the affirmative, the division being as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. SMITH, F. L. WALCOTT, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. SPRINGER, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, CRAWFORD, GARNER, TALMA, MOTTLEY, and Mr. SPEAKER—15.

Noes: Messrs. HAYNES, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON, and LEWIS—5.

REFUND OF CUSTOMS DUTY TO THE BRITISH-AMERICAN TOBACCO CO. (BARBADOS), LTD.

Mr. BLACKMAN: The next Resolution is for the sum of £279. 10. 5. to be granted to the British-American Tobacco Co. (Barbados), Ltd., as a refund of the Customs import duty and package tax paid on sixty-four cases of aluminium foil which was subsequently re-shipped to the United States of America. The addendum states that on the 8th October, 1945, the British-American Tobacco Co. (Barbados), Limited, paid duty and package tax amounting to £279 10. 5. on 64 cases of aluminium foil. This foil was found to be of faulty manufacture and was re-shipped to the manufacturers on the 24th January, 1947. Section 51 (2) of the Trade Act, 1910 (1910-4), allows the owner of an article on which import duty has been paid to export that article and re-import an article of the same description and value free of duty if the following conditions are fulfilled:—

> "If before exporting the article he or his agent files in the office of the Comptroller a declaration that the article has not been used, that it has been imported within a month, and that it is his intention subsequently to import an article of the same description and value, and if on importation he satisfies the Comptroller that the article imported is an article of the same description and value."

The delay between the date of receipt of the foil and its re-shipment was due to the need for examination of the foil and correspondence between the British-American Tobacco Company (Barbados),

Limited, and the suppliers and shipping agent. The Comptroller of Customs has reported that the foil was not used in the island and that a Landing Certificate has been received from the Customs Department in New York stating that the foil had been received there. In view of the circumstances of this case, it is considered equitable that a refund of the import duty and package tax should be made, and this resolution is to provide for the refund. I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. COX: Before the question is put I want to get some more information in regard to this matter. What I understand is that this company should have sent back this foil within a month and here approximately three months have expired,—a period which does not permit them to get this refund; so I want to get some more information before I vote on this Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable member has not read Section 51 (2) of the Act carefully. The section does not provide that the article must be re-exported within a month. It says that if the exporter files a notice that the article has not been used, that it has been imported within a month and that he subsequently intends to send it back to the place of origin and import an article of the same description he shall be entitled to a refund of duty.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I would like to know, if it is not a trade secret, what was wrong with the foil.

The CHAIRMAN: The Resolution is for a refund of this duty and not to provide an opportunity to enquire into somebody's business.

Mr. LEWIS: I understand, Mr. Chairman, that I can get the information and I think it is well that we should have it.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is——

Mr. SPRINGER: The honourable member is entitled to the information and he can get it. It is this: An excessive gum stream was used to mount the aluminium foil to the tissue and the gum had penetrated the tissue; as the result, all the combined pieces of foil and tissue were glued together in a solid mass.

The CHAIRMAN: Is any other honourable member entitled to find out any information about it? (Laughter.)

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

On the motion of Mr. BLACKMAN, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the CHAIRMAN reports the passing of three Resolutions and the postponement of one in Committee of Supply.

The House resumes and on the motions of Mr. BLACKMAN, seconded by Mr. SPRINGER in each case the three Resolutions are read a first and a second time and are agreed to.

THE ARTHUR EVELYN ARMSTRONG PENSION BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order is to resume debate on the second reading of a Bill to authorize the payment of an additional pension to Arthur Evelyn Armstrong. On the last occasion when the motion for the second reading of the Bill was being debated, the honourable senior member for St. Michael moved, seconded by the honourable junior member for St. Andrew, that the further consideration of the Bill be postponed. Both of these honourable members have the right to speak before any other honourable members on this occasion.

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker.—I am wondering whether you will allow the senior member for St. Philip, who is in charge of the Bill, to make his explanation first.

Mr. SPEAKER: You don't wish to say anything further?

Mr. COX: Yes, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to hear the explanation first.

Mr. SPEAKER: If you do not speak now, you will not be allowed to speak again on the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On the last occasion when this Bill was discussed, a lot of opposition was expressed in connection with it. I think I am correct in saying that most of that opposition was centred more around the individual concerned than the principle involved (Cries of "Shame") but I hope that today honourable members will, after viewing the facts of the case, be prepared to consider the matter dispassionately and eventually arrive at some decision, not only with regard to this particular Bill but in connection with the state of affairs generally. Now, in the Objects and Reasons of the Bill, Sir, it is pointed out that Arthur Evelyn Armstrong was appointed Chaplain of the Prisons and Lunatic Asylum in 1926 and held this office until 1934. He resigned in 1934 to assume the headmastership of Combermere School. The latter service is pensionable by law and the Government has been advised that his services between 1926 and 1934 are not so pensionable; but the Government, after due consideration, decided that Mr. Armstrong should be given a pension in respect of his period of service between 1926 and 1934 as Chaplain of His Majesty's Prisons and Lunatic Asylum. Well now, what are the facts —and I hope honourable members will listen carefully to this explanation? Under the Teachers Pension Act, Rev. Armstrong is entitled to a pension for the period of service as Headmaster of Combermere School but as he resigned from his Cure at St. David's and then his appointment to the Prisons as Chaplain, he is not entitled to count those periods as qualifying pensionable periods because there is no legal provision to safeguard the pensionable rights of a Civil Servant other than an elementary schoolteacher who accepts an appointment under a School Authority; in other words, when the Rev. Armstrong left the Prisons and went to Combermere School, the Authority which ran the school was not then a Government Department and there is no provision in the law which allows any Civil Servant, other than an elementary schoolteacher who accepts an appointment under a School Authority, to consider as pensionable a period of service which he rendered under an Authority other than a Government Department. Section 8 of Teachers Pension Act contains safeguards for the pensionable rights of any teacher who leaves the service of a School Authority for employment under the Crown; in other words, while a Civil Servant, other than a teacher who leaves the service of the Crown and accepts a job under a School Authority, cannot have his services regarded as pensionable, on the other hand a teacher who leaves the service of a School Authority and takes a job under the Crown is, by law, entitled to have his services considered as pensionable. The Government in 1941, I am told, decided to make no legal provision to safeguard the pensionable rights of persons vacating offices under the Crown for service under a School Authority. It is, therefore, a question for the House to decide whether—in the case of Rev. Armstrong and, generally speaking, in any similar case that might arise—steps should be taken to safeguard the pension rights of people who leave or have left a job under the Crown for service under a School Authority. In this particular case the Government decided, rather than review the whole position generally, to consider the merits of this case and send down this Bill to provide a pension for Mr. Armstrong for his

period of service as Chaplain of the Prisons and Lunatic Asylum from 1926 to 1934. In the remarks which I heard on the last occasion when this Bill was discussed, there were at least two honourable members who opposed the principle involved; hence as it is Rev. Armstrong, they are nothing to do with it. We all know that Rev. Armstrong, owing to very unfortunate public utterances by himself, has made himself unpopular among certain sections of the community. His last utterance at the Empire Theatre was not one that was calculated to endear him to the mass of the people of this community. But I am asking honourable members to-day to forget the individual and assist the Government, perhaps in resolving finally whether or not steps should be taken to provide pensions for public employees who are placed in a similar position to that of Rev. Armstrong. We are being asked to decide, Sir, whether or not the safeguard which is provided for persons who leave secondary schools and enter the service of the Crown should not also be provided for servants of the Crown who leave the service of the Crown and become secondary teachers. At this stage I have nothing more to say on the matter and I hope that the underlying principle of the situation will commend itself to honourable members. If any further information is needed and I am in a position to give it, I shall be pleased to do so.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—I was not present to hear the beginning of this debate and while it would seem that the Government is doing something to reward some person who has been in its service and through some flaw in the law or strict legal interpretation it is unable now to do so. As far as I can view the matter, the Chaplain of the Prisons and Lunatic Asylum must be a government servant appointed by the Governor in the same way as the Headmaster of Combermere School is a government servant, but what is worrying my mind is this: Is this not a good opportunity to enquire from the Government whether there are other persons similarly placed, whether there are other persons who have resigned in somewhat similar circumstances and have not been compensated because of the interpretation of the law? I know an instance in which an employee of the Government with previous service with a parochial board had the latter service taken into consideration in the computation of his pension, on his retirement. I know another officer of the Crown——

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member going to be much longer?

Mr. LEWIS: I shall be a couple of minutes longer, perhaps more than you will allow.

Mr. SPEAKER: It being now two o'clock, this House stands adjourned until a quarter to three o'clock in accordance with Rule 40 (a).

REPLIES LAID

On re-assembling,

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to lay on the Table of the House the replies to questions No. 54, standing in the name of the honourable senior member for the City; and the replies to questions No. 42 standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Philip.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (A)

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (a) in order to revert to Government Business.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Rule 61 (a) be now suspended in order to revert to Government Business.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

ARTHUR EVELYN ARMSTRONG PENSION BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: When the adjournment for lunch took place, the House was debating the motion for the second reading of a Bill to authorise the payment of an additional pension to Arthur Evelyn Armstrong, and the honourable junior member for the City was speaking.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—I was merely trying to enquire whether there were any other persons in the service of the Crown or who have recently retired, who would be in a position similar to that of Rev. Armstrong. I was wondering whether we should ask the Government at this stage if they intend to give other persons who may be in this position similar consideration. What I had in mind is to use this Bill as a means of getting the Government to bring in other persons. I understand that there is someone in the employ of the Government —someone connected with the Peasants' Loan Bank who has done some parochial service and then went over to the Government—and now his service with the Parochial Body will not be taken into consideration for pension. I was wondering if the Government know of any other cases which could be brought to their attention so that it would not appear that we are favouring a particular individual. Very often we discover that after Bills of this nature have been passed many other cases are brought to light in which there is the very injustice which we are trying to remedy in this Bill; we discover that there are many other cases which are not considered merely because the persons concerned are not influential persons or they have nobody at court to plead their cause. I should not like to be put in the unfortunate position of being told that I voted for this Bill because it concerned Rev. Armstrong and others who left one form of employment to go for another are not going to receive similar consideration. I think that it is regrettable that anybody should work for the Government and not be given a pension for their service. I am sorry that the honourable member in charge of the Bill has already replied, however, I am voting for the second reading of this Bill with the understanding that I am not, in addition to doing this gentlemen the justice of giving him a pension, putting him in a favoured position so that it can be thrown at him and at me that he was a privileged person working for the Government. It is perhaps unusual for the Chaplain of the Prison in Barbados to be given a post ending up with a salary of as much as £750 per annum. It would seem as if this is a Bill about which there is likely to be a great deal of misunderstanding. I understand that the service is being regarded as continuous for the purpose of computing the pension and if that is so I say that that is unusual. I hope that the Government is not leading me in the position where it can be thrown at me that there are other persons who are entitled to the same consideration and they have not got it. I agree that any person who serves the Government should not only be paid for his service but he should also be given a pension.

Mr. SPRINGER: It is not clear to me whether the honourable junior member for the City was saying that in this case Rev. Armstrong's pension in respect of his services at the Prison will be at the rate of his salary as Headmaster of Combermere School. That is not the proposal. I think that the matter has been sufficiently explained but

the honourable member may be in some doubt and I ask leave to explain it again. If Rev. Armstrong had served for ten years as Chaplain of the Prison he would have been entitled to a pension for his service. He served for only eight years and had to resign that post in order to take up a post with a School Authority which he did immediately after he resigned the post. If there had been passed at that time the new Pension Bill which was recently passed by the Legislature, his whole service would have been one continuous service. At the time when Rev. Armstrong retired, the two periods of service were separate, one being under the Pension Act and the other being under the Teachers' Pension Act. It is now proposed that this eight years' service should be considered by itself and to give Rev. Armstrong a pension on the salary which he was receiving for his duties as Chaplain of the Prison. As regards the case where a person has served with a Parochial Authority and then transferred to the Government Service, there is a precedent for the Government considering the period of service with the Parochial Authority when computing the pension at the end of the person's entire period of service. I think that it was towards the end of the last session when there was a case where a person who was a sanitary inspector with the General Board of Health was given a pension based on his whole period of service both as a sanitary inspector with the Board of Health and in the service of the St. Michael's Vestry. The reason for that is that subsequent to his transfer from the parochial service, parochial servants became pensionable by law and it was felt just that he should be put in the position in which he would have been if the Pension Bill had been passed earlier. It is not a question of any special treatment in the case of Rev. Armstrong.

Mr. TALMA rose to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member has already spoken.

The question that this Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. LEWIS, BRANCKER, SMITH, F. L. WALCOTT, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, SPRINGER, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, CRAWFORD, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT and WILKINSON.—17.

Noes: Messrs. RAMSAY and TALMA.—2.

The second reading was passed.

On the motion of Mr. CRAWFORD, seconded by Mr. ADAMS, Mr. SPEAKER, left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

Clause 1, the title Clause, was read and passed.

Clause 2 was read as follows:—

2. The Colonial Treasurer is hereby authorised and required to pay in equal monthly instalments from the Public Treasury on the warrant of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to Arthur Evelyn Armstrong, formerly Headmaster of Combermere School, during the term of his natural life a pension at the rate of thirty-three pounds six shillings and eight pence per annum as from the seventeenth day of April, one thousand nine hundred and forty-six, in addition to any pension to which he is at present entitled.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. TALMA: Before the question is put, I should like to say that this is the point which I attempted to make a few minutes ago after listening to the remarks of the honourable senior member for St. George. How can we have a special Act for Rev. Armstrong which really is not in conformity with the pension Regulations? Any employee of the Government who resigns after eight years' service gets a gratuity. A pension is based on at least ten years' service; but because it is the case of Rev. Armstrong he has only given eight years' service, and left one job for a more remunerative one, a special Bill is sent down! If this was a case of some Waterworks foreman or Hospital employee we would have been told that a pension is based on ten years' service and that he can only get a gratuity. This Clause states that Rev. Armstrong is to be paid a pension of £33 6. 8. per annum as from the 17th of April, 1946, during his natural life. If Mr. Armstrong lives until he is eighty years of age —and we hope that he will live until then—he will receive this pension whereas in truth and in fact he is only entitled to a gratuity of one month's salary for each completed year's service. A policeman who has to get all the dew is not treated in the manner in which this gentleman is being treated.

Mr. LEWIS: I am wondering if the honourable member in charge of the Bill will offer some explanation to what has been said.

Mr. CRAWFORD: To reply generally, I can assure the honourable senior member for Christ Church that in any case in which the merits are such as to deserve similar treatment by the Government, whether it be a policeman, Waterworks foreman or a casual labourer of the Waterworks Department, the Government will give the same consideration to it as it has given to this particular case. In this case my information is that on the 19th of February, 1937, Rev. Armstrong elected to receive a gratuity and a reduced pension on his retirement; but inasmuch as his service prior to his appointment as Headmaster of Combermere School has been deemed to be non-pensionable and he had on that date held this office for two years, it appears that he had not exercised his option under the particular Section of the Teachers' Pension Act. On the 1st of September, 1944, he became eligible for a pension in respect of his service as Headmaster of Combermere School and he should have exercised his option in respect of this service. He was under the impression that the option which he had exercised was in order. I know how you feel over this matter, Mr. Chairman. The honourable senior member for Christ Church has really answered himself when he said that Rev. Armstrong elected to give up the job at the Prison for an infinitely more reliable job realising that he would forfeit his rights as Chaplain of the Prison. What I want to emphasize is this; as the case now stands, out of a period of thirty-five years' service in one way or another with the Government, Rev. Armstrong is now only receiving a pension in respect of twelve years' service. I know that it has been argued that he broke the service for more remunerative jobs, but apparently he was under a misapprehension in some cases and the Government feels that he is entitled to a pension for the eight years during which he served as Chaplain of the Prison.

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

Clause 2 was passed.

Clause 3 was read and passed.

On the motion of Mr. CRAWFORD, seconded by Mr. TALMA, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

The House resumed.

On motions of Mr. CRAWFORD, seconded by Mr. GARNER in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

QUARANTINE BILL

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. SPEAKER,—I ask leave to proceed with Order No. 2 as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. John,—Second reading of a Bill relating to Quarantine and similar matters.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker,—In moving the second reading of this Bill I should like to explain that as a result of a recommendation of the West Indian Royal Commission of 1938-1939, a Conference on Quarantine was held in Trinidad in December, 1943, to consider the following agenda:—

(1) Preparation and adoption of a Model Quarantine Ordinance and Regulations.

(2) Consideration and adoption of the recommendation of the Advisory Medical Committee on Quarantine in 1942.

(3) Recommendations for arrangements for the exchange of epidemiological information and the co-ordination of quarantine procedure in the West Indian area, and

(4) Recommendations for special agreements between the British Colonies in the West Indian area in respect of (a) Maritime traffic and (b) Air navigation.

All the Colonies in the Caribbean area, with the exception of Barbados, have enacted the uniform Quarantine Legislation before the end of 1944.

This Bill is of a technical nature and I am advised by the experts here that in entering into the details of the Bill it must be pointed out that Clauses I to II (with the exception of Clause 3 (3), (4) and (5) and Clause 4 (1), (2) and (3) follow very closely Clauses 1 to 10 of the Model Legislation and the Quarantine Acts which have been passed in Trinidad and the Leeward Islands. Clause 3 (1) and (2) make provision for the Quarantine Authority.

As there is no organised medical department in Barbados corresponding to that in the other West Indian Colonies, an *ad hoc* organisation— limited solely to quarantine matters—had to be created. This has been done by Clause 3 (3), (4) and (5) and Clause 4, bearing in mind the recommendations of the Conference and certain provisions in the First and Second Schedules which form part of the Bill.

It is important that this Bill come into operation at an early date because of the conditions arising from the entry and departure of aircraft.

Clauses 12 to 19 are entirely new and themselves explain the reasons for their adoption.

The Bill is identical with Acts already passed in all the other Islands and is intended

(1) to give the British West Indies adequate protection against the introduction of disease from without.

(2) to subject the travelling public to the minimum of inconvenience consistent with adequate safeguards and;

(3) to furnish ourselves with a Quarantine Code embracing all the measures which are considered to be essential by modern medical science for our own safety and for that of our neighbours. And I may say that the introduction of air travel makes the whole world our neighbours.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that. This Bill is somewhat belated. As honourable members will see, the Convention was held in 1943 and the Bill has only now got here. Just a few months ago we had quite a scare here in connection with Cerebro-spinal Meningitis and we had to institute measures that are now contained in this Bill in order to deal with that situation. By passing this Bill hurriedly we will avoid anything of the sort taking place again at least as far as disinsectisation is concerned.

Mr. LEWIS: This is a Bill which honourable members have just looked at. It contains many clauses and several schedules and it is one of those Bills in which you show no interest because it is difficult to comprehend them. This Bill has been in the making for some four years; it was introduced in this House on the 22nd of July, 1947, it was circulated only recently and we are passing it today! We have adopted the method of dealing expeditiously with Bills in Select Committee and I am wondering if honourable members will agree to a motion for referring this Bill to a Select Committee so that we might get the Chief Medical Officer and the Sanitation Officer along with the hon. senior member for St. Thomas to enlighten us as to the technicalities of the Bill. I know that it is very difficult for honourable members to understand the real meaning of this Bill and some of the terms used in it; and we are supposed to be passing legislation in the interest of the people and using our ordinary intelligence. We can get before us the people who can explain these matters. The members of the Executive Committee might not be able to retain all that they have heard about this Bill, and when honourable members are voting on a Bill irrespective of its size or technicality, I think that they should do so with a certain amount of assurance that they are enacting something which they have made every effort to understand to the best of their ability. I am sorry to say that I have to vote for this Bill wthout knowing anything about it, without knowing whether it is intended to do good and will eventually work to the detriment of the people of this colony or not. I do not know that I can turn to many honourable members and ask them anything about this Bill. I see that it is the habit of the Other Place to refer Bills to a Select Committee but we are against that because we hold that Select Committees have established a reputation for delaying and killing Bills That, however, is not my experience. I think that it would be a good thing to refer this Bill to a Select Committee so that honourable members can be made acquainted with the objects and reasons and how the Bill is going to affect the people. I would not like to delay this measure because it is an important one; but we do not know anything about it and we are accepting it merely because we have got thus far. I am wondering if the honourable mover of the second reading of the Bill will agree to refer it to a Select Committee after the second reading has been passed so that we can get some technical officers of the Government to explain it. After all, the members of the Government will be failing in their duty if they do not get some technical direction on this Bill, and we in turn will be failing in our duty if we do not acquaint ourselves with its provisions and applications so far as lies within our power to do so. I am supporting the motion for the second reading of this Bill and I do so with the admission that I know absolutely nothing about the Bill.

Mr. GALE: In reply to the honourable member who has just sat down, I should like to say that this Bill is the outcome of a Quarantine Conference which was held since 1943 and it should have been passed long ago. All the other British West Indian Colonies have adopted this Bill; it is a model of the Bill which was endorsed by the Conference. Medical men in the various British West Indian Colonies went to Trinidad and this is what they have produced. We

are the only British West Indian Colony which has not fallen into line and adpoted this measure and I do not see that any useful purpose will be served by referring the Bill to a Select Committee.

Mr. RAMSAY: I do not understand everything in this Bill. In the "Objects and Reasons" certain clauses are referred to; these things sound very nicely but they are technical and there are no special scientists in this Chamber. Barbadians profess to know everything under the sun, but they do not know everything under the sun. I was wondering why these things were not put in everyday language. We do not know anything about the Conference because the proceedings of the Conference have not been laid on the Table of this House. I am asking that this Bill be postponed for the purpose of having the "Objects and Reasons" put in everyday language so that we can understand them. How in the name of patience can this House of Assembly composed of ordinary men like myself be expected to read through all this data. I am suggesting to the honourable member in charge of the Bill that he should put the "Objects and Reasons" in a different shape. In the "Objects and Reasons" for instance, reference is made to Clauses 12 to 17; well I do not know what is Clause 12 or Clause 17. I think that these things should be put so that they can be understood. I do not know how they can put these things into the hands of ordinary laymen. I am not moving that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee, but I am moving that it be postponed for the express purpose that the honourable member in charge of it will be able to put the "Objects and Reasons" in a wider scope. We want a comprehensive resumé of all these data which none of us will read, not even the honourable mover of the second reading of the Bill. (Laughter). I beg to move that this Bill be now postponed.

Mr. ADAMS: While we like to see a little comic element introduced into serious affairs, we also have to remember that we have been telling the public and the world that we are taking our business in this House seriously. We have to thank both the honourable junior member for the City and the honourable junior member for St. Peter for being frank enough to tell us that they have not read the Bill. The honourable member who has just spoken has gone in the "Objects and Reasons" that Clauses 12 and 17 of the Bill repeated in the "Objects and Reasons."

Mr. RAMSAY: I never said that I wanted them repeated. I said that I wanted them condensed into everyday language. I do not know if the honourable member understands what "condense" means. (Laughter).

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable member has it in the "Objects and Reasons" that Clauses 12 to 17 of this Bill differ from the existing Laws of Barados, of which he has a copy, in certain respects and he is asking for a condensed statement of Clauses 12 to 17. We must really thank those honourable members for giving reasons for referring this Bill to a Select Committee—

Mr. RAMSAY: I never said anything about referring this Bill to a Select Committee. I expressly said that I wanted it postponed.

Mr. ADAMS: I apologize to the honourable member and I withdraw my accusation of him. I really coupled the honourable member with the honourable junior member for the City who asked that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee. I was under the impression that we had got a Select Committee of two honourable members but it is obvious that we have to get a Select Committee of only one honourable member—the honourable junior member for the City. (Laughter). If the honourable junior member for the City takes the trouble even only to look through this Bill, he will see that there is not even a line in it which can be called technical unless he refers to the line in respect of—

At this point, it now being 3.30 p.m. Mr SPEAKER stated that it was now time for the consideration of Private Members' Business.

ADDRESS *Re* SENDING A DELEGATION TO SURINAM TO EXPLORE POSSIBILITIES OF EMIGRATION.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I ask leave to move that the Address of which I gave notice today be taken as the first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to move that the Address of which I gave notice today be taken as the first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business.

Mr. RAMSAY: I beg to second that. I do not think that it is necessary for me to elaborate on the reasons why my colleague has asked for leave to proceed with this Address. He is dealing with a well-known subject. This House as well as the community knows that emigration is of vital importance to this country taking into consideration the peculiar phase through which we are passing. I take it that honourable members will grant my colleague the opportunity to have this Address discussed this afternoon with a view of passing it to His Excellency the Governor.

The question that this Address be taken as the first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business therefore stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Peter:—To move the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor relating to the sending of a delegation to Surinam to investigate and report on the conditions of living and work to which Barbadians are being invited to go. Has the honourable member circulated some copies of the Address?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Yes Sir. The Address reads as follows:—

The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Governor

The House of Assembly feel that in view of the visit of the Commission from Surinam exploring possibilities of recruiting Barbadians for work and settlement in that country, the Government should take immediate steps to send a small delegation to Surinam to investigate and report on the conditions of living and work to which Barbadians are being invited to go.

This Address is simply worded and the sentiments expressed in it re-echo those which have been expressed by this Chamber on more than one occasion. At the beginning of this session an Address was unanimously passed by this House asking the Government to explore the possibility of emigration to various parts of the West Indies and other countries. Fortunately for us, some of the Authorities in Surinam have visited this colony and they are willing to take people from here to that country for settle-

ment or for work. I feel that with this situation before us, the Government will be well advised to take immediate steps so that a small delegation from this colony should visit Surinam in order to investigate the possibilities of our people going there. It is well to bear in mind that although we have agreed in broad principle with emigration, we realise that in connection with settling and putting people to work, it should be the duty of the local Government to see that the conditions are such that the people will benefit. I know that making a long speech on this matter is not necessary because even those members of the Conservative element have already agreed with the principle of emigration and if this opportunity comes along it is only natural to ask the Government to conform to something with which they have already agreed in principle. I beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Mr. RAMSAY: I have great pleasure in seconding the motion for the passing of this Address. Words fail me to express my joy in anticipating any success which this venture may create. I pronounce upon it the benediction of Almighty God and hope that something good will be achieved.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Before the question is put, I should like to say that on the day after the Commission came to Barbados, in the course of a discussion with them I suggested that the local Government would have to send to Surinam a delegation to investigate the conditions there. I even went further and suggested that representatives of the types of workers who are likely to benefit from the scheme should be included in the delegation. In other words, this exploratory delegation should include in its personnel one or two, if not more, agricultural workers who would be given the opportunity to investigate at first hand the conditions under which the emigrants are expected to work, and therefore they would be in a position on their return home to explain the conditions to their colleagues in a way in which perhaps the other members of the delegation would not be able to do. As a sort of counter suggestion the Chairman of the Commission suggested or rather recommended that it would perhaps be a better idea if a small group of workers numbering about four or five dozen were first sent to Surinam for an experimental period of about six months in order to ascertain the conditions for themselves and then return here and publicise the conditions of which they would have had practical experience. Subsequently, last Sunday morning, the Commission with their delegates and observers discussed the question at further length with the executive members of the Congress Party and they assured the Party that they themselves would suggest to the Government immediately, if they have not done so already, to send a small delegation comprised of experts—perhaps of legislators or other people who may be able to contribute to the scheme—to Surinam since the Netherlands Government had nothing to hide and were only too anxious and willing to have the conditions of work in Surinam investigated by a delegation representative of the people from whom they were selecting emigrants. We were left with the impression that this action had already been suggested to the Government otherwise similar action would have been taken here today by one of us. There is no point in duplicating action of this sort; we were already assured that the matter was receiving the consideration which it should receive and therefore we allowed it to rest there feeling sure that the Government would very shortly take action in this relatively important matter. The general conditions as outlined by the Commission are such that———

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not want to interrupt the honourable member but he seems to be in favour of the Address. Without going any further—

Mr. CRAWFORD: I just want to emphasize how important I think it is for the Government to accede to the request made in the Address. All I want to say is that the general conditions of work as outlined by the Commission are such that before any of us who represent the working classes in this colony could wholeheartedly recommend the scheme to likely emigrants, we should like first of all to be in a better position to explain as a result of practical knowledge, the conditions under which we are recommending the scheme to the emigrants. The only way in which we can do that is by sending competent observers to the spot and then on their return we should be in a position to rely on the information which they have gleaned; and probably we will be in a position to recommend more strongly that this scheme be undertaken.

Mr. ADAMS: Every right-thinking member of the community will deplore any attempt to make this matter seemingly a Party issue. If the honourable senior member for St. Peter happens to move the passing of this Address it is not necessary for us to say: "We thought of it too", because we could go on like that for ever. Surely every right-thinking member of the community should do his utmost to try and get a successful scheme of emigration to take place: he should draw to the attention of the Government any snags which may appear to him. Inasmuch as the honourable member who has just sat down has seen fit to say what he has said, it is only fair for us to say that on the very afternoon on which this Commission arrived the Labour Commissioner wrote me a letter and I got in touch with him and promptly suggested that the honourable member on my right who is responsible for agriculture, and the honourable senior member for St. Philip, inasmuch as his name has been associated in this island with emigration, along with myself should meet the Commission and we appointed the meeting for Thursday. I am informed that the honourable senior member for St. Philip went to the hotel and met the Commission on the night before. He has not told the House that. On Thursday when we met I made it very clear that it was unfortunate that the Executive Committee was not meeting on that day but as soon as the Executive Committee met on Thursday of this week, we would raise the matter with the Government in relation to sending a small delegation to Surinam to enquire into the conditions. I also pointed out that an agricultural labourer should go along with the delegation and see the conditions for himself. I do not desire to get any credit for myself in saying what I have said, because it is deplorable that a matter like emigration should be made a Party matter just because somebody in a Party happens to mention it first. We must stop this petty stupidity; we must show ourselves responsible especially when the eyes of the Colonial Office are on us in more senses than one; let us all say that we are going to make this scheme a success. Do not let us say; "I thought of it first"; it is up to everyone of us to make emigration a reality. I can say with 100% of assurance that even without this Address the Government being reasonably sensible—including the honourable senior member for St. Philip—will give its utmost attention to this matter and will see that a delegation goes to Surinam to find out things for themselves. The honourable senior member for St. George and I enquired of the Commission almost as if we were in the Law Courts cross-examining them as to the conditions with regard to malaria, housing, water, transport, cinemas, dancing—all those things. The House can rest assured that the Government is going to be very thorough in their investigations before they allow any

Barbadians to go to Surinam. I am hoping that this will be the last occasion on which I will have to appeal to honourable members to regard matters as affecting the island as a whole rather than adopt a Party attitude towards them.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have remarked before that there seems to be some jealousy when a member of one Party introduces a matter before a member of another Party. As the Government is constituted at present, I think that honourable members can leave matters to the consideration of the Government without being jealous or having any ill feelings as to the Party which first introduces any matter. (Cheers).

Mr. TALMA: This Address on the face of it is laudable but apparently unnecessary because the Commission from Surinam is here; they can furnish us with the facts and they tell us that the wage offered the workers is $1.08 per day. I do not see how a delegation from this colony can assist unless a living wage is offered. If the wage offered is $1.08 per day —it must be remembered that in the absence of Trade Unions if you go to work on contract you have to keep to the contract. If you break the contract you go to jail and the majority of workers will break a contract to work for $1.08 per day. Except the Commission were able to offer a living wage—something far in excess of what is being offered—how can the average worker be satisfied or induced to go to Surinam to work? We have to know what the housing and climate are like there, but unless the basic wage is adjusted it is a waste of time to send a delegation there; it is only a waste of the taxpayers' money to do that. This is really an absolute farce because unless they can satisfy the representatives of labour and the Executive in particular as to terms of the contract, what is the object of a delegation going down there? That is how I feel about the matter. I feel that with experience as to these slavish countries—at least when our workers go to a place like Surinam where they cannot speak the language, it is not like going to the United States of America.

Mr. RAMSAY: People went to Cuba where Spanish is spoken and they did not die.

Mr. TALMA: They got locked up.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is out of order.

Mr. RAMSAY: I beg to apologise, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. TALMA: I am not throwing any cold water on this scheme but I say that I do not see that any useful purpose will be served by passing such an Address. We have representatives here to deal with these matters; we can appoint a Committee to interview these people who are now here and see whether they will offer a living wage or not, and with regard to the question of a contract we can appoint to prepare the contract a few of our outstanding barristers or solicitors who know about preparing contracts. I do not see the object of passing an Address like this one. Another point is this: just on the eve of a Commission being sent out to investigate the possibilities of emigrating people to British Guiana, we find that a Commission is sent here from Surinam and that has left me fairly bewildered. Surinam is only about one-half the size of British Guiana; they have failed to secure agricultural workers elsewhere, and knowing that we have a redundant population here, they have come here to see if they can pick up about one thousand Babradian slaves and pay them $1.08 per day. That is not even the wage which is paid by plantation owners; agricultural workers are paid more than that by virtue of Trade Unions and organizations of that sort. In this case, this is not a question of saying that you can bargain for more money; because if you sign a contract you have to keep to that contract and if you break it, the law comes into play. You will be sued in the Law Courts and be locked up for some time. I can tell you that in Cayenne where the people have no proper representation, they suffer immensely. I can see a similar thing happening in Surinam unless a living wage is offered. There is no point in putting people in a trap: if you are helping them, then help them. People cannot send back to their families anything out of $1.08 per day. Another point is this: a guilder is 40 cents as far as I know, but the Commission make out that it is 63 cents. This is a question of currency and it is something that you have to be satisfied about. I say that our workers cannot live on a basic wage of $1.08 per day; they will not work for that in any part of the globe. For those reasons I say that this Address cannot serve any useful purpose. This is only a matter of vote-catching.

Mr. WILKINSON: As the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said, this is not a question of Party politics. We are all in favour of emigration provided that the conditions are satisfactory; there is not a single member of this House who would vote against the expenditure of a reasonable sum of money in order to investigate the possibilities of emigration and settlement of Barbadians in other places. From what the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said, it seems to me that the Government are very much alive to the present situation and this Address is absolutely unnecessary. (A MEMBER: What about the Address relating to a Deep Water Harbour?) I do not see that there is anything to be gained by passing this Address on the assurance we have had that two members of the Executive Committee have interviewed this Commission. I am sure that if there is the slightest opportunity of getting away 500 or 1,000 of our people, the Government will send down a resolution asking for some money so as to send down the Labour Commissioner or some delegates to investigate the conditions under which our people will have to settle down there. It is for that reason that I say there is no necessity for passing this Address as we know that steps have already been taken in the matter.

Mr. MOTTLEY: This Address has been introduced by a member of this House, a member of one of the Parties which form this Coalition Government and judging from the remarks of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, he would know all that transpired between the members of the Government who actually met this Commission. I am supporting the passing of the Address for this reason; I am not a member of either of the Parties which form the Government and I take it that the spirit of the Address is to ensure that those of us who are not members of the Parties which form the Government would unanimously support a Resolution which is sent down for the purpose of sending the delegation to Surinam. Since every honourable member wants his position to be publicly known, I should like to say that I, too, became very much interested when I saw the headlines in the "Advocate" setting out the possibilities of carrying people to Surinam. I cannot be accused of being an agricultural capitalist. I had the opportunity of meeting this Commission and what struck me forcibly—and it must also strike other people forcibly—is this: the Commission told me that they were informed that the highest wage paid in Barbados even in harvest time is 7/- per day and they spoke about the payment of 4/6 per day. That statement must have been made by those in charge of labour activities in this country and I take it that every member of this community deplores such a misleading statement which will tend to make the people in Surinam underpay our people

because they feel that they are underpaid here. If statistics are obtained it will be seen that on the average that statement is not true. The people in Surinam feel that with the over population in this country, because our workers are paid 7/- per day in harvest time, they are going to pay them 4/6 per day. I do not think that that will work. I am supporting this Address no matter from which side it comes because it is one of those things which, in my opinion, are rightly done in order to allow the public to see that you are alive and are not merely allowing the members of the Government to say that they are doing everything. While no mention has been made of this point in the Address, I am suggesting that someone with some agricultural experience—someone with scientific agricultural knowledge—should be associated in one way or another with a delegation of this nature, and we should not merely have a lot of politicians on it. Such a person would be of assistance in discovering whether the conditions down there are suitable for the emigrants or not.

Mr. SPRINGER: Much talk has taken place during the last few minutes about the rate of pay referred to in the Press interview given by Dr. de Groot and his associates. I had the opportunity of meeting these people last Thursday morning as has already been mentioned, the same morning on which the interview appeared in the Press in which the wage of 4/6 was mentioned. I want to make it clear that no members of the Government, as far as the political side of the matter is concerned, saw these people until after they had given their interview to the Press which took place at 10 a.m. on Wednesday; so that they had this information about the wages paid in Barbados from some other source. I would like to add that according to Dr. de Groot, this is intended to be not a daily wage but an average wage. I distinctly remember him say that the work was piece work and that the 4/6 which was the average wage, was what not a particularly active worker would make, but a good worker could make $9 or $10 a week. I quite agree that the matter needs investigation and I am supporting the Address.

Mr. BRANCKER: There is no reason why this Address should not commend itself to honourable members irrespective of whether or not the Government had done what was their obvious duty to do in this matter—to send a properly constituted delegation to this place to explore and investigate the possibilities for themselves. As I gather from these Commissioners, they had either invited or they intended to invite the Government to send a strong and representative delegation to visit the spot in the first place and let them report back, and the onus would be on us after the delegation had reported back to decide as to whether this was a fit place to send Barbadians to settle or not. The Commissioners have explained that they are in favour of the emigrants not going alone but accompanied by their families. For some reason or other they seem to think that contact should be avoided between the Javanese natives and the imported workers. They have expressed their desire that about 50 workers should try out the conditions on one of the plantations there and then they could let us know from first-hand experience how they found the place for purposes of settlement. There are people here who express themselves as being in favour of emigration but who in their hearts are really against emigration; they will try to put fear in the minds of the would-be emigrants by making mention of disease and malaria. I think that in that delegation should be included a Government Medical Officer, either the Chief Medical Officer or the Sanitation Officer, so that the people will not be scared by some peril which does not exist.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do you suggest that the Government will not include a medical officer in the delegation?

Mr. BRANCKER: I do not like to leave matters to chance and I think that it would be wise to throw out that suggestion in the hope that they will not leave out somebody who will give a conscientious report on the conditions of the country from the standpoint of public health. Naturally we want to encourage emigration wherever possible and this is a matter which should be investigated fully by the most competent explorers that we have available at the moment.

Mr. MAPP: I was a member of the Press Delegation which interviewed the Commission and at no stage of the interview was any of us asked about the wages which are paid here. We pointed out that the wage of 4/6 per day was low. The Commission said that that was the average wage which was worked for and I need not repeat what has already been said by the honourable senior member for St. George about a willing worker being able to work for more. We asked about the cost of living in Surinam as compared with the cost of living here and we were told that it was about the same thing but that certain articles were cheaper down there. When asked about the basic wage—

Mr. SPEAKER: I suggest to the honourable member that that is one of the matters which the Government will enquire into. The honourable member who has moved the passing of the Address is asking that a delegation be appointed to go into these matters. Honourable members are referring to things which any delegation would naturally investigate.

Mr. MAPP: I was anxious to say what I have said because an atmosphere has crept into the debate—an atmosphere which I abhor. I think that decent people in this House must abhor that atmosphere more and more. I have no doubt that this Address will get the support of the majority of honourable members of this House.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to make a small contribution to this debate. In the first place, irrespective of what honourable members say, undoubtedly they do import Party feeling into this question whenever it comes up.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do not let us waste any time on that.

Mr. LEWIS: I am finished with that, Mr. Speaker. I may say that as a matter of fact in February this year I was in Surinam but I did not send the Commission up here. I did not even tell them about the 4/6. To be more serious, this is one occasion on which we are investigating a proposal which has been put to us. I take it that this Address will have the effect of letting the Government know that we will favourably consider the expense of sending a delegation to Surinam. I take it that the delegation will investigate everything including the daily wage. that has been offered. Therefore I do not see any good in our discussing that here. I do not see any point in our discussing now whether the cost of living in Barbados bears an unfavourable relation to the cost of living in Surinam or not, or in case a man is living in Surinam and his family is in Barbados. I take it that the delegation will have sufficient sense to see all these points. One of the reasons why the Government should have a hand in this matter is

this: if people are emigrated to any part of the world and they succeed and are happy they can pay their own passages back. If they fail, it is possible that the Government will have to repatriate them; therefore it is incumbent on the Government to investigate the conditions under which these people are to leave in a foreign land. What is worrying me is that there is no mention in this Address as to who should be chosen as the delegation. I am not saying that names should be mentioned, but if you feel that an agricultural labourer should be there, you should mention that in the Address. If you feel that members of this House should be there, you should say so but do not mention the names of the particular members. If a Government medical officer should be there, it is your duty to mention that because if you leave this Address as it is I am hoping that I will not hear any member of this House express any dissatisfaction as to who is chosen on this delegation. There is one particular observation which I shou'd like to make now and it is this: it would seem to me that if the unemployed and other people want emigration, it is time that they take the matter into their own hands and keep politicians out of it.

The visitors to the House cheered.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to ask the visitors to keep quiet otherwise I will have to clear the House.

Mr. LEWIS: We are likely to prejudice the opportunity of labourers leaving this colony with remarks that have been made here today. some of the things said here to-day needed not to have been said because an investigation has to be made and these things should have been left to those who are carrying out the investigation. While we have failed in our efforts to secure emigration to the United States of America and elsewhere, there is an emigration scheme which is succeeding if not 100% nearly so. Labourers for Curacao and Aruba are being recruited by a private firm and I say that this is the mainstay of this country so far as emigration is concerned. I feel that it is my duty to publicly register some praise for the persons who are doing it. I do not see that they are publicly praised for it and it is regrettable—

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that that is anything to do with this matter.

Mr. LEWIS: We are not discussing this matter on the high plane of finding work for our people irrespective of who brings it about or who thought of it first, and we are injuring the chances of sending our people to work abroad. I know that employers abroad are somewhat diffident about accepting emigrants when the question of emigration is too nearly mixed with politics. Perhaps they may want to exploit the labourers. I feel that the Government as a Government and apart from politics should protect their people who have emigrated. I hope that this scheme will not meet the fate which others have met; there have been some expressions of opinion here today which I feel were unfortunate.

Mr. GARNER: I am supporting the passing of this Address but before doing so I wish to offer an amendment. I beg to move that after the word "delegation" the following words be inserted: "including representatives of the type of workers who are likely to benefit from the scheme".

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not want to stop you from moving the amendment but do you think after what has been said in the House to-day that the Government would not send a delegation including some member drawn from the working people?

Mr. GARNER: I am not sure about that, Sir. It is true that the Commission is here but we are not quite sure as to the conditions there. Therefore if some agricultural workers were sent along with other persons to see that the conditions are suitable for living, that will help the whole scheme. If the actual worker went there and saw things for himself, he would come back and publicise them and we will decide on the line of action which we should take. If he thinks that the scheme is not a good one then we will not commit ourselves to it, but if he thinks that it is all right we will explore the possibilities. That is why I have offered this amendment. I feel that while this is not a Party issue—and I have no intention of making it a Party issue—it is true that members of the Government knew of it before us——

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that anything to do with the passing of this Address?

Mr. GARNER: The honourable senior member for St. Joseph made some remarks about a Party issue. I happen to be a member of a Party and I think that I should vindicate my character.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Party question is nothing to do with the passing of this Address and I ask the honourable member not to argue that point any more.

Mr. GARNER: I will not argue it any more. I think that something should be done about the wages before our people can——

Mr. SPEAKER: The delegation will have to go fully into the matter.

Mr. GARNER: I am only expressing my opinion on the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: The delegation will look into the class of work, the remuneration to be paid and so forth.

Mr. GARNER: If we are paying our agricultural workers $1.20 per day as a basic wage I do not see how they can be attracted to work in a foreign country for 4/6 per day. That is the point I wanted to make. I do not see how we can really ask the Governor to sanction this Address if we do not emphasize that very strongly. Personally, when I read about this offer of 4/6 in the Press I thought it *infra dig*. While I have every hope that we will get an emigration scheme working, people cannot come to these shores and expect to get slave labour. I am not saying that that is in the minds of these people. I hope that there is no such idea. I hope that the people who will go to Surinam as a delegation will lay great emphasis on this point otherwise the scheme will break down.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: In reply I should like to quote these words: "To thine own self be true." I hope that this House will some day see an issue bigger than a Party issue, and that matters affect the community as a whole. When I moved the passing of this Address I had no idea in my mind of any Party issue, but remarks have been levelled against the mover of the Address as if there is something of a partisan nature about it. You will see———

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to leave out the Party issue.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I mention that because the honourable senior member for Christ Church in unvarnished language said that this is only a farce—

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member not to take any notice of that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: With Your Honour's ruling I feel that this Address will receive the favour of the House. An amendment has been offered by the honourable junior member for St. Philip; well, if the Devil brings it the Lord has sent it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will you accept the amendment?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I accept it because I know that if an amendment is offered to an Address which is introduced there is the idea of doing something for the benefit of the people who sent us here. I hope that the Government will take appropriate action and come to the rescue of the people.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Address with the amendment which has been accepted do now pass. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it. I will ask the honourable senior member and the honourable junior member for St. Peter to present this Address.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: As Your Honour pleases.

Mr. RAMSAY: As Your Honour pleases.

ADDRESS *RE* DECREASE IN DAIRY FARMING

Mr. RAMSAY: I ask leave to move that the Address of which I gave notice earlier to-day be taken as the next Order of the Day. The Address is not controversial; it only asks the Government to look into the question of dairy farming in this island.

Mr. TALMA: I object.

Mr. RAMSAY: The honourable member has not seen the Address and yet he is objecting.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that leave be granted the honourable member to move that the Address of which he gave notice to-day be taken as the next Order of the Day. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. RAMSAY, LEWIS, SMITH, F. L. WALCOTT, COX, MAPP, SPRINGER, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, GARNER, MOTTLEY and GALE—13

Noes: Messrs. BRANCKER, FOSTER, CRAWFORD, TALMA, HAYNES, S. A. WALCOTT and WILKINSON—7.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been resolved in the affirmative, thirteen honourable members voting "Aye" and seven honourable members voting "No". The honourable member may therefore make the motion.

Mr. RAMSAY: I beg to move that this Address, copies of which I have circulated, be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. BLACKMAN seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day therefore stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Peter:—To move the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor relating to the recent decrease in Dairy Farming in this Island.

Mr. RAMSAY: I shall not weary the House with any lengthy remarks on this Address. It reads as follows:—

The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor

The House of Assembly beg to draw to Your Excellency's attention the recent decrease in Dairy Farming in this Island as well as the ever increasing scarcity and the continual destruction of Dairy cattle. The House feel that the following circumstances are responsible for the above state of affairs in this industry:—

(1) The fact that too much tinned milk is allowed to be imported and put on the market at one time thereby precluding the Dairy Keepers from being able to sell their milk.

(2) The price at which this imported milk can be sold forces the Dairy Keepers to sell their milk at prices which are too little above, and in some cases below, the actual cost of its production.

(3) The quality of the standard feed supplied has decreased, by about at least one third the quantity of milk formerly obtained from the same cattle, thereby necessitating the outlay of much larger capital, and also correspondingly increasing the concentrated feed, fodder and labour expenses.

(4) The increased cost of maintaining and running a Dairy due to (a) the recent introduction of Regulations and (b) the increased cost of feed, fodder, labour and all the equipment necessary to permit the functioning of the Dairy business and the upkeep of transport.

The House feel that the further decrease of this industry must be detrimental to the welfare of the Island by (a) depriving many of their means of sustenance; (b) closing avenues of employment for employees in Dairies, milk vendors and others; (c) destroying the means for peasants and others of manuring their crops; (d) further limiting the supply of fresh meat from aged cattle as well as (e) placing the Public at some future date in the position of being unable to refuse to pay any price demanded for imported tinned milk.

The House therefore respectfully ask that Your Excellency will appreciate the seriousness of the present situation and take immediate steps to stop the further decline or total destruction of the Dairy industry. of this Island.

This matter is of vital importance to this community; it is a constitutional matter. It concerns the Dairy industry, the supply of milk, etc., and I ask honourable members to read the Address. I shall say no more about it except this: that those of us who are interested in our country and are watching things from a general standpoint and not being possessed fundamentally with any partisan spirit—those of us who are true representatives in the full sense of the word—will see the necessity for passing such an Address. This Address is no charge on the Government; it just asks the Government to look into the conditions complained of and remedy them. I beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. GALE: This is an Address which will have the sympathy of everybody in this island. We would like to see the Dairy industry maintained on a proper standard. However paragraph (1) of this Address says that it is a fact that too much tinned milk is allowed to be imported and put on the market at one time, thereby precluding the Dairy keepers from being able to sell their milk. I do not know that that is a fact because the population of this island is very large and if we look back to 1939 and see the quantity of condensed milk imported here—I do not think that one quarter of that quantity is imported at present—all of that milk was consumed besides that produced by Dairy keepers. It is a fact that milk is expensive and while it is necessary to foster Dairy farming in Barbados and to see that people who are keeping dairies are able to make a living out of the industry, we have to be very careful that we no not prevent milk from coming into this island because milk is very necessary for the nutrition of the people. It is necessary for us to keep some statistics in connection with these matters. In this Address there are many things that need very careful examination; it has been set out that the quality of the standard feed supplied has decreased. Everybody will agree with that, and the quality of the feed is not likely to be increased in the near future. If people will look at the world picture of things today they will realise that animal feed like oilmeal and soya bean meal is in very short supply and we have been extremely lucky to get them in past years from South America. That is a condition of things world wide and I do not think that the Government will be able to cope with

that. That condition of things has been brought about by a shortage of animal feed all over the world, and except the Government will allow people to sell milk at a greater price or subsidise the milk in some way so that the Dairy keepers can increase the yield the industry is made very uncertain. The British Government is trying to encourage Dairy keeping throughout the West Indies. We have just opened a new Farm at the Pine with a view to encouraging the industry; we are trying to get a better breed of animals and I think that encouragement should be given to the industry in every way. I am in sympathy with the idea of this Address but there are certain things in it that I think will need quite a lot of examination. I hope that this Address will not be passed in its present form because it would be very difficult to go into these matters at such short notice. I hope that the debate on this Address will be postponed.

Mr. ADAMS: I agree with everything that the last speaker has said and I hope that the honourable mover of the passing of this Address will agree to the postponement of the debate on the Address. This is a matter which requires more thought than what can be given to it in a haphazard twenty minutes this afternoon. If there had been a meeting of the Executive Committee last Thursday I would have raised this matter because the honourable junior member for St. Peter drew it to my attention and I promised that I would raise it there. I think that the House should thank the honourable member for bringing the matter to our attention because it is a pressing matter and there are many Dairy keepers in this island who think along these lines. I cannot agree that too much tinned milk is being imported into this island and I hope that the honourable junior member for St. Peter will agree to an amendment to the Address. If the position is that dairy keepers cannot sell all their milk because of the price of tinned milk perhaps—I speak now for myself—the most appropriate remedy or one of the first remedies should be that the Government undertake to buy the surplus milk and see that school children drink it. I beg to move that the further debate of this Address be postponed.

Mr. COX seconded the motion which was agreed to.

ADDITION TO DELEGATION TO PRESENT ADDRESS

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—When you asked the honourable junior member for St. Peter and myself to present the Address which has just been passed, you did not include the name of the honourable junior for St. Philip who moved an amendment to the Address. I think that the honourable member should also be asked to accompany us to present the Address.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the honourable junior member for St. Philip to accompany the honourable members for St. Peter to present the Address.

Mr. GARNER: As Your Honour pleases.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to this day week, the 19th day of August, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon.

Mr. SPRINGER seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER accordingly adjourned the House to Tuesday next, the 19th day of August, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon.