

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1947—48

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 2nd December, 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*), Messrs L. E. SMITH, F. L. WALCOTT, M. E. COX, D. A. FOSTER, R. G. MAPP, C. E. TALMA, G. H. ADAMS, B.A., H. D. BLACKMAN, V. C. GALE, S. A. WALCOTT and Dr. H. G. CUMMINS.

Prayers are read.

Messrs DOWDING, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, and Dr. WILSON enter the House and take their seats.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 25th November, 1947, having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

Mr. GARNER enters the House and takes his seat.

PAPERS LAID

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

Regulations made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the 29th November, 1947, under section 3 of the Travelling Allowance Act, 1932 (1932-5).

Report of the Committee appointed by the Governor to consider the report submitted by Dr. C. Y. Shephard entitled "The Sugar Industry of Barbados, a method for calculating the price of sugar cane" and to submit recommendations regarding the action to be taken thereon.

NOTICES

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Mr. TALMA: Resolution to approve the Regulations entitled The Travelling Allowance (Amendment) Regulations 1947, made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the 29th day of November, 1947, under the provisions of section 3 of the Travelling Allowance Act, 1932 (1932-3).

DR. CUMMINS: Special resolution under the provisions of section 13 of the Prisons Act, 1890 (1890-13) as amended by section 6 of the Civil Establishment (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act, 1944 (1944-26), and by section 2 (2) of the Prisons (Amendment) Act, 1947 (1947-33).

Mr. CRAWFORD enters the House and takes his seat.

Other Notices are as follows:—

Mr. BRANCKER: A Bill to amend the Supervision of the weighing of Sugar Canes Act, 1939 (1939—1).

Mr. COX: Of the following Address:—

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency the Governor

In view of the many grievances existing among the employees of the Department of Highways and Transport, the House of Assembly urge upon Your Excellency the immediate setting-up of a Commission of Inquiry to probe the said Department.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Of the following Address:—

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency the Governor

The House is of the opinion that the continued maintenance of a large number of American citizens in the armed forces of the country and the decision to keep U.S. occupying forces in the Far East at a considerably high level, will create a labour shortage in the United States and make it imperative for both industrialists and agriculturists to import foreign labour during 1948.

2. The House is also of the opinion that in view of the unemployment situation and the urgent need for procuring U.S. dollars in order to cope with the exigencies of the dollar crisis, every effort should be made with a view to obtaining employment for Barbadian workers in the U.S.A. next year.

3. Accordingly, the House is of the further opinion that

(a) Even if the U.S. Government is no longer willing to assume responsibility

the possibilities for recruitment at the hands of private employers directly should be explored;

- (b) the Government should undertake to enter into negotiations with potential contractors whether or not transportation costs will be fully or partially borne by the U.S. Government authorities, or such private employers as may require West Indian workers for their labour forces.

Mr. WILKINSON enters the House and takes his seat.

QUESTIONS.

Mr. SMITH: To enquire of the Senior Member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House.

- (1) Are the periods of duty of Police Constables at the out Stations regulated by a Schedule?
- (2) If the answer is in the affirmative,
 - (a) Are these periods of duty similar to those of the Police Constables at the Central Station.
 - (b) If they are not similar; will the Government say how they differ?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: To enquire of the senior member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House:—

- 1. Has the Government contemplated the sending down of legislation for the securing of Holidays with pay for all types of workers?
- 2. If so, will the Government send it down in the shortest possible time?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME.

On the motion of Mr. BRANCKER, seconded by Mr. SMITH, a Bill to amend the Supervision of the weighing of Sugar Canes Act, 1939 (1939—1) is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, seconded by Mr. Cox, a Bill to fix the minimum price for Peasants' Canes is read a first time.

BREACH OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Before you proceed to call the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House to Rule 73 relating to the privileges of this House. What I intend to deal with is a report in a newspaper called "The Torch", published on the 29th November. That newspaper, Mr. Speaker, carries on its front page a headline that is a misrepresentation of the proceedings of this Chamber. Then on page 4 of the same newspaper, there appears another headline stating that the honourable junior member for St. Peter and myself were mad at not having been invited to a Government House party and the headline in red type on the front page states "Governor taboos League's M.C.Ps". I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that it is not the intention in a democratic country to suppress any writings of the Press. It is not my intention to prohibit or try to prevent any unscrupulous journalist from having an excursion in cheap journalism but, Mr. Speaker, you lay claim to the ancient rights and privileges of this Chamber against such persons in this community and as long as this Chamber remains with those rights and privileges I feel that it is my duty as a responsible member of the community in this Chamber to see that those rights and privileges are preserved. Sir, I am sure that you are acquainted with the law. I know that you realize what

"privileges" means and when we get a gross representation of such a nature, saying something in big print that never occurred in this Chamber at all, I feel, Mr. Speaker, that it is time that we put a halt to such practices. I am sure that you, Sir, and the other honourable members are aware of the debate that took place in this Chamber on Tuesday last and those who get a copy of the official report when it is available can see for themselves. Mr. Speaker, whether what is stated in these headlines is a true report of what took place in this House or whether it is a gross misrepresentation. Speaking for myself, there was nothing in my speech which showed that I was not invited to Government House, or that there was anger on the part of any honourable member or that any honourable member was mad at not having been invited to Government House. The junior member for St. Philip, the senior member for St. Philip and the senior member for the City took part in that debate and you find a report in this newspaper stating that two members who also spoke on the motion for the adjournment of the House were mad at not having been invited to Government House. I say that this is one of the privileges of this Chamber that every honourable member should try to protect. If we want anarchy then we do not need any laws; then there will be a survival of the fittest and the strongest will prevail. If in a democratic society right must prevail against other things, then, Mr. Speaker, I feel we should see to it that incidents of this nature are not allowed to take place. I realize that we have no Standing Committee of Privileges of this House, like the House of Commons has, to deal with a matter like this but, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that you lay claim at the opening of each legislative session to the ancient rights and privileges of this House, it would be a transgression of those rights and privileges if we allow an incident so glaring as this not to have the full attention of this Chamber. I am going to move that a Committee be appointed to deal with this matter and shall be very glad if you, Mr. Speaker, will allow yourself to be associated with any Committee that is named for the purpose because I feel that the Speaker of this House should be a person who would be able to guide and assist any Committee that is appointed to deal with a breach of the privileges of this House. I do not want to take up any more of the time of the House to-day but I feel that matters such as this should be brought to the notice of this House because if these lapses are allowed to persist, we do not know what will eventually happen in this country. I beg to move that a Committee be appointed to go into the matter of the report complained of. Mr. Speaker, I do not know if you would like me to hand a copy of the newspaper to the Clerk.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the Committee is appointed, a copy of the newspaper can be placed before it when it sits.

Mr. SYMMONDS enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. MAPP: In seconding the motion for the appointment of the Committee I do not think I can add very much to what the honourable member has said. Sometimes we are tempted to ignore the ramblings in journalism of certain small newspapers but, Sir, you must remember that this is a small community. You must remember that very many people may not be aware of what actually happened in this House Tuesday after Tuesday and, therefore, they are apt to be guided by what they read in these newspapers, small though they be. It is not the first time, Mr. Speaker, that I have seen glaring inaccuracies.

curate headlines appearing in this said newspaper and although they have caused me some amusement at times, yet I think that in so far as they infringe the privileges of the House, we should act quickly and take steps to prevent such infringement. As I said before, this is a small community and we never know the harm that may be done by such glaring, not inaccuracies but lies. These misstatements appear in big, bold, red type to attract the attention of people and make a mockery of decent discussions in this Chamber. By all means I agree that if anything happens in this House which wants showing up, the facts should be brought to light through the medium of the newspapers, but when a newspaper undertakes to print, time and again, such glaring lies, to attempt to mislead the public as to what actually happened in this House, to attempt to bring scorn on certain members of this House for what may be mistaken as improper conduct, then notice should be taken of it and the practice stamped out very quickly. I think that it should be realized that the people in this community are going ahead with the times, that we are becoming more and more responsible and journalists who command some attention and guide public opinion, should have some sense of responsibility in this place; they should realize that our people are becoming more wide awake and they should try to be accurate and not do things that will mislead the public or create disorder in this community. We are a peaceful community but we are apt to be very virile at times and one never knows what may happen when newspapers print these things. English justice is very swift as it descends on all persons—the politicians the M.P.'s, the big journalists, and the millionaires. The days of privilege are past and even members of this House who can guide public opinion should have a greater sense of responsibility. I do not think I should say much more but I hope that this will be a test of the honourable members of this House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not speaking on the motion. I rise merely on a point of order. I think it would be impossible for members to vote either for or against the motion, unless the article complained of is brought to their attention. I have a slight recollection that I have seen the headline but I certainly do not remember ever having read the report about which these allegations are made. I think it is asking honourable members too much to vote one way or the other until both the headlines and the report have been read.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, I will have the report read by the Clerk.

The Deputy Clerk reads the report as follows:—

“GOV'T HOUSE TABOOS LEAGUE M.C.P.'s.—(4).

“COMRADES RAMSAY AND F. WALCOTT MAD AT NOT
“BEING INVITED TO GOVT. HOUSE PARTY

“‘de leader’ says—Shut Up—

“Stop Talking—And they Stop

“RAMSAY MANFULLY TALKS BACK

“Mr. J. T. C. Ramsay, junior member for St. Peter, on last Tuesday afternoon at the meeting of the House of Assembly moved that the House be adjourned for five minutes to discuss the matter arising out of the manner in which invitations were issued for the recent celebration held at Government House in honour of the marriage of Princess Elizabeth to the Duke of Edinburgh.

“Mr. Ramsay said that he had not received an invitation to the function and he felt that as

“a representative of the people and a member of the Legislature he was entitled to an invitation. He said that he felt it was an indiscretion on the part of the person recommending the issuing of invitations and he felt that it was not contributive to the goodwill of the community.

“Mr. Ramsay continuing said that it was the rule to sign the Visitor's Book, but if he did not sign the book he felt that as a member of the Legislature, and on an occasion as auspicious as the abovementioned, he should have received an invitation.

“Mr. F. L. Walcott said that it was unfortunate that an incident such as that should have occurred. He said that he knew that Mr. Ramsay was not the kind of person who was fond of social gatherings. The relationship between the Head of the Administration and the House was a very close one.

“Mr. Walcott said that he felt that the matter should be given consideration in the responsible quarters, so that a similar occurrence would not take place again.”

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is—

Mr. GALE: Mr. Speaker,—While I sympathize with the honourable mover of this motion, yet I think that if people are in public life, such as members of the Legislature are, they must not be too thin-skinned. Newspapers have different points of view and each newspaper takes up a different attitude towards affairs. Some are really serious newspapers and you will treat them with some seriousness (Laughter). I do not think that the newspaper in question should be treated with the seriousness about which the honourable mover and the honourable seconder of this motion speak. These headlines, no doubt, are rather amusing to some people and the honourable mover of the motion was perhaps somewhat stung by them but I would ask him not to treat this matter so seriously. It is not a very heinous offence. The writer of the article, no doubt, would like to hold up certain members to ridicule but I do not think that this House should take any notice of it whatsoever. In a big country, newspapers say all kinds of things about politicians and people in public life. A paper like “Punch” in England publishes some witty cartoons and all sorts of things about politicians and I do not read of any members of the House of Commons wishing to suspend the publication of that journal. I think it would be a mistake on the part of this House to take this matter seriously.

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable junior member for St. Michael has probably spoken as a newspaperman. I too will speak as a newspaperman. What the honourable member has said about leveling criticism based on facts is probably true but when newspapers set about deliberately to lie week after week, to bring the administration of justice into contempt, to ridicule our debates in this House and to manufacture statements that have not an atom of truth in them, that is a vastly different thing from what the junior member for St. Michael has just spoken of. If this criticism was based on facts, who would complain, especially the two members for St. Peter and myself who have done more criticism of other people than anybody else in this island and must expect to be criticized? But there is too much deliberate propaganda intended to incite and influence the minds of people in this island and with the deliberate intention of creating civil strife. (A MEMBER: You are talking about 1937). If the honourable member cares to make that remark outside I know what to do. Because

some people have adopted the attitude of the junior member for St. Michael and think that these publications should not be taken seriously, that is regarded as a sign of weakness until we find people who go farther than merely ridiculing our deliberations and attempt to sully the very foundation of justice in this colony. Some people are lucky that they are not in prison to-day, simply because of others who have been offended not willing to take any steps. I appeal to honourable members to see that there is a vast difference between legitimate criticism based on facts and the fabrication of lies; that is the only expression to use. If out of the blue, out of a writer's mind without any foundation of fact we find our debates brought into contempt, then it is time that the members of the House as a whole take notice of it. It is regrettable that some members, far from exercising some influence to try and uphold the dignity of this Chamber, give encouragement to the less instructive elements of the community to make a mock of our proceedings. It is not a question of suspending the publication of any newspaper but it ought to be drawn to the notice of the House when these things happen. I would just like to remind the junior member for St. Michael that within the last two years, newspapers in England have been rather chary about commenting on the proceedings of the House of Commons. In one case a lady who went outside and wrote letters to the Press about proceedings in the House of Commons was summoned to the Bar of the House of Commons and made to apologize. I am not suggesting that action should be taken on the report of the Committee if it be appointed. I am not anticipating what the House would do but just as it has been found necessary by the Chief Justice to warn people that they will go to jail for attempting to sully justice, so people should be warned by Your Honour that the dignity of this Chamber is to be maintained.

Mr. RAMSAY enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. GARNER: There is a lot of truth in the statement that the only thing to be done with a bully is to give him a dose of his own medicine; there is a lot of truth in that. Give a bully a greater dose of his medicine and he feels like somebody else feels. Not a day goes by on which the various factions in this island do not want to cut one another's throats either in the Press or on the floor of this House and now the time of honourable members is being taken up with a trivial matter such as this. I have seen the blinking "Beacon" report my speeches and I sometimes don't know that I am reading my own speech; they have called me all sorts of things—demagogue, local preacher—and I have never come to this House and complained because I am too big for that. My mission here is on behalf of the electors and people who want to be in society are simply making fools of themselves; they are catching at the shadow and letting go the substance. Any dignified person who sees statements of this sort about him in a newspaper would let them go for what they are worth. I have my work to do but I still come to this House in the interest of the people. I leave my business to come down here to hear what? Trash. It is time we stop this foolishness. To bring a matter like that on the floor of the House is going too far. The blinking "Beacon" has done it very many times; they have done me some rotten things in the "Beacon" but I do not think about them. I less count them. I do not care what they say about me. I do not care what they think about me. There is nothing

at all in a matter like this. Having seen what was printed in the other newspapers the Editor of "The Torch" would come to the conclusion that perhaps the senior member for St. Peter had taken part in the objection because it is stated in a very short paragraph that the honourable member thought that these things should be rectified or words to that effect. This sort of thing is done all over the world. In Jamaica they have made everything of Bustamante except a man. As he walks the streets of Jamaica, people say all sorts of things about him. And he is in power! If there is one thing I would like to point out it is this. The day certain people get a majority in this House, you can see what we will have in this country. Editors will not be able to print their newspapers and the Press will be muzzled unless it caters to those people. People must be big enough to give up some of their rights if they want to be in public life; all sorts of things are said about people in public life and they must be big enough to stand for it. I have seen them call me demagogue, lackadaisical gospeller, local preacher—all sorts of things—and I have never taken exception to it. I have to give the Editor of "The Torch" great sympathy. Everybody is talking about this matter of having been or not having been invited to Government House on the streets. People came to me and asked me if I was not invited and I had to explain it away. If the Editor of "The Torch" took the matter up and gave his version of it, there is nothing at all in that. They are calling upon you, Mr. Speaker, in your most exalted position to get into the gutter with them in their dirty mess. I believe you are too great, too honourable, too honest—

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—I do not think that you should permit the honourable member to address you like that. The honourable member states "they are asking you to come down from your exalted position and get into the gutter with them in their dirty mess." Those words, Mr. Speaker, should be withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. Peter complains that the headlines and the report in this newspaper are a breach of the privileges of the House. What other people say about other honourable members is not before the House at the present time. The only thing before the House is the headlines and the report of which the senior member for St. Peter complains.

Mr. GARNER: What I was referring to was your position as Speaker of the House—

Mr. SPEAKER: You may leave me out altogether.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—I am taking objection to the words of the honourable member when he accuses other honourable members of this House of asking you to get down in the gutter with them in their dirty mess. When the honourable member says "they are asking you to come down from your exalted position to get down in the gutter in their dirty mess," that is a reflection on you, Mr. Speaker, and the members of this House and I am taking objection to those words.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. Peter takes objection to words of the honourable junior member for St. Philip in comparing me with other members of the House and I ask the honourable member to withdraw that remark.

Mr. GARNER: I cannot understand what the honourable member is taking objection to. I am referring to you as a man.

Mr. SPEAKER: I want you to withdraw the remark. There is no reason for bringing me in comparison with any other member of the House.

Mr. GARNER: I withdraw the remark only in reference to you.

Mr. SPEAKER: You must withdraw the remark in its entirety.

Mr. GARNER: I will withdraw it. I will leave you aside and let them go on with their mess in the gutter.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Again I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member must withdraw the remark properly.

Mr. GARNER: I particularly pointed out in the first part of my speech—

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not asking you about the first part of your speech. I ask you to withdraw the remark about my being asked to bring myself down in the gutter in the dirty mess of other members and you must withdraw it.

Mr. GARNER: I have withdrawn it as far as you are concerned.

Mr. SPEAKER: You must withdraw it in reference to other members.

Mr. GARNER: All right, Mr. Speaker. I withdraw the remark. This article is a trivial matter. As I said before, it is a storm in a tea-pot it is nothing; it bears no weight; it carries no sting it is not derogatory. The Editor of "The Torch" has a right to publish in his newspaper certain debates and to make comments on them. All other newspapers do it. Editors do not always see eye to eye with everything that goes on and they make their comments in accordance with their views of a matter. Very often the same thing is done on the floor of this House. I counsel honourable members to give this matter the attention which it deserves, that is, to vote against the motion. It has taken up the precious time of the House while we have urgent business to do, — business which concerns the good government of this island. I have a great deal more that I could say but I will not say it because I know Your Honour would stop me. But, Sir, it is a very bad sight to see politicians taking small trifles like this and bringing them here. For what purpose? If these things were left alone they would be passed by and forgotten. I read sometime ago that in America a good friend of a certain politician sent him a cable drawing his attention to what somebody said about him in a certain newspaper and his reply was, "Keep Frappe; to-day's newspapers begin tomorrow's fires." If the senior member for St. Peter had read that, he would have known that Saturday's papers began Sunday's fires. I cannot be a party to this, not because I happen to be friendly with the Editor of "The Torch" or because he is a member of my party but because it is unfair to journalism. There is nothing damaging in these statements. I fail to see that this matter is as serious as they are trying to make out. I do not remember hearing anything damaging in the statements while the Deputy Clerk was reading them. Let me have a look at the newspaper. One headline states "Government House taboos League's M.C.Ps." Perhaps the printer made an error but one member definitely complained of having been snubbed. And when the writer states, de "Leader says Shut up", what happened was tantamount to that. The honourable member got a good castigation for having done it. I chuckled in my seat when the Leader of the House was castigating the honourable member. That is a fact and if the matter had to be taken to Court I would say that that is what happened. Another headline states: "Ramsay manfully talks back".

The honourable member really did talk back. The honourable member is not a child, and after all he must talk back. When you come to the substance of the article, what is it? Nothing at all. The time of the House is being wasted. I could have done a similar thing on six or seven occasions in respect of the blinking "Beacon"; they have called me whatever names they like. Let them say whatever they like about me. In this matter no case has been made out. All the captions are true because the senior member for St. Peter did sympathize with his colleague and perhaps what was publicized would have given the Editor of "The Torch" the impression that the colleague of the junior member for St. Peter was not invited also; so there is nothing wrong in that. We know how things are printed by some sections of the Press—very badly. Sometimes you cannot get the substance of what took place. Some of my constituents come to me and ask me what was said because they do not get all the facts in the newspapers. This concerns me too. I too was snubbed. I did not get an invitation but I do not care. I am not going. The only thing is that the junior member for St. Peter might have a little more pride and dignity as regards the social status of the colony than I might have; that is all. But I have a sincere feeling for the people whom I represent and that is what I care about. When I go to Government House I go there to see His Excellency on business matters. I do not go there to drink cocktails. I drink cocktails at home. This matter is nothing. I could talk on it the whole day. If a precedent is going to be established I can bring my complaints too but I am too big for that. People who live in glass houses should not throw stones. What is this? This can be torn to bits; there is nothing in this. Certainly somebody was mad at not being invited to Government House. The Leader did say "Stop talking" and the junior member for St. Peter did talk back as a man, for which I am very proud. The Editor of "The Torch" was not here but whatever this newspaper says did happen here and there is nothing wrong with it. I think the time of the House has been wasted and I hope that honourable members would give this matter the treatment it deserves, that is, by voting against the motion.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker,—I do not wish to prolong this debate any longer but I too, Sir, have had a certain amount of unjust criticism in a newspaper called "The Beacon" which I feel, Sir, according to the words of the Leader of the House—

Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask the honourable member not to bring in anything that is written in other newspapers. All that is before us is the particular report that was read by the Deputy Clerk.

Mr. DOWDING: May I submit that we are asked to appoint a Committee to go into this matter and the comparison which I shall make would show honourable members why that Committee should not be appointed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, I will hear what you are going to say.

Mr. DOWDING: As I was saying, Sir, the newspaper called "The Beacon" has stated that I speak to the gallery. Now, I am a serious-minded member of this House and I consider that when I speak I should do so fearlessly and stick to the point at issue and not—

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that that is before the House at all. The whole question before the House is whether the article complained of by the senior member for St. Peter is a breach of the privileges of this House or not.

Mr. DOWDING: Well, Sir, the matter has been brought before the House. Several honourable

members have spoken on it and in supporting the remarks of the junior member for St. Michael who thinks that the matter is so slight that it should not be sent to a Committee I should like to say a few more words. I do think that the instance which I have quoted will also show that this matter should not be sent to a Committee of this House. The newspaper called "The Beacon" has accused me of addressing the gallery—

Mr. SPEAKER: Again I want to point out to the honourable member that what has been published about other honourable members in other newspapers is not before the House. You can say that this matter is trivial but you cannot say that because something was written about you sometime ago, therefore, this is not a breach of the privileges of the House.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker,—It has been suggested by previous speakers on this subject that this is propaganda. I am submitting, as a reason for this matter not being sent to a Committee, that I have personal knowledge of deliberate propaganda being made in another newspaper and I feel that after I have explained the circumstances to which I am referring, honourable members will see that this is a trivial affair and that the matter is of no importance to be sent to a Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think I can allow you to bring in anything that is not before the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Before you put the question, Sir, I want to say that I agree entirely with the junior member for St. Philip that the presence of this motion before the House to-day is in itself an indication of what would likely take place if certain people in this country were able to acquire the political power of which they dream. It is indeed very fortunate for this country that these people, in comparison with the Nazi and Fascist gangsters who no longer will be able to dominate Europe, will never be able to obtain in this country the sort of political power which is their ambition. I was amazed, Sir, for instance, to hear the senior member for St. Joseph accuse a section of the Press of this country of setting out deliberately to lie and to ridicule honourable members of this House when the newspaper of which he himself is Editor only a week ago deliberately, in flaming headlines on the front page, lied against the action of a member of this Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must tell the honourable member that that has nothing to do with the particular headlines and report before the House. The only question before the House is whether or not those headlines and the report are a breach of the privileges of the House. Whatever another newspaper has written on another occasion has nothing to do with what is before the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I appreciate that that is not before the House but I mention it by way of comparison between—

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot allow you to do that. It has nothing to do with what is before the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What I do want to submit, Sir, with all due deference is that if another newspaper in the colony, supposedly responsible, goes out of its way to deliberately distort and lie and present in an incorrect way what takes place in this Chamber, a newspaper with which the people who are making this stand are associated—

Mr. SPEAKER: What I am pointing out is that if another newspaper on another occasion published something about another member of this House, that has nothing to do with the particular matter before the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That is precisely the same point I intended to make. I was saying that only a week ago the newspaper to which I am referring actually lied against a member of this House and no notice was taken of it.

Mr. SPEAKER: That may be the fault of the particular member but you cannot bring that in connection with this particular matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Perhaps what I may have to do at the next meeting of the House is to bring in a similar motion and ask that action be taken against the newspaper to which I am referring. In any case my point is this. I do not remember exactly word for word the speech made by the senior member for St. Peter but I want to submit that it is highly possible that the tenor of his remarks and what he said may have led to the reasonable interpretation that he along with the junior member for St. Peter had not been invited to Government House. I do not recollect if at any time during his remarks he said that he had not been invited. But if he did not—and the record is there—certainly I am inclined to that view from the manner in which he associated himself with the remarks of the junior member for St. Peter. They both represent the same parish and the junior member for St. Peter took the failure to get an invitation, not as an insult to himself but as an insult to the people of St. Peter whom he represents. That is what brought the senior member for St. Peter to his feet. In other words, the junior member for St. Peter said "As far as I am concerned I do not care; but when you refused to send me an invitation you insulted not me but the people in St. Peter whom I represent," and the senior member for St. Peter then decided he would have to come in.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The honourable member said that the junior member for St. Peter made a statement and then I decided to come in. The honourable member is trying to give the impression that I spoke immediately after the junior member for St. Peter but the junior member for St. Peter had already moved the motion and it was seconded by another honourable member before I spoke.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not remember exactly what took place, but, speaking from memory, it seemed to me that after the junior member for St. Peter spoke, the senior member for St. Peter spoke because the matter affected the constituency which both of them represent.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The senior member for the City seconded the motion and when the motion was before the House I spoke.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that it makes any difference.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I want it corrected for the purposes of the record. The motion was seconded by the senior member for the City; so it is not a matter of my jumping up to speak immediately after the junior member for St. Peter had spoken.

Mr. SPEAKER: My impression is that you spoke because the junior member for St. Peter had spoken.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That is the inescapable conclusion to which any reasonable member of this Chamber would have come. I was trying to establish that from the tenor of the remarks of the senior member for St. Peter, the Editor of this newspaper may have reasonably inferred, in the absence of any statement to the contrary, that the senior member for St. Peter along with the junior member for St. Peter had not been invited to Government House and, therefore, since that interpretation is possible and since it is not going too far to suggest that a mistake of that sort was possible from reading the debate as

published on the following day, I think that to support the motion before the House would be tantamount to taking a sledge hammer to kill an ant. It is not necessary to import into these little fracas between newspapers in this country any attempt to create disturbance and to promote civil strife in the community, unless people are so themselves concerned or worried over the possibility of being themselves accused of promoting civil strife. After all, if a newspaper states that because an honourable member was not invited to Government House he made a row in the House, where is the justification for the interpretation that that is likely to promote civil strife in the community? What is more likely to promote civil strife is when another honourable member gets up in the House of Assembly and objects to a motion and he is accused by another newspaper of objecting to that motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is again doing something that I have told him he has no right to do. What another newspaper said on another occasion is a different matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am sorry. This, in the words of the junior member for St. Philip, is a triviality. As he correctly pointed out, in Jamaica the recognized and duly elected Prime Minister, the Leader of a proper Government, is abused weekly in the most vicious manner possible by the friends of honourable members on my right. Sometime ago, the municipality of Kingston began collecting wild goats on the streets and the organ of the People's National Party on the following Saturday in a long article counselled the municipal goat-catchers to go to the House of Representatives in Jamaica where they will find the biggest collection of goats possible and not to forget to bring the biggest goat with long horns—Mr. Bustamante—calling the members of the House of Representatives goats and Mr. Bustamante the biggest goat in the House of Representatives! I submit that if anything like that had been written about people with such an infantile mentality, about people who are so thin-skinned, we should have had the suggestion to call the British Army and Navy to prevent a riot, in the full spirit of Nazi and Fascist dictatorship. People, Sir, who go out of their way to use the most foul propaganda against their opponents, people who go out of their way to distort the facts on every possible occasion, people who go out of their way to present one side of the picture to the people at all times, should be the last in any Legislature or elsewhere to attempt to restrict or muzzle what is, after all, merely a free expression of opinion, perhaps with a humorous twist, as the honourable junior member for St. Michael has pointed out, along the lines of the humorous London newspaper, "Punch." After all, I ask, incidentally, what would life be like if we were so lacking in a sense of humour that we see in everything an attempt to infringe the law, to interfere with the privileges of the House and to hold up the august and self-important members of the Legislature to ridicule? We have devoted a great deal of time to this discussion and I think that honourable members have made it quite clear—at least those who have a sense of their responsibility—that they do not intend to be associated with any gesture of this sort, and have also made it indisputably clear that if certain honourable members want action of this sort taken they should not be amazed if they find themselves stewing in their own juice and, finally if they want truth to be disseminated, if they want the facts publicised, if they want the community to maintain these standards, they must set the example and be the last, if they are guilty perhaps of throwing stones, to suggest that they are entitled to redress and that the

people who are following their lead are the primary offenders.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member has already spoken.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I spoke at the beginning of the debate and I rose on points of order while the junior and senior members for St. Philip respectively were speaking.

Mr. SPEAKER: Of course, you have the right to reply.

Mr. RAMSAY: Mr. Speaker,—I am unfortunate in that I came late and have not heard all that has been said. I take it that the senior member for St. Peter has brought this matter before the House as a breach of the privileges of the House and with that I profoundly agree. I was fortunate to hear the junior member for St. Philip speak about public life but, Sir, there is nothing more important than that public life should be real; public life should be true. If public life is unreal, if public life is untrue, then in truth and in fact there is no public life. Well, Sir, you have ruled against the expression about asking you to come down from your high position into the gutter with certain people's mess and with that ruling I also profoundly agree. No assertion should be allowed in this House which intimates that matters which are brought before this House by honourable members are to be considered as mess in the gutter. In fairness to the public and journalism a journalist should print the truth and by the way, Mr. Speaker, not so long ago the Chief Justice had to call attention to the use of flamboyant headlines in certain newspapers. I am only saying what a dangerous thing it is for people to parade in the guise of the Press and do irreparable harm to other members of the community. Nothing that the senior member for St. Peter said at the last meeting of this House could cause any intelligent or honest person to print the tripe that is printed in that yellow sheet, a sheet which I would not take cognizance of. I am sorry that the senior member for St. Peter brought it before the House because it is not worthy of being countenanced; the paper that is published by that section of the Press is not worthy of the consideration of this House. The junior member for St. Philip said that I was castigated. I should like to remind him that we are not little children in this House and that I at no time considered that I received any castigation. The honourable member also stated that the public do not always get the substance of what takes place in this House from the printed reports of the debates. That is quite true. The Press makes such mistakes that people do not get the substance of what takes place in this House. The things that are written in this newspaper, if I may bandy words with the honourable member, could not possibly have been written by anyone who styles himself an Editor.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is debating whether or not the particular headlines and the report are a breach of the privileges of the House and there is no need to abuse the Editor of the newspaper.

Mr. RAMSAY: I will withdraw any insinuation of abuse but I am speaking facts (Laughter). In my opinion the Editor of this newspaper—

Mr. SPEAKER: I rule that the honourable member must not debate that.

Mr. RAMSAY: The time of the House is not wasted when honourable members bring matters of this sort before the House. If we do not start sometime, somewhere, somehow to bring the Press

to a realization of its proper position, it may get the bit between its teeth and cause a lot of trouble. We are more likely to believe a lie instead of the truth and that is why I say that the time of the House is not wasted by bringing this matter before the House. Nothing that the senior member for St. Peter said on Tuesday last could cause any honest, any discreet Editor to publish such headlines; they are published for certain reasons which I am not prepared to state at this time. Now I pass on to the remarks of the senior member for St. George. The senior member for St. George complains—and rightly so—that certain things have been written about him but because the senior member for St. George does not bring it on the floor of the House, there is nothing wrong in other members bringing their grievances before the House. I am saying that the senior member for St. George has been treated unfairly but because he has glossed it over, that is no reason why other members should do likewise. They are bringing this sort of thing into politics but when certain people begin to throw stones they do not single out whom they are going to strike and if we as responsible members of this House do not bring home forcibly to the section of the Press that publishes these things the fact that they are wrong, then we may be more wrong than they are. There should be no licence for wrongdoers even though people do wrong things and they are glossed over by certain people. Now, the senior member for St. Philip referred to the debates of this House as people making a row. I say that no matter that is debated on the floor of this House must be referred to by honourable members as a row.

Mr. SPEAKER: I may have been wrong in allowing the honourable member to use that expression but I am afraid I did not hear him.

Mr. RAMSAY: Reference was also made by the senior member for St. Philip to the mentality of members of this House but the late Prime Minister, Mr. Winston Churchill, has a peculiar phrase which he uses in reference to certain people; he calls them mental degenerates. I am not allowed to call certain people mental degenerates, although I think they are. (Laughter). I would characterise them as mental degenerates if I am allowed to do so but I am not allowed to do so and therefore I cannot (Renewed Laughter). When honourable members vote against this motion that is before the House as not being a breach of the privileges of this House I want to say to them what my grandmother used to say in her lifetime—"To-day for you, tomorrow for me." What is wrong for one is wrong for all. If my greatest friend, if the Editor of the "Beacon" or the Editor of the "Advocate" had published these headlines I would say that they are deliberate lies. Nothing that was said by the senior member for St. Peter could convey the meaning that these headlines are intended to convey. I say that it is time for us to call a halt to such actions of the Press, a most valuable institution in this community. When they do things of this nature, they are making trouble for themselves and for future generations in Barbados and I am not going to associate myself with it. These headlines and this report are, in my opinion, a breach of the privileges of this House and I shall support the motion for the appointment of a Committee to go into the matter.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I have no apology to make for replying and I should like to deal with the other speakers in the order of their speeches. This motion which I have made to-day is a challenge to this House and after listening to two of the speeches made by honourable members I am more than

pleased that I have brought this matter to the notice of the House because once and for all honourable members of this House must show they realize their responsibility to the community. I am not concerned with what has taken place with other people. I can withstand all the gibes about being thin-skinned or being thick-skinned. I am dealing with the Rules of the House and the practices that have been established long before I was born and for the benefit of honourable members I will quote from "May's Parliamentary Practice." It states that the wilful misrepresentation of the proceedings of members is an offence of the same character as a libel; that the published names of Members of the House (meaning the House of Commons) and reflecting upon them, and misrepresenting their proceedings in Parliament is a breach of the privilege of this House and destructive of the freedom of Parliament. The junior member for St. Michael rightly spoke about criticism. Any public spirited man, any man who is in public life must appreciate criticism of his public life because he is representing the public and must be criticized sometimes but can anyone say that this is criticism: "Government House taboos League's M.C.P.s, See page 4?" And when you turn to page 4 you will see that your humble servant's name is mentioned there. The junior member for St. Philip did not read the name of Comrade F. Walcott on page 4—

Mr. GARNER: On a point of order. I did call the honourable member's name.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: You turn, I say, to page 4 and you read there "Comrades Ramsay and F. Walcott mad at not being invited to Government House." According to "May's Parliamentary Practice," how can anyone say that that is criticism? Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to this House, no member in his right senses can say that is criticism. That purports to be a statement of fact. It ceases to be criticism when the headline states "Comrades Ramsay and F. Walcott mad at not being invited to Government House." I may say that long before I entered this House I always looked upon the junior member for St. Michael not as a flamboyant speaker or an orator but I looked upon him as a man who possesses the qualities that make a good statesman. How can he begin to say that I am objecting to criticism as a public man? This ceases to be criticism. Statements are made in this House; someone goes forward and states that I said something that I did not say or that never occurred; that ceases to be criticism. Now I come to the senior member for St. George. He does not justify that this thing is right; it is either a breach of the privilege of the House or not and we must be concerned with that as the issue. The senior member for St. George says that because an article was written in another newspaper—

Mr. SPEAKER: I have ruled against that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: When another honourable member makes comparison with what is written in another newspaper and suggests that that is sufficient justification for not dealing with this matter, that is beside the point. What we are concerned with at the moment is whether this a true statement of what took place in this House. The junior member for St. Philip and the senior member for St. Philip spoke about propaganda. As the junior member for the City has said on a previous occasion, the English language can be used in many ways to denote different meanings. If propaganda can be useful, propaganda can be harmful. When we hear an honourable member ask this House to dismiss this matter because it happens that I be-

long to a Party and the Editor of this newspaper belongs to another Party, what has that, Mr. Speaker, to do with the rights and privileges of this House? When Dr. Dalton, the late Chancellor of the Exchequer made a mistake, the majority of his Party felt that he made a mistake and that he should go. Another member of the Labour Party misconducted himself and he was expelled from the House of Commons. You cannot deal with the rights and privileges of this House on Party lines. You, Mr. Speaker, lay claim to the rights and privileges of this House and when those rights and privileges are challenged, we find honourable members making excuses. Those honourable members who feel that to-day is the day for not upholding the rights and privileges of this House may do so; as free men, all people are entitled to do right or wrong. But Sir, the truth will out. Nothing in the speech I made on Tuesday last could lead the senior member for St. Philip to say what he said. The honourable member was in the House and heard my speech and I feel that it is uncharitable to me when he spoke about infantile mentality. No man whose mentality is not defective and who heard my speech could come to the conclusion that I was not invited to Government House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I never gave that interpretation of the honourable member's remarks. What I said was that the tenor of his remarks and the way in which they appeared in the Press on the following day may have given anybody the impression that since he did not make a statement to the contrary stating that he was there, the interpretation was possible that he may not have been there.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: How any man with any sense of propriety, after what the honourable member has now said, could have interpreted a speech like the one I made to mean that I was not invited to Government House? How could any person who heard or read my speech come to the conclusion that I was mad at not being invited to Government House? I am glad to hear the defence put up by the senior member for St. Philip and I am just as glad that we still have in this community people who do not see things in the same way. I would not like to be personal in this debate but would speak to certain honourable members privately after this debate is over to show them that this caption was deliberate. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that this is a matter which this House should decide. If the House believe that this is a true statement of what took place, all they have to do is to vote against my motion but if they believe that this statement is untrue then they should regard it as a breach of the privileges of the House and vote in favour of the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that a Committee of the House be appointed to consider and report on the headlines and the report complained of. Honourable members in favour will please say "Aye"; those against will please say "No". I think the "Noes" have it.

A division is taken as follows:—

Ayes. MESSRS. RAMSAY, SMITH, F. L. WALCOTT, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, TALMA, BLACKMAN, and DR. CUMMINS—9.

Noes. DR. WILSON, MESSRS. SYMMONDS, BRANCKER, CRAWFORD, GARNER, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, DOWDING, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, and WILKINSON—11.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been decided in the negative, nine honourable members voting "Aye" and eleven honourable members voting "No." (Cheers.)

RESOLUTION RE DEVELOPMENT OF THE FISHING INDUSTRY — SELECT COMMITTEE ASKED FOR

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Speaker,—Before you proceed to call other Orders I would like to ask leave to give notice later in the day of my intention to move for the appointment of a Select Committee to consider Resolution No. 2 which relates to the maintenance, expansion and development of fisheries production.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member can make a motion to that effect now, if he likes. When the House is in Committee of Supply, you will not have the opportunity then to do so.

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that a Select Committee be appointed to consider Resolution No. 2 for the sum of £24,460 to be placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to meet the capital cost of the maintenance, expansion and development of fisheries production, marketing and distribution and to provide for the recurrent expenditure to the 31st March, 1948. My reason for so doing is this. This is a very important matter and I feel that a large majority of the members of this House are in favour of it but we want more details and in my opinion the only way to get those details is to refer the matter to a Select Committee. That is the usual procedure and we will be able to get the evidence of the people who are interested in the scheme. I see absolutely no harm in having a Select Committee for the purpose but I do see a greater advantage because although those who have devoted their time to the scheme have recommended what they consider best, I do think it is right that the members of the House should understand what is being put before them. At the last meeting of the House, the senior member for Christ Church was, in my opinion, not able to give the information that several members asked for —

Mr. TALMA. I rise to a point of explanation. If the honourable member would remember correctly when he occupied a position like the one I am now occupying he and his colleagues on the Executive Committee never supplied the House with any information at all. The memorandum which accompanies the Resolution is as full as it can possibly be.

Mr. WILKINSON: I repeat, Sir, that in my opinion the honourable member was not able to give the information that was wanted and the surest way to get that information, in view of my sixteen years' experience in this House, is to refer this matter to a Select Committee and let that Committee summon before them the people whom they want to give evidence. I see no harm in doing that. Even if this Resolution is passed to-day it cannot be put into operation immediately. A diesel engine is to be imported for this experimental boat which is to cost £2,500 and you cannot get that engine in a day. There are several things, in connection with this Resolution, that need to be explained. The memorandum states that the original scheme has been modified but I had a glance at it last night and I do not see much modification. What I do see is that expenditure is taken from one head and put to another. Whether that is an improvement or not I am not in a position to say. We all want to do what we can for the fishing industry. Fish is very difficult to be obtained and anything that is done to encourage fishermen, anything that is suggested for the improvement of their

fishing gear is a wise step. This is part of the ten-year plan but is it wise to pick out one item in the plan? That is another point. I do think that we should not do these things in a piecemeal fashion. If we are going to modify this ten-year plan — which I am afraid we will have to do on account of the dollar crisis—we should go through the various items and pick out those that should be done. But nothing of that sort has been done. We have been told by the introducer of this Resolution that this is part of the ten-year plan but it seems as if the ten-year plan has been by-passed. We are facing the worst crisis that Barbados has faced in the last 40 years. I do not mean the dollar crisis. We are going to have less revenue to the extent of £1,000,000 coming into the country — let honourable members think what that means — and we should be very careful to see that the money with which we are entrusted — that is what we are really here for — is spent in the right direction. There is a further point. It is not stated in the Resolution whether any of this money is to be provided from Colonial Development and Welfare funds. I do not know if it is the intention of the honourable introducer that all this money is to be charged against our present revenue. If so, I think we will have to consider that very carefully and see whether we should not try to raise a loan. I warn honourable members that the time is coming when they will not be able to raise a loan in the island of Barbados to carry out these projects. We shall have to go to the Home Government as far as I can see, unless things are improved, and ask them to guarantee such a loan. I hope honourable members will agree with me that this matter should be referred to a Select Committee and I now formally move that that be done.

MR. SPEAKER: I rather think that this debate will take some time and as it is now 2 o'clock, I adjourn the House until 2.45 p.m. in accordance with Rule 40 (a).

REPLIES LAID

On re-assembling,

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to lay on the Table of the House the replies to questions No. 31 standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to lay the replies to questions No. 11 standing in the name of the honourable senior member for the City, and the replies to questions No. 7 standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. John.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to lay the replies to questions No. 26 standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are several questions which were asked during the last session and which were replied to but not debated. It seems to me to be unnecessary to ask those questions again just to have a debate on them. I am wondering when these questions should not be raised on a motion for adjournment instead of putting the same questions again to bring forth the same answers. I see no reason why, in cases where questions have been already asked and answered but not debated, during Question Time a motion should not be made by the particular member for the adjournment of the House to discuss the matter which will be the question which has been put and replied to. I think that is simpler than putting the question again.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (A)

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

Mr. GARNER: I object.

Mr. SPEAKER: An objection having been taken, I shall have to put the question. The question is that leave be granted the honourable member to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (a) in order to proceed with Government Business. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No." I think the "Noes" have it.

The following division was taken:—

Ayes: Messrs. SMITH, F. L. WALCOTT, COX, MAPP, TALMA, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, GALE and Dr. CUMMINS—9.

Noes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. BRANCKER, FOSTER, CRAWFORD, GARNER, MOTTLEY, DOWDING, S. A. WALCOTT and WILKINSON—9.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been decided in a "tie", nine honourable members voting "Aye", and nine honourable members voting "No". I vote with the "Noes". Of course, however I vote it will be of no avail in view of the subsequent question being put. It is now time for the discussion of replies to questions.

OMISSION OF BREAD FROM DIETARY OF INMATES AT GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS

Mr. SPEAKER: At Question Time on the last occasion the House were debating the replies to questions No. 6 with regard to the diet of inmates at the Government Industrial Schools. The honourable senior member for St. Philip was speaking.

Mr. CRAWFORD: When the debate was adjourned on the last occasion I think I had got to the point where I had begun to make some reference to the statement made by the honourable senior member for St. Thomas. During the course of his remarks in reply to the honourable junior member for St. Philip, the honourable senior member for St. Thomas had quoted paragraph 166 of the Report of the Committee appointed to make recommendations for the re-organisation of the Government Industrial Schools. I was at the stage when I was proposing to join issue with the honourable member because he had read one paragraph but not the other which follows as a matter of consequence to the introductory paragraph which would have given an entirely different colour to the issue before the House. Paragraph 166 of the Report says this: "In 1946 the Chief Medical Officer reviewed the diet scale and reported that it represents an adequate and reasonably balanced diet. The fact that each child received one pint of whole milk per day in addition to meat, fish, eggs, fruit and green vegetables was satisfactory. In order to increase the supply of eggs, fruit, tomatoes and greens, he recommended the School authorities be instructed to develop this side of their work fully." The honourable member stopped there and one would have thought that the conditions were completely satisfactory with regard to the supply of these items of the diet. But if one goes on to paragraph 167 one will read this: "An attempt to do this is being made. Nevertheless much still remains to be done." In other words, the conditions are by no means final. Some

attempt has been made to implement the recommendations of the Chief Medical Officer and it is not accurate to say that everything that could possibly be done has been done. I therefore think that in the interest of accuracy and of giving a more balanced perspective of the entire matter before the House, it was necessary that this consequential paragraph should also have been included in this discussion. With regard to the other phases of the matter I do not think it is necessary for me to say much at present other than to say this: I have not got my notes of the earlier debate here today but I am under the impression that the remark was used that honourable members know that the Government is proceeding with the Report of this Committee and therefore it was unnecessary to take the Government to task on this score. I should be very amazed to hear honourable members admit that they know that the Government is proceeding with the Report of the Committee. Personally speaking, that is completely beyond my knowledge. As far as I know, all that has happened is that this Committee was set up by His Excellency the Governor to make recommendations for the re-organisation of the Government Industrial Schools as far back as April last year, and after a protracted session the Committee reported and the matter now stands at the point at which we have been furnished with a copy of the Report. Therefore for honourable members to be told that they know the Government is proceeding with this Report, that is absolutely untrue. Many of us feel that the Government should proceed with the Report of the Committee and hope and pray that they will do so. I was therefore astounded to hear the honourable senior member for St. Joseph give the impression in his remarks that we are aware that something practical or tangible is being done. If something is being done along the lines suggested by the Committee, speaking for myself I should be extremely grateful if some honourable member who has this valuable information would impart it to the House and let us know whether it is not completely true to say that the Report has not been attended to and no steps have been taken to implement the recommendations. Bearing in mind the importance of the matter before us, that since April last year this Committee was appointed, and that it is only within the last few months that this Report has been made available to honourable members and the public, I feel justified in saying that if the Government were giving this matter the attention which it obviously deserves, some steps would have been taken before now to see that the practical recommendation contained in the Report are put into effect. I should like to draw the attention of honourable members to page 6 of the Report and paragraph 25 in which the main recommendations of the Committee are summarized. In this summary it is set out that new legislation has been recommended on the lines of the Children and Young Persons' Act, and a new Act broadly similar to the Prevention of Crime Act for the Borstal Age Group. The creation of three institutions has also been recommended and, in my opinion the entire crux of the new recommendations, the basis on which all the recommendations must eventually revolve, is the suggestion that an Authority should be responsible for the administration of the Schools, the Y.O.D.I. and the Probation and After Care Services. That is, I submit, the king-pin of the recommendations of the Committee and I also submit that if the Government were concerned about this matter, steps would have been taken before now to lay the foundation for the establishment of this Authority which in the final analysis would be

responsible for the administration of the re-organized Schools. This is a matter which I must emphasize is deserving of immediate attention and that the time and attention devoted by the Author of this Report—I know that the Author in question has devoted a lot of time and energy and even did some travelling so as to enable the members of this House and the public to have the recommendations contained in this Report. A very fine job was done. I had the experience not so long ago of going to the Industrial Schools at Tony Hill, Jamaica, and spending a day there—I was not detained there—(A MEMBER: I am sorry) but merely to see what was going on. (Laughter). I discovered that the Assistant Social Welfare Officer, Miss Arne, had previous to the publication of this excellent Report, spent some time in investigating the operations of the Schools and displayed a very commendable interest in the activities and policy, so to speak, of these Schools in Jamaica. This Report is her attempt, and of course the attempt of the Committee associated with her, to put into operation in Barbados some of the splendid policies which are in operation in Jamaica, England and other advanced countries of the world. I say that it is nothing short of criminal neglect to treat the Report with the inertia which has characterised the treatment by the Government in the past, there being no attempt made at all to implement even the basic recommendations contained in the Report. Not only do the conditions at these Schools cry out for ameliorative treatment but it is to say the least disheartening for people in public life to put themselves to the task of preparing a valuable and informative work like this and see little if any attention being paid to it. I emphasised that part of the matter as I did because the statement that the Government is doing something about this Report is, so far as we know, completely inaccurate and it is high time that something be done especially in the matter of creating this Authority who would be responsible for the administration of these Schools. All that is necessary for the creation of this Authority is legislation and then subsequent steps should be taken to put into practice the recommendations which really revolved around this basic and important suggestion.

Mr. GARNER: I think that on this occasion I should emphasise the fact that I paid a visit to these Schools and I can assure the honourable member in charge of this portfolio that the inmates at these Schools would welcome a change from biscuits to bread. That is the consensus of opinion at the Schools. It is not only for the sake of having a meal but it is a question of taste; and the Government have been viewing this matter from an economic point of view. They have been very frugal and I understand they give the boys two biscuits instead of a loaf of bread with their tea. A lot of people outside perhaps hearing or seeing the replies to my questions would not think that the Government were so mean as they are. One would have thought that these boys get six or seven biscuits with their tea, but I have been informed that they get only two. The honourable senior member for St. Thomas who is in charge of this portfolio has visited the Government Industrial Schools and he has said on the floor of this House that biscuits are better for the teeth than white bread when in truth and in fact these boys are getting only two biscuits. It is a shame that these boys are doing harder work than they should be doing and they are only getting two biscuits with their tea (Mr. MOTTLEY: The Government does not know that) instead of a loaf of bread. Knowing the Superintendent as I do, I am surprised

that he would not take away the biscuits. He is that sort of man. I am beseeching the honourable senior member for St. Thomas not to press this case against these boys. Let the honourable member investigate the conditions and see them for himself and if what I am saying is true, let him try and have them improved. To give two biscuits with his tea to a boy who has to labour is a crime and the person responsible for it is a criminal. I give two biscuits to my dogs and they do not have to work. These boys do all sorts of work and they are given two biscuits and the Government tell me that that is right!

Mr. SPEAKER: The question under discussion is not the number of biscuits given to the boys but the difference between bread and biscuits.

Mr. GARNER: Yes Sir, but are they getting what is adequate? Two biscuits are absolutely nothing. At first I thought that there should be a change from the point of view of variety, but after I pressed my question and I heard that the Opposition were trying to defeat me I made enquiries during which I found out more than I knew before. Something is wrong in Denmark; something is wrong at the Government Industrial Schools. I have asked another question in connection with which I will be given latitude to say what I have to say because the Government is wasting time in keeping the Superintendent of these Institutions there. He antagonises the boys. You want at the head of these institutions somebody who knows something about dealing with delinquent children. Some of us are not honest enough to say what we mean and to say it when it should be said. These boys do a lot of work at the Institution and if the Government had to pay for this labour I do not know if they would show a profit or if it would be worth while for them to carry on. I do not think it was the idea of making money which urged those who thought of founding this Institution to found it. If it were a charge on the Government for reforming these boys that would be a part of our civilisation and part of our family life. As I see it, this Institution is now in the hands of strict capitalists who want to use the boys for making money for the Government, and they want to run the Institution however chinky they can manage to run it. Dodds is now more a plantation than it is a reformatory Institution.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not want to interrupt the honourable member, but the question before the House is in relation to the diet supplied at the Government Industrial Schools.

Mr. GARNER: If the whole system is wrong, something would necessarily be wrong with the diet. I will not dilate on this but I feel that something is wrong. The system is not run in the spirit of reformation; it is not run with a sense of justice and fairplay, and it shows up the weaknesses which are very prevalent and numerous at these Institutions. The time has passed when we could condone these things; after all, if these young boys have to go out and work hard — I am sure every honourable member knows that they have to do strenuous work — and they are given two biscuits and a cup of something and then I am told that this Government feels that these boys should not get a loaf of bread at least, I do not think that we are very far removed from the slave era. These boys are being treated as slaves; two biscuits and a little tea is not adequate for them. The least that they should give a boy would be a penny loaf of bread but they prefer the cheap system. When these boys are given two biscuits and they go out on the plantation and see canes and potatoes and they are hungry they must steal because they have to do hard work and there

is nothing in the belly. You cannot then reform these boys and the Superintendent takes these same hungry boys and disciplines them in the ways of the Institution for having taken something because they were hungry. We have got to do something about this and I hope that the Government will do something about it. If any of us has any human sympathy, if we know what it is to be hungry, if we know what it is to be underfed we will not countenance this malpractice at this Institution. The Government say in the replies to my questions that these inmates get a pint of milk. I would like the House to know that although this Institution is being run on plantation lines, they buy condensed milk so that these inmates do not get any fresh cow's milk. What honourable members see written down here is only so much on paper, but if you investigate it you will see something different. I repeat that something is wrong and while I do not want to labour this question, I have a lot of things to tell the Government about this Institution and they are burning within me because they are the things I think we should come to this House to rectify. These are unfortunate people and if this Government with a big interrogation mark behind it do not see to it that something is done to improve the conditions at this Institution then we are only wasting our time. After all, if this Institution is really to reform these boys then they must feed them. You cannot reform a hungry child: that is like a hungry man going to hear a sermon. I am asking that these boys be given bread instead of biscuits. It seems to me that these boys are there primarily to work on the plantation. I do not know if I am saying too much but it seems to me that the reformatory side of it is out of the question altogether. If you have slaves you feed and clothe them as cheaply as possible. This Government is looking for profit from these boys as far as I can see: I repeat that they are entitled to a change from biscuits to bread. I hope that I have said enough and that this change will be made. As I said before, this Government make good bread at Glendairy's. I saw some of this bread at the Mental Hospital on several occasions and if they want to give these boys at Dodds some bread, any Government vehicle can carry up this bread on Sundays or twice or three times a week. Transportation is nothing now; our world has become very small. What used to be a big job by way of transportation is a small matter now. A Police van could be used to transport this bread. In the same way that they can give bread to adult prisoners at Glendairy and the mental delinquents and the inmates of the Lazaretto they can give it to these little boys. But they are treating these little boys as slaves if they do not give them bread. I hope that this matter will receive due attention in the right quarters and that they will not allow these people who know nothing about reformation, who have no goodwill for these boys or no human feelings besides those for their immediate families, to continue with this job. There are those in our midst who know how much they care for their people at home but they have no use for others. We are here to see that this state of affairs does not exist at this Institution.

Mr. RAMSAY: The honourable junior member for St. Philip has brought before this House a peculiar charge and I am guilty in that I have not visited the Government Industrial Schools for about two years. It would have done a lot of good if we were detained there for three or five years. It is our duty to visit these Institutions.

There is something striking about the remarks of the honourable junior member for St. Philip relative to a reformatory Head. I think that Head used to be the Schoolmaster who used to be very interested in the boys. The remarks of the honourable junior member for St. Philip must be listened to. Complaints go to him whether they are fictitious or not and he has a chance to prove them. Inasmuch as the honourable member has brought this matter before us it is for the Government to move in relation to it. Variety is the spice of life and I feel strongly that it would not cost the Government any tremendous lot if they gave the inmates of these Institutions some sweet bread once or twice a week. That would allay a lot of unnecessary bickering and complaining. The Government ought to give these inmates bread but when the honourable junior member for St. Philip spoke about sending up this bread by a Police van I think that we should stop the Police vans from going to the Government Industrial Schools. It is time that when they are sending up things of this sort that they send them by some other means. I should have been brought up there because I have done a lot of things and few of us from the highest to the lowest could have got off if we had been charged. I want the honourable member who is in charge of matters relating to these Institutions to understand that it would do a lot of good to recommend that these inmates be given sweet bread twice a week. I do not find any fault with supplying biscuits; as a matter of fact I eat biscuits every morning and when my children will not eat the ends of their bread I eat them because I like hard bread. Inasmuch as this case has been brought before us, it can do no harm to give these boys a change. At the St. Michael's Almshouse you will be surprised to know that they can make bread of their own and they give the inmates a little pill. As far as the question of working the plantation as a commercial plantation is concerned, I do not think that the Government can be charged successfully from that standpoint. I think some recommendation has been made for a change; however it is the Government's business to investigate this charge. I am going up to the Government Industrial School before Christmas (Laughter) because it is my duty to verify some of these things for myself. If I may emphasize this, there is absolutely no harm in giving these inmates a little bread even if it costs a little more to supply it. The things which appear to cost more are very cheap. A little goodwill will save all this valuable time. As regards this antagonistic Head I want the Government to investigate the charge against the Head Officer because it is a serious charge to say that he is antagonistic towards these boys and if it is true deal with him. If it is not true it is the Government's duty to try and erase it. At this particular time they are about to have a Head and I must quote the words of the honourable senior member for St. George last Tuesday that we are too much bent upon experts. Experts think this and they think that and I do hope that somebody from around here who are interested in children—

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

AGE GROUPING AND SUPERANNUATION IN SCHOOLS DISCUSSED ON MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SYMMONDS: Mr. Speaker,—Before the further business of the afternoon is entered upon I beg to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes to speak on a matter of public impor-

tance. It is a matter affecting thousands of poor persons in this colony who are suffering from certain disabilities as regards the education of their children. For many years the people of this colony were afforded a sound elementary education to such a good purpose that wheresoever a Barbadian travelled abroad he commanded the respect of his fellows and those with whom he came into contact by virtue of that sound elementary training backed up by christian training by his mother or grandmother. The average Barbadian when he compares his daily lot in life with that in Great Britain finds life in Great Britain a paradise in comparison with the miserable existence which he has to eke out in this island because of seasonal employment. With the bulk of the population of this island faced with unemployment for the greater part of the year, with the bulk of the working people faced with employment for two or three days a week, their lot is one with which every humane Barbadian will sympathise and it is the duty of everyone of us to do something about it—

Mr. SPEAKER: I thought that the honourable member was speaking about education.

Mr. SYMMONDS: The remarks which I am making are very relative to the education of the section of the people to whom I am referring. You will find that many a poor working mother who, because of deplorable financial circumstances, has been forced to keep her child out of school because with ordinary motherly pride she feels ashamed to send that child to school hungry or naked; but when at a later period in life her circumstances are somewhat better she sends that child to school perhaps at the age of nine, ten or eleven years, what do we find happening in this island today? Such a child is not put into the lowest standard and gradually taken out according to its ability, but it is promptly promoted either to the middle of the school or, if it is of an advanced age to the top of the school. Hundreds of working mothers are complaining that they did not have the opportunity of sending their children to school at a stage in their lives when they would have received one or two years' elementary education and when the children are sent to school they are promoted to the highest forms. The result is that the already overworked elementary teachers with a doubling of their numbers cannot effectively deal with the education of the masses under the specialized system of grouping them as is now being carried out and they are forced to neglect such children. I will give a concrete example. In standard 3 you will find that children are divided into four or five groups, and the same teacher who ordinarily would be dealing with an average of 40 children is sometimes called upon to deal with as many as 70. You can imagine the teacher's plight; to teach these 70 children the same subjects would be absolutely plain sailing, but when you get them subdivided into four or five groups the teacher can only devote one day a week to teaching the same subject to these 70 children. The result is that for the money which is being spent by the Government on education only one-third or one-quarter of the time which would have been spent on the child is being spent. In that way the resources of this colony are not being used to the best advantage educationally and the result has often been that children entering school late in life have gone through standard 7. In many elementary schools today the highest standard is standard 6, because of this disability which I have just mentioned and time and again a poor parent finds his child has passed through standard 7 without being able to write his name. (A MEMBER: Shame). This is a matter

which is incensing the minds of thousands of the labouring people of this colony. It is a system—I do not say that it has been deliberately set up for such a purpose—but it is a system which in actual fact is denying the children of thousands of working people a few years of elementary education which would ordinarily bring them from the lowest standard up to let us say, standard 3. There is a vast difference between a child coming out of standard 3 and one coming out of standard 7 under this system. Under the old system a child came out of standard 3 knowing at least the work of that standard; today he comes out of standard 7 with a grievance against those who have set up a system by which his honest desire to learn is frustrated. There is another aspect of this system—another very evil aspect—which bears very heavily upon the population of this colony. It is this: when a bright child, a child who has been blessed by nature with exceptional brains, begins to progress rapidly in an elementary school today, he is, by the same vicious system, held back in such a way that he cannot be promoted beyond the average age of his fellows. I shall show you Mr. Speaker, how that affects the same child later on. Because of the miserable lot which faces the bulk of the population of this island, because of unemployment, parents find it all the more necessary to tighten their belts and give to their children opportunities for the highest education such as they themselves never had with the legitimate hope and desire that having been better fitted for the battle of life they should not endure so many of the hardships which life has meant to them. Many of these parents having sent their children through the elementary schools in times past have, at the age of 13, taken out the last child or the last two of their children and tried to give them some higher education. They generally did this at a time of their lives when their circumstances had so improved, when the burden of rearing a large family had somewhat lessened with the coming into maturity of the earlier born children. They did that, when their children reached the age of 13 at a time in life when their financial position did not afford it but with their sacrificial spirit the parents wanted to promote the development of their children. It is generally at the age of 13 that these children are sent to the secondary schools and today many of these children are still in secondary schools. At the age of 13 they are put in 1B, at 14 they are promoted to 1A, at 15 to 2B and at 16 they are in the Third Form. The honourable member on my left says that at 16 he happened to be in the Fifth Form. Not all Barbadians are so fortunate, not all Barbadians are born with gold spoons in their mouths. The only opportunity which they ever obtained for achieving equality with their rich fellows is by way of an equal educational opportunity. (Cheers). I spoke a short while ago with a frantic parent who told me that he was willing to work his fingers to stumps if only his children could be given the opportunity to obtain a higher education. Such a spirit compares very well with the spirit of the period of the Renaissance when the people of Europe in their desire for learning set about the establishment and the promotion of education in all its branches so that the period of the Dark Ages was removed from the world's history and this period of educational light and advancement, the heritage in which we now live, has come upon the world. At the close of the last War one of the greatest of Britain's Prime Ministers declared that it is essential as far as Great Britain is concerned that every British boy should be given opportunities for imbibing

the very best education of which he is capable, for, said he, in the post-war world it shall be the survival of the fittest. Those remarks, very relevant to Great Britain, are equally relevant to Barbados. (Cheers). We are at a period in our history when we hope to join in the building of a West Indian nation which shall rear its head as the equal of other free nations in the world within the framework of the British Empire. It is very important that in Barbados we give young Barbadians the opportunities for being so fitted for life that when they reach manhood and womanhood they should be equal educationally to any set of people in the British Empire or in any other part of the world. (Cheers). Mr. Speaker, I go back to the point which I was trying to bring to your attention. It is this; many working people in this island have children who are being educated at secondary schools, at Harrison College and at other schools, under a system which permitted an elementary school child to enter them at the age of 13 and to continue working in such a way that at 16 he would be found in the Third Form doing well. But under the present system which has been inflicted upon a suffering population in this island, children who enter these secondary schools at the age of 13 and who are doing well in the Third Form at the age of 16 are being expelled from the schools. This is a problem of plain economics in the interest of Barbadians. It is of no use saying that you have a system of age-grouping and superannuation in Great Britain or any other country which is very much more advanced than the island of Barbados. We in Barbados have got to see to it that there is set up in this island a system adapted to the economic conditions of the people of this island; that the children of the working people of this island should not have their deserving ambition to attain higher education dampened and that is the effect of the present system. In Great Britain there has been sufficient employment that you cannot find a sufficient number of people to do the work which is necessary to be done. If the economic recovery at which Great Britain aims is to materialise in Barbados we have to put our heads together and try to find employment for the thousands of working people in this colony who are anxious and willing to work but have nothing to do. It should be known that our educational system cannot be taken directly from the English type; it should be adapted to the living conditions of the people of Barbados. (Cheers). To tell our working people who only get seasonal employment that they must be ready and have their children so coached that at the age of 11 they must be fit to sit an entrance examination to one of the secondary schools is a grave injustice; but you have set up a system in the elementary schools whereby a brilliant boy is told "You are getting along a little too fast: you are running in front of the other boys: wait back here a little." When the time comes for an ambitious parent to send his child over to a secondary school he is faced with the other side of the picture. If sickness overtakes the child during a good year then the time which he has lost through the grouping in the elementary schools rebounds upon him like a boomerang and out he goes under the superannuation scheme. But another aspect of it is this: the people who have sent their children to secondary schools under the old system, and there are still hundreds attending first and second grade schools, children who are doing well will within a very few weeks be superannuated unless something is done about it. At present we have in this island 334 pupils at Queen's College—these figures are up to the 31st of March this year—209 at

the Lodge School, 499 at Harrison College; 542 at Combermere; 70 at the Coleridge School; 198 at the Boys' Foundation School; 74 at the Alleyne School; 101 at the Parry School; 318 at the St. Michael's Girls' School; 138 at the Girls' Foundation School and 114 at the Alexandra School making a total of 2,597 children who are receiving secondary education up to the end of March this year. If we say that the children of the working classes have no right to secondary education then it is time for us to say that the schools are overcrowded. If we say that this colony cannot afford secondary education for the children of the working classes then it is time to set up barriers and say that we are condemning that. But if every worker in this colony who buys a yard of cloth or a pint of rice contributes to the taxation by which the education of the colony is furnished how can we advance the argument that we have no room for his children? We have sufficient stone in this colony and we know that there is sufficient lumber to build schools to satisfy the ambition of workers for secondary education for their children. Why should we have room for only a few? There is a large assembly hall at Combermere which is used only in the morning and that could be floored and use to accommodate other classes. There is also a large assembly hall at Harrison College and a library building and people are tightening their belts so as to get secondary education for their children. I feel very strongly in this matter: I have been for years associated with the working people of this colony and I am prepared to draw to the attention of honourable members who, I am sure have been giving consideration to this question that no investment in this colony can yield such high dividends as education facilities offered to the masses. It has been well said that the wealth of a nation is not to be measured by the strength of its budget or by the beauty and size of its public buildings, but by its men of culture, enlightenment and character. (Cheers). The working people of this colony who have laboured in educational darkness desire to see the light of education given to their children. (Hear, hear). Anyone of us who feels that he owes his seat in this Assembly to the votes of the working classes of this colony has in duty bound to do his utmost towards assisting in furthering the ambition of the workers to provide their children with higher education. Mr. Speaker, in the United States of America the children of the working people are compelled to receive higher education. The economic system of Barbados is such that the working people, unless they receive Government assistance in sending their children to school, cannot send them to school until they are financially able to do so. The present system bears very hardly upon the children of the workers; there are 2,597 children attending the public schools of this colony seeking higher education and there are 3,000 seeking higher education outside in private schools which, while they are trying to do their very best, are not equipped and professionally staffed to the degree whereby the best results can be obtained from such teaching. It is our bounden duty to grant relief and immediate relief to this section of suffering humanity who with all their hopes and with all their fears of future years are looking to see whether we will or will not give sympathetic consideration to their aspirations. Mr. Speaker, I again beg to move the adjournment of this House for five minutes as a mark of protest against the continuance of these barriers which have been set up in this colony.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I rise to second the motion of the honourable junior member for St. George. I am quite sure that after listening to what can only

be called the statesman speech of the session (Cheers) all honourable members despite Party allegiance will come to the conclusion that the knowledge of the honourable junior member for St. George as a schoolteacher in this colony, as a parent, as a businessman, as a politician and with all put together as an educationist, is wide and his speech is one which even his greatest opponents as far as party politics are concerned will agree, is worthy of serious consideration. The honourable member's speech was lacking in that flamboyant style, lacking in the style to which we are accustomed in this House from some members, that style which greatly appeals to the non-thinking. It will be agreed that those of us with any interest, with any knowledge of the living conditions of the people of this colony, more especially the economic conditions of the people of this colony, took it very hard indeed when it was brought home to us that an elected Chamber, a Chamber elected by the people so readily agreed with the new system of age-grouping in elementary schools. As I have said on more than one occasion, age-grouping might well be introduced in Barbados 10 or 15 years hence with all the necessary facilities in the educational set-up for continuation schools. No greater hardship could have been put upon the working people of this colony than the method introduced by the then Director of Education and accepted by an elected Chamber more especially as it is constituted of people some of whom have won the blue riband of this colony educationally. It is true that the people could do nothing but sit and groan under it; they are groaning under it now. Many a family in this colony to-day look on with pity at their sons being thrown out of school because of this vicious system and the protest only came from a few voices crying in the wilderness. I described it when it was brought about as nothing but an attempt to flood the labour market of this colony with a lot of youngsters. (Mr. ADAMS: With a market that is overflowed?) The market is overflowed and people are allowed to put more on the market. It is obvious that if there are 100 jobs going around and 50 people apply for them and then 200 are thrown out of school that must mean cheap labour. That is how I summed up the position when the system was brought about and I am still of that opinion. I hope the honourable junior member for St. George will not withdraw this motion; this seems to be the only method and opportunity with our present set-up and with a voluminous Order Paper, for ventilating this pent-up grievance of the many parents in this colony. The hon. junior member for St. George rightly described the economic plight of several parents with more than five children and having the idea of giving them a smattering of education, some sort of culture and association with people, and I was much surprised to hear learned and distinguished people who have been elected to this Chamber criticise the idea of allowing children opportunities to attend secondary schools and then not coming out with special qualifications as only training them as snobs. I have never subscribed to that and therefore I support this motion very strongly. There are still a number of honourable members in this Chamber who were present on the occasion when this matter was dealt with. There is still a number of honourable members who I believe even though their position in relation to the Government has changed, will stand their ground and have the courage of their convictions in this matter. I am not putting anybody on the spot, but I recall the debates which took place in this Chamber. This is a matter in which a mere change of

portfolios should not make one change his position if he is mindful of the plight of the people of this colony. When the honourable junior member for St. George said that he is intimately connected with the working people of this colony, that is true; and there is no member of this House more fitted to speak from experience of his association, economically so, with the people of this colony than the hon. junior member for St. George. His long experience as a schoolteacher, his association with thousands of families as a businessman and as Secretary of one of the largest societies in the West Indies would have brought him into intimate contact with people who desire education but whose economic position can ill afford it. The hon. member has taken the time to give the figures as to the present number of pupils in the secondary schools of this colony, but I wished that he had gone one step further and given the figures of applicants who are being turned down at the beginning of a term. It is a most pathetic thing. I will show the House the desire of the people of this colony for education. People are actually going about in this colony—they realise that children must leave these schools—and when their children cannot get into these secondary schools they are actually bribing masters and mistresses to let them come in.

Mr. SPEAKER: Did the honourable member use the word "bribing" or the words "attempting to bribe?"

Mr. MOTTLEY: They are attempting to bribe them. I do not want this to be any reflection on the teachers but I want to make it clear that the desire of the people is for education. I repeat that I wished the honourable junior member for St. George had given figures to show that several hundred children are awaiting admittance to one school. Due to the lack of room or the present set-up they are being turned back through no fault of their own. We are at a transitional period it is true, and while that is so it is still the duty of any Government to make the necessary preparations to receive these children. With the experience of statesmen and educationists in our midst I say that we should not have found ourselves in this position. I wonder if honourable members are aware that by turning back numbers of young people term after term and year after year from these schools they are causing a feeling of discontent, a feeling that these young people are not being properly looked after. Incidentally I have had it thrown at me by a youngster of 16 and everybody knows that we have had cases in this colony—it is a wonder that nobody has put it to the last Director of Education—where boys who have held scholarships and who in their first 16 years at school showed absolutely no promise but who during the last three years when they were given the opportunity to be taught the things of their choice, showed promise rapidly and became very distinguished. I do not think that we can sit here, unless we really want it to be felt that we are disinterested, and allow this opportunity to pass without voting for the adjournment of the House as a means of our protest against the present system. As I said before, there is no other means of doing this, and when this vote is taken I hope that the Government will appreciate the seriousness of the situation and as the honourable senior member for St. George has said, take steps to see that this age-grouping is only a means of throwing a lot of small children on the labour market. This is not an industrial country and there is no means of training these children for anything. I do not think merely of Bridgetown

but as I go about the country I see that children have been thrown out of school and they only get into contact with the police earlier than they should. Even if they are going to be agricultural labourers they should still be given the opportunity to spend a longer period of their lives in school. It is laid down in Holy Writ that a man's years are three score and ten and we find that under this system children are forced into manhood or womanhood earlier than they should be. They are thrown into the labour market due to a practice which has been thrust down our throats and no real protest has been made against it. I do appreciate this opportunity to second this motion and I hope that hon. members will come to the conclusion to-day that they were wrong in agreeing with this recommendation and will see that it is their plain, simple duty to say "We have erred." To err is human and if you err and you see that it is causing a hardship on people, it is your duty to undo what you have agreed with and do what is in the interest of the masses of this colony. I say; great are the men who can admit where they have made an error. On many occasions propositions are put up and we think for the moment that they will be in the interest of all concerned; but on reflection and hearing other people we come to the conclusion that we are wrong. To-day I am sure that hon. members will agree that after watching the working of the age-grouping system and discussing it with the members of the teaching fraternity and with the several parents in this colony, they will readily vote for the adjournment of the House as a protest against this system. There are few of us who can boast of any education other than that which is offered in Barbados; there are few of us who can boast that if our children were put out of school here we could send them to the United Kingdom or the United States of America for their education. I am at a loss to understand how hon. members can seriously agree or associate themselves with any kind of age-grouping which must effect a hardship on their brothers and sisters—the working people of this colony. I have much pleasure in seconding the motion of the hon. junior member for St. George.

• Mr. DOWDING: It has been a pleasure for me to listen to the speech of my honourable colleague. I am not in any position to query the facts which he has put before us but there is one point which I would like to bring forcibly to the notice of this House. Sir, it is a sore point with me; it is the question of these imported experts. (Laughter). Now, Sir, we have in our midst capable men but we must always import these experts; and whatever they say it seems that we are guillible enough to allow them to pull the wool over our eyes, for what motives I am at a loss to know. I do feel that if we, as the representatives of the people in this island, allow these experts whom we import to come here and pull the wool over our eyes and we do not get the knowledge of local experts not only in this matter in question but in connection with local conditions, then we are not representing the people as we should.

Mr. COX: For about half an hour I have been listening to at least two cunning speeches made in this House relative to the question of education.

Mr. SYMMONDS: Mr. Speaker, I object to the use of the word "cunning" by the honourable member in relation to my remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know that the word "cunning" is objectionable.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I think that the word should be taken down.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the House are of the opinion that the word ~~should be taken down~~ I will put the question.

Mr. TALMA: I presume that you, Sir, as Speaker of this House will decide on a ruling; you will say whether the word is objectionable or not.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the honourable member takes steps for the word ~~be taken down~~ I will put the question.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that the word "cunning" be taken down. It attributes unfair motives to honourable members.

Mr. WILKINSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS: This morning mention was made of a sledge-hammer to kill an ant. After that happened—

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid I cannot hear the honourable member; I shall have to put the question. The question is that the word "cunning" be taken down. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Noes" have it.

The following division was taken:—

Ayes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. SYMMONDS, BRANCKER, CRAWFORD, GARNER, MOTTLEY, DOWDING, S. A. WALCOTT and WILKINSON—9.

Noes: Messrs F. L. WALCOTT, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, RAMSAY, TALMA, ADAMS, BLACKMAN and Dr. CUMMINS—9.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question that the word "cunning" be taken down has been resolved in a "tie", nine honourable members voting "Aye" and nine honourable members voting "No". In accordance with the Rules I vote with the "Noes" (Cheers).

Mr. COX: A straw shows where the wind blows. By this time the public can very well see the alliance between the Conservative group in this House and a Party which claims to be representing Labour the members of which only a couple of months ago were trying to cut the throats of the same Conservative group. I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that I have listened to these two speeches. The honourable junior member for St. George started off by dealing with the economic condition of the working classes of this colony and he said that due to the people not getting more than two or three days' work a week they were not in a position to send their children to school at an early time whereby they could get the education they desire. I will make a few remarks as regards the economic set-up of this colony. Now the honourable junior member for St. George ought to know by now that the condition in which the workers find themselves is the result of the capitalist rule of this colony. After the abolition of slavery the shilling-a-day system was introduced and even quite recently I have seen the scale of remuneration for witnesses attending the Law Courts. It states gentlemen 5/- to 10/- per day businessmen 2/6 to 5/- a day and when you come down to the bottom it states labourers and the like 1/- a day. There was no sliding scale or incremental system. Even from 1939 that system has existed that people like the cantoneers employed by the Department of Highways and Transport got 8/- to 10/- per week and today they are getting \$6.72 and no 40-year period has elapsed. What was the Government spending on education in 1910? (A MEMBER: What was the budget? The budget was £200,000 and out of that amount £20,000 was spent on education. In 1937 when the riots broke out, when the rich people voted £114,000 to blow down the working classes the Education vote did not exceed £60,000; but today within ten years it exceeds £218,000. That is what this Government has recently done. (A MEMBER: What is the revenue today?) It is over a million pounds. What must we do?

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that the question before the House?

Mr. COX: The honourable junior member for St. George started off with economics and led up to age-grouping. I want to tell the Government and the people of Barbados that this matter was concocted at a rich man's home during last week so as to upset this Government.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I object to the remarks of the honourable member.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am trying to get the honourable member to explain what he is saying. The point is that owing to the economic condition of the people of this colony the children leave school earlier than they should leave, and that when they are going to school and are put in classes with their equals a hardship is caused to the people of the colony. I cannot see therefore what difference it makes as to the cause of the economic condition of the people.

Mr. COX: The honourable member cleverly evaded the cause. After all, there is cause and effect.

Mr. SPEAKER: I rule that the cause of the economic condition of the people has nothing to do with it. There is no reason for saying how that economic condition has arisen.

Mr. COX: I am prepared to bow to your ruling. With regard to the question of age-grouping I will say that I know nothing about it more than what I have heard. I still feel, however, that before we can blame the Government for doing an injustice to these children or their parents we should go a little further back; because here again, due to the economic set-up, many people are unable to send their children to school at an early age. They have to take their children into the field with them in order to assist them in balancing the home budget.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no point in saying that again.

Mr. COX: I was trying to point out that in order to offset any disadvantages so far as age-grouping is concerned, a system of compulsory education should have been put on the Statute Book. I understand from a few teachers that the hardship is not upon the parents and the children but upon the teachers who have more work to do in having to teach so many children of different intellectuality in the same group. I do not know whether age-grouping is an admirable thing or not; but from my own experience I feel it is far better to put a child with others who can help it than to keep it in a class with others who know no more than it or in some cases not as much. That is commonsense. I am not saying whether this system should remain or not. What I am against is this; now that this Government is trying its best to improve the condition of the down-trodden people of this colony, you find people who claim to be interested in the very people doing everything subterraneously to upset the Government so that the people might go back into slavery, chaos and everything like that. I am speaking fearlessly because I do not cringe or bow down to anybody. I have never yet received anything from any capitalist to deceive my people and therefore when I rise to speak I can speak fearlessly to the vagabonds, rogues and crooks. I know what is going on: I know that day in and day out, morning, noon and night, attempts are being made to upset the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the honourable mover of this motion and the honourable seconder gave reasons why this system should not have been brought into effect. The honourable member would be quite in order to show that the bringing into effect of the

system would be good. I think the honourable member should try and confine his remarks to the relative good or evil of the system.

Mr. COX: I agree with that, but the honourable junior member for St. George and the honourable senior member for the City have gone so far as to ask the members of this House to censure the present Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the honourable member understands the motion which has been made and seconded. The honourable mover and seconder intend that with the passing of the motion they will satisfy the Government that the House are of the opinion that the system is evil. It is not a question of who brought it into effect.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I object to the remarks of the honourable senior member for St. Michael. I was not attaching any blame to the Government; I made that clear. I made it clear that the adjournment of the House for five minutes would be a mark of protest to show that we felt the operation of this age-grouping was not in the interest of the people.

Mr. SYMMONDS: At no time during my speech did I try to lay any censure on the Government. I just want to make it perfectly clear that there is no intention to censure the present Government.

Mr. COX: Whether those honourable members mean to do that or not the point is that it will happen if this question is decided in the affirmative. As regards the honourable senior member for St. George, he seems to have a definite dislike for experts; but when he wants his children educated he sends them to England to be taught by experts. We are concerned with whether we are taught at all, let alone being taught by experts. It has always been said that a Barbadian is a know-all and many people who know little or nothing about things generally assume the role of authority on these particular things. The position is that the Government is paying an official £1,000 a year to tell us what is good for us as the education of the people of this colony is concerned and you find people who know nothing about education denouncing his plan. What must we do in fairness to the man who was trained in this matter of education? We should give his recommendation a fair trial; we should not offer him destructive and not constructive criticism. I know, as I said before, that the Government is doing its best not only from the educational point of view but from every point of view to improve conditions of the people in this colony. Before Labour members came into this House there was no question of the common people's interest; all sorts of barriers were put in their way and that is what we have inherited. But today we find that a crooked bunch of people are associating themselves with the Conservatives in order to retard the progress which we have made. I have noticed the attempts that are being made to upset this Government and those of the rich who are engaged in it are using one Party to break the neck of the other and then finally destroy the former own necks. That is what they have arranged to do but I would counsel them to be careful lest they themselves despite the fact that they are anxious to see the downfall of this Government, fall harder when their time comes. I regard this motion more especially when the honourable member presses it to the vote as a wicked attempt, a malicious attempt—

Mr. SYMMONDS: I object to that statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the honourable member has any right to suggest the motives for the motion before the House. The honourable mover has

shown reasons which are perfectly reasonable and the honourable member must not attribute bad motives to anyone.

Mr. COX: I withdraw that statement. Despite the fact that they are now joining with the capitalists to destroy—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is again doing what I asked him not to do.

Mr. COX: On the question of education I feel that we should have compulsory education in this colony. Instead of children going to work in the third class gang and places which are undesirable at times, let them go into the schools; and for the work which the parents do they should receive a wage as much as will feed them and their children comfortably, provide them with somewhere to live and enable them to put by something for a decent support when they can no longer work.

Dr. CUMMINS: For obvious reasons I want to take this opportunity to speak. In 1945 I voiced my objection to this system of age-grouping and to one or two other things in this new educational set-up. As a result of this objection I was invited by Mr. Hayden to discuss the matter with him. I spent about half an hour discussing it with him and at the end of that half an hour we were both still unconvinced. My opinion is still the same today. (Hear, hear). When this question comes to be put to the vote I may have left my seat; but with all that has been said by the honourable junior member for St. George, I cannot add very much to it, and I believe that if an opportunity is given things will be put right. This system has been in operation for a few years and it cannot be changed overnight. Mr. Hayden asked me to give it a trial for a few years and see whether I would change my opinion or not. Well, I have waited for about three years and my opinion remains the same, that this age-grouping does not suit Barbados. The children of the poor people leave the schools at the age of 14 and I know that some of them can hardly read and write. Because of economic and other reasons they are unable to go to school regularly and under this system they are forced into classes higher than they are able to attend on account of the fact that they have not received that foundation which they should have received at an earlier age in the lower classes. Consequently, when they leave school they are not fit to be put in any responsible position. The result is, as has been already said, the labour market is flooded. I still think that if the parents showed greater interest in the children conditions would be better. Only yesterday I happened to pass through Watkins Alley and under a tamarind tree I saw about half a dozen boys of about 9 or 10 years playing cards. It was during school time and those children should certainly have been in school; but very often parents have to go out to work and leave their children home and the children run wild. The result is that our juvenile delinquency is increasing. I was saying that these conditions cannot be changed overnight and I do feel that in time more schools will be built. We have just started the Training College at Erdiston for the training of teachers; more schools will in time be built and when we have a system of compulsory education the children will be compelled to go to school and age-grouping will be no longer necessary. As regards the question of removing from the secondary schools children who are considered backward at the age of 16, there are arguments pro and con; but I have found many children who had not begun to learn until a very late age, and it certainly does work some hardship on children who do not show

the aptitude for learning at an early time. In consequence I know that there is a deplorable condition existing amongst some of our schools which are called private secondary schools, and if the Government can only manage as soon as convenient to build more secondary schools the condition as I have mentioned existing amongst some of these schools will be ameliorated.

Mr. WILKINSON: I do not wish to prolong this debate; I just want to say that it is a mistake for some hon. members to think that those who vote for this motion for adjournment have any intention of censuring the Government. That is not so. It is wholly in connection with the question of age-grouping. When age-grouping was introduced here about two or three years ago I do not think that any member of the Executive was very anxious or enthusiastic about it; but we were persuaded by the expert, Mr. Hayden,—I think the honourable senior member for St. Joseph will confirm what I say if he wishes to do so—to give it a trial. Mr. Hayden pointed out to us that in England age-grouping has been tried out for some years and it has proved to be successful. I have always been doubtful about it. At the last General Elections I brought up the question and tried to find out from people at all the meetings I attended whether they considered this age-grouping to be successful or not. I must confess that they really never gave any definite decision. Some people said that it was causing a hardship while others were of the opinion that it should be given a longer trial. I only want to show why I shall vote for the adjournment and I should like the Government to say whether age-grouping has proved to be a success or not. I fear that it has not proved to be a success. I assure honourable members that my vote will not be one for censuring the Government. We want the children to be educated but the question is: which is the best method to be adopted in educating them, whether age-grouping or the one which we had before? I am voting for the motion.

Mr. MAPP: It has been said that every new movement or activity of human life when unfamiliar to people's minds is sure to be misrepresented and misunderstood. I would appeal to the honourable introducer of this motion not to misrepresent—

Mr. SYMMONDS: I must object to that.

Mr. MAPP: I have not said that the honourable member misrepresented it. If the honourable member will listen he will see what I am aiming at. I regard the matter of this motion as a very important one; it is one which I have discussed both with parents and with members of the teaching fraternity in general. It is obvious that the Government acted with the best of motives in allowing a regulation like this to be put on the Statute Book: they acted on the advice of one whom they considered to be an expert and one whom other people also considered to be an expert. I was disappointed at the manner in which the matter was discussed. The honourable junior member for St. George laboured the point that in this colony age-grouping is inflicting hardships on the working classes and that people are suffering worse than they are suffering in England. When you vote for a motion like this would it not appear that you are saying that in introducing this regulation and putting it on the Statute Book the Government intended to work a hardship on the people? It looks as if that was the idea uppermost in the honourable mover's mind. This matter cannot be easily dismissed. When I used to teach in an elementary school especially in the lower standards I had, and I daresay the other teachers had, the greatest difficulty in instilling sound advice and knowledge in

the minds of older children especially of the cloddish type when they were put with smaller children. The bigger children always wanted to be with their chronological equals. I have spoken with teachers who say that that state of affairs remains the same. They say that the big child when put with children of his own age, generally improved. He does not give as much trouble as when he is placed with smaller children. I have no doubt that when the former Director of Education gave advice to the Government to try this system he gave it on the results obtained in the country from which he had come. Unfortunately, he had gained experience in a country which is more advanced educationally and socially than this colony, and it is a mistake to impose a regulation like on the educational system in this colony where the teacher is not properly equipped. Honourable members have expressed much regret and rightly so that when a boy has reached standard 4 or standard 5 he is unable to write his name. But he is looking at the matter from the wrong angle. We should erase such organisational methods from our minds in dealing with this matter. We really want more schools, we want schools specially adapted to deal with backward children and the situation would be greatly improved. I feel that the Government is in a difficult position and I do not think that there should be any attempt made to censure it. It must be remembered that this is the first occasion on which this matter has been discussed in this House since the Elections. The Government will have to test bodies of opinion throughout the island in this matter; they cannot just say "People do not like age-grouping and we will abolish the system." If people were anxious to see the system abolished and the matter was brought to the attention of the Government and they refused to do anything about it, then you could move a vote of censure. I repeat that this system should first be discussed with responsible bodies of opinion and probably in the future when we have some better educational facilities in this island we could think of re-introducing it. Age grouping is not a bad system in itself but it might be too advanced for our present system of education.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I beg to move that this debate be now adjourned.

Mr. RAMSAY: I am not seconding that motion: I am speaking on the original motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before you speak I will ask the DEPUTY SPEAKER to take the Chair.

Dr. WILSON: I beg to second the motion for the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. RAMSAY: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—Honourable members should have risen from their seats when His Honour the Speaker left the Chair. It is an omission on our part and there was no intention of being disrespectful. I want to say this: in my opinion there is not the slightest argument as to why age-grouping should be maintained. No self-respecting, intelligent, well-meaning member of this community could ever tolerate age-grouping as practised in this colony.

I am thoroughly opposed to it. As a matter of fact, I cannot say anything unkind about a former House but I say that they were mental degenerates. What I am saying does not at all mean that I am voting for the adjournment of the House because I consider that to be tantamount to a vote of censure on this Government. During the course of my going about this country I have come—

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: On a point of order. I have made a motion for the adjournment of this debate and it was seconded.

Mr. RAMSAY: There is no motion before the House because His Honour the Speaker said that he was leaving the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On referring to the records of the House as taken by the Clerk I have discovered the following: "Mr. S. A. WALCOTT moved seconded by Dr. WILSON that this debate be adjourned. Mr. Speaker vacated the Chair and Mr. Deputy Speaker took the Chair."

Mr. RAMSAY: That is an incorrect statement of the proceedings of this House. When I got up to speak the SPEAKER informed me that he was going to vacate the Chair and that the Deputy Speaker would take it. I sat down. Then the honourable senior member for St. James moved the adjournment of the debate and the honourable senior member for St. John seconded the motion which was altogether wrong. I am calling upon the House to say whether that was right or wrong. There was no motion before the House at all.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must regard myself as being bound by the record of the House. Before I vacated my seat around the Table I heard the honourable senior member for St. John second the motion for the adjournment of the debate and that is borne out by the record as taken by the Clerk.

Mr. RAMSAY: You heard the honourable member second the motion but in truth and in fact there was no motion. If the Speaker stop an honourable member from speaking because the Deputy Speaker would take the Chair, there is no motion. An incorrect version has been given of what took place in the House. I am saying that no one would agree that the honourable junior member for St. George is wrong; any honourable member who could argue that age-grouping should continue is not looking after the interest of the people whom he professes to represent. I will not associate myself with any adjournment of the House for five minutes because I personally feel that that is tantamount to a vote of censure on the Government. (A MEMBER: The present Government). There is only one Government and we hope that it will be a better Government in the future. Not long ago I visited the home of a friend—a lady whom I consider to be of a quiet temperament. I have never heard her raise her voice. She had a daughter attending Queen's College and the mere fact that the girl had to leave at an age higher than that required for her form made the lady become almost hysterical. I agree with what the honourable senior member for St. George has said; we are all prone to allow experts to take us off our feet. We must listen to them but we should not go with them all the way. I associate myself with the hon. junior member for St. James who says that he is not prepared to vote for any censure of the Government but he would like this matter to be brought to the attention of the Government. Why is it that honourable members are asking for a vote of censure of the Government? (A MEMBER: It is not censure of the Government). An honourable member has retorted that it is not censure of the Government; but if honourable members look at the sun and call it the moon, that is not my fault. It is unkind for hon. members to look upon the Government when it has good intentions and ask that it be censured. Opposition must be based upon reason, fairplay and justice otherwise there is no opposition. Opposition is a

most integral part in the make-up of this Assembly, but when it is not based on reason, fairplay and justice we are just building on the sand. We must never want age-grouping because it is harmful. The grouping of the mentalities of children used to be practised at Harrison College and Combermere. About five forms used to be grouped together and I heard parents quarrelling about it; but the mentalities of the children were grouped for their particular benefit. I am not giving any silent vote in this matter; I have told the honourable junior member for St. George that I would vote against age grouping because I detest it. I will give you a case in point. As you know, I have several children; when one of them reached the age of 14 she left Carrington's Village School, went to St. Michael's Girls' School and came through with her School Certificate in five years. That might not have happened if age-grouping were in existence then. Whether we want age-grouping or not, let us leave it to the masters and mistresses to do what is in the best interests of the children.

Mr. TALMA: I compliment the honourable junior member for St. George on bringing this matter to the attention of the Government. I think the honourable member has done a very useful service in doing that this afternoon. The explanation given by the honourable junior member for St. James that age-grouping was merely an experiment is also useful to this Assembly, but age-grouping is a wicked thing to be in existence here. It is even more wicked than the introduction of the £5 bond which is a legacy of a previous Conservative Government. The blame cannot be attributed to this Government which has had nothing to do with retarding the hands of progress as far as education is concerned. I can boast of having the—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I can hear every honourable member except the honourable member who is on his feet.

Mr. TALMA: I am one of the few who had the distinction of rejecting or preventing the institution of that wicked thing—the £5 bond—and also age-grouping and co-education in Christ Church. No member of the present Government intends to have anything to do with anything which has proved to be vicious, unworkable or impracticable. Age-grouping creates a hardship on the average teacher, because under that system one can have in one form four different groups of pupils and that is something which no Labour Government would continue. With regard to the £5 bond, the honourable junior member for St. James who is not now present in the Chamber, happened to be a member of the Government at the time when the introduction of that bond and age-grouping and co-education schemes were being implemented by Mr. Hayden. To my surprise the same honourable member was the first person to take steps for the removal of the bond—something which many Labour members had previously fought against. Today the honourable junior member for St. George with the best of intentions says that age-grouping is a wicked practice and he has done a very useful service. But the honourable member should not go so far as to say that we should adjourn as a mark of protest. That is carrying the matter too far. What is going on now is the legacy of a Conservative Government and the matter has not yet been dealt with. When you say that we should adjourn for five minutes as a mark of protest that shows that you have no confidence in the present Government and that they are willing to do things from which people derive little or no benefit. Age-grouping is an experiment which has been proved to be a failure; it

is a system introduced by Mr. Hayden whose absence from the colony as far as I am concerned—I am glad to say that he has gone. (A MEMBER: He was an able man). When people are given a living wage in the first instance and then compulsory education is introduced, then and only then should age-grouping come about. I must say that I appreciate the speeches which have been made in connection with this matter; I appreciate the reference which has been made relative to these so-called experts.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I would like to say in passing that this question which we have been discussing for the greater part of this afternoon is one to which honourable members should address their minds without any heat or rancour. Speaking for myself, I am not as prolific as my colleague with a plenty of children, but I still happen to be in the category of being a father. I can see for myself some of the difficulties of children today in this matter of age-grouping in elementary schools. I do not believe that age-grouping can work successfully without a system of compulsory education. If you are not bringing children into schools at a given age but they come in as they please, it is a difficult problem to group their mentality. If they have the opportunity of entering school together, they will develop together. The position can be very embarrassing for the teachers under this system of age-grouping. As regards the question of superannuation, that can be a very serious one in any community. If you are superannuating children at an age when they can very well learn, you should have somewhere to absorb them. I feel that we have had sufficient debate on this question and to force the adjournment of the House for five minutes means that you are indirectly censuring this Government. The matter has been brought to the attention of the Government and they would be failing in their duty not to pay attention to a debate like this. If no attention is paid to this debate then the honourable junior member for St. George would be quite in order to bring to the attention of the Government that no notice was taken of it; but such a motion should not have been made on the first occasion when the matter is drawn to the attention of the Government.

Mr. ADAMS: I regret that I shall have to make my remarks much shorter than I would have liked to make them because of the fact that it is now dark. In view of some of the remarks which have been made I find it absolutely necessary to speak at this moment. Those who fight and run away may possibly live to fight another day. Inasmuch as I have what is called the portfolio for education I feel in duty bound to speak on the matter. Although my views on this matter are well known some remarks have been made which call for refutation. One thing that strikes me about some honourable members of this House is that they talk like little children on this question of education. I have heard nothing that comes anywhere near my views of what the education of the children of this island should be. As the honourable junior member for St. James has said, none of us liked age-grouping when it was introduced but we were persuaded that it was a success in England and we should give it a fair trial here. If

a building contractor said that he had tried out a certain material and that it was better for building than cement and he asked me if I would try it with my next building, I would say: let us try it. What is the earthly use of our debate? I am speaking for the Government and I dissociate myself from any pontifical remarks that age-grouping is bad. I do not know whether it is bad or good. I almost had a cold sweat when I heard some of the educational pronouncements that were made in this House this afternoon. I heard the honourable senior member for the City say that the honourable junior member for St. George is an educationist. I attended the greatest University in the world for more than five years; I mixed with all sorts of people who were experts in educational matters and I do not claim to be any educationist. None of us is an educationist. The only educationist that I have seen in this colony for years is Mr. Hayden. I repeat: none of us is an educationist and many of us are cowards. I have said on more than one occasion that the fact that a child is backward means that it should have more education. If age-grouping means that children are leaving school before they should leave, the answer to that is that we shall have to build schools for the mentally backward children just as you have these schools in England. Age-grouping has been a success in England because there are schools for dealing with mentally backward children. I repeat what I have always said, namely, that I hope to see free education given from the elementary school to the university. Far from being opposed to people getting education I suggest that we should examine the question in the calm, cold light of what educational experts have experienced in the outside world and not make it any political Party issue.

Mr. GARNER: Speaking on this motion for adjournment and in connection with the question of age-grouping, I should like to say here and now that what the former Director of Education thought was good for England is not good for Barbados. That is the crux of the whole matter. Perhaps he felt that the system which obtains in England as far as this age-grouping is concerned is good enough for Barbados also. But, Sir, it has been found that—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the honourable member just pause for a moment? It is difficult to see, but so far as I can observe there are not twelve members present. I ask the Clerk to have the Bell rung.

The Bell was being rung

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: While the Bell is being rung, I suggest to honourable members that steps be taken between now and the next meeting to ensure that something be done in the matter of installing electricity in this Chamber. If electricity cannot be installed then we must consider getting oil lamps.

The Bell having been rung,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There were not twelve members present in the House, the Bell has been rung and there still not being twelve members present, this House now stands adjourned until this day week at twelve o'clock noon.