

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1947—48

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 9th 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*), Dr. J. A. LE V. WILSON, Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Messrs. L. E. SMITH, F. L. WALCOTT, M. E. COX, D. A. FOSTER, R. G. MAPP, C. E. TALMA, H. D. BLACKMAN, E. D. MOTTLEY, J. A. HAYNES, V. C. GALE, and E. L. WARD.

Prayers are read.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT enters the House and takes his seat.

MINUTES.

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 2nd December, 1947, having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

Messrs. GARNER and DOWDING enter the House and take their seats.

PAPERS LAID.

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

Message No. 37/1947 from His Excellency the Governor informing the House that there is a probability that the United States Sugar Corporation may be prepared to recruit not less than 500 Barbadians in the near future if this Government will bear the cost of transportation to the U.S.A., estimated at between £13 and £16 per head, and the cost of recruitment, and enquiring whether the House is in agreement that this Government should bear these expenses. (Cheers).

Order made by the Governor under section 2(1) (a) of the Pensions Act, 1947 (1947-20).

Regulations made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee under section 3(3) of the Apprenticeship Bursaries Act, 1928 (1928-9) as contained in section 2 of the Apprenticeship Bursaries (Amendment) Act, 1947 (1947-34).

Regulations made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee under section 12 of the Boatmen, Carters and Porters Act, 1891 (1891—10) as contained in the Boatmen, Carters and Porters (Amendment Act) 1947 (1947—25).

Report on the Government Bacteriological and Pathological Laboratory for the year 1945.

Report of the Department of Labour for the year 1946.

NOTICES.

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Mr. TALMA: Resolution to approve the Order entitled the Pensions (Pensionable Offices) Order, 1947, made by the Governor on the 3rd day of December, 1947, under the provisions of section 2 (1) (a) of the Pensions Act, 1947 (1947-20).

Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution to approve the Regulations entitled the Boatmen, Carters and Porters (Fares) Regulations, 1947, made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the 29th day of November, 1947, under the provisions of section 12 of the Boatmen, Carters and Porters Act, 1891 (1891-10) as contained in section 3 of the Boatmen, Carters and Porters (Amendment) Act, 1947 (1947-25).

Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution to approve the Regulations entitled the Apprenticeship Bursaries Regulations, 1947, made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the 6th day of December, 1947, under the provisions of section 3(3) of the Apprenticeship Bursaries Act, 1928 (1928-9) as contained in section 2 of the Apprenticeship Bursaries (Amendment) Act, 1947 (1947-34).

Mr. BLACKMAN: Resolution to approve and sanction the statement in the Schedule hereto showing the mileage and the locality of the highways or portions of the highways which the department of Highways and Transport propose to take control of, with an estimate of the cost of constructing, reconstructing, or repairing, and of the annual cost of maintaining the same in repair.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Resolution to place the sum of £350 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to purchase and equip a motor lorry for the Waterworks Department.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Resolution for £1,200 to supplement the Estimates of Expenditure for the year 1947-48 under Head VIII, Post Office, Item 13,

Overseas direct mails (Surface) by £800, and Item 15, Transit mails, by £400.

Mr. BLACKMAN: (On behalf of Mr. Adams): Resolution to grant the sum of £66. 13. 4 from the Public Treasury as an ex gratia grant to James Goring, formerly employed as a porter at Queen's College, in consideration of his 8 years' service at the College.

Dr. CUMMINS: Bill to amend the Food and Drugs (Adulteration) Act, 1933 (1933-2).

Dr. CUMMINS: (On behalf of Mr. Adams): Bill to amend the Income Tax Act, 1921 (1921-6).

Dr. CUMMINS: (On behalf of Mr. Adams): Bill to vest in the Crown the property in petroleum and natural gas within the island, and to make provision with respect to the search for, and the getting of petroleum and natural gas, and for purposes connected therewith.

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

Other Notices are as follows:—

Mr. COX: Of the following Address:—

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency The Governor

The House of Assembly urge upon Your Excellency to take immediate steps to install a Government Broadcasting Station with a view to installing a receiving speaker in every house required and Community Hall at a minimum cost. The House are satisfied that in order to create and maintain a healthy public opinion such a project is absolutely necessary.

The House pray that Your Excellency will give immediate consideration to the abovementioned object.

Messrs. WILKINSON, SYMMONDS and CRAWFORD enter the House and take their seats.

Mr. COX: Of the following Address:—

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency the Governor

The House of Assembly are convinced, that the two weeks' sick leave granted to Public Employees, under the Public Employees Leave Regulations Act of 1935 is so inadequate as to demand an immediate and drastic amendment.

The House of Assembly, therefore, respectfully, request Your Excellency to send down with as little delay possible the necessary Legislation for the implementation of the abovementioned object.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Of the following Address:

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency the Governor

1. In view of the fact that Christmas Day falls on a Thursday and the 26th day of December, 1947, on a Friday, both of which days are Bank Holidays in accordance with the Bank Holidays Act 1905 (1905-2) as amended by the Bank Holidays (Amendment) Act 1946 (1946-15), the House of Assembly are of the opinion that Saturday, the 27th day of December, 1947, should also be declared to

be a Bank Holiday by the Governor-in-Executive Committee as provided by the said Bank Holidays (Amendment) Act 1946 (1946-15) so as to enable government and other employees in this colony to enjoy a longer holiday after the business and rush usually experienced immediately before Christmas Day.

2. The House therefore respectfully request Your Excellency the Governor-in-Executive Committee to declare the said 27th day of December, 1947, to be a Bank Holiday so as to give effect to this proposal.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Of my intention to ask leave to move for the passing of this Address later in the day.

Mr. COX: Of the following Address:—

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency the Governor

In view of the fact that certain land owners, more especially those of Carrington's Village, have cleverly side-tracked the Public Health Amendment Act of 1945 which sought to fix the price of land and at the same time to reduce the exorbitant high prices charged by the said owners, and have thereby rendered it nugatory, the House of Assembly urge upon Your Excellency the immediate introduction of Legislation for the accomplishment of the desired object.

Mr. COX: Of the following Address:—

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency the Governor

In view of the fact that certain landlords are considerably increasing their rentals without reasonable justification the House of Assembly respectfully request Your Excellency to take immediate steps to send down Legislation to give effect to the Address passed by the House earlier this year relative to a Rent Restriction Board.

Mr. COX: Of the following Address:

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency the Governor

In order to give greater educational opportunities to children of poor parents who are not in a position to send their children to school regularly, the House respectfully request Your Excellency to send down legislation for the purpose of increasing the elementary school leaving age from 14—16 years.

Mr. COX: Of my intention to move for the appointment of a Select Committee with the view of recommending to the Government and the Authorities concerned the tenantry roads to be taken over and repaired and sites for the erection of stand-pipes and the installation of hydrants.

Mr. SPEAKER: The way in which that is to be done is to give notice of an Address and before the Address is passed you might move that it be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. COX: I will give notice of an Address after lunch.

Mr. SPEAKER: No. You cannot do that. Now is the time for the giving of Notices. If, how-

ever, the House gives you leave, you may proceed to give the notice later in the day.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Of the following Address:

*The House of Assembly
To*

His Excellency the Governor

The House of Assembly is of the considered opinion that in spite of the present existence and activities of the B.W.I. Central Labour organization, the immense possibilities which exist for emigration of Barbadian workers to the United States within the next few months, make it absolutely essential that a strong and competent delegation be sent to the United States at once in order to investigate all phases of the situation, with special reference to the best possible terms of engagement.

2. The House is of the further opinion that arrangements should be made for the secondment to Washington of a suitable officer to represent the interests of this colony in particular for a period of not less than 6 months, subject to future developments.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know if the honourable member was in the House when a Message from His Excellency the Governor on the subject of emigration to the U.S.A. was read.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am quite aware of that. As a matter of fact, recruiting is going on in Jamaica and if steps are taken to implement my Address we should send 6,000 instead of 500 workers.

Mr. RAMSAY enters the House and takes his seat.

SELECT COMMITTEE'S REPORT

Mr. BLACKMAN hands in the Report of the Select Committee appointed to draft a reply to His Excellency's Message No. 35 of 1947 relating to an error in Resolution No. 45 of 1947 in connection with the Cotton Spinning Plant.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, a Bill to amend the Food and Drugs (Adulteration) Act, 1933 (1933-2) is read a first time.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS (on behalf of Mr. Adams), seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, a Bill to amend the Income Tax Act, 1921 (1921-6) is read a first time.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS (on behalf of Mr. Adams), seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, a Bill to vest in the Crown the property in petroleum and natural gas within the island and to make provision with respect to the search for and the getting of petroleum and natural gas and for purposes connected therewith is read a first time.

ADDRESS *Re* EMIGRATION TO SURINAM

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph,—To move the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor *re* emigration to Surinam.

Mr. BLACKMAN asks for and is granted leave to take charge of the Address.

Mr. WILKINSON: This is a matter, Mr. Speaker, that must be referred to a Select Committee and I would like to make a motion to that effect.

Mr. SPEAKER: The proper procedure is for the passing of the Address to be moved and seconded

and then the honourable member may make his motion that it be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move the following Address:—

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency the Governor

1. The House of Assembly have the honour to thank Your Excellency for a copy of the Report of the Commission appointed by Your Excellency to investigate the prospect of recruiting Barbadian labour for employment in agricultural work in Surinam, which has been laid on the table of the House.

2. The House respectfully suggest that steps be taken by this Government to implement as soon as possible the recommendations of the Commission in order that some relief in the local employment situation may be gained by emigration to Surinam.

This emigration to Surinam is somewhat different from the ordinary emigration because it has as its aim land settlement. In every scheme of land settlement, it seems to me that the principal things we have to keep in view are wages, health conditions, social services and education. On the question of wages, the wage which has been offered to a labourer in Surinam happens to be only 4/6 a day but in addition to that, there are certain amenities which tend to increase the attractiveness of the offer. For instance, his wife will be assured five days' work every week along with him; he will be given free medical care for himself and family, a quarter of an acre of land on the estate for his own use, regular employment for five days every week, pay for overtime work, facilities for keeping live stock, the use of playing fields free and the use of dance halls. The service of shops in which there is a sufficiency of food, clothes and household supplies, the price of which is controlled by the Government of Surinam, will be available to him and he will also have cheap entertainment in the form of cinema shows, the admission fee to which will be a matter of ten cents. I think that when all these things are added to the wages, it will be found that no agricultural labourer in Barbados will be able to work for anything near that amount of money on purely agricultural work. As regards the health conditions and social services, the Chief Medical Officer who accompanied the Commission to Surinam, is of the opinion that the medical and social services that are offered are as good as could possibly be desired. The health conditions of the country are far superior to the existing conditions in Barbados and I will give honourable members some figures which have been prepared by the Chief Medical Officer. I may mention that the population of Surinam is 180,000 as compared with 192,841 in Barbados but the number of acres of land in Surinam is 29,478,400 as compared with only 106,240 acres in this island. The birth rate in Surinam is 34.2 per 1,000 whereas the birth rate in Barbados is 31.60 per 1,000. The death rate in Surinam is 11.3 per 1,000. In Barbados it is 16.83 per 1,000. The infant mortality rate in Surinam is 61.8 per 1,000 live births, whereas it is 160 per 1,000 in Barbados. The maternal mortality rate in Surinam is 3.6 per 1,000 live births; in Barbados it is 5.92 per 1,000. The still birth rate in Surinam is 3.4 per 1,000 while in Barbados it is 2.17 per 1,000. It will be seen that the health conditions in Surinam are better than in Barbados and there is, therefore, no danger whatever in Barbadians emigrating there. The figures which I

have quoted are obtained from the Health Department in Surinam; they have not been invented by the Chief Medical Officer. Now as regards education, the Commission found that elementary education is compulsory and therefore, of course, free. There are facilities for secondary education which are offered by the Moravian and Roman Catholic Churches, as well as private schools. I do not think I need say much more. The report of the Commission has been published in the Press. The wages are fairly attractive when everything is taken into consideration; the health conditions of the place are excellent, as is reported by the Chief Medical Officer and facilities for education are offered. As a matter of fact it is possible for a man to become a lawyer in Surinam by being articled to a practising lawyer and there is the possibility of his being promoted to the Bench. There is a medical school attached to the General Hospital where a man might graduate as a doctor and be allowed to practise in Surinam as well as in Aruba and Curacao. With those few introductory remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—It is a pleasure to me to second the motion for the passing of this Address. Earlier in the session when I moved an Address requesting the Government to send a Commission to Surinam I did not anticipate that their report would have been before this House so soon and I must compliment the Commission, of which the junior member for St. John was the Chairman, for having given such close attention to and reporting on such an important matter as this so quickly. Mr. Speaker, I believe that anyone who is acquainted with conditions in Barbados must agree that a settlement of this nature would be of great assistance to the economic structure of this colony. We have been hearing for a long time that there is over-population in this island. We have had schemes for temporary emigration, even now emigrants are returning from time to time, but those schemes cannot take the place of a scheme for land settlement. I feel that in view of what this report envisages if this scheme materializes, it will mean a lot to the future of this island economically. The Commission has taken all the factors into consideration, especially the health factor which in years gone by was not always a feature of the reports of Commissions. Close attention to the health conditions in Surinam has been given by no less a person than the Chief Medical Officer of this colony and anyone who knows the Chief Medical Officer cannot but testify that he takes a deep interest in the health of the people generally. When, therefore, we get a report from him stating that Surinam is a place to which our people can safely be sent I feel that that is sufficient to cause this House to accept the Commission's report. There is one regret I have and it is this. There was a Press release a short time ago stating that this scheme would not be put into operation before the end of the crop and I imagine that there are obvious factors, such as the building of houses in Surinam for our workers, which cause that delay. However, I feel it is my duty as a member of this House to compliment the members of the Commission and to express the hope that the Government will give this project as close attention as the Commission gave it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—Let me preface my remarks by saying that I shall always endeavour on the floor of this House or elsewhere, to support any scheme which will tend to relieve the density of population and the economic plight of the people of this country. But, Sir, even as a junior member of this House I cannot sit here and support the pass-

ing of this Address. For me to support this Address I would be admitting a capital dictatorship in this island. What are the facts? A report, as voluminous as this is, dealing with all phases of the question of sending Barbadians to Surinam, is laid on the table of this House and perused, it is true, by honourable members. Then the Leader of the House introduces an Address, on behalf of the members of this House, committing the members of this House to the terms of the report. While I have, Sir, the greatest respect for and sympathy with the members of the Commission, especially on the technical side of it, that went to Surinam there are lots of things in this report which we would do well to thresh out with the members who comprised that Commission. If we pass this Address to-day, Sir, without having it considered by a Select Committee, we shall be establishing a precedent which we will have to follow in future. Mr. Speaker, the honourable mover of the Address made mention of several aspects of this question but, Sir, there is one aspect which he seems, apparently, not to realize and upon which a great deal of stress has been laid by other honourable members of this House. I refer to paragraph 11 of the report which points out that hitherto the labour problem in Surinam has been solved by the introduction of East Indians and Javanese and which goes on to state that the largest factory in Surinam which used to employ 4,000 people is now employing 800. On the face of that, it will be seen that even the East Indians and Javanese do not want to work for 4/6 a day. Are we not entitled, therefore, to have this matter considered by a Select Committee of this House? As the senior member for St. Peter has said, this scheme will not be put into operation until after the crop and I see no harm in referring this Report to a Select Committee. There are phases of this Report which should be discussed in Select Committee. Sir, I am not going to labour the point because I think honourable members will see the reasonableness of and wisdom in taking a step of that sort.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you going to make a motion?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. It may be true that if this was a matter that had to be expedited in a week or two, the sending of the report to a Select Committee would be delaying the putting of the scheme into operation but it has been made clear that it will not be put into operation until after the crop. This Address must be amended because there are lots of things in the report to which reference will have to be made. As I said before, we cannot create a precedent such as this—Government appointing a Commission, Government sending in a report and Government recommending that that report be implemented without allowing any other members of the House to express their views on it. I say that that is capital dictatorship and I cannot subscribe, in a democratic country like this, to such a state of affairs. I am going to move that this report be referred to a Select Committee. I am doing so with the best intention and I hope honourable members will appreciate it. I say for the last time that we cannot allow a condition of affairs of this sort to continue. I imagine hearing the senior member for St. Joseph outside the Government and any Government at all sending down a report of this nature and the Leader of the House introducing and moving the passing of an Address approving of that report without any other honourable members expressing their views on it! We cannot stand for that sort of conduct. I have much pleasure in moving that the report be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. GARNER: Mr. Speaker,—I am going to second that motion. I feel, Sir, that it is time we show our hands plainly. I suppose everyone knows my views on this matter because I have spoken on it before. I hardly think there is one of us around this table who does not really want to see a real emigration scheme for Barbadians but I am very doubtful about this one. What I dislike about it, most of all, is the wages to be paid these workers. The honourable member who has just spoken has rightly referred to the number of East Indians and Javanese who were once employed at the largest factory in Surinam and that, in itself, does not look quite right. I would like to know if the members of the Commission that went to Surinam made any bargaining with the authorities there to increase the proposed wages because, after all, it does seem paradoxical. Agricultural workers in Barbados live very near their relatives and the lowest wage which they receive here is 5/- per day and now you are asking them to pack their grips and go to Surinam to work for 4/6 a day. It is somewhat paradoxical to me. I do not like to kill the idea but from what I have been reading about the Dutch people it looks to me as if they are looking for slaves; they are on the march for slaves again. Just recently we have had a bitter pill in respect of the Dutch in Indonesia and I am afraid that this is a repetition of the same thing. It seems to me that the Dutch have this sort of thing in their blood. As I said, I do not intend to kill this scheme. I would like to see emigration to any place, though this is not an emigration scheme; this is a colonisation scheme. It pains me to hear one honourable member say that this emigration to Surinam will help Barbados in that the workers will be sending back money. Sir, I doubt that very much; it will not help Barbados one bit; not one cent will be coming back to Barbados out of 4/6 a day. 4/6 is no money and the cost of living is the same! Sir, I do not wish to kill this project because I would like to see a colonisation scheme established. As a matter of fact I have something on the Order Paper along that line but I have my doubts about this. From what I have read about the Dutch and their recent acts in Indonesia I would counsel this House to beware of the Greeks that bring gifts. I repeat that I have been reading not long ago what the Dutch have been doing in Indonesia and it stinks from earth to heaven. These Dutch people think that there is a ready market here for slaves to go to Surinam to work in their rice fields and I will not be any party to that; whoever wants to support it can do so. These Dutch people can no longer get cheap labour from the East and now they turn to this little Bajan colony to see if they can get it. I will be no party to that. They cannot get coolies; they cannot get Javanese and now they turn to little Barbados. I would particularly like this Report to be referred to a Select Committee, so that we will be able to ask members of the Commission questions, especially the person who drew up the report. There are many things in this report, as the senior member for the City has said, which should be discussed and I can punch a lot of holes in it; it is full of misgivings and unless it is referred to a Select Committee so that we can deal with it as it should be dealt with, we shall be misinforming the labourers of this colony and sending them to face a future which perhaps we ourselves might come to regret. I therefore, have much pleasure in seconding the motion that the report be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. GALE: It is usual when a Message is sent down by the Governor for a Select Committee to be appointed to draft a reply to that Message. That

has been the procedure in this House for very many years. I am not going into the merits or demerits of this report to-day. Previous speakers have indulged in criticizing certain parts of it but I think that, on the whole, it is an excellent report. I think that it would be unfair at this time for us to condemn or say things about this report that are not complimentary. The report, I think, has gone very fully into the matter. There are several kinds of emigration. In recent years we have been sending casual emigrants to the U.S.A. for a few months to come back here; that is a different scheme from this. This is a scheme by which people will be asked to go and settle, to take up land and become citizens of Surinam,—a different kind of emigration altogether. If this scheme is carried out, it will be of more lasting benefit to this country than the transient emigration of people to the U.S.A. But, Sir, I agree with the mover of the motion that the Report be sent to a Select Committee because we will be able to thresh the matter out very much better than we can in the House. Further, that has been the procedure in this House from time immemorial in respect of Messages which are sent to the House by the Governor.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I would like to save time by saying that I am quite willing that the report be referred to a Select Committee. But as far as paragraph 11 is concerned, I should like to inform the honourable member who referred to the Marienburg factory which is said to be the largest in Surinam that it is not a rice nor a banana factory; it is an up-to-date sugar factory that makes white crystals. I saw it myself. The number of people whom it employs is 800 whereas it used to be 4,000 and that should be an indication to members who question the wages that are going to be paid. The decrease in the number of employees should satisfy members as to the reason why the factory is not able to pay higher wages because it can only get through as much work on its plantation of 6,000 acres as 800 people can do. They cannot pay as much wages as they would be able to pay if they were employing 4,000 labourers. I may also say that the Commission was told that if the Javanese were employed for five days a week at 1/- per day, that is, 5/- a week, they would work the whole week but that if their wages were raised to 2/- a day they would work only 2½ days and that is the reason why the Surinam employers want to employ people who would work continually throughout a whole week. Another point is this. At the termination of the contract, a single man will be given 2½ acres of land and a married man will be given 3 acres of land free of rent for six years. I am sorry that I forgot to mention that point when I was mentioning the different things that would be added to the small wage but I think that that is a very important phase and when it is considered that one acre of land produces 4,500 lbs of rice and that in Barbados we consume 1,768 bags a week, you will realize that these labourers will be able to grow as much rice as will feed the whole of the Barbados public for a year. I have seen a field of 3,500 acres with rice growing on it. I consent to the report being referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I must confess that I was considerably amused at the remarks of the last speaker, seeing that he was Chairman of the delegation which went to Surinam. The senior member for the City referred to the difference in the number employed at the Marienburg factory to-day as compared with the number that was employed before and the junior member for St. John, in explaining the matter

said, as far as I understand him, that they could not employ 800 at the same wages they previously employed 4,000.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member opposing the motion that the report be referred to a Select Committee?

Mr. CRAWFORD: No, Sir, but I want to give my reasons for the stand I am going to take. My interpretation of the reduction in the number of workers which the Marienburg factory previously employed and the number they employ to-day is that it goes to show the inviolability of labour to-day in the question of wages. Years ago the labour supply was more easily available and they employed 4,000; to-day it is not available and they employ only 800 and that is the explanation I expected the Chairman of the delegation to have given to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Possibly he would have given it to a Select Committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD: All right, Sir, I am not finished. He also gave us the impression, in his remarks, that the present labour forces in Surinam comprise, to a great extent, of Javanese and that if their present wages were increased they are going to do less work; that if they are paid now 1/- per day for 5 days a week and that wage is doubled, they will work only 2½ days. It is a peculiar argument coming as it does from the junior member for St. John. That is the same allegation that is being made or has been made about the workers throughout the West Indies, not only in the Dutch West Indies. Right here in Barbados you hear the allegation, completely unjustified, that if you increase the wages of agricultural workers they will work less because they get the same amount of money for a shorter working period. The whole truth of the matter is that the Javanese are no longer available for work in Dutch Guiana. With the movement for independence in the East, the Dutch are no longer able to use the Dutch East Indies as a source of supply of cheap labour; therefore, they are turning their eyes to these colonies to see if they can tap our human resources and use them as a source of the cheap labour market they want. But there is, Sir, another aspect of the matter which really intrigues me. Mention has already been made by the senior member for the City that in his opinion it is a rather peculiar procedure for the senior member for St. Joseph to draft a reply to a Message sent down to this House by the Governor and the honourable member says that he is not prepared to accept dictatorship. What is really worrying me, Sir, is this. Is it correct for the Address relating to the report to be on the Order Paper under Government Business? After all, the Government sent down the Report to this House—

Mr. SPEAKER: What I really want to ask the honourable member is this. Are you going to oppose the appointment of a Select Committee to consider the report?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am trying to resolve in my own mind what I should do.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thought you were trying to persuade other honourable members, not yourself (Laughter).

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am doing both at the same time. This report was sent to the House by the Governor, and we have the leading member of the Government drafting a reply for the House of Assembly to be sent back to the Governor. After all, I do not think that this is the Reichstag yet and I am in agreement with the senior member for the City that we should have an opportunity to express our view on this important question. As a matter of fact, Sir I was amazed on reading a notice in the Press a few weeks ago to the effect that emigration to Surinam would start sometime in June next year. My inform-

ation before I came back to Barbados in October was that the Dutch Government was not in the least interested in securing Barbadian workers for work in Surinam, and since I have returned here, that information has been confirmed by further information from the most authoritative sources. The desire of the Dutch Commission to obtain Barbadian workers was, so to speak, spiked by certain representations which were made to the Commission when it came here. With that I intend to deal at a later day more fully. The Commission that went to Surinam has painted a very rosy picture of conditions there but the Dutch Commission which came here admitted that in their opinion conditions in Barbados were far more rosy, far more healthy than conditions in Surinam. As a matter of fact a small paragraph from the Report of the Dutch Commission to the Dutch Government will illustrate what I am saying. It states:—"Further, it must be noted that the Barbadian may not be an easy going type of individual. Deeply attached to his country with city life easily at hand and accustomed to beautiful roads, absence of mud, and non-existence of malaria he may think emigration not worth while. When the Barbadians who resolve to emigrate remember the easy life they had at home, they may grow dissatisfied with what Surinam has to offer and, as stated above, there is a chance that their leaders will support them in this view." "It is, therefore," says the Dutch Commission, "a possibility that emigration of Barbadians.....may introduce discontent into Surinam." That is only one paragraph but when I went through that report some weeks ago there were not less than 10 or 12 paragraphs which were exceedingly damaging to Barbadian workers. I know that early in October, it was admitted in many influential quarters in British Guiana and Trinidad that Barbados was the last place from which the Dutch were willing to immigrate workers into Surinam. They are more keen on St. Lucians or even Porto Ricans if they were available. We shall be used as a last resort. If the labour they want is not available elsewhere, well then they may be willing to experiment with Barbadians on a very small scale to begin with. Later, Sir, when things have reached a more advanced stage in connection with this matter I propose to utilize the information which I have and which has induced such conclusions in the minds of the Commission which visited Surinam earlier this year.

Mr. ADAMS: Before the question is put I want merely to state very briefly the cause of the Government asking that this be made a matter of urgency. I do not desire, despite the temptation, to enter into any controversy as a result of the arrant nonsense which has been spoken by the two honourable members for St. Philip but if we are honest and keen about emigration we should explore every outlet, to use the words of the senior member for St. Philip who has on the Order Paper an Address dealing with emigration.

Mr. GARNER: On a point of order. Before the honourable member came into the House I said that nobody likes emigration more than I do.

Mr. ADAMS: To talk about the Dutch and their treatment of the people in Indonesia is arrant nonsense. All the imperial nations have big, bad blots in their history and to use that as an argument against our entering into negotiations with the Surinam Government is a waste of time.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not going to allow myself to be misquoted.

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable members could talk about British imperialism in the same way if they like but to say that because the Dutch did not treat the Indonesians properly we should not enter into negotiations with the Surinam Government is just sheer nonsense. Whichever Party in this House

introduces a measure affecting emigration the rest of us support it; it is not a Party question at all; such argument is indulged in just for the sake of argument and to waste time. To make these false allegations from time to time is merely an attempt to throw bricks at the Government. Even the honourable member who has just sat down referred to what is common property when the late senior member for St. George is supposed to have thrown a spanner in the works by asking about trade unionism. That alone shows that we of the Barbados Labour Party are perfectly determined to get emigration but that Barbadians who go abroad are not engaged in foreign places without the right to trade unionism just as they have the right to use it in British colonies. Let us forget what Party we belong to in this matter of emigration. The Government is anxious to enter into negotiations with the Surinam Government and that is why the matter has been placed on the Order Paper in the position which it occupies. Your Honour was tolerant with the senior member for St. Philip who questioned whether it was in order to place this question in the position which it occupies on the Order Paper. Well, the Governor—not the Governor-in-Executive Committee nor the Government—the Governor appointed the Commission which went to Surinam; that Commission has reported to him and he has sent copies of that report to this House. He need not have done so but it was the obviously sensible thing to do. That report has been laid on the table of the House. It is not a Message. The Government is perfectly entitled to say "We feel that this is a matter which should be immediately explored." For Heaven sake, let us get on with the work. If we say that we are in favour of emigration there is no reason why this matter should be postponed for any great time. I do hope that the honourable members, whose names I have suggested to Your Honour to be members of the Select Committee will meet soon because it is very essential that the Government should continue negotiations with the Surinam Government. Do not bring in anything about Barbadians going to Surinam and making a row. A Barbadian will make a row in Heaven if he has cause to do so; that is his disposition. The honourable junior member for St. John who knows the conditions well has said that it is not a bad idea to refer the matter to a Select Committee and I am appealing to the honourable members of the Committee to attend the first meeting summoned by the Clerk and submit their report because it is essential that these negotiations should be finished as soon as possible. To show how some people run true to form I do not think I should sit down without adding this. It seems rather remarkable. There are "congressiveticians" who are attacking us for wanting to send emigrants into Dutch territory while their Leader, as I suppose he is styled, has on the Order Paper an Address asking that Barbadians be sent to Aruba and Curacao which are also Dutch territories.

Mr. WARD: What makes me feel that this Report should be sent to a Select Committee is this. If honourable members will refer to paragraph 32 of the report, they will see stated there that the Director of Social Affairs and Emigration assured the Commission that he has never had before him a dispute between management and labour as to what constitutes a fair task of work on plantations. That, to my mind, is amazing and I feel that all these things should be gone into before we send our people from here to Surinam. The conditions there may be so compulsory that it may be impossible for a labourer to go to a manager about his wages. Another thing is this. The junior member for St. John who was Chairman of the Commission said that the wages

which are offered are reasonable. I do not think that they are. If you tell a good worker that a wage of \$1.08 per week is reasonable to-day I should not like to say what he would tell you in return. I feel we should have more information before we decide to send these people to Surinam to live there at the whims and fancies of the Dutch people and possibly be taken advantage of. I feel that this House which is supposed to represent the people of this island should know more of the affairs of the people whom we are going to send and when we send them we should feel satisfied that we have done and are doing good for them, not to send them there and after three months we understand that they are not doing well, that they are suffering from disease and want to return home. I think that before we pass this Address to the Governor we should refer the report to a Select Committee, so that we shall be able to know more about the conditions in Surinam than we know to-day.

Mr. RAMSAY: I have to compliment the honourable member with whom the idea of sending this report to a Select Committee originated; no intelligent member of this House can be against it and the bandying of words will not get us anywhere. This is supposed to be a democratic House and those of us who have taken the trouble to study democracy know that in many instances there is a great deal of talk and very little action. I want to say this to the junior member for St. Philip. There is a crisis in this country and we do not want to work for 4/6 a day but by March next year we may have to work for 2/6 a day! (Mr. Garner: I hope not.) I hope not myself. I have seen people in the Republic of Cuba work for food after refusing to work for \$5 a day. Do not bring politics into this question of emigrating people to Surinam at all. The junior member for St. John spoke on practical economic lines. Those of us who have to be engaged in business, especially machinery, realize that it may be a failure to work 400 men on a large plantation—it may not pay the manager or the labourers—but if 8,000 were employed, naturally the turn-over would be greater and the business would flourish; that is economics and commonsense. It is thought that the raising of the agricultural workers' pay in this island to 5/- per day each is going to run the small man out of business first and the big man later on. In the course of a recent conversation with a big man he told me "you will go out of business first if you have only 10 acres but I have 1,000 acres it will take a longer time to put me out of business and even then I will still have a few dollars when I get out." When some people talk about workers not working as long as they should if their wages are increased I should like to say this. All over the tropics it is known that labourers would only work for a certain time; that is inevitable; they cannot stand up to the burning sun for an indefinite period. It is done in Barbados too. Give men \$5 a day each and they will work for a week; give them \$40 a day and they will work for only a half-day. Ask the managers of plantations and they will tell you that that is so. Do not let us bring politics into this matter. The reason why the Dutch people would prefer St. Lucian labourers is because the St. Lucians are more accustomed to swampy areas and forests. Barbadians do not like to work in swamps and forests but the labourers from places like British Guiana and St. Lucia do not mind it because they are accustomed to that kind of work. I went to Cuba and started to cry in the second week while I was there. I am voting in favour of this report being sent to a Select Committee because if

anything goes wrong it cannot be said that any particular Party sent the people to Surinam but that they were sent by the House of Assembly. I hope the junior member for St. John will not offer any objection to the report being sent to a Select Committee; in fact, he has sufficient sense not to do a thing of that sort. I cannot serve on the Committee (Laughter). I have "he—two sticks" to carry on my business. (Renewed Laughter).

The question that the Commission's Report be referred to a Select Committee is put and resolved in the affirmative without a division.

Mr. SPEAKER: Subject to the approval of the House I appoint the members of that Committee as follows:—The junior member for St. John (Mr. Blackman), the senior member for the City (Mr. Mottley), the senior member for St. Michael (Mr. Cox), the senior member for Christ Church (Mr. Talma), the junior member for St. George (Mr. Symmonds), the junior member for St. Lucy (Mr. Brancker), the senior member for St. Lucy (Mr. Ward), the senior member for St. Peter (Mr. F. L. Walcott), and the senior member for St. Philip (Mr. Crawford).

Mr. CRAWFORD: My name was not on the original list.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the authority to add your name to the list.

PROPOSED EMIGRATION OF WORKERS TO THE U.S.A.

Mr. ADAMS: Before Your Honour calls the next Order I am asking the leave of the House to deal with the Message from His Excellency the Governor relating to the sending of 500 workers from this island to the U.S.A. in the not too distant future.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that an Address be passed acknowledging the receipt of His Excellency's Message and expressing our agreement with the proposal contained in the Message. I shall read again the Message which is as follows:—

His Excellency The Governor

To

The Honourable The House of Assembly

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that there is a possibility that the United States Sugar Corporation may be prepared to recruit not less than 500 Barbadians in the near future if this Government will bear the cost of transportation to the United States, estimated at between £13 and £16 per head, and the cost of recruitment.

2. His Excellency would be glad to learn as soon as possible whether the Honourable House of Assembly is in agreement that this Government should bear these expenses.

HILARY BLOOD,
Governor

Government House,
Bridgetown,

8th December, 1947.

The Government—I think I am at liberty to make this disclosure—has had this question of the recruiting of workers by private employers, after the U.S. Government's employment came to an end, in mind for months. When the present Governor

and Mr. Perrin went to the United States of America in connection with the last lot of emigrants Mr. Perrin was especially instructed to remain behind and enter into negotiations having as their object the making of contracts with individual employers both for those emigrants who may be in the U.S.A. working with the U.S. Government—I think they were about 350—and also for workers who might be sent there in the future. Mr. Perrin, as the House may remember, negotiated with several employers. He also passed through Florida in order to enquire—this is by the way—into conditions for workers in Florida because reports had been made of racial discrimination and things of that sort. However, since that time the Government has, for months, been in constant communication both with liaison officers there and, as far as possible through them, with Washington and with private employers direct. A week or so ago the Governor received an urgent cable on this matter and the Government promptly sent a cable—I think the cable from the U.S.A. came on a Friday; the Executive Committee met on the next day—Saturday—not, it is true, primarily to deal with that but as a result of its deliberations and decision a cable was sent back endeavouring to get the position clarified and asking clearly what were the terms and conditions under which they would accept our workers. This will mean a cost of 500 workers multiplied by £16 each, plus the cost of recruitment and the cost of transportation. This Island will pay the cost of transportation one way and the American employers will pay it the other way. It is the feeling of the Executive Committee that if we were at least getting back no money, either by way of compulsory or voluntary savings, we would be doing even better than that; we would be having the goodwill of persons who feel that they are being given the opportunity to go and work abroad and that is better than mere £s.d. In consequence, the Governor's advisers have advised that he should send down a Message of this sort; hence it has come to us. We tried to get them to cut out the cost of transportation and the farthest they would go is to say that they will pay transportation one way. Owing to the International Convention the Secretary of State has forbidden us from accepting money from emigrants. I feel pretty sure that so many Barbadians are so anxious to go the U.S.A. that they would pay the passage themselves or even do more but, as I say, owing to the International Convention in which it is laid down that no emigrant should be asked to pay any of his transportation expenses, the Secretary of State will not allow us to take any money from them. Despite what we feel about the cost, owing to the shortage of the crop next year we should send these 500 out. The Government is not prepared to tell the House that it is going to use this as a precedent for all time. If there is going to be any bigger emigration we shall consider the point whether we can agree to pay even half of the cost of transportation. It is conceivable that the American authorities by making this offer may have been bluffing but we have done our utmost to get them pay the cost of transportation both ways and as far as I can see, we are not likely to succeed. The most I can say is that the Government asks the Legislature, in these special circumstances, to agree to this proposal but the Government is not telling the Legislature that any time the Americans put forward the suggestion that we have to pay half the cost of transportation, we are going to accept it if we do not see that the result makes it worth while. I hope that this would not lead to any controversy but I must say that when I heard to senior member for St.

Philip give notice of the Address of which he has given notice I could not help congratulating him on seeing through closed doors. The honourable member should know a great deal about this. He was a member of the Executive Committee until August this year; he knew that the Government was constantly engaged, until August or September when the House was prorogued, in negotiations with American employers to get Barbadian workers there. Again, I do not say this to provoke any unseemly controversy but if there is any suggestion in the honourable member's Address that the Government is not doing its utmost, it is on par with his Address on this same question of emigration to the U.S.A. The honourable member knows or ought to have known that we were in constant communication, both by cable and letter, with the American Authorities on this question. The Governor's Message is not an answer to the Address tabled by the senior member for St. Philip. The honourable member's Address coincides with the Governor's Message and again I congratulate him on seeing through closed doors when the Executive Committee was considering this very question. I am going to say quite bluntly and plainly that I do not see how the honourable member could have got his information except through closed doors. That statement is not intended for the senior member for St. Philip because if anybody goes and tells him something, he will be silly not to listen to it. What I have said does not refer to him at all on that point. I am suggesting that this is a lot of money to send our workers abroad but when it is remembered that they send back sums of money to their dependents and also save sums of money for themselves, these safeguards should recommend themselves to members of the Legislature to spend this money because it is coming back eventually in the form of American dollars to this island. I, therefore, beg to move that the following Address do now pass:—

His Excellency the Governor

To

The House of Assembly

The House of Assembly beg to acknowledge the receipt of Your Excellency's Message No. 37 of 1947 and in reply thereto beg to inform Your Excellency that they are in agreement with this Government bearing the proposed expenses of recruiting the 500 Barbadian labourers mentioned in the said Message.

Before I sit down I think I should remind honourable members of the 350 emigrants who are in the U.S.A. and who may be repatriated at any moment unless we try to get some of these private employers to keep them there.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir,—

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you going to second the motion for the passing of the Address?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I propose to do so and I want to inform the last speaker, merely in passing, that the only occasion on which the Executive Committee discussed the possibility of recruiting directly with American employers during the time that I remained on this year was early in the year when Mr. Perrin came back from Florida with a report on his discussions with certain private employers in the States. And naturally I paid particular attention to the report because I think I am at liberty to disclose that much of the information contained therein I had asked for. But for all the months after that—I think Mr. Perrin came back either in March or April—until August when the Legislature was prorogued I took part in no discussion. As

far as I know, there were no cables nor did any correspondence take place, during the period after Mr. Perrin submitted his report in August, between the Government and private employers in the U.S.A. in regard to this question. Mr. Perrin's report was submitted either in March or April and that was the last time, I repeat, on which this matter was discussed in Executive Committee while I sat on it as a member. Now, the position is—I think it is public knowledge; everybody who reads the newspapers know it—that early this year the United States Congress refused to pass the Appropriation Bill for the amount which was asked for by the United States Employment Service to bring in foreign workers to augment the labour forces in the U.S.A. The appropriation was drastically reduced with the result that for the future employers who needed foreign labour would have to enter into negotiations themselves direct, in order to pay the cost of transportation to and from the place of origin.

Mr. SPEAKER: Again I do not want to interrupt the honourable member but he is seconding the motion that the House agrees to pay the cost of transportation.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am merely trying to say, in passing, that the knowledge which I used on the floor of the House last Tuesday is knowledge which any well-informed person in this community should have.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Apparently the mover of the Address thought so.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes; he did say something about it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I believe that in fairness to myself some reply is essential.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, do not make it too long.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do not propose to do that. With regard to the sneering reference about seeing through closed doors, the information contained in my Address is available to any well-informed member of this community and with regard to the special knowledge which has now become fairly generally known in consequence of very recent developments in the labour situation in the U.S.A., there are other members sitting around this table who beside myself within the last ten days have received direct communication from the U.S.A. emphasizing the gravity of the situation and claiming that West Indian workers will be needed immediately. As a matter of fact, only last Thursday at a meeting of the Dollar Crisis Committee which I attended, one of the members of that Committee informed the meeting that only a few days before, he had received information from a relative in a Southern State emphasizing the gravity of the situation and claiming that West Indian workers are needed in order to assist in improving the situation. Now, Sir, I want to inform the senior member for St. Joseph of two things. When it comes to this particular question, my contacts in the U.S.A. and my source of information are just as good and as authoritative as the Government's and sometimes I get information ahead of them (Hear, hear and Laughter); for yesterday when I told a government official that the U.S. Sugar Corporation had already sent their representatives to Jamaica he did not even know that, and it is more than likely that recruitment for Florida began yesterday in Jamaica. Secondly, I want to say this. It is purely a stroke of luck that the Government has obtained this small quota for Florida. But it is absolutely necessary that

we take immediate steps to strengthen our representation in Washington and that is the view of both British and American officers in Washington at the moment. It is absolutely imperative that Barbados strengthens its representation in Washington if its interests are to be protected with regard to this question. This is not to cast any aspersion on Mr. Macdonald or any of his Staff who are engaged at the Central Labour Organization. As a matter of fact, on the last occasion on which I corresponded with Mr. Macdonald on a very important matter I found him very co-operative but the position really is that the situation in which he finds himself is that of a Jamaican and in view of the fact that on more than one occasion the Jamaican Government has hauled him over the coals for what is interpreted to be a less partial representation of Jamaican interests than it is, he in consequence almost has to go out of his way to pay more attention to the interests of Jamaicans than those of other West Indians whose interests he is also supposed to protect.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member likely to finish in a five minutes' time?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Oh, yes, Sir; in less than that. Even now, the Jamaican workers who are in the U.S.A. work for infinitely better wages than the Barbadians because they are given the plums. They get the best jobs available and our people get the remainder and, therefore, I repeat that it is now the considered opinion of both British and American officials that if Barbados is to receive a proper share of any labour that is available, then the Barbados Government must take immediate steps to see that it has in Washington on the staff of the Corporation a competent official to protect particularly the interests of Barbadian workers. Within the next few months it is highly probable that the number of West Indian workers who will be needed in the U.S.A. may be increased to 5,000 and if we are to derive any benefit from that, it is imperative that a Commission be sent to investigate all phases of the situation and that a suitable official be appointed in Washington to protect the interests of our workers.

At this stage, 2 p.m., Mr. SPEAKER adjourns 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. 14 standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to lay the replies to questions Nos. 16 and 32 both standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to lay the replies to questions No. 10 also standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (A).

Mr. ADAMS: In view of the fact that there are one or two urgent matters under Government Business, namely, the Resolution dealing with the appointment of the Resident Surgical Specialist for the General Hospital, the Address with which we were dealing before lunch and the Report of the Committee relative to the Cotton Spinning Plant which I have been asked to get through today, I am asking leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (a) in order to continue Government Business.

Mr. BRANCKER: I will not object to leave being granted the honourable member as long as he

assures us that he will proceed only with those matters which are urgent.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Rule 61 (a) be now suspended.

Mr. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to.

ADDRESS RE SENDING BARBADIAN LABOURERS TO U.S.A.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the adjournment for lunch took place, the House were debating the Reply to His Excellency the Governor's Message which was sent down this morning.

Mr. RAMSAY: During the course of his remarks the honourable senior member for St. Joseph said that there was a rule that no money should be taken from emigrants. I am not sitting as a member of the Committee and I want to say this: I want it made a condition of the Contract that a reasonable percentage of the earnings of the emigrants be withheld and sent back to Barbados to be banked here. Since the Government is footing the entire bill, the Government ought to make sure that when the emigrants return here they will not be any charge on the very people who assisted them in working for the money which may be squandered. I have been to America and I have seen how money has been spent. I am not saying whether it should be 10% or 5% but a reasonable amount of the earnings of the emigrants should be sent back here so that when they return they will not have to go into the Almshouses.

Mr. WILKINSON: I do not think that anybody would want to oppose this Address although some of us like myself think that perhaps this is a dangerous procedure. We are spending this money so as to get these people to America where we hope that they are going to earn good money. This is an instance which points out the importance of Barbados having representation in Washington. I think that the honourable senior member for St. Philip mentioned it. I understand, not from a member of this House, that the same condition has been asked of other colonies and it has been refused; yet Washington is still recruiting emigrants in these colonies in spite of their refusal to pay the passages one way. I feel that if we had representation in Washington we would be in a much better position. I would like to point out to honourable members that it is dangerous to select 500 people and subsidise them—that is what it amounts to—out of 192,000 people. I am of the opinion that and many honourable members including the honourable senior member for St. Joseph are of the same opinion, these 500 people would be quite willing to pay their way. They would be proud to do so. Under the terms of the proposed Contract we are called upon to assist these 500 people to get good jobs and it is very hard on those who do not get selected. I may say that I have friends in the Southern States: it so happens that I have two sons-in-law in America and they have told me that the prospects there are good for getting people from the West Indies in the canning industry. There again I think that if we had proper representation in Washington and they required labour and applied to our representative he would be able to put them in the right channel and it would probably not be necessary for the Government to ask for money to get these people up to America. I do not think that anyone has the slightest intention of opposing this Address. I understand that it is a matter of urgency and that people are required early next month to help in the

reaping of the sugar crop in Florida. I repeat: this is a very dangerous precedent and I suggest that we take steps to have in Washington our representative to whom we can refer in international matters.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I do not know that I can follow the same line as the honourable junior member for St. James in saying that this is a dangerous precedent. If I view this matter from an economic point of view it is clear to my mind that although we would like to have the American Authorities pay all the necessary expenses in the recruiting and transportation of the emigrants we must look at the returns. That is to say, this is one of those instances where, in a crisis, we can get dollars in a sterling area; and from the fact that you are able to send these workers to America now, even although the cost is high, it means that dollars which are much needed will be coming in. I would like to point out to the honourable junior member for St. James that this cannot be a dangerous precedent because many other countries that have had schemes of emigration were more fortunate than Barbados because they had shipping facilities at their disposal; but the cost of transportation had to be borne by the country which the emigrants were leaving. Therefore you have to bear in mind that at this late hour Barbados has been called upon to pay this transportation bill; and I think that when you take everything into consideration you will find that we stand to gain more than we lose. It is the duty of any Government to try and get employment for its people and I do not feel that this is any dangerous precedent. This is a precedent which is worth while in relation to any country in a crisis such as this. With regard to the remarks of the honourable junior member for St. Peter as to the amount of money to be retained on behalf of the workers, I do not know what instructions have been given to the local Government in the matter of international agreements but from what I have read of two international Labour Conferences in Philadelphia and Paris on the question of emigration, it was stated that when emigrants are leaving one country for another the wages earned should benefit the country which they are leaving; therefore a percentage of the money should be sent to the country which emigrants are leaving. I do not know if the Agreements have been ratified by this Government, but I feel sure that they were ratified by Great Britain because these were Conferences of employers' and workers' representatives and there were two representatives from the various Governments; Barbados would be represented in the fact that the metropolitan Government of Great Britain would represent the Colonies. Barbados would be well advised that in adopting a measure such as this we will not be doing anything difficult; it is in the interest of people to help others. Many an occasion has passed where no compliment has been paid to the Government for their expedition and I heartily compliment them for acting in a manner such as this. To my mind, they have acted in a businesslike manner in order to get this emigration scheme through. If we were to block this scheme because of the fee many people would say that we could have paid the fee and let the people go. I am sure that the prospects of more people going out of the colony are worth while considering. One other point: as regards our representation in Washington, I would like this colony to have strong representation anywhere, even in Moscow; but I would like to know the facts as to this strong representation and not mere generalities. It is very easy to say in this House that we

should have strong representation in America but it is something else to go to America and talk about having strong representation there. I do not know how big Barbados looks to the Americans but I feel that this representation would have to be a West Indian representation rather than a Barbadian representation; because while we respect a big person in Barbados, in the United States of America he is just another man and there is not the same idea that he is a big bug there as he is a big bug walking down Broad Street. Therefore we have to think of having a strong West Indian representation in America.

Mr. WARD: It is a fact that the whole House is in favour of getting some people from this colony in the United States of America, but to say that this is not a dangerous precedent is to make a very reckless statement. I feel that the American people may say this: "Barbados is willing to pay so as to emigrate some of their people to America and they have made an agreement to send them; so in future they must pay to send these emigrants or we will not have them." Suppose the Americans had said that they wanted 5,000 people; would this Government spend £75,000 to send people to America to work for themselves when those who remain would have to contribute to this expenditure and these 5,000 people will reap the benefit of it? This is another way of subsidizing people where their passages are concerned. Jamaica has refused to pay any money towards the cost of the transportation of their emigrants; the American people would like their sugar crops reaped and it is their duty to pay the cost of the transportation of our emigrants. We are only in this position today because we cannot find employment for the many people that we have in this colony; but I feel that this Government must be very cautious and I say that we must absolutely refuse on any future occasion if the American Government say that we must pay for the transportation of our emigrants. The honourable junior member for St. James is not wrong when he says that this is a dangerous precedent. Any intelligent man would see that it is a dangerous precedent because we are simply bowing to the American people.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am afraid that although the honourable junior member for St. James is economically sound I cannot agree with him. It is true as the honourable member has said that this may be creating a precedent; but if I accept what the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said as to the activities of the Government in this matter, it would appear to me that this is a matter of Hobson's choice. I am 100% in favour of having more representation in Washington. Like the honourable senior member for St. Peter—

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable members have made mention of representation in Washington but I do not think that has anything to do with the matter before the House. I do not see any object in pressing that all the time.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I hope that I am not wasting any time. It has nothing to do with this Reply except that an argument has been used by the honourable junior member for St. James and replied to by the honourable senior member for St. Peter and that leaves one to reply on either side. If Your Honour rules—

Mr. SPEAKER: I think you should leave that out.

Mr. MOTTLEY: While the honourable junior member for St. James would appear to be economically sound, and I doubt whether any honourable member would challenge him on the economic side of the

question, if you accept the statement by the Government to-day that they have made representations and they have actually failed in getting the American people to accept our people unless under the conditions that we pay their passages either one way or the other, we cannot do otherwise. Whatever you prove to me to be economical, I would have to see the position otherwise because it would be a question of sending 2,000, 3,000 or 5,000 people out of the island. However unsound it might appear to spend £75,000 in order to get 5,000 people out of the island, on account of the mentality of the Barbadian and his eagerness to send back money to this island, I would have to agree, if every possible avenue had been explored and we could not get any agreement reached whereby our people would have to pay, that we would have to pay the passages of the emigrants not merely one way but both ways. I may be wrong, but I will stand alone on that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable junior member for St. James did not suggest anything about the cost of sending 5,000 people; the matter before us is that of sending 500.

Mr. MOTTLEY: We have had before us a Message from the Governor and we are now dealing with the Reply. Surely if the Government conducts the negotiations the Reply will be some guide for the Government. If to-day we, by our comments, create the impression that we are not prepared in the future to bind ourselves or agree with any decision of the Government to pay for the transportation of emigrants to the United States of America, then it would automatically follow that the Government would realise that they could not get a majority, so to speak, to vote the money and the negotiations would break down. Emigration is not a Party issue: it should not be any Party issue. I say that if we have to pay money for people to emigrate to the United States of America, any Government could depend upon my vote for providing the necessary funds.

Mr. SPEAKER: Whatever the expression of opinion of the House is to-day it would not have any effect on its action on some future occasion; and it is hardly worth while discussing something that has not yet come.

Mr. MOTTLEY: With all due respect to Your Honour's ruling I feel that the expression of opinion of honourable members will be that these negotiations should continue, and we all hope they will continue so that more people will be able to emigrate to the United States of America. If the Government feel that they cannot successfully get through the measures for providing the funds necessary for emigration, that might cause a breakdown in the negotiations. Although the honourable junior member for St. James has pointed out the economic side of the matter—and that is an important side—yet there must be those of us who are bound to look at the matter from the other angle. Although Your Honour has ruled that the question of representation in Washington is not before the House, in any event the Government should know that we appreciate the argument of the honourable junior member for St. James and the activities of the honourable senior member for St. Philip, and it is true to say that the majority of honourable members appreciate that representation in Washington or in any part of the United States of America would be of assistance in getting people to that country.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. Joseph made the motion for the passing of the Address and I take it that he will present the Address.

Mr. ADAMS: This is an Address to the Governor therefore there is nothing anomalous if I present it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the honourable member to present this Address.

Mr. ADAMS: As Your Honour pleases.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

RESIDENT SURGICAL SPECIALIST FOR GENERAL HOSPITAL

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman,—I ask leave to proceed firstly with Resolution No. 8 on the Order Paper.

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

Dr. CUMMINS: This Resolution is one to place the sum of £431 at the disposal of the Hospital Board to enable the Board to engage the services of a whole-time Resident Surgical Specialist at the rate of £1,000 a year, to pay him a cost of living allowance at the current rates, and to provide him with a house allowance at the rate of £150 a year.

The facts are that the three Senior Visiting Surgeons at the General Hospital will soon be leaving the Institution and that leaves us with no senior member of the Staff who can be carefully entrusted to carry on the work of these gentlemen with the possible exception of one. Consequently, the Government thought that it would take the opportunity to secure the services of a well-qualified surgeon at the Hospital and so, to a certain extent, give the people of this colony the opportunity of getting done this surgery which heretofore could not be done in this island. The gentleman whom we have in mind is a Barbadian who is abroad and he has signified his willingness to come to the Hospital. He is well qualified, holds the highest qualification possible for surgery in the British Empire and is attached to the Hospital of a colony which is not far from us. I think it is an open secret that the gentleman whom we have in mind is Dr. Leacock. As I have already said, he holds the highest qualification that can be obtained in surgery in the British Empire. We know that from time to time the people of Barbados have had to seek surgical aid in other places; some of them have gone to Trinidad while others have gone as far as America. With the appointment of this Specialist people who are unable to go abroad for surgical aid of a major sort will have the opportunity of getting it in this colony. As will be seen from the Resolution, it is proposed to pay this gentleman a salary at the rate of £1,000 a year plus a Cost of Living Allowance at the current rates and a House Allowance at the rate of £150 a year. The reason for the urgency of this matter is that this gentleman's period of service at the British Guiana Hospital will soon expire and he will go to England on leave and it will not be possible to get him in a hurry. But he is willing to come to us as soon as we can get the position clear. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILKINSON: I am not opposing this Resolution particularly after hearing what the honourable introducer has said, namely, that we are going to lose these surgeons at the General Hospital; but I hope that the Hospital Board will not lose sight of the other side of the question. Not only do we want surgeons at the Hospital but we want physicians as well. I do hope that when the Hospital is re-organized as I believe it will have to be, the members of the Board will remember not only one side of the question but also the other side of it.

Mr. HAYNES: I thoroughly endorse every word that the honourable junior member for St. James has said. I was hoping that this Resolution would have been in respect of a physician. Apparently, although I believe it is on the programme of the Hospital to have a physician on the staff, those in authority do not yet see fit to have one. I certainly think that medicine is wanted as much as surgery. Most institutions of this sort have physicians attached to them but we have no specialist of that nature at the Hospital at present. I hope that at an early date the Government will send down a Resolution to provide for the appointment of a physician there.

Dr. CUMMINS: I give honourable members the assurance that it is proposed when the Hospital is re-organized to make provision for a highly-qualified physician. But this matter before us is urgent owing to the fact that three Senior Visiting Surgeons will be resigning in a very short time and we must therefore have somebody to put in their places. The fact that a physician is needed is not lost sight of.

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

The Resolution was passed.

COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCE TO STAFF OF THE PEASANTS' LOAN BANK

Mr. TALMA: I ask leave, Mr. Chairman, to proceed with Resolution No. 7 on the Order Paper.

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

Mr. TALMA: This is a Resolution to grant the sum of £332 to the Peasants' Loan Bank to pay a cost of living allowance to the staff of the Bank with effect from the 1st April, 1946, to the 31st March, 1948. These employees well deserve this treatment as has been given to employees in other branches of the Government service. This has been the policy adopted in the past and although this Department is not strictly a Government Department, yet employees in other Departments which are not strictly Government Departments are already in receipt of a Cost of Living Allowance. The rates are set out in the Schedule to the Resolution as follows:—

On the first	£100 of salary or part thereof	40%
" " second	£100 " " " " "	30%
" " third	£100 " " " " "	25%
" " fourth	£100 " " " " "	20%
" " fifth	£100 " " " " "	15%
" " sixth	£100 " " " " "	10%

The addendum sets out the position in detail. It states:—

By resolution No. 14 of the 4th of February, 1947, provision was made for the payment of a cost of living allowance to Public Officers from the 1st April, 1946, to the 31st of March, 1948.

2. It is proposed to grant a similar allowance to the staff of the Peasants Loan Bank on the same basis as was granted to Public Officers and this resolution is to provide the necessary funds from the 1st of April, 1946, to the 31st of March, 1948.

I do not think that anybody would object to the payment of this Cost of Living Allowance to these employees inasmuch as it has been paid to others. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. ADAMS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

The Resolution was passed.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. TALMA, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of four Resolutions in Committee and that the Committee had asked for leave to sit again.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. TALMA in each case, the Resolutions passed in Committee were read a first and second time and agreed to.

SELECT COMMITTEE'S REPORT *Re* COTTON SPINNING PLANT

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to proceed with the consideration of the Report of the Select Committee appointed to reply to His Excellency's Message No. 35/1947 relating to an error in Resolution No. 45 of 1947 in connection with the Cotton Spinning Plant.. I have been informed by Dr. Saint that it is very essential to get through with this matter as soon as possible so that it can become law. The Report of the Select Committee was presented to-day; it is merely a question of correcting an error and I am asking leave to deal with it now.

At this stage, it now being 3.30 p.m., Mr. SPEAKER stated that he had no alternative but to call Private Members' Business.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (B)

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (B) so as to deal with the Report of the Select Committee, which was laid on the Table of the House to-day.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Rule 61 (B) be now suspended.

Mr. RAMSAY: I beg to second that.

Mr. GARNER: I take it that the honourable member will give an assurance that he will not proceed with any further Government Business.

Mr. ADAMS: I made it clear that I was moving the suspension of the Rule only to deal with this Report. If honourable members want to continue Government Business after that, I am entirely in their hands.

The question that Rule 61 (B) be suspended was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SELECT COMMITTEE'S REPORT *Re* COTTON SPINNING PLANT

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to proceed with the consideration of the Report of the Select Committee which was appointed to reply to His Excellency's Message No. 35/1947 relating to an error in Resolution No. 45 of 1947 in connection with the Cotton Spinning Plant.

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

Mr. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker,—The Select Committee considered His Excellency's Message and

agreed to the passing of the following Address in Reply:—

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency the Governor

The House of Assembly have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of Your Excellency's Message No. 35/1947 dated 12th May, referring to Resolution No. 45 of 1947.

The House concur that the revolving fund should be used to meet the cost both of the purchase of cotton lint and of operational expenses.

I beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Mr. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to.

The Address was passed.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the honourable junior member for St. John to present this Address.

Mr. BLACKMAN: As Your Honour pleases.

Mr. ADAMS: If it is the wish of the majority of the House to continue Government Business I am entirely in their hands.

REVERSION TO PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to move that the House do now revert to Private Members' Business.

Mr. GARNER seconded the motion which was agreed to.

AGE-GROUPING AND SUPERANNUATION IN SCHOOLS—

DISCUSSION ON MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: When the House was engaged in Private Members' Business on the last occasion, a motion made by the honourable junior member for St. George that the House stand adjourned for five minutes was being debated. A motion was made by the honourable senior member for St. James that the debate be adjourned and that was seconded by the honourable senior member for St. John. When the House was adjourned for want of a quorum the honourable junior member for St. Philip was speaking. Before the honourable member continues to speak I should like to say that the question of the House debating an important matter on a motion for adjournment is a privilege or right to which the House is entitled, but I think that right is only meant to be exercised on a question of great importance and not very frequently. In this particular matter before the House we are debating what is really the law of the country. To my mind, the honourable member who made the motion could take one of three courses; he could introduce a Bill to amend the existing law, he could have an Address passed to the Governor asking him to send down a Bill to amend the law or he could do what he has done. It seems to me that the course which the honourable member has adopted is the one which will get him the least far. Assuming that the House adjourns for five minutes the honourable member really gets nothing by the adjournment. If, on the contrary, the House does not adjourn he is practically in the same position: the existing law continues. It seems to me that if the honourable member wants to test the matter properly he should introduce a Bill asking for an amendment to the existing law. I only say this because I do not want honourable members to make it a practice to move the adjournment of the House at every meeting to discuss some matter which may be a matter of the existing law of the country or it may be a matter which is not really urgent. Since the last meeting of the House I have devoted a

certain amount of time to looking up the authorities on the matter and they all point to the fact that the motion for the adjournment of the House is made to consider a very important question. I am just throwing out the suggestion to the House that there are a number of items on the Order Paper under Private Members' Business, and when the adjournment of the House is moved to consider some matter the items on the Order Paper will never get any fewer but they will rather be added to every Tuesday. I just wanted to make those few remarks because I feel that we are not getting any further with Private Members' Business.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable junior member for St. George who moved the adjournment of the House last Tuesday did so because it was getting to the end of the school year, and he was hoping to have a general expression of opinion as to the advisability of maintaining this system of age-grouping and superannuation. The Government might have been tempted to take action before the beginning of the next school year.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have only made a suggestion.

Mr. ADAMS: I am appealing to honourable members on both sides of the House to remember that in doing a thing of this sort they are really doing two things. Whatever may be the position as regards urgency or otherwise the honourable junior member for St. George has on the Order Paper an Address in connection with age-grouping. In the first place, if we do this every Tuesday there will be a scrambling in order to get matters discussed earlier than they appear on the Order Paper; and secondly—this is a matter for Your Honour—but I appeal to honourable members to see that if we do not observe Rule 123 we may just as well destroy the Rules of the House. Rule 123 says this:—

"No member may reflect upon any vote of the House, except for the purpose of moving that such vote be rescinded."

The honourable junior member for St. George and other honourable members were at pains to say that they were not censuring the present Government. They are censuring a previous Government and an honourable member may just as well get up next Tuesday and move the adjournment of the House and speak in connection with the discontinuance of the present rates of income tax. You can do that every Tuesday; you can say that you protest against the continuance of such and such a law. It is perfectly true that these Regulations in respect of age-grouping and superannuation did not come to us as such; they were made under Section 9 of the Education Act, 1890 which makes them law.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member should have risen on a point of order.

Mr. ADAMS: I am just drawing to the attention of honourable members that if they are reflecting on a previous vote of the House they are killing all Parliamentary procedure; because all they have to do is to move the adjournment of the House and protest against the speed limits for motor vehicles or anything of that sort. If they are not censuring the present Government they are impliedly or explicitly reflecting on a previous vote of the House.

Mr. GARNER: Having listened to what Your Honour has said I will not debate this question at any length; but I do think that to have age-grouping on the Statue Book is against the best interests of the masses of this country where education is concerned. It has been pointed out by previous speakers that the dull boys more or less suffer because of their association with brighter boys with whom they are not able to compete. They are placed with the

brighter boys by virtue of their age. As I have said already, if the former Director of Education has seen age-grouping practised in England it cannot be a very good thing for Barbados; because in truth and in fact there were vocational and continuation schools in England long ago but we have no such schools here. We have to take into account the economic position of the island when we are considering this question of age-grouping. There are those who at one time or other were unable to send their children to a secondary school and when their financial position improved they tried to give their children as much education at a secondary school as they possibly could. Very often a child goes to school at a late age and when he is put in a class with boys of his age he is more or less handicapped temporarily. To my mind it is a wrong thing in Barbados to practice age-grouping when our economic condition does not afford it. I am entirely against age-grouping and the majority of the people are against it. I have spoken with several school teachers who are against it. There are a few optimists, who, perhaps, because they want to be in the good graces of those who advocate age-grouping are in favour of it, but the majority of school teachers are against it. It works a hardship on the teachers; inasmuch as you have those children in a classroom who know nothing about the subjects which you are teaching them, that presents a very onerous state of affairs and the school work becomes very tedious. The time is now far spent, much has been said on this question and it is of no use my going any further with it because there are other honourable members who want to speak on it. I am sure that if age-grouping were taken off the Statute Book, if the law were amended or repealed, that would do the mass of children a great good.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Before you put the question, I should like to say that I was hoping that some of the proponents of age-grouping would have given us some of the fundamental reasons which justified the introduction of this system in this colony at this stage. None of those honourable members who have criticised this motion has in any way attempted to do so. A lot of extraneous matter has been imported into the debate and those who have been endeavouring or believed to have been endeavouring to make out a case for age-grouping have failed miserably to do so. More recently the question has been discussed by one who is entitled to be regarded as an authority on the matter, and even he has failed to shed any real light on the question. We have been told by this final authority, so to speak, on education that the most powerful——

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: On a point of order. The honourable member is reading from a newspaper.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the honourable member is quoting from memory that is all right. He can only quote from memory.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The final authority on this question has declared in a recent public announcement that the most powerful argument in favour of age-grouping is the psychological argument. That is not good enough. All this authority has done in an attempt to justify the introduction of age-grouping in this colony is to say that purely on psychological grounds it is the best thing to have children of a certain age in the same class; and goes on to add that too often in schools we concentrate on the intellectual side in relation to the children and ignore the others. We in this Chamber in a community like this cannot afford to concentrate purely on the psychological factors of any given case and disregard entirely the other more vital factors. Three years

ago I tabled some questions in this Chamber with regard to the introduction in this island of this system of age-grouping, and I think, Sir, that it is relative that I should repeat those questions today. I asked the Government whether they were aware of certain instructions issued to teachers relative to the grouping of children in classes according to age, and provided they were so aware did the Government in introducing these changes take the sociological and economic conditions of the people who attend these schools into consideration? I went on to ask whether the Government were aware that owing to economic conditions a considerable percentage of children attending elementary schools are handicapped in their progress by irregularity of attendance. I also asked the Government to state what percentage of children in the schools were likely to be retarded in their progress as a result of failing to obtain promotion through this age-grouping. For some reason or other these questions were never replied to. They were asked on the 10th of October, 1944, the session lasted for some time after and the Government has never replied to these questions. I repeat that the economic and sociological conditions of this colony are more important and more worthy of consideration when it comes to introducing vital changes in our educational system than the psychological factors involved. To my mind, those honourable members who decry the introduction of this system by an expert on the ground that it obtains in Great Britain and therefore it should be tried out here, are completely justified in doing so. In Great Britain they have had compulsory education since 1880, and the peculiar social conditions, conditions of unemployment or employment for short periods do not obtain in Great Britain to the same extent as they obtain here. Neither have we got the facilities for education which are available to the average British child. Not only is education compulsory up to the age of 16, but in a recent Act the age for continuing elementary education even after children leave school has been extended. Then secondary education is free up to University standard and you have technical schools and training schools which allow children to continue some sort of education after they have actually left the four walls of the primary school. In addition to that, every attempt is made to see that the children during their school years are physically capable of benefiting from the education which is offered in the various schools. They are given a hot meal daily and within more recent years allowances have been given to parents to enable them to keep their children in school; so that the conditions which obtain here where many parents find that they are unable to send their children to school owing to the lack of food or clothing or both cannot possibly obtain in England. For those reasons and for other reasons I submit that it is totally unfair to suggest that because a system is in operation in Great Britain and is working with success it automatically can be transplanted here and be expected in a colony like this to give the same satisfactory results. Until the proponents of age-grouping can provide reasons to justify the system other than that it is successful in England they cannot expect the people who have the interest of the children of the people of this colony at heart to stand by unprotestingly and let this new system to be pushed down their throats. Many of us had hoped that the authority to whom I referred would have attempted to give some justification for the new system; but even he failed to do that and therefore I believe the honourable junior member for St. George is more or less on very sound ground when he asks this House to record its pro-

test against this new system and take every possible step to bring it to an end within the shortest possible time. One final point. It is to be expected that any reasonable person would appreciate the fact that any member of this Chamber who sees eye to eye with any other member would, irrespective of Party feelings, vote according to the dictates of his conscience. I seem to recall that earlier this year in Great Britain the present Labour Government was only saved from a vote of "no confidence" by the combined action of a large group of Conservatives who agreed with the foreign policy of the Labour Government. When over one hundred Labour members rebelled against the foreign policy of Bevin and—

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that anything to do with this debate?

Mr. CRAWFORD: If you allow me another moment I will develop the point to satisfy you.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are debating the relative good or evil of age-grouping. I do not think what the Labour Government did or did not do affects this question, at all.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The point is this: perhaps Your Honour recalls that because the hon. junior member for St. George happens to be in agreement with other honourable members as to the discontinuance of age-grouping, the whole thing was characterised as an unholy alliance to overthrow the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: When these remarks are made I am afraid that I do not take them in time; however, I do not think I can let you argue that point.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do not intend to argue it at all. I was merely making a comparison. I repeat that any honourable member is entitled to vote with any other honourable members on any question and there is absolutely no justification for the ill-founded assumption that because an honourable member happens to vote with another honourable member of a Party on any given matter, the similarity of voting is the result of some evil concoction or some sinister attempt to overthrow the Government. The way to overthrow the Government is by a straight vote of "no confidence." In the meantime honourable members need not have the fear that because there is a grouping together of votes of members outside the so-called Government that any attempt is being made to overthrow the Government. I am only now trying to save them some anxiety and to save their hearts from some unnecessary palpitations. To go back to the motion made by the honourable junior member for St. George, I repeat that this community is entitled to some proper explanation for the continued maintenance of this age-grouping. Until that explanation is given, agitation must and will be continued with a view to reverting to the system which was in practice before until conditions no longer make that necessary. With regard to superannuation, in my opinion there is no honourable member in this Chamber, who has any regard for the truth, will claim that it is not working a hardship on people who, within recent years, have found themselves in a position to send their children to secondary schools. Within recent years the standard of wages in this colony has considerably improved and many parents are now, for the first time, finding themselves in a position of being able to give their children a secondary education; therefore they send their children to school at a fairly late age. From the time this superannuation was introduced, there were honourable members in this Chamber who protested against it both within and without the Chamber. Last Tuesday one honourable member who sat as a member of the Executive at the time when the

system was introduced, declared that during the last election campaign his constituents had drawn to his attention that they were more or less dissatisfied with the system and he had given an undertaking in case the dissatisfaction was general to have something done about it. I submit that if any member of this Chamber, sitting as a member of the Government or elsewhere, decides to support the introduction of this system at the instance of the Director of Education and then when he goes to his constituents they tell him that they are not in agreement with it, he is entirely entitled to come back within the Legislative Hall and express the views as they have been expressed to him by his constituents. If we are here as the representatives of the people whose votes we solicit to come here, it is our solemn obligation when we get here to translate their views into the sort of legislative sanction they want. It is correct to say that throughout this colony people who have children at secondary schools are thoroughly opposed to this system of superannuation, and they feel that with our social background the time is not ripe and the conditions are not proper for the imposition of this practice on the educational system of the colony. Therefore, until our conditions have advanced to the stage at which we can satisfactorily support these innovations, we are justified in taking every possible step to relieve the hardship—I almost said the injustice—which the operation of these innovations creates upon the people of this colony.

Mr. BRANCKER: I will just make a few brief remarks. I feel that the honourable member on my right is to be commended in bringing this matter once again before the eyes of the public. I am not now expressing any opinion as to whether or not this is the best method or the second best method of bringing the matter to the attention of the Government, but I recall that about a year ago—it was on the 17th of December last year—the question was asked by me as to whether the Government was aware of the existence of dissatisfaction throughout this island at the continuance of the policy of age-grouping. You will recall that on the 15th of April of this year the Government replied that it is aware that some dissatisfaction was expressed at the time of the introduction of age grouping but this seems to have largely disappeared. If it is a fact that this dissatisfaction has not disappeared—and I support the honourable member on my right that it has not disappeared but has rather increased—then the Government should be made to realise through the voice of the people's representatives in this Chamber that this dissatisfaction has not disappeared and they must see whether the time is not opportune for reverting to the old or the better system. This system of age-grouping is pre-eminently one of putting the cart before the horse; not until we have compulsory education should age-grouping be introduced. We have considered the system in deference to the wishes of the expert and it should be plain that if it has not been found practicable at this stage owing to our social and economic conditions, then we should revert to the previous system. I feel that the honourable junior member for St. George has done well in allowing this matter to be fully discussed in this Chamber so that the public will have an idea as to the feeling of the people in this colony in relation to it.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I want again to make it plain that in bringing this great public grievance so speedily before this Assembly I never for one moment dreamt that by any stretch of the imagination honourable members on my immediate left would consider that any attack was being made upon them or that any effort was being made by me to overthrow

the present Government. (A MEMBER: This Government can only be overthrown if it wants to be overthrown). I am very emphatic and on account of remarks which I have just heard, I want before I sit down to impress upon honourable members the reasons for my bringing this matter before this Assembly in the manner in which I have brought it. In Great Britain they have had compulsory education for at least 70 years; they have enjoyed the facilities and opportunities afforded them, they have had the expert staff necessary for montessori and kindergarten teaching with the application of the Dalton and other modern methods in junior and senior schools. But up to this date none of these facilities exist in Barbados; we have not got those social services and that Government assistance which would enable the children of the workers to be sent to school at an early age. During this debate I have never attempted to condemn age-grouping as a system, but I am prepared to demonstrate inside and outside this Chamber that such an excellent system applicable to the ideal conditions of Great Britain, was never intended to be imposed upon a community such as this until the necessary facilities, the necessary preparations and the necessary period for the introduction of compulsory education would have elapsed in order to prevent an excellent system from becoming an evil in our midst. I give one concrete example: after the cessation of hostilities there were many young men who, having ceased military service and who at the beginning of the last War were students at the various Universities in England, resumed their studies. Imagine the Professor of Oxford or the Professor of Cambridge calling out those youngsters who are now five or six years older and telling them with congratulatory remarks that they have been successfully grouped and therefore he would confer upon them the various degrees in medicine or law and allow them to practice! Or, conversely, imagine him saying to those young men who had so served their country that they have reached the age or the stage of maturity where they can be expelled from the University! That is a clear indication that the experts in England never intended that the system of age-grouping should be imposed in cases and under conditions where it is the general rule rather than the practice for the students who are admitted to any educational centre to be received at varying ages.

Hundreds of people including myself in this colony are suffering because our children are being penalised on account of the application of this system in this island many years before the necessary preparations have been made for it. It is something which they and I very strongly condemn. That is the reason why I have moved the adjournment of the House to discuss this question of age-grouping. It may be asked, why is it that the poor people complain about superannuation? Well, the honourable junior member for St. Peter who gave very strong support in this protest, has supplied the answer which is being given by hundreds of working people in this island. The honourable member said that at the age of 14 under the old system he sent one of his children to a secondary school and at the age of 19 that child had secured the School Certificate. Under the present system the bulk of the workers of this colony are denied such an opportunity. I want to say here and now that the work of Mr. Hayden, the former Director of Education of this colony, will long be remembered. He has made many attractive proposals in his "Policy for Education" and in his "Evaluation of Education in Barbados" he has produced statistics whereby he

shows that the standard of intelligence among the children of Barbados at a given age is somewhat less than that among the children of Great Britain. The Ministry of Education in England has shown that the level of intelligence among the children of Great Britain has been somewhat lowered as a result of the standard of nutrition. In Barbados the working people, the masses, have lived and are still living in a continuous state of malnutrition, nutrition below the normal civilised standard; it is therefore an injustice to ask the children of workers who have to live under such disabilities to qualify arbitrarily at the age of 11+ for entry into the secondary schools of this colony. And the result of the continuance of superannuation as at present practised in this colony is that it denies any opportunity to almost every working parent to tighten his belt and make a very great financial sacrifice in order to give secondary education to his son or daughter after he or she had passed through the elementary school. The practice of superannuation in this colony is similar to that of some of the ancients who sacrificed some of their most promising and beautiful maidens so as to appease the wrath of some false god. The honourable member on my left tells me that it should not be done in Barbados in this day. We are always willing to treat strangers in our midst with the greatest courtesy, and I would not be so unkind as to attribute to any Director of Education in our midst any deliberate attempt to impose upon this colony conditions which can very well obtain in England. But it is as plain as daylight that this is a matter of putting the cart before the horse and someone has blundered. Many members of this Assembly have given very strong support to that expression of disapproval which I have made and lest the members of the Government who, I am sure never at any time had any intention of inflicting any hardships upon the children of the working people of this colony but were rather giving a trial to a new idea—lest it be said that some attempt is being made to force the hands of the Government in this matter, Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to withdraw my motion in the hope that relief will be brought by the Government to this poor section of the community before the new year begins. (Cheers).

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

ADDRESS *RE* DECLARING SATURDAY, DECEMBER 27, A BANK HOLIDAY.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I ask leave to proceed with the Address of which I gave notice to-day and with which I gave notice of my intention to deal later in the day. It merely asks the Governor-in-Executive Committee to exercise the power to make the Saturday which follows Boxing Day a public holiday.

Mr. ADAMS: I object for one reason only, and it is that the Government is considering the matter. Personally, I would like every Monday to be a Bank Holiday. It is already late and many honourable members are anxious to get away. Why should we pass an Address in connection with something which is already under consideration?

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that leave be granted the honourable member to move the passing of this Address. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The address reads as follows:—

1. In view of the fact that Christmas Day 1947 fall on a Thursday and the 26th day of Decem-

ber, 1947, on a Friday, both of which days are Bank Holidays in accordance with the Bank Holidays Act 1905 (1905-2) as amended by the Bank Holidays (Amendment) Act 1946 (1946-15), the House of Assembly are of the opinion that Saturday, the 27th day of December, 1947, should also be declared to be a Bank Holiday by the Governor-in-Executive Committee as provided by the said Bank Holidays (Amendment) Act 1946 (1946-15) so as to enable government and other employees in this colony to enjoy a longer holiday after the business and rush usually experienced immediately before Christmas Day.

2. The House therefore respectfully request Your Excellency the Governor-in-Executive Committee to declare the said 27th day of December, 1947, to be a Bank Holiday so as to give effect to this proposal.

The Act has been amended so as to give power to the Governor-in-Executive Committee to declare any day to be a Bank Holiday. Honourable members will appreciate the reason why the Address asks for a Bank Holiday rather than a Public Holiday; It is that the day will be a general holiday and not merely Government employees but other employees will be entitled to the holiday. I think that all honourable members will agree with this; the matter has to be expedited because if the Address is not passed this afternoon it will not reach the Executive Committee for consideration in proper time. I beg to move that this Address, which is respectfully worded, do now pass.

Mr. COX: I beg to second the motion. I would like to say that during last week I asked the Leader of the House to draw to the attention of the Government this matter of making Saturday, the 27th day of December, a Bank Holiday. That is why he was able to tell the honourable senior member for the City that the Government is considering the matter. It is well that this day be made a Public Holiday. Christmas Day falls on the Thursday, the next day is a Bank Holiday and Saturday can well be made another deserving holiday for a large section of people who would have been very busy during that week and who will be afforded an unbroken holiday.

Mr. RAMSAY: As far as I can see, there is nothing to be enthusiastic about; this will only make some people starve throughout the day. Nevertheless I will vote for the passing of the Address. (Laughter).

Mr. SMITH: While I am in agreement with this matter I am wondering whether the Government will consider the people in the country districts because at some of the plantations they will not pay any money before the same Saturday. I hope that the Government will ask the managers or plantation owners to pay their employees at an early time so that they will be able to get their food.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The honourable senior member for St. Michael said that he had asked the Leader of the House to draw this matter to the attention of the Government. It does not matter to me who was first or last in this matter but Your Honour will appreciate the fact that I brought this Address to you privately before I brought it before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that you need mention that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I only mentioned that because the honourable senior member for St. Michael said that he brought it up first.

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

The Address was passed.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that there need be any feeling of competition arising because an honourable member gets ahead of another honourable member in dealing with any matter. I will ask the honourable senior member for the City to present this Address.

Mr. MOTTLEY: As your Honour pleases.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 60

Dr. WILSON: I ask leave to proceed with Order No. 42 standing in my name as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the honourable member does that he will have to ask leave to move the suspension of Rule 60.

Dr. WILSON: I ask leave to move the suspension of Rule 60.

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

Dr. WILSON: I beg to move that Rule 60 be now suspended.

Mr. RAMSAY I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS: There is another Order standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Andrew and he will want to deal with that also. (Mr. CRAWFORD: We can do both of them). If honourable members are unlucky enough to have their matters low down on the Order Paper they must take their bad luck.

The question that Rule 60 be now suspended was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

THE ST. JOHN (HIGHWAYS) LOAN BILL

Dr. WILSON: I ask leave to proceed with Order No. 42 standing in my name as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day therefore stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. John:—Second reading of a Bill to authorise the Commissioners of Highways of St. John to raise a loan for the purpose of completing the purchase of a Diesel Motor Roller.

Dr. WILSON: This Bill seeks to authorise the Commissioners of Highways of the parish of St. John to raise a loan not exceeding £600 so as to complete the purchase of a Diesel Motor Roller. I have received a communication from the Commissioners of Highways of the parish and they will be very pleased if this Bill were passed today. They want to complete the purchase of this Motor Roller which will be used in repairing the roads in the parish. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS: This Bill asks for this loan to complete the purchase of this Motor Roller. Are we to understand that the Commissioners of Highways came to this House before and got a loan which was not enough or what?

Mr. RAMSAY: I hate that wrong information should be given to this House. I was drilling the honourable senior member for St. John in order to find out if this is an entire purchase, part purchase or what. He told me that he did not know. We will have to postpone this matter until proper information is brought before the House. I am not prepared for the honourable member to say that he does not know in the first instance, and then "yes" when he is prompted by the honourable senior member for St. Philip. I am speaking seriously: I am quite prepared to help the honourable member but we

cannot do business in this House in any slipshod manner. I beg to move that the further consideration of this Bill be postponed until the honourable member can bring a proper and truthful statement before this House.

Mr. SMITH: I beg to second that.

Dr. WILSON: This money is required to complete the purchase of this Motor Roller.

Mr. SPEAKER: A motion has been made that this Bill be now read a second time. An amendment has been moved that the further consideration of the Bill be postponed. The question is that the further consideration of the Bill be postponed. 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. RAMSAY, SMITH, ADAMS and BLACKMAN—4.

Noes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. CRAWFORD, SYMMONDS, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, GARNER, MOTTLEY, S. A. WALCOTT and HAYNES—10.

The question that this Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The second reading was passed.

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

On a similar motion, the Preamble was postponed.

The four Clauses of the Bill and the Preamble were read and passed.

On the motion of Dr. WILSON, seconded by Mr. SYMMONDS, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

THE ST. ANDREW'S PARISH (BARBADOS) LOAN BILL

Mr. FOSTER: I beg to move that Order No. 43 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. COX seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Andrew:—Second reading of a Bill to authorise the Vestry of St. Andrew to raise a loan not exceeding £2,000 for the purchase of sites in certain districts and erecting Public Baths and Latrines.

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

Mr. COX seconded the motion which was agreed to.

On a similar motion Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

Mr. FOSTER: I beg to move that the Preamble be postponed.

Mr. COX seconded the motion which was agreed to.

The thirteen Clauses of the Bill were read and passed, the word "June" being inserted in the blank in Clause 4.

The two Schedules and the Preamble were read and passed.

On the motion of Mr. FOSTER, seconded by Mr. COX, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to this day week, the 16th day of December, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon.

Mr. COX seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER accordingly adjourned the House to Tuesday next, the 16th day of December, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon.