

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT).

SESSION 1946—1948

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 25th March, 1947.

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

Present:—

His Honour Mr. G. B. EVELYN (*Speaker*), His Honour Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, (*Deputy Speaker*), Mr. J. T. C. RAMSAY (*Chairman of Committees*), Dr. J. A. LeV. WILSON, Messrs. A. E. S. LEWIS, M. E. COX, D. A. FOSTER, R. G. MAPP, H. W. SPRINGER, M.A., G. H. ADAMS, B.A., H. D. BLACKMAN, W. A. CRAWFORD, J. A. HAYNES, B.A., and V. C. GALE.

PRAYERS AND MINUTES.

Prayers are read and the Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 18th March, 1947, having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

Messrs. S. A. WALCOTT and E. D. MOTTLEY enter the House and take their seats.

DOCUMENT.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Report of the Inspector of Trees for the parishes of St. James and St. Joseph respectively.

PAPERS LAID.

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

Message No. 10/1947 from His Excellency the Governor informing the Honourable House of Assembly, with reference to the Address from the Honourable House, that Dr. C. Y. Shephard has been appointed to undertake an enquiry with the following terms of reference:—"To recommend the method by which the price of canes should be calculated."

Message No. 11/1947 from His Excellency the Governor informing the Honourable the House of Assembly, with reference to the Address from the Honourable House dated the 18th March, that as the result of advice which has just been received in a telegram from Washington he is proceeding to Washington today by air accompanied by the Labour Commissioner.

Report of the British Union Oil Company Limited on Geological Investigations of the Ground-water Resources of Barbados, B.W.I.

Statement showing Customs and Excise receipts for the ten months ended 31st January, 1947.

Statement of advances to Colonial Postmaster for the payment of Money Orders to 28th February, 1947.

Ten Year Development Plan for Barbados, 1946-56.

NOTICES.

Mr. CRAWFORD gave a notice on behalf of the Government as follows:—

A Bill to authorize the payment of an additional pension to Julian Hyde Gittens.

Other Notices are given as follows:—

Mr. BRANCKER: Of the following Address:—

*The House of Assembly
To*

His Excellency the Governor

The House of Assembly begs to draw to the attention of His Excellency the inadequacy of the remuneration fixed for certain offices and positions in the Department of Highways and Transport, viz:—

- (1) the Executive Engineer;
- (2) the Stone Clerk;
- (3) watchman; and
- (4) the unestablished staff and casual labourers.

2. The House begs to point to the fact that the office of "Executive Engineer" yet remains vacant due, as appears very probable, to the unattractiveness of the salary to a properly qualified Engineer. Such vacancy adversely affects the output of road work undertaken by this Department.

3. The House further draws to the attention of Government the fact that the person presently employed as "Superintendent Mechanic" is only a part time employee of the Department, he being also an employee in the Harbour and Shipping Master's Department, a state of affairs this House deprecates and invites the Government to take appropriate action to remedy before the introduction of the next Colonial Estimates.

4. The House further is of opinion that the allowance for labourers of the Department who work with tar and oil is too low and merits substantial increases.

5. The House brings the foregoing matters specifically to the notice of the Governor in order that His Excellency shall take urgent steps to cause to be

introduced this Session in the Legislature of the Colony Resolutions or/and Bills to make provision for appropriate increases in respect of the salaries and wages appertaining to the offices and positions mentioned in the foregoing paragraph.

Mr. DOWDING enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. BRANCKER: Of the following Address:—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Governor*

This House views with deep concern the impending threat of reduction or removal of Imperial Preference, as it is the opinion of this House that such action will adversely affect the prosperity of this Island and the standard of living of persons of every section in this Colony.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. CRAWFORD, seconded by Mr. ADAMS, A Bill to authorize the payment of an additional pension to Julian Hyde Gittens is read a first time.

Mr. WARD enters the House and takes his seat.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee of Supply, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

SUBSIDIZATION OF SUGAR.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—The first Resolution is for the sum of £17,000 to be placed, at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to meet the cost of subsidizing sugar manufactured for local consumption during the year 1947.

At the outset let me say that when this decision was taken in Executive Committee certain things had not yet happened that have subsequently happened; this makes it necessary for us to ask for an amendment of the £17,000 to £21,000, and honourable members will see, after I have made my explanation, that £6,000 of the amount will be recoverable. Put briefly, the decision of the Government in this. Until the whole question of subsidization is examined anew, the general policy of the Government is to make every attempt to lower the cost of living with which the question of subsidization is bound up and this Resolution has for its object the keeping down of living expenses, although at first sight the increase might appear to be small. When it is considered that the consumer has to pay the new price which the producer will be getting it will mean that as far as sugar manufactured for local consumption is concerned the price would be advanced by half cent per lb. I repeat that this increase seems small but the Government has taken this decision in view of its general policy and in order to prevent a rise in the cost of living and it has now been calculated that the sum of £21,000 will be needed for the purpose. Dr. Saint and the Attorney General have gone very carefully into the matter which, as honourable members will realize, involves, in the actual working-out, much complication and a careful definition, among other things, of what is sugar intended for local consumption. Dr. Saint has prepared a memorandum which forms the basis of such legislation

as will be necessary and I will tell honourable members, as fully as I can from his memorandum, how it is proposed to carry out this scheme. All sugars manufactured for direct consumption during the coming year should be subsidized at the rate of £2 per ton. It is estimated that the quantity of this sugar which will be manufactured will be in the neighbourhood of 10,000 tons, so that the sum of £20,000 will be required; it is estimated that there are about 2,000 tons of 1946 direct consumption sugars in stock, making a total of 12,000 tons, of which about 3,000 tons will be exported to neighbouring West Indian colonies. A tax of £4. 15 will be paid into the Treasury to cover the £2. 15. for special purposes and £2 for subsidy for each ton of direct consumption sugars exported. In that way, we shall get back about £6,000 from the quantity of direct consumption sugars exported to neighbouring colonies. It is suggested, in view of the difficulty of drawing any definite dividing line between direct consumption sugars and other sugars—the junior member for St. James will be able to help the House even more than I can on this point—that direct consumption sugars shall be defined as sugars as may be so determined by the Director of Agriculture. “Direct consumption” obviously means local consumption but sugars specifically manufactured for local consumption may also be exported and in effect will be exported, as honourable members know that there are certain colonies which have been buying some of our direct consumption sugars for a number of years and are waiting to buy next year. It is proposed that direct consumption sugars will be permitted export on the presentation of export licences to the Comptroller of Customs which may be granted by the Chairman of the Sugar Production and Export Control Board on production of a receipt from the Treasury showing that the sum of £4. 15. per ton has been paid on the quantity of sugar for which the export licence is required. I hope that is clear to honourable members. The subsidy for direct consumption sugars will be paid to the purchaser on production of a certificate signed by the Chemist and the Manager of the factory and countersigned by the purchaser stating that the quantity of sugar has been manufactured for direct consumption and bought for this purpose by the purchaser. The owner of every factory will be required to make a return to the Sugar Production and Export Control Board each month of the quantities of direct consumption, dark crystal and molasses sugars that have been manufactured, and the total amount of direct consumption sugars so returned as manufactured will be balanced with the amounts subsidized. Monthly returns, it is also proposed, should be made to the Controller of Supplies by Commission Merchants showing the amounts of direct consumption sugars delivered to each dealer with the names of the dealers and the amounts delivered. The dealers will make returns showing the amounts of direct consumption sugar received by them from Commission Merchants with the names of the Commission Merchants and the amounts of sugar; also the amounts of direct consumption sugars delivered to shopkeepers with the names and addresses of the shopkeepers and the amounts delivered and the shopkeepers equally must make monthly returns showing the amounts of direct consumption sugars purchased by them and the names of the dealers with the amounts purchased from each. By this means, a check will kept on the Commission Merchants, the dealers and the shopkeepers. I think, perhaps, I should give the reason for the extra £4,000 because it is a fact which should be made known to

this Committee. No special or official communication was made to any particular manufacturer but as honourable members know much of this sugar is manufactured by Searles Factory and it is pointed out by that Company that inasmuch as it takes 106 tons of raw sugar to manufacture 100 tons of their "special" which is direct consumption sugar, they will be losing; that they will not be making the same profits which they made this year. Dr. Saint has taken that into consideration and has revised our estimate, putting up to us the necessity for asking for this extra £4,000 which brings the sum to £21,000 but at the same time pointing out that about £6,000 will come back to us from neighbouring West India Colonies. I do not know that at this stage I can tell honourable members any more, except to say this. I am really repeating what I said in my opening remarks. The Government is very much concerned over the amount of money that we are spending on subsidization; the Government is very much concerned over discovering ways and means of cheapening the cost of living without necessarily having subsidization on a large scale and equally it is very much concerned with the question of what are and what are not legitimate profits and legitimate mark-ups. In the meantime and until the whole question has been investigated it is proposed—the proposal will come before the House shortly—that subsidization should be continued on the same basis as has been observed during the past 4 or 5 years. I may tell honourable members that the proposal which will soon come before the House in respect of subsidization will not be for a sum for six months but for three months. I mention that to show that the Government is very much concerned, however much it may like to help the workingclass, as to what is an appropriate allocation for this or that public service, one of which is subsidization. I now beg to move that this Resolution do now pass and, again, I assure honourable members that it is merely carrying out the general policy of subsidization which has been accepted by previous Houses and previous Governments and which will be revised speedily.

Dr. CUMMINS enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second the motion.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—There are many members in this House who no doubt have some expert advice to offer in connection with this Resolution, so I am going to speak early in order that they may help me when they do speak. This proposal, Sir, has caused me no end of trouble in trying to understand it. I have been told that the staple product of this island is sugar and that we derive our prosperity, revenue and everything else from sugar; therefore, I feel that when we come to the point of subsidizing sugar, we are subsidizing sugar with sugar. It is somewhat paradoxical. I would like to say at the outset that I would be the last person to do anything to raise the cost of living, even by a half cent, to the working classes of this colony but it seems to me that the subsidizing of sugar may be a very dangerous thing. You might get off half cent in this instance but to provide the tax for this £17,000 or £21,000 you might pay more than half cent on something else of which the people use a greater quantity. We have to be careful. I would like the senior member for St. Joseph to tell me whether there is only one grade of sugar sold locally. I think he has already explained the sugar that is shipped to other islands and I would like to know whether it would not be cheaper to export all our sugar and import some from one of the islands (Laughter) It sounds

like something for honourable members to laugh at but if you are going to get £2. 15 more for the sugar you send out of the island, you may negotiate with one of the islands for the purchase of sugar to be sold probably at half cent per lb. less than what it is sold at now. I am just throwing that out as a hint. A year or two ago I asked in this House whether we were not then subsidizing sugar out of the equalization fund as I heard that we were doing so. Anyhow, let us say that we are going to subsidize sugar. Can the honourable member help me with this? Is the principle that of subsidizing an article at the price you can get for it? I think you should subsidize an article on the basis of its cost of production, not at the price that somebody will pay you for it. If somebody offers you £3 per ton more than what the article costs are you going to subsidize it at that figure? This whole question of subsidizing sugar will be bound up with the cost of manufacturing sugar and if you make allowance for a reasonable manufacturing cost and a reasonable profit, that is all that is needed, not to come to the House and ask it to subsidize sugar because somebody will pay you £2. 15 per ton more for it. I am going to make a suggestion to the senior member for St. Joseph, provided this debate continues and honourable members are not satisfied in mind as to the rights of the principle on which this Resolution is based. My suggestion is that we report progress and ask leave to sit again and that a Select Committee be appointed to go into the matter with the Director of Agriculture and others who have worked out this scheme and are more acquainted with the details of it; so that if honourable members vote for or against it they will know the grounds on which they do so. I must say that I am very hazy and perturbed over the matter.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I too, Sir, have to say that this Resolution has confused me. I cannot quite understand what it is all about. I would like the people's food subsidized so that they can obtain it cheaper but the right articles should be subsidized, not an article which we produce. How does it look to the outside world if we say that the price of sugar is too dear? because if we subsidize sugar, we will be saying that sugar is costing us too much. How does it look to the Imperial Government who is helping us if we say that the price of sugar is too dear? I should prefer to see such articles as rice and stockfeed subsidized, not an article which we grow; imported articles should be subsidized. That is the first point I would like to make. The next point is that £2. 15. per ton will be lost to the sugar industry and it is proposed that of that £2. 15. per ton, £1. 15 per ton should be placed to a Price Stabilization Fund, £1 per ton to a Capital Rehabilitation Reserve Fund and 10/- per ton to a Labour Welfare Fund. Well now, Sir, for any Government, particularly a Labour Government to say that the industry that supports Barbados is to be robbed of £2. 15. per ton, is in my opinion, somewhat hard. I cannot see how that could possibly be right. I repeat that it is nothing but robbery. If honourable members would refer to the addendum to the Resolution they will see that it is stated that it is not proposed to collect the amount of £2. 15. per ton on sugar manufactured for local consumption and not exported from this island..... Well, if they are not going to collect that amount on sugar that is manufactured for local consumption, then the sugar that is exported to St. Vincent, for instance, will get the benefit of that £2. 15. per ton. If the Imperial Government which has given us this price made the stipulation that this amount be allocated to these special funds for the benefit of the sugar industry, how then can

this Government take that amount away from the industry? £1.5 per ton is for a Price Stabilization Reserve Fund, which means that every sugar grower, large and small, will be able to pay a better wage to the worker. The £1 per ton for the Capital Rehabilitation Reserve Fund will mean better machinery and that will result in a better price for canes because the better the machinery, the less canes it will take to produce a ton of sugar. And now comes the most unkindest cut of all,—the proposed deprivation of the Labour Welfare Fund of 10/- per ton! Well, Sir, I cannot see how a Labour Government could do a thing like that. I do not think that any Government—Conservative or otherwise—should suggest that the sugar industry of this island should be robbed of this £2.15 which forms part of the increased price which has been offered to us for our sugar. I have said enough for the present and, if necessary, I shall speak again.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman,—I too am not convinced that it is necessary for us to subsidize sugar. As the junior member for the City has said, the reason why we subsidize commodities is because we feel that they are too expensive for the community to buy. If we subsidize sugar it is tantamount to saying that the price of sugar is too high and, therefore, we should give the people some assistance to enable them to tide over the difficulty. To my mind, this proposal is a great slap to the taxpayers in Great Britain. They have given us this preference, this increase in the price of our sugar, to enable us to raise our people's standard of living and this Government is saying "Oh, no! that will not do. We will use this money to subsidize the same sugar which the British Government has already subsidized." Now, Sir, the British Government who is buying our sugar is paying us £4.15 per ton extra for it in order to help our people and this Government is saying "Give £2.15 of this money to the people who produce our sugar by way of subsidy." I feel that it is the most ridiculous proposition I have heard for quite a while. This same Government, a few months ago, absolutely refused to subsidize rice, an imported commodity which the people use in greater quantities and now it is proposing that sugar which the people themselves produce, the main product of the island, should be subsidized. It is absolutely impossible, Sir, to speak as one feels on a proposal of this sort; it is only a political manoeuvre. This Government discovered that it made a desperate mistake by not subsidizing rice and it comes now with this proposal to camouflage the people of this country and make them believe that it is trying to do something for them when it is actually squeezing them because as the junior member for the City has said, it may pay us better to sell the sugar and then import it. As the senior member for St. James has said, the Government proposes to take away from a Price Stabilization Reserve Fund £1.5 per ton, £1 per ton from a Capital Rehabilitation Reserve Fund and 10/- per ton from a Labour Welfare Fund,—something which the British Government has stated should be done; that is what this Government proposes to do. If that were done and I were a British taxpayer I would say "We are helping the sugar industry in the West Indies to too great an extent because we are giving them more money to help their people and they are taking that money to subsidize the same commodity which they are manufacturing." There is much more I would like to say but I know there are other honourable members who would like to speak on the subject, so I will stop for the present.

Mr. WILKINSON: I am delighted to know, Mr. Chairman, that the Government is concerned over the subsidization of the people's food: it is delightful that in less than three months the Govern-

ment has made a change in that direction. The Government did not hesitate to increase the price of rice by 50 per cent. but as far as sugar which is consumed at the rate of 46.8 cents per annum per person is concerned, it proposes to subsidize it. If we take the Government's own figures, the local consumption of sugar in the island is 1.8 pound per person per week and that includes such luxuries as pastries, confectionery and so on. Well, as I say, Sir, sugar is consumed locally at the rate of .9 cents per person per week or 46.8 per person per annum and to increase the price by half cent per lb. will not result in such a substantial sum to the producer when you consider that the British Government has increased the price of sugar in order to help us and we have increased the cost of labour by about 30 per cent. To give a subsidy on 46.8 cents per annum, in addition, would be a most generous act on the part of this Government. The point of view that I take is that this proposal is really immoral. Two previous speakers have emphasized that point but I do not think that it can be overemphasized. Here we have the British taxpayer putting up £4. 15 per ton extra for our sugar to enable us to pay more for labour, to pay additional cost of supplies and to put aside a certain amount of money for stabilization in case the sugar market collapses in the future, a certain amount for improved machinery and a certain amount for social welfare purposes. What is proposed by this Labour Government? It is proposed that we should not collect it all; it is proposed that the producer of the sugar that is consumed locally should not get the benefit of £4. 15 per ton but only £2 per ton. Well that is the most ridiculous thing I have ever heard and I think it is absolutely immoral. We are to subsidize an item which is grown in this island! We have put forward our claims year after year showing our increased costs and the British Government has generously met our demands, and here, as the junior member for the City has said, we are going to subsidize the very thing on which we depend. We grow sugar and we are going to subsidize it! I have never heard such a proposal in my life. It is immoral for us to subsidize our sugar now that we have successfully begged and are continuing to beg the British Government to give us more money to enable us to put the industry on a better footing. There is another point and that is what the senior member for St. Joseph has said about the exporting of sugar manufactured for local consumption. The acoustics in this Chamber seem to be very difficult nowadays but if I understand him correctly I gather that the £4. 15 will be taken off the amount of the subsidy. That, to my mind, is also immoral; the whole thing is immoral. What we should do is to postpone the further consideration of this Resolution until the Bills referred to in the Governor's Message No. 9/1947—the Bills for the establishment of the Price Stabilization Reserve Fund, the Capital Rehabilitation Reserve Fund and the Labour Welfare Fund—come down from the Government. We do not know on what lines those Bills will be drawn and I suggest to the senior member for St. Joseph to postpone the further consideration of this Resolution until they are laid before this House. I really cannot understand how the members of the Executive Committee could again allow themselves to be persuaded by the ships that pass in the night. There is an expression on the wharf—and a lot of humour can come from the wharf—that we have had five years of bush tea and we are now going to get a series of blood transfusions. (Laughter).

Mr. ADAMS: Before any other honourable member speaks I would like to say this to those members who have made the criticisms that the Gov-

ernment is politically manoeuvring or camouflaging or is immoral. The Government would feel strange if expressions like that were not hurled at it. The Government is trying its best to keep the cost of living as low as possible and it considered that this is one of the ways to do so. I hope there is no political camouflaging by honourable members of the Conservative Group whose hearts are bleeding today for the British taxpayer but that when the Income Tax Bill comes down they will talk and not be silent so as to help the British taxpayer. I am suggesting to honourable members that the duty of the Opposition is at least to be helpful in their criticisms but not to assign motives of the sort which they have imputed, especially to a Government like this that is absolutely determined to examine every matter that is for the good of the community, in the light of the ability of the community to pay, that ability necessarily having some reference to the incomes of people in the lowest income groups. This Resolution has been before the House for some time and honourable members must have had conferences with others connected with the sugar industry and, maybe, even connected with the Government and they should know that nothing in this proposal is in any way going to interfere with the scheme for stabilization, rehabilitation or labour welfare; merely to throw that at us is to accuse us not of being immoral but of having sawdust stuck into our heads instead of grey matter.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair did not understand the honourable junior member for St. James to suggest that the Government is immoral; he is saying that the proposal is immoral.

Mr. ADAMS: It is very difficult for a person to put forward an immoral proposal without being immoral himself. I am perfectly willing if honourable members have those ideas now—ideas which obviously were formed before they heard the Government's point of view and to which they are holding strongly—to accept the suggestion of the junior member for the City that a Select Committee be appointed to interview Dr. Saint and any other persons who may be helpful in giving information on the subject. It is no good telling the Government about subsidizing rice and stockfeed; we may come around to the subsidization of khaki pants which the senior member for St. Andrew has been always advocating. The Government has told this Committee that this Resolution has been brought merely in keeping with the principle established by previous Governments and accepted by previous Houses during the War and the Government would not be so stupid as to dream even of attempting to ram anything down the throats of honourable members who, as I say, have evidently made up their minds before they heard the Government's point of view. I think that the suggestion of the junior member for the City is an excellent one and when the House resumes I shall make a motion for the appointment of a Select Committee to consider and report on this matter. I would just like to point out that the merchants are anxious to get the matter settled, so that the members who are appointed on that Committee should meet promptly and submit their report as quickly as possible. I intend to postpone the further consideration of this Resolution and proceed with the next Resolution.

RESOLUTION TO PAY SALARIES OF ARCHITECT AND
PLANNING OFFICER AND HIS STAFF.

Mr. ADAMS: The next Resolution is for the sum of £2,861 to be placed at the disposal of the

Governor-in-Executive Committee to provide for the payment of the salaries and other expenses of the Architect and Planning Officer and the staff of his office until the 31st March, 1948.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, what is happening.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable senior member for St. Joseph is in charge of Government Business. He has postponed the further consideration of the first Resolution relating to the subsidization of sugar and is proceeding to the next Resolution and I rule that he is in order to do so.

Mr. MOTTLEY: All right, Sir.

Mr. ADAMS: As the addendum to this Resolution states this House has already in its reply to a Message from the Acting Governor approved of the proposals for the appointment of an Architect and Planning Officer to succeed Mr. L. DeSyllas and for the provision of the necessary staff and equipment and this Resolution—

Mr. WARD: On a point of Order.

The CHAIRMAN: Before any honourable member speaks I should like to say that it has been drawn to my attention that the senior member for St. Joseph should have asked for and obtained the leave of the House to postpone the further consideration of the Resolution relating to the subsidization of sugar.

VOICES: That sounds better.

The CHAIRMAN: The only person who has never made a mistake is the person who has never had anything to do. (Laughter).

Mr. ADAMS: I have been in this House long enough to have seen divers rulings on this point. With great respect, Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to postpone the further consideration of the Resolution relating to the subsidisation of sugar.

There being no objection the honourable member is granted the leave asked for and the Resolution is postponed.

Mr. ADAMS: I was saying that the Resolution for the sum of £2,861 is to provide the necessary funds to meet the cost of the salaries and other expenses of the Architect and Planning Officer and the staff of his office until the 31st March, 1948. I would just like to remind honourable members that it is hoped that he will come speedily because we desire that he should be here before Mr. DeSyllas leaves. I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I would just like to enquire from the senior member for St. Joseph whether it is proposed to keep the same staff and the same equipment which Mr. DeSyllas has or whether we are going to increase the personnel and the equipment. I would have liked to have had more details in the addendum. If I am voting for the retention of the staff and the same equipment I will not mind, but if the staff is to be increased and the equipment enlarged I would have liked to have been given more details in the addendum.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—I have not the file here but the details were all set out in the Acting Governor's Message and the House approved of them after a Select Committee considered the Message and submitted its report. This is purely formal. The House having stated that it approved of the proposals, this Resolution has been sent down to carry them into effect.

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

EX GRATIA GRANT TO EDGAR EDWARDS.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The next Resolution, Sir, is for the sum of £57. 5. 10 for the purpose of granting an *ex gratia* payment representing one month's salary for each completed year of service, within the pensionable age limit, as a casual employee in the Public Works Department, to Edgar Edwards. The addendum explains the matter. Edwards was employed until the 25th October, 1946, when he ceased to work on medical grounds and it is proposed to pay him a grant based on one month's salary for each completed year of service within the pensionable age limit. He was not a permanent employee of the Public Works Department but he was a member of one of the gangs that obtained employment fairly regularly. Now that he has retired on the grounds of ill health and has no means of subsistence the Government proposes to give him this grant. I may say that there is precedent for it. We have in the past given grants of this sort to employees of the Public Works Department who resigned on grounds of ill health after working for a number of years in the Government Service. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. SPRINGER, the Chairman reports the passing of two Resolutions and the postponement of one in Committee of Supply and asks leave to sit again.

The House resumed and on the motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the two Resolutions which are passed in Committee of Supply are read a first and a second time and are agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 88

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to take Order No. 11 as the next Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I refer the honourable member to Rule 88 which says *inter alia* that no Resolution shall be removed from its position on the Order Paper, so as to have precedence of other business, except the mover thereof shall have given notice at the previous meeting of the House of his intention to ask for leave to do so.

Mr. ADAMS: In that case, Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to move the suspension of Rule 88 in order to proceed with Order No. 11.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Rule 88 be suspended in order to be able to proceed with Order No. 11.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that.

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

COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCE TO
EMPLOYEES OF THE GOVERNMENT
SAVINGS BANK

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph,—To move the passing of the following Resolution:—

Resolved that with effect from the 1st day of April, 1946, and until the 31st of March, 1948, a cost of living allowance be paid to

- (a) officers in the full time service of the Savings Bank who receive their salaries from the funds of the Bank

- (b) officers who retired from the full time service of the Bank at any time between the 1st day of April, 1946, and the date of the passing of this Resolution in circumstances rendering them eligible for the grant of a pension or gratuity

at the rates, and subject to the terms, conditions and exceptions set out in the schedule to this Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—The Savings Bank is worked under a special Act and the Resolution which we have passed giving a cost of living allowance to public officers does not include the employees of the Bank; therefore, it is necessary to bring forward this Resolution. The rates, terms, conditions and exceptions are the same as those in respect of other branches of the Service. I beg to move that this Resolution be now approved of.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. GALE: I am not opposing this Resolution because I think it is fitting that the allowance be granted to the employees of the Bank but anybody who visits the Savings Bank must come to one of two conclusions,—either that it is understaffed or the premises in which its business is being done are too small.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that this is the occasion to go into that phase of the matter.

Mr. GALE: I was only endeavouring to bring it to the notice of the Government.

Mr. BRANCKER: I just want to say that I welcome this or any other Resolution to provide for the payment of a cost of living allowance. I am glad to see that the Government comes with this Resolution but I would like it to know that I have not given up hope and am still looking forward to the time when it will have a change of heart in respect of the cost of living allowance to the unestablished staff of the Highways and Transport Department.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member knows that those remarks are out of order.

The question that this Resolution be now approved of is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

FACTORIES BILL POSTPONED

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph,—Second reading of a Bill to make provision for the registration and supervision of factories and for the safety and well being of workers employed therein.

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave, Mr. Speaker, to postpone the consideration of this Bill, as the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on it has not yet completed its labours.

There being no objection, the consideration of this Bill is postponed.

DAIRIES REGULATIONS FURTHER
POSTPONED.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order is to resume Committee on the Resolution to approve Regulations made by the General Board of Health under Section 3 of the Dairies Act, 1941, and approved and sanctioned by the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

Mr. SPRINGER: The position, Mr. Speaker, as honourable members will remember, with this Resolution is that there were certain questions raised during the last debate which I duly noted and referred to the Chief Medical Officer. Those points are still under consideration; therefore, I ask leave to postpone this Order and the next Order standing in my name.

There being no objection, Orders Nos. 3 and 4 are postponed.

HOTELS AID BILL POSTPONED

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Philip, —Second reading of a Bill to encourage the Hotel Industry in this Island.

Mr. CRAWFORD: With your permission, Sir, I should like to ask leave to postpone the consideration of this Bill to-day.

Mr. SPEAKER: It seems that there is a general postponement of Orders to-day.

There being no objection, the consideration of this Bill is postponed.

COLONIAL TREASURER'S AMENDMENT BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, —Second reading of a Bill to amend the Colonial Treasurer's Act, 1941 (1941—9).

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I am afraid that on the last occasion, owing to my not making as full an explanation as possible, certain criticisms were made by some honourable members who felt that the House would be giving up some of its power. Provision for the House to appoint the Colonial Treasurer still exists; it is not touched by this amendment. But on the last occasion when the Colonial Treasurer was unfortunately ill, in order to get a cheque signed to be able to draw Government money it was necessary to drive to Mr. Gittens's house and get him to sign the cheque on his bed. We are trying to prevent that from happening again, if the Colonial Treasurer is ill. If honourable members will look at the "Objects and Reasons" for this Bill, they will see there stated that as the law stands at present, no person can be appointed to act as Colonial Treasurer unless he has been nominated by the House of Assembly and approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. Recent experience has shown that such a position may lead to considerable inconvenience in case the Colonial Treasurer should fall ill and this Bill accordingly seeks to amend the law so as to authorize the Governor to appoint a person to act as Colonial Treasurer in the event of the Colonial Treasurer becoming temporarily incapable of performing his duties through illness,—nothing else. The House will still continue to appoint the Colonial Treasurer and to make acting appointments too but if the House happens not to be in session when the Colonial Treasurer is too ill to come out to work it will mean, as the law stands at present, going to his house, as I said just now, to get cheques signed. This Bill seeks purely to meet that possibility and has no intention whatever of taking away any power from the House. I beg to move that the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second the motion and I would like to add this. The present situation also causes a hardship upon the senior clerk in the Department who, in such cases as described by the senior member for St. Joseph, cannot receive any pay for acting; in fact, until an appointment is confirmed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee no one can act and receive half of the pay of the Colonial Treasurer which a person ought to be receiving for shouldering a responsibility of that sort. Honourable members will realize that in the event of the Colonial Treasurer falling ill, the next senior person in the Department has got to fill his place; whether he is in

the official position or not, he must undertake the responsibility and it is only fair that if the man has to shoulder the responsibility, in fact if not in law, he ought to be allowed to draw what remuneration is available for him. If honourable members in spite of that explanation are still opposed to the slight change in the method of the appointment of the Acting Colonial Treasurer, I suggest that we pass the second reading of the Bill in order that we may go into Committee and there we may be able to make suitable amendments.

Mr. RAMSAY: In view of what the senior member for St. Joseph and the senior member for St. George have said I am satisfied, especially when the senior member for St. Joseph stated that no acting appointment can be made except with the consent of the House. I was apprehensive that in case the Colonial Treasurer was incapacitated for a long period, someone might be appointed by the Governor and during that period we may have been left in the cold. I am perfectly in agreement with what the two honourable members have said and I am going to vote for the Bill.

Mr. LEWIS: I do not know whether I should agree to or disagree with the principle of this Bill as it stands but I know that it will be wrong on the part of the House to leave the Government in such a position that it cannot carry on if the Colonial Treasurer falls ill. However, I would like to point out that this Bill makes provision for illness only. I understand that there are occasions on which the Colonial Treasurer may have to be out of the Island. There is such a body set up in these parts as a Currency Board; if there is anybody in this island to serve on that Board it may be the Colonial Treasurer, in which case he may have to go to Trinidad where the Board is being set up and I do not see any reason why this Bill should not provide for such a contingency. The next thing I may say is that the point raised by the junior member for St. Peter is worthy of consideration by this House. If the incapacity of the Colonial Treasurer continues for longer than three months I think this House should have a say in who should continue to act as Colonial Treasurer. Not that alone. I think that this Bill should also contain some provision that if anybody is appointed, even for a day, the matter should be referred to the House so that it could be placed on record that such a thing did take place. I am of the opinion that provision should be made in the Act for these contingencies. I do not say that if the Colonial Treasurer is out of the island somebody should not act and be given some compensation for acting. I am prepared to let the Government make the adjustment for a short period but I am going to insist in Committee that some amendment be made, making it obligatory on the Government to report the matter to this House at its very next meeting after that adjustment has been made. It has come to my knowledge that the person who has acted as Colonial Treasurer for some considerable time—not perhaps within the last 18 months—has received absolutely no compensation whereas if he had been acting for someone else in the Government Service he would have been compensated and I do not think that this House should cling to a privilege unless it makes an adjustment whereby people who are affected by it are compensated. Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly willing to approve of the principle of allowing the Government to make an adjustment so that if the Colonial Treasurer is ill for a short period, the Governor can appoint someone to act and report the matter to the House at its very next meeting after but I am not pre-

pared to let that acting continue for an indefinite period without the consent of the House.

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

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

Clause 1 is read and agreed to.

Clause 2. The Colonial Treasurer's (Amendment) Act 1941, is hereby amended,

(a) by deleting the words figures and symbols "(i) The person holding the office of Colonial Treasurer's Act 1891 (hereinafter referred to as the Principal Act) and may be cited as the Colonial Treasurer's (Amendment) Act, 1941" occurring immediately before section two of the said Act and substituting as section one the words, figures and symbols following, that is to say:—

"1. This Act shall be read together with the Colonial Treasurer's Act, 1891 (hereinafter referred to as the Principal Act) and may be cited as the Colonial Treasurer's (Amendment) Act, 1941."

(b) by renumbering section four thereof as section 4 (1) and by adding thereto as so renumbered the following new subsection to be numbered (2):—

"(2) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in subsection (1) of this section, if the Colonial Treasurer through illness shall become temporarily incapable of performing the duties of his office, the Governor may if he shall consider it expedient so to do appoint some fit and proper person to act in his place and stead during the period of his incapacity."

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that that be Clause 2 of the Bill.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. WARD: Before the question is put I would like to have an explanation of sub-clause 2 of this Clause. It says: "If the Colonial Treasurer through illness shall become temporarily incapable of performing the duties of his office." How far does "temporarily" go. I feel that there should be some limit. Suppose the House was prorogued or dead and it became necessary for the Governor to appoint someone to act as Colonial Treasurer, the new House should be notified within a reasonable time after, so as to give it the opportunity of saying whether it approves of the acting appointment or not. I feel that there should be some amendment to make it clear that the House will have the last say in the appointment of that Acting Colonial Treasurer. There is another point. As the junior member for the City has said, this Bill, as far as I see, covers only illness. The Colonial Treasurer may have to go on leave and that should also be taken into consideration. I beg to move that we report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. ADAMS: I should like to point out that the normal sick leave to the Colonial Treasurer would be only three weeks; after that, he would have to apply for further leave and the House would have the right under section 4 of the Act to appoint someone to act as Colonial Treasurer. The Act does not, however, make any provision for the possibility of the House not being in session or the Colonial Treasurer dying or being on leave. If an honourable mem-

ber would make an amendment to cover that possibility I would be perfectly willing to accept it.

Mr. LEWIS: I suggest the deletion of the words "through illness" occurring in lines 3 and 4 of sub-clause 2 of this Clause and the substitution of the words "for any cause whatever" therefor and the insertion of a new sub-clause as follows:— "Provided that all such acting appointments are reported to the House of Assembly at its next meeting for confirmation and provided also that such acting appointment shall not continue for longer than three months."

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman,—I would not like the House to do anything wrong, so I feel that it is better to postpone this matter and let a proper amendment be prepared in the meantime.

Mr. ADAMS: I do not know what honourable members want. If they will tell me what they want I will draft an amendment in keeping with their desire.

Mr. WARD: Section 4 of the Act says:— "If the Colonial Treasurer shall be granted leave or shall become temporarily incapable of performing or is from any cause temporarily prevented from acting in the duties of his office, the House of Assembly shall nominate some fit and proper person to be approved of by the Governor-in-Executive Committee to act in his place and stead." According to this amendment we would not have the power to nominate at all. The Governor can appoint someone to act as Colonial Treasurer for a year and we would not have any say because there is no provision here that the matter should be reported to this House for confirmation. Suppose for argument sake the Colonial Treasurer suddenly died, for how long would the Governor be authorized to appoint an Acting Colonial Treasurer? It might be for a period of ten years.

Mr. SPRINGER: I do not like the proposal of the junior member for the City, who is not in his seat, because if you allow us merely to confirm we will be reversing our present position. Our right under the present law is to nominate and it should not be a matter merely of confirmation by this House. The first sub-clause of this Clause states that in case of leave other than through illness, the House nominates, just as in the case of the original appointment, and the Governor-in-Executive Committee approves. I see no reason why the position should be reversed in the case of illness. I should like to point out that the eventuality of death is not provided for under the Act and death is as much an unforeseen emergency as temporary illness. I am suggesting that the words "or shall die" be inserted after the word "office"; that the words "during the period of incapacity" be deleted and the following substituted therefor: "Until an appointment shall have been made by the House of Assembly," in fact, I beg to move that sub-Clause 1 of Clause 2 be deleted and the following substituted therefor:—

"(2) notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in subsection (1) of this section, if the Colonial Treasurer through illness shall become temporarily incapable of performing the duties of his office or shall die the Governor may if he shall consider it expedient so to do appoint some fit and proper person to act in his place and stead until an appointment shall have been made by the House of Assembly. The Governor shall inform the House of Assembly at its next meeting of such appointment and the House of Assembly shall thereupon nominate

some fit and proper person to be approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee to act in place of the Colonial Treasurer."

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: There is only one point, that is, the contingency of the Colonial Treasurer going out of the island to attend a Conference, for instance.

Mr. SPRINGER: That is covered by sub-clause 1. If it is known that the Colonial Treasurer is going to leave the island, the House will be informed in advance and on the day he is going someone will be nominated to act but where there is some unforeseen circumstance such as illness or death, some means of temporarily filling the post should be provided.

Mr. ADAMS: I am more inclined, in the circumstances, to accept the motion of the senior member for St. Lucy because the principal Act makes it incumbent on us to make an annual appointment and the wording of the amendment of the senior member for St. George does not quite fit in with the section of the Principal Act which speaks of the annual appointment. I will confess that this is an oversight by the Government. Even the Principal Act will have to be altered some day unless honourable members want to continue to appoint the Colonial Treasurer every year, although the session is for a period of two years. I beg to second the motion of the senior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. GALE: I do not quite understand the argument of the senior member for St. Joseph. I think the Act was amended sometime ago and the provision with respect to the annual appointment of the Colonial Treasurer was deleted. When the House appoints a Colonial Treasurer now he occupies his office as long as his behaviour is good.

The question that the Chairman report progress and ask leave to sit again is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The CHAIRMAN reports and the House resumes.

At this stage, 2 p.m., Mr. SPEAKER adjourns the House until 2.45 p.m., in accordance with Rule 40 (a).

NOTICE OF RESOLUTION

On re-assembling,

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I do not propose to ask honourable members to resume the consideration of Government Business; I am merely asking leave to give notice of a Resolution that the sum of One Thousand Five Hundred Pounds be granted from the Public Treasury to supplement Resolution No. 57 of the 27th September, 1946, to provide the necessary staff and stationery for, and to meet incidental expenses in connection with, the carrying on of an organisation for banking the compulsory savings of Barbadian workers employed in the United States of America, for the payment to their nominees of the allotments authorised to be paid under the terms of the workers' contracts, for the payment of any Court order in respect of the maintenance of any persons dependent on the workers, for the reimbursement of any monies paid by the Government of Barbados in respect of duties incurred by the workers in the United States of America, and in respect of advances made to workers by way of cash or in order to effect insurance.

There being no objection, the honourable member was granted leave to give notice of the Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply

at its next meeting to deal with the Resolution of which I have just given notice.

REPLIES LAID

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to lay on the Table of the House the Replies to Question No. 18 standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Michael.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to lay the Replies to Questions Nos. 25 and 26, both standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to lay the Replies to Question No. 22 standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy:

SCARCITY OF STANDPIPES IN ST. JOHN

Mr. SPEAKER: On the last occasion at Question Time, the House was considering the motion for adjournment made by the honourable senior member for St. John in order to discuss the Replies given to his Question No. 12, relating to the scarcity of standpipes in St. John, and the honourable senior member for St. Michael was speaking.

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker,—I was assured last week by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph that a very comprehensive scheme for the water supply is on foot, and I am satisfied that some steps have been taken to improve the conditions. I only hope that the Government will put the scheme into effect as soon as possible.

Dr. WILSON: With regard to this matter of the scarcity of standpipes in the parish of St. John, as I said when the matter was being discussed, I am very glad to know that the Government is paying some attention not only to the improvement of the water supply but also to the extension of the water system. I am hoping that the Electric and Hydraulic Engineer will re-double his efforts because of the urgency of this matter, so that he will be able to make his Report and present it to the Government as soon as possible. I now ask leave to withdraw my motion.

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

FORMATION OF A POLICE ASSOCIATION

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes so that I might discuss the Replies given to my Questions No. 4. For the benefit of those honourable members who might not readily recall, those Questions dealt with the formation of a Police Association. I enquired:—

1. Whether permission or approval has been sought from Government on behalf of the Police relative to the formation of a Police Association?

2. If the answer to the above is "Yes", was such approval, or permission, given?

3. If such approval or permission was given, will Government ascertain, and inform this House, whether such an Association has yet been formed?

4. If the answer to Question two is "Yes", and to query three is, that "such an Association has not been formed," can Government enlighten this House as to the reason why it has not been formed?

The answer to the first Question is "No," and the other three Questions have been answered in the automatic, characteristic and traditional fashion, "Do not arise." I cannot understand how the Government can tell this House that permission or approval has not been sought from them on behalf of the

Police relative to the formation of this Association. The facts, as I have been able to ascertain them, are exactly the opposite to the information which the Government has supplied. There was a petition dated the 9th of October, 1944, from the senior Non-commissioned Officers of the Barbados Police Force which stated, among other things, that "We, the undersigned Non-commissioned Officers of the Barbados Police Force, respectfully beg to forward this petition to Your Excellency praying that favourable consideration be given to this petition for an increase of salaries and amelioration of living conditions for the improvement of the Force. Matters which are of paramount importance and call for urgent attention are classed under the following Heads: Heads 1 to 6 are mentioned, and Head 7 states: "Formation of a Police Association." At present the only means of bringing before the notice of the Commissioner of Police any dissatisfaction amongst the members of the Force is through the Non-commissioned Officer under whose charge the aggrieved party is placed, and the aggrieved person often refrains from expressing his grievance through this channel for fear of victimisation, and that his case will be treated as a complaint. Such a feeling is inimical to the well-being of the Force, and also a stumbling-block to a satisfactory service."

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the honourable member reading from?

Mr. BRANCKER: These are notes which I have made; I have no objection to their becoming the property of the House. The petition went on to state:

"The formation of a Police Association as formed by the Metropolitan Police Force would alleviate, if not overcome, this element of suspicion and *inter alia*, would be a safe means of bringing any grievance to the notice of the Commissioner of Police for redress at the earliest opportunity. This, in our opinion, is bound to result not only in a better mutual understanding between all ranks, which is essential in any organized body, but also in the dispelling of that fear and suspicion which exists."

This petition from the senior Non-commissioned Officers of the Barbados Police Force dated the 9th of October, 1944, has been forwarded to the Governor, and the reply, lest we think that the petition was misplaced in the post or did not reach the Addressee, which was received signed P. F. Campbell, Acting Colonial Secretary, dated 15th of November, 1944. Reference No. 1315, Volume 11/68, says this:

"His Excellency has no objection to the formation of a Police Association, and would be prepared to render such assistance as might be necessary for the formation of such an Association on recognized lines. His Excellency is uncertain, however, what sort of Association the petitioners have in mind."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I doubt whether there is any honourable member of this House who would disagree with me that nothing is more desirable and essential in the interest or well-being of this very considerable and important body of public employees in this island than that they should have a direct channel whereby they might ventilate their grievances in the proper quarters. This petition was sent up in October 1944, more than two years ago, a reply was received in November of that year, but the Association has not been formed! The rank and file are wondering why it has not been formed. Many of the members of the Force believe that there is opposition to the formation of the Association in high quarters, and some of them have told me that they have been informed that the Officers of the Force claim that they

have written to England for particulars of the Police Federation of London as mentioned by Superintendent Calver in paragraphs 263, 264 and 265 of his Report. In paragraph 265 of his Report Superintendent Calver says that "The Police Federation was established by the Police Act, 1919, for the purpose of enabling the members of the police forces of England and Wales to consider and bring to the notice of police authorities and the Secretary of State all the matters affecting their welfare and efficiency, other than questions of discipline and promotion affecting individuals." In paragraph 266 of the Report Superintendent Calver says this: "The Police Federation and every branch thereof shall be entirely independent of and unassociated with any body or person outside the Police Service." Honourable members will recall that the investigating Officer referred to the fact that advice had been sought of him by individual members and in a paper presented to him on behalf of other ranks of the Barbados Police Force, upon the means authorised in the Metropolitan Police to enable policemen to consider and bring to notice matters which they wish to raise affecting the Force as a whole, or ranks within the Force, and he advised them that in London the machinery for dealing with this subject is called the Metropolitan Police Branch Boards which are part of the Police Federation. When members of the Force sought information from their superior officers as to the Association, they were told, they informed me, by the senior Officers "We have written to England to get particulars as to how the Metropolitan Police Branch Boards are being run, and we have even written to Jamaica, but no reply has been received." Superintendent Calver submitted his Report since December, 1945: nearly a year and half has elapsed and nothing has been done about this Police Federation! I think that it should be clearly stated in this House that not only has the Government no objection to the formation of this Association, but it should be positive and display enthusiasm about it and say that it would welcome the formation of such an Association and will do all in its power to make it a success. The Government should say that and mean it. There has been a communication between these public employees and the Government from the former as to the formation of this Association; the Government replies in an official document, and when they are queried in the House as to whether permission or approval has been sought from them on behalf of the Police relative to the formation of a Police Association, the Reply is "No." I can only take that to mean that the Government is asking this House to believe that no permission or approval has been sought from the Government on behalf of the Police relative to the formation of such an Association. I have not heard of any loss or destruction by fire or anything else of Governmental files, and I would be led to think that the Government is trying to deceive or refusing to supply information to the House. I take it that this Reply would not have been given if certain honourable members of this House were not aware of what is going on. It is very unsatisfactory to be told in a carefully considered Reply that permission has never been sought relative to the formation of a Police Association, when it is on record in certain Governmental files that this permission has been sought and the Government has replied that it has no objection to the formation of such an Association. The point I want to make is that this Reply is completely unsatisfactory; it is untrue and inadequate. Apart from that the Police want to feel that the Government is really enthusiastic about this matter and is not merely

saying that it has no objection to the formation of this Association, because, if the Government has no objection to it, the Police will continue to feel, until the Association is formed, that replies will never come from the Metropolitan or the Jamaica Police Force or the various avenues from which advice is being sought. What should have been given is an unqualified, unconditional statement from the Government that a Police Association is welcome and is being enthusiastically looked forward to by them. Because of the very unsatisfactory nature of these Replies, and the inaccuracies therein contained, because this is a burning question and one which I feel the House would be glad to let the Government know how it feels about the formation of such a necessary body as a Police Association, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for five minutes in order that we may consider, analyse and discuss these Replies.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member's motion has not been seconded.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What I want to suggest is that the further consideration of the Replies to these Questions be postponed.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that you cannot do that because the motion has not been seconded.

Mr. COX: I beg to second the motion of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the honourable member wanted to second that motion he should have done so at once. I have already said that the motion has not been seconded.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I should like to say in view of the remarks made by the honourable junior member for St. Lucy—

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that I can let the honourable member speak now because I have already said that there has not been any Seconder of the honourable member's motion, and therefore that is the end of the matter.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (A).

Mr. RAMSAY: I beg to move that Rule 61 (a) be now suspended in order to proceed with Private Member's Business.

Mr. HAYNES seconded the motion which was agreed to.

ADDRESS *Re* NATIONALISATION OF THE BARBADOS ELECTRIC SUPPLY CORPORATION LIMITED.

Mr. SPEAKER: When Private Members' Business was last being considered, the House was debating the motion for the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor relating to the nationalisation of the Barbados Electric Supply Corporation Limited. The passing of this Address was moved by the honourable senior member for St. Andrew, a motion for the postponement of the further consideration of the Address was made by the honourable junior member for St. Philip and that was seconded by the honourable junior member for St. Michael. The honourable junior member for St. Philip has the right to continue his speech if he wishes to do so, and after him, the honourable junior member for St. Michael.

Mr. GARNER: On the last occasion I had just begun to speak on this matter and I said that electricity is a luxury. I am still of that opinion to-day and I want to give some reasons for saying that. For many years the Electric Company has been enjoying certain privileges in this island, and no doubt they may have amassed a lot of money; but what do we find to-day? They are very reluctant to spend any

of their resources to extend the service; at this time when the world is being modernised, you get this Company being very indifferent and recalcitrant in extending their service to the inhabitants of this island! I think that they should not only be censured, but the people of this island should consider that this company has broken its Contract, and the Government should take over and control and nationalise it. This Company has not lived up to expectation; everything is moving forward and onward and they are very many respectable people who would welcome this service in their homes; but this Company is sitting on its rights and it does not intend to increase its service to the people of this colony. That is a crying shame. When you get a company which has a large reserve and it does not want to take that money and further extend its service, that Company is no good. When a Company wants to create large reserves, that is not doing anybody any good. This Company is living to itself. We in Barbados want electricity because it is the modern way for cooking and lighting, and if this Company refuses to extend its services something should be done about it. You will find the Company operating in certain places, like Bathsheba where certain people live, and in other places where people want the same service, you go to the Company and they will tell you that you have to pay some of the expenses for installing the service. It is their Company and you have to pay for that! If you have to pay for erecting the posts and running the wires and what not, I do not see any reason why you should not be a partner in the business. The moment you do that, you are a partner in the firm. I say that something is wrong with this Company and it should be taken over by the Government. I see no reason why it should not be nationalised. I have been reading the Act in connection with this Company, and it is a peculiar proposition; I have no doubt that they make a lot of money. I have not seen the books, but I think that they should operate and capitalise their business to a large extent and give the people of this island electricity. Kerosene oil lamps are almost out of date but we have to keep them as "stand-bys". On the greatest railways they carry along oil lamps for use in case of emergencies; but we are not now talking about emergencies, and there is no doubt that this Company should be strongly censured because if they wanted to extend their services they could have done so. It is true that they had a three-mile limit, but in 1936 or 1937 they got an extension and they could have made capital out of that. If they wanted to live up to their Contract, they would have supplied the inhabitants of this island with cheap electricity because they get a lot of their fittings free of duty. I do not see why the Government should not own this Company, set up a proper department and run it. The Waterworks Department was not always run as it is being run to-day. Mr. Speaker, electricity is very essential to the people of this island and this Company ought to be told that the time has come when the standard of living in Barbados is such that electricity is an absolute necessity. There are very few villages where electrical services would not be welcome. It is very difficult nowadays to get a servant who will do almost anything, and if the lady of the home has her electricity, she can do her ironing, boil her tea and many other things without working her domestic servant too hard. It is true that we are English to the core in that we like a lot of servants, but in America people do a lot of their house work themselves, and electricity is of much assistance in doing this work. When there is any pressing to be done, instead of going back to the old-time method of lighting a coal-pot, you use a

plug and do all your pressing by electricity. If this Company does not want to modernise the island, although they have it in their power to do so, something should be done about it. They must either modernise the island or get out of business. This Company is not a Company in itself, because it enjoys certain special privileges and in that way, it has something in common with the people of this colony. It is typical of these Companies which are registered in London not to spend too much money and this Company is just a good example. They have it in their power to make a lot of money in a legitimate way; if they only had enough foresight they would see that, by the extension of their services to the neighbouring parishes where there are certain homes and businesses, they would reap a big harvest, but their minds are made up on keeping their reserve funds and not allowing their capital to be expended from those funds. This Company would create bigger reserves if they would create a bigger capitalisation fund, and meanwhile they would give the people of this colony service for their money, having regard to the privileges which the Company enjoys. It is not a matter of overhead expenses; if you have a bigger trade, your profits must be greater. So long as you are making a profit, the volume of trade counts. It is not a question of spending more money and giving less service; if you are extending the service into more homes you are collecting more money. If they are making more money per unit, they will make more money on the whole volume: if they are not making any money, let them come out of business. If they are enjoying privileges and are not giving the people of this colony the service which they should give them, then something should be done about that. I do not think that we are alone in this matter: other people want this service nationalised, and I do not think that there would be any difficulty in setting up a bureau or Committee to run this Department. There are other services which need to be nationalised, and the telephone service is one of them. I cannot pay \$12 per month for telephone service. Going back to the Electric Company, I say that they will not spend any money in extending their services, and I am told that they have large reserve funds. I repeat, the Government will have to take over this service and run it. (A MEMBER: Not like the Waterworks.) An hon. member says "not like the Waterworks," but I suppose that the Waterworks will be brought up to standard. (Cheers). If we are taking over this service, I have no fear about our creating a proper department to run it, otherwise we will be censured too. We have come to the stage where, if the capitalists hint at anything, the Labourites will have to do it. (Hear, hear). The capitalists may not want to extend their services for fear that they will have to spend more money. We are not primarily interested in the profits made by the Electric Company, but as to how much service the people of this colony are getting from the Company. We are aiming at service; we owe it to the inhabitants of this island to see to it that they get cheap electricity. In certain country shops you cannot tell what you are buying; you cannot see because the people have the old-time method of lighting. Conditions are much worse when you come to the Almshouse especially when children are about to be born. They had to borrow a gas lamp in the parish of St. Philip at one time. These things should be brought to the notice of the Electric Company and perhaps they will give proper service. If they have no money for this purpose, they can float a loan; if they have a few services and they make money, they should extend

the service over the whole island. If a man sell a dozen items and make a dollar on each item, he can increase the numbers of items and even charge one-half the value and still come out all right. Some people differ from me, but I maintain that. Those who differ from me are not business people and they cannot see that but I excuse them. I do not think that I can speak too strongly on this matter. I myself am feeling the pinch. I should very much like to have electricity in my district. Some time ago, I interviewed the Company in connection with the matter, and they were very non-committal. They promised that a few Government places like the Government Industrial Schools up there would be supplied. I regard that as foolishness; the Electric Company wants people with business acumen. Something is wrong with this Company because they enjoy certain privileges and they do not want to launch out. They should go out and look for customers; the people want them to extend their service. If this Address is passed, I would counsel those who are members of the Government to see to it that they get proper men to run this concern and do not let it be a fiasco. I am not standing for inefficiency or anything like that. If we agree that the people should get service through these public utilities, then we must create departments and equip them with men who know their job and who are eager to see to it that business are run not at a loss, but that they pay their way. I hope that the Government will work on this programme, because as I visualise the position, many utilities need to be taken over, and it is necessary for those who are in the Government to get together and do things for the interest of the people. Things which are going on in this colony now have been going on for the last 300 years, and if this Labour Government is carrying on in the same way, they are not doing anything. If the standard of living has been raised, the people should have electricity.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the hon. member is going a little too fast. He should only make these points after the Address has been passed.

Mr. GARNER: I thank you for the latitude which you have given me. Mr. Speaker. I know that I have digressed a little. I see no reason why this Company should not be taken over, because they have broken faith with the people. They have not given the people the service to which they are entitled, and even at this late hour, in the apology which they have made in a letter to the Press, they do not say that they have made up their minds to improve the service! I repeat that if the standard of living of the people has been raised, they should have cheap electricity, and if they are to get cheap electricity, the Government must take over the concern. You cannot expect to get cheap electricity from a Company which has to pay premiums on its shares. We can ask them to extend their services, but if the people want to get electricity more cheaply than they are getting it to-day, the Government will have to take over the concern or control it. It is an undeniable fact that the people of this colony would welcome an extension of this service; it is also true that the standard of living in Barbados has gone up but this Company has not been moving on with the trend of things. They look for certain places in which to carry their service, but they must be more realistic and extend the service into every nook and corner where people will have the use of it. Do you think that this Company will extend their service into the remote corners of this island when there is nobody to force them to

do it? No, and therefore the only thing to do is to let the Government take over the concern and nationalise it. These people are hard-headed business people who are accustomed to investments on their money and not to spend the money in the way in which we are proposing it would be spent. They are out to get as much money as they can out of the people of Barbados: hence, I repeat, the only thing to do is to nationalise the concern. Whatever it costs us let us do that even if we have to borrow the money. That has to be done because the world is moving on, and electricity is becoming a commonplace service; but we find that this Company intends to draw lines of demarcation, they want to serve just the well-to-do people, but we cannot have that. We have come to the age of all being for one, and one being for all. The people of Barbados want to know that the Electric Company can extend their lines so that they can get away from the primitive methods of lighting. There are many children who have to wear glasses because of the primitive method by which they have to read at night. Sometime ago a friend advised me to put a shade over my lamp because, he says, the glare of the light will hurt my eyes. This Electric Company will not do anything: I had to go to the expense of putting up a windcharger so as to get light in my premises. In this connection, if you buy a radio, you have to buy a battery set. Very often you suffer unless you have batteries, and you must have a windcharger. One hon. member says that you must keep a proper windcharger. That is so uncertain and out of date, that I hate to think that the suggestion came from a Labour member of this House. I forgive him, however, because he made the suggestion in a jocular way. Many children suffer from bad eyes because of the primitive methods of lighting, and when these matters are brought to the notice of the Government, I think that a proper case has been made out as to why the Government should take over this concern and run it. We want service, and if this Company and other Companies cannot cater to the demands of the people in an efficient way, then they should be taken over by the Government. I feel that that is the consensus of opinion among my Labourite colleagues in this House: we want to give the inhabitants great and small of this island a fair chance of enjoying the amenities of life. As I have said, electricity is an absolute necessity and not a luxury and the time has come when we want not only to promote business but to render service. Service is the keynote, and I look forward to the day when there will be more peace and tranquillity and full service. That is what we, as a Labour group, will have to initiate to-day. When we say that we want to nationalise this Company, we are on the way not only to reform Barbados, but we are beginning what is going to be the very best service. The amount of good that each individual can get out of an industry is the thing that counts. We want a new departure where this and other Companies are concerned, because they have started in a primitive way making profits for a few financiers. If we, as Labourites, are going to do anything, if we have any faith in our ideologies or political convictions, we will make sure that these Companies which enjoy special privileges in this island, are not run to the detriment of the inhabitants of this colony. I again repeat that electricity is a very essential service, and we must have it for the people of this colony. Whether you nationalise or control the service, it is well that this Government take steps at once to see that something is done to bring this island in line electrically with the outside world. (Cheers).

Mr. GALE: Unlike the hon. member who has just sat down, I am not in favour of this Address. (MEMBERS: Shame!) If we go into the history of the Electric Company, we will find that this Company was started as far back as 1911 and has been running up to the present time. The hon. member who has just spoken has talked about large profits which, he says, this Company has been making. Well, the hon. member has evidently not taken the trouble to look at the balance sheets of this Company which are filed every year according to the law. If the hon. member had taken the trouble to look at these balance sheets, he would have discovered that from 1911 to 1927 this Company had not paid one cent in dividends to the shareholders. They worked for sixteen years and they did not pay a single dividend to the shareholders! From 1928 to 1932 they paid a 5% dividend for one year, and then they paid a 7% dividend and that is the highest which has ever been paid by the Company since they started. If a mean is taken, it will be found that for the 36 years during which the Company has been working, they have paid a dividend of 3.79% to the shareholders. Therefore, I do not see how anyone can argue that this Company has been paying large dividends to the shareholders. As far as the extension of electricity is concerned, when the Company started, the franchise was only for the City of Bridgetown and not beyond a five-mile limit. That continued up to 1936. In August, 1936, the Company was given the privilege of extending their lines all over the island, and extensions took place immediately. The service went to Bulkeley, Brighton, to other parts of St. George, St. John and St. Joseph, and to the Leeward parishes down to Speightstown. That was a period of only three years during which the Company extended its programme and so they covered a radius of 55 miles from 1936 to 1939. Those who have criticised the Company for not further extending their service seem to have forgotten that from 1939 to 1945 a War was on, and the Company was not allowed by the Government to make any extensions. The Government clamped down on the importation of all machinery and the importation of electrical supplies. As far back as 1941, this Company applied to the local Government for permission to import certain machinery so as to extend their plant, and the Government appointed the Colonial Engineer to inspect the plant, but the Company's request was refused and they were not allowed to get any machinery of any kind whatsoever. After continual applications were made to the Colonial Secretary, the Government gave instructions for the issue of an import licence in 1942. The indent for the plant was made in 1943 and the machinery was due to arrive in 1945. However, it did not arrive until 1946 and it has been installed and is working. The Company has not yet been able to complete their extensions. Far from the Company not wanting to extend their services, they are ready and willing to spend large sums of money to increase their services and to make electricity a general use so that the price can come down. The hon. junior member for St. Philip says that he would like to see electricity put into every small village all over Barbados. I quite agree with him; but if hon. members would turn to the history of the Waterworks Department which the Government took over since 1895, they would see that although the most essential thing in the world is water—much more essential than electricity—the Government has not been able to make the water supply reach every nook and cranny in Barbados. The hon. junior member for St. Philip has said that the Government should own this concern: well, they

have owned the Waterworks for the last 50 years, and at every meeting of this House I still hear questions being asked as to why water is not in such and such a village. Hon. members of each parish have their grouse about water, and they are continually calling on the Government to increase the water supply in the parishes. If the Government has been running the Waterworks Department for 50 years, and they have not yet been able to get water into every small village in Barbados, I say without fear of contradiction that the Electric Company has done a much better job in their period of existence than the Government has done with respect to the water supply since they took over from a private company and have been running the concern for the last 50 years. If hon. members will refer to what is going on in the West Indies, they will see that at present the Jamaica Government owns the telephone system, and that the Labour Government is now asking an English Company to come and relieve them of the burden of running the system. It has been an absolute failure and they are losing thousands of pounds a year. The Government runs the Telephone Company of Trinidad and Tobago and negotiations are now being made by the Government to have a private Telephone Company to take over the system as it is in a terrible condition. As far as the Government running the Electric Company is concerned, I cannot vote for that. I find that they are good at running certain Departments like the Civil Service and other Departments like that; but I have known that the people of Barbados have found to their sorrow that, in the case of certain undertakings run by the Government, there has been absolute failure. Mr. Speaker, I will not detain the House any longer, but this is a very important subject. (Cheers).

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is noticeable that people who would otherwise be uncompromising, would appear to be the most ardent Socialists when it comes to seeing their areas or constituencies or whatever the case may be, in a very good condition and enjoying all the social amenities that can be offered. That must be expected from public-spirited citizens. The honourable senior member for St. Andrew must be complimented on his attempt and his manner in expressing his public-spiritedness in this matter, more especially when he clearly points out that the extension of electricity affects the parish of St. Andrew. Far be it from me to suggest that there is any selfish motive on the honourable member's part. I am convinced that this is due to the public-spirited attitude of the honourable member in this matter. Mr. Speaker, it is known that a little after I came into public life in this colony, I pledged myself to fight the Barbados Electric Company as soon as the War was over, and the honourable senior member for St. Andrew reminded me about that since he tabled his Address. I possess the same feeling now about the Electric Company and its administration, and I am not going back on that pledge. I am, however, worried about a few things. I am cautioning the present Government; I am reminded of a recent speech made by the Leader of the House as to how easy it is to make a speech for the unthinking. As far as the Electric Company is concerned, I am not dealing with any figures. I would caution this House that the passing of an Address of this nature immediately after a Labour Government has assumed office and is attempting to improve the social conditions in this colony, is in my opinion, and I have considered the matter very carefully, something which should be watched from every possible angle. We find that there is a pressing need for several social reforms in this colony foremost amongst them

being the question of housing; then there is the question of roads and water. I must agree that, with conditions as they are in Barbados to-day, and we are mindful that the world has become socialist, it is necessary to do first things first. As I understand it, the Electric Company has a capital of £260,000, and if we pass an Address asking that it be nationalized, we will have to look around for half a million pounds in order to buy out this Company. Should we pass such an Address in respect of a Company which has not had any opportunity of getting any replacements and keeping its machinery up-to-date, a Company with ten or twenty-year-old machinery? It has been admitted on all sides that this Company has no up-to-date machinery, and should we pass an Address asking for the nationalization of such a Company with the taxpayers' money? I say that nationalization must come, whether we like it or not, but first things must come first. Any of us who has had a glimpse of the ten-year Development Plan will appreciate the fact that housing is the most pressing problem in this colony, and roads and water are of paramount importance. Mr. Speaker, it can be correctly argued from the floor of this House that electricity is a necessity in this island, but to have a decent house in which to live is also a necessity. The honourable junior member for St. Philip has said that there are many respectable people who would like to have electricity installed in their homes. I am not in agreement with that; I say that I represent the island, not any section of respectable people (Cheers). The honourable senior member for St. Andrew feels that there are lots of people in St. Andrew who would install electricity if the service were extended. Of course they would do that. If we nationalize this Company, it would also be necessary to subsidize electricity at the expense of people who have not got proper houses in which to live, never mind to put electricity in them. I quite agree that this Company must do something and they must do it immediately. Coming back to the administration of the Company, I say that I am the first person to associate myself with the view that this Company should be controlled. It is ridiculous in a community such as this, to think that this Company can expect to charge a few people who can afford to pay it, twenty-five cents per unit for electricity. I say here and now that that does not necessarily mean that you must nationalize electricity. Let me put it this way: not only the Electric Company, but all other public utility Companies in this colony must be controlled, and if the necessary legislation is enacted to control them, I do not see the wisdom in the immediate nationalization of any Company. If we enact this legislation, we will have to set up a Board to regulate and control the prices charged and the profits made by, and the efficiency of, public utility services in this colony. If such legislation were enacted, there would not be any point in taking up a half a million pounds and buying out this Company when the money could be spent immediately upon better housing because, I view this question of housing as a very important one. The housing conditions are very bad and nothing should be done to prevent a Housing Bill from being passed as soon as it is presented in this House. What would be the point of going in for the expenditure of half a million pounds to nationalize this Company before dealing with the housing problem? I stress the question of housing because much stress has been laid on the question of water. I have some experience of housing in this colony. I would like to remind the honourable senior member for St. Andrew and the honourable junior member for St. Philip that electricity has

not yet been installed in certain areas in Bridgetown. There are tenantries in which the roads are in a deplorable condition, where people have to swim in order to get into and out of their homes, and electricity has not been extended to these areas so that they could be illuminated. I quite agree that this Company should be controlled, but I cannot subscribe to the view that the proper thing to do is to nationalize it immediately. I say that the Government should be aware of the general responsibility for running this concern; this might be an opportunity for showing lack of efficiency and I view the matter quite seriously. I am proposing an amendment to this Address because I feel that people should understand the true state of affairs rather than feel that we have bound ourselves under any conditions; because if this Address is passed as it is, it will mean that we are bound to accept whatever condition in which this Company might be, when the time comes for nationalization. I say that not only should electricity be available to people of a certain type, but it should be put at the disposal of all the inhabitants of this colony. Nationalization of electricity only means that those who can afford to pay for electricity will get it. It is quite a different matter with regard to water and housing. How many people in the parish of St. Andrew, for instance, how many employees at Parks will be able to install electricity in their homes? The economic condition of the people will not afford them to install electricity in their homes. The first paragraph of the Address as introduced by the honourable senior member for St. Andrew reads as follows:—

"The House of Assembly note with grave concern the fact that only one third of the Island of Barbados is at present serviced by the Barbados Electric Supply Corporation in spite of the fact that this Corporation has been functioning for over 37 years and has enjoyed Government preference on all imported equipment throughout its existence."

I quite agree with that. The second paragraph says:

"The House therefore respectfully ask that His Excellency the Governor will take immediate steps to nationalize this corporation and thus help to remedy this serious state of affairs."

I am convinced that that will not remedy the serious state of affairs. Honourable members are aware of what has happened in Trinidad, and also of the time which will be required to bring about what has been suggested. I beg to move that paragraph 2 of the Address be deleted and the following be inserted in place thereof:—

2. "The House of Assembly respectfully request Your Excellency to send down the necessary legislation to provide for the establishment of a Board to be known as the Public Utility Board with powers to regulate and control the prices charged by and the efficiency of Public Utility Services in this island"

No doubt, honourable members will realise that this is a proposal to control the Electric and Telephone Companies, Radio Distribution and all these Public Utility Services in this colony. There is also an opportunity for controlling the Transport Service of this island, and I am of the opinion that if this amendment is accepted, the people of this colony will benefit from the results immediately; and by that I mean within the next six months. I understand that there exists in this colony the authority to object to the price charged for electricity, if it is felt that the price is exorbitant; but a Board of the nature as I have suggested would have more power to regulate and control the price of electricity, and people would immediately benefit therefrom. I appeal to honour-

able members to see the wisdom of this amendment. I know that quite a lot has been said at the election period about this question of nationalisation, and there is at present on the Order Paper an address relative to the nationalization of the sugar industry. I repeat that nationalization must come and nobody can stop it; but the real question now is whether or not with our present finances we can take steps immediately to nationalize or control this Company or these Companies. I think that if my amendment is accepted, the representatives of the people will have an insight into the working of these Companies, and within six months, or a year or two years' time we will be able to see the ways and means of nationalization.

Mr. ADAMS: At this stage, in view of the fact that a Bill has been returned from the Other Place, I am going to move that the further consideration of this Address be postponed in order to deal with this matter under Government Business. I take it that I will have to obtain the leave of the House in order to do that. I am therefore asking leave to move that the further consideration of this Address be postponed.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that the further consideration of Private Members' Business be postponed.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE OTHER PLACE RETURNING EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL WITH AMENDMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a Message from the Other Place returning the Bill to continue various Expiring Laws with an amendment. It is a matter for the House to decide as to whether or not they will deal with the amendment under Rule 262 of the Rules of the House. If the House wish to deal with the amendment this afternoon, I think that a motion should be made that this amendment be considered forthwith.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that this amendment be dealt with forthwith, under Rule 262.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS: This amendment is the insertion into the Bill to continue various Expiring Laws of another Clause which originally appeared in the Bill permitting persons to ride on bicycle bars. The Bill which was passed by this House did not have that Clause in it and therefore it would have been again an offence for persons to ride on bicycle bars. The Other place has inserted the Clause which reads as follows:—

"3. The provisions of Sub-section (4) of Section fifty-one of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937, shall be read and construed as if the reference therein to the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and forty-four, were a reference to the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and forty-eight."

Honourable members may therefore enjoy their riding on bicycle bars until the thirty-first day of March, 1948. (Laughter). I beg to move that this amendment be now read a first time.

Mr. Lewis seconded the motion which was agreed to.

On motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. LEWIS in each case, the amendment was read a second time and agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the House should now continue with the consideration of Private Member's Business.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WILKINSON: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to this day week, the first day of April, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon.

Mr. GALE: I beg to second that.

Mr. COX: I understood that we would be resuming the consideration of Private Members' Business.

Mr. ADAMS: While I am anxious to see this matter completed, I think the majority are in favour that we should adjourn at this stage.

Mr. SPEAKER: A motion has been made that this House do now adjourn—

Mr. ADAMS: Before the question is put, the Order Paper will have to be fixed. I think it will remain the same except that I am withdrawing the Resolution in Committee of Supply on to-day's Order Paper, the Resolution with which we were dealing to-day.

The question that this House do now adjourn to this day week, the 1st day of April, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The House was accordingly adjourned to meet on Tuesday next, the 1st day of April, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon.