

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT).

SESSION 1947—48

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 24th February, 1948.

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. H. G. CUMMINS, Messrs L. E. SMITH, F. L. WALCOTT, M. E. COX, R. G. MAPP, G. H. ADAMS, B.A., H. D. BLACKMAN, H. A. DOWDING, V. C. GALE, and S. A. WALCOTT.

Prayers are read.

Mr. WILKINSON enters the House and takes his seat.

MINUTES.

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 17th February, 1948, having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

DOCUMENT.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Inspector of Trees for the parish of St. George his Report for the year 1947.

Mr. MOTTLEY enters the House and takes his seat.

PAPERS LAID.

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

Message No. 4/1948 from His Excellency the Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly presenting for the consideration of the House the draft Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the financial year 1948—49.

Report of Comptroller for Development and Welfare in the West Indies for the year 1945—46.

Reports of the Commissioner of Police on the Barbados Police Force for the years 1946 and 1947.

Report of the Department of Education for the year ended 31st March, 1947.

Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for nine months ended 31st December, 1947.

Barbados Blue Book, 1945—46.

Regulations made by the Director of Highways and Transport under section 7 of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937, as amended by sections 41 and 42 of the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945.

Report on the Progress of the Barbados programme of development.

PETITION.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to present, on behalf of the senior member for Christ Church, a petition from the Highway Commissioners of the parish of Christ Church praying the House to pass a Bill to authorize them to increase the salary of the Inspector of Highways of the said parish by £150 per annum and the salary of the Assistant Inspector of Highways of the said parish by £137. 10s. per annum. The petition is respectfully worded and I ask that it be taken as read.

The petition is taken as read.

NOTICES.

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Mr. BLACKMAN: Resolution to approve the Regulation entitled The Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations, 1948, made by the Director of Highways and Transport on the 13th February, 1948, under the provisions of section 7 of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937 (1937—16) as amended by sections 41 and 42 of the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945 (1945—12), and approved and sanctioned by His Excellency the Governor on the 14th February, 1948.

Mr. FOSTER enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. ADAMS (on behalf of Mr. Talma): Bill to continue various expiring laws.

Mr. ADAMS (On behalf of Mr. Talma): Bill to authorise the Governor-in-Executive Committee to advance loans and pay travelling allowances to public officers required to travel for the due performance of their duties.

Mr. ADAMS: Bill to amend the Volunteer Act, 1909 (1909—6).

Mr. ADAMS gives notice, on behalf of Mr. Talma, of a Bill to authorize the Highway Commissioners of the parish of Christ Church to increase the salary of the Inspector of Highways and the salary of the Assistant Inspector of Highways of the said parish.

QUESTIONS.

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

When does the Government intend to implement the passing of the Address from the House of Assembly which asked to make provision for University Scholarships to be known as Victory Scholarships to mark the cessation of hostilities in World War II?

Mr. TALMA enters the House and takes his seat.

SELECT COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to hand in the Report of the Select Committee appointed to draft a Reply to His Excellency's Message No. 36/1947 relating to the emoluments attaching to the office of Governor of Barbados.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME.

On the motion of Mr. TALMA, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, a Bill to continue various expiring laws is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. TALMA, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, a Bill to authorise the Governor-in-Executive Committee to advance loans and pay travelling allowances to Public Officers required to travel for the due performance of their duties is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, a Bill to amend the Volunteer Act 1909 (1909—6) is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. TALMA, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, a Bill to authorise the Commissioners of Highways for the parish of Christ Church to increase the salaries of the Inspector and Assistant Inspector of Highways of the said parish, is read a first time.

Dr. WILSON enters the House and takes his seat.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE APPRENTICESHIP BURSARIES REGULATIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas,—To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Regulations entitled the Apprenticeship Bursaries Regulations, 1947, made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the 6th day of December, 1947, under the provisions of section 3 (3) of the Apprenticeship Bursaries Act, 1928 (1928—9) as contained in section 2 of the Apprenticeship Bursaries (Amendment) Act, 1947 (1947—34).

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—These regulations are consequent on the amendments to the Apprenticeship Bursaries Act which were passed by this House in October last year. Those amendments were, in effect, to pay all apprentices a flat rate of \$3.00 per month instead of \$1.50 and \$2.40 per month respectively and to give the Governor-in-Executive Committee authority to make regulations from time to time under the Act as conditions change; that is to say, if it is the wish of the Governor-in-Executive Committee that the amount to be paid to the bursars should be further increased, instead of having to come to the Legislature for permission to do so, it can make a regulation to that effect and then forward it to the Legislature for approval or otherwise. The regulations were laid on the table of the House on the 9th December last year and I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—On the occasion when the Bill to amend this Act was before the House I commended the Government for having made this change and I said then that even though the increase was something to be appreciated, yet the amount of \$3.00 per month was too small. I suggested that the present living conditions should be taken into consideration and that the amount should be increased to \$6 per month. I pointed out that Barbados was in need today of good workmen and stated that we should do everything in our power to encourage these lads, bearing in mind that the majority of them came from the homes of very humble people who could not afford to give them pocket money. I am conscious of the fact that this is not being given to them by way of compensation as workmen but when one takes into consideration the cost of a cup of tea or a breakfast or transportation, to-day one must realize that \$3.00 is too small. I know that we cannot increase this amount but I suggest again to the Government to consider increasing it to at least \$6.00 in the very near future. Since the last occasion when this matter was before the Legislature, several parents have approached me in connection with my suggestion and I think that the honourable introducer of this Resolution will appreciate that \$3.00 per month is really too small.

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

RESOLUTION *Re* APPOINTMENT OF OFFICERS AT GLENDAIRY PRISON.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas,—To move the passing of a special Resolution, under the provisions of section 13 of the Prisons Act, 1890 (1890-13) as amended by section 6 of the Civil Establishment (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act, 1944 (1944-26), and by section 2 (2) of the Prisons (Amendment) Act, 1947 (1947-33).

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—This is a special Resolution dealing with the appointment of the staff of Glendairy and District "A" Prisons. Honourable members will remember that on the 28th October last year we passed an Act amending the Prisons Act of 1890 and the purpose of that amending Act was to increase the number of the staff at the Prisons in order that the present staff may be relieved from working for such long hours day after day. One of those amendments gives the Governor the power to increase the staff without having the Act amended and this special Resolution is for that purpose. It is similar to the Resolutions which we passed a short while ago in respect of the staffs of the General Hospital and the Department of Science and Agriculture. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Messrs. CRAWFORD and SYMMONDS entered the House while Dr. CUMMINS was speaking and took their seats.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker,—On more than one occasion I have drawn the attention of the Government to the inadequate staffing at the Prisons and I would like to know whether the proposals in this Resolution provide for the complete staffing, such as is asked for by the employees at the Prisons and meets with the approval of the Civil Service Association; also whether these proposals will ensure that no employee at the Prisons would have to work more than 40 hours a week. It would be a pity to deal with the matter in a piecemeal fashion.

because these employees at the Prisons have been working for extraordinarily long hours from the time there has been a Glendairy Prison in this island; it has always been short staffed. There is an abundance of suitable material in this island available for the filling of the posts of warders, so I am wondering if the honourable member responsible for this Department can assure this House what will be the average number of hours for which these warders will be required to work in a week, after the passing of this Resolution. I have no doubt that it will be passed and our minds will be set at rest, knowing that we have done something substantial for the benefit of these people who will no longer have to complain about the trying hours for which they are employed. As I have said, there are persons available with the qualifications demanded for these posts and it is only a matter of appointing additional staff. I am wondering if this is sufficient to relieve these people of such strenuous working hours and enable them to have the same amount of leisure time as the employees of any other organized Department of the Government have.

Mr. MOTTLEY: There are a few things about this Resolution which seem strange to me. Twenty eight third class warders are to receive a salary of £75 rising by annual increments of £5 to £100 each and the two messengers will receive £75 rising by annual increments of £5 to £120 each. Then you come, Sir, to the Baker Instructor and the Carpenter Instructor, both of whom must be trained and skilled men, and the former is being paid less than a messenger while the latter is being paid the same salary as that which a messenger receives. I do not know how the Government reconciles this. I do not see how you can place a baker or a carpenter in the same category as a messenger and I would like an explanation about that from the honourable introducer of this Resolution because it must be appreciated that a carpenter instructor who receives the same salary as a messenger could never be satisfied. Further, when the warders who are placed in charge of prisoners realize that they get the same salaries as the messengers, it must create a certain amount of dissatisfaction.

Mr. HAYNES enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. COX: I should like to say that I am exceedingly glad to see that at last the Government has brought relief to this Department. I know as a fact that the people employed at Glendairy Prison, more especially the warders, have to work for very long hours and they sometimes lose their leave owing to the Department being short staffed. Now, there is one question which, I think, is worrying most of the employees of that Department and it is that each employee has to be examined by a medical practitioner every year in order to be able to carry on with his or her work.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think a debate of that nature comes within the scope of this Resolution which deals only with appointments at certain salaries.

Mr. COX: Yes, Sir, but there are terms, besides the question of salaries, which are embodied in these appointments.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are going into a different matter now.

Mr. COX: I want to raise this question now because there is discrimination on the part of the Government, as far as I can see. In the Service, no medical examination takes place unless the employee is ill. In the Police Force if a policeman

wants to re-enrol for a further period of three years he has to be re-examined; the same thing applies to the Fire Brigade. But in the case of Glendairy Prison, the employees of that Department have to submit to a medical examination every year. I am not saying whether it is right or wrong but what I do say is that these should enjoy the same privileges which other members of the Service enjoy.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think I can allow the honourable member to debate that point under this Resolution. A debate of that nature might be initiated when the Estimates are under consideration.

Mr. COX: I am quite finished with that, Sir, but this year about five or six of a staff of 37 at the Prisons were actually sent home. The question of the salaries has been raised but I am not prepared to go into it now because I understand that Mr. Adams, C.B.E., is going into the emoluments of all Government employees and I prefer to wait until his report has been published. At the same time I still think that these salaries, as are set out in this Resolution, must be a source of annoyance to many of these persons, not that the messenger is getting too much but in my opinion the baker instructor and the carpenter instructor are getting too little. The salary of the baker instructor has been discussed in this House on many occasions and I would like to know why he has never been given relief in this respect. Sometime ago, all the employees at Glendairy Prison were given increased salaries with the exception of the baker. I do not know the reason but surely if the Government feels that he is incompetent, it should tell him so; to keep him in its employ and allow his salary to remain at this figure, when he is, I am told, more or less carrying out his duties efficiently, is definitely unfair and I am hoping that, inasmuch as the question has been raised at this moment, something will be done to give satisfaction to this employee. At a time like this, when the cost of living is so high, I definitely feel that these salaries are far below what they should be.

Mr. SYMMONDS: Mr. Speaker,—I should like to add something to what the previous speakers have said in respect of this particular Resolution. It strikes me that in an age like this, when we are preaching and teaching and talking about the dignity of labour, it is actually a disgrace for any Government to send down a Resolution of this kind. It seems as though we have not yet departed from the old tradition and that our vision is still clouded by a very cheeseparing policy. I cannot see how we can sit here and honestly legislate for the appointment of a carpenter instructor at £120 per annum—\$48 per month—when the ordinary wage of the most indifferent carpenter to-day is \$2.00 per day. And the Government is going to employ a carpenter as an instructor—an expert in his vocation—and pay him \$48 per month! Then the Government is going to appoint a warder, a man whose parents you are expecting to educate him in such a way that he would secure a certificate at one of the secondary schools, and pay him \$40 per month in a day like this! There is something definitely wrong with the way in which these things are being done. I do not know at whose doors blame must be laid but there is certainly going to be blame laid at our doors if we sit here and perpetrate these injustices. What I mean by "injustices" is this. These salaries were the same about four years ago when the cost-of-living was low and to-day when the cost of every item is about five times what it was before, it is a definite disgrace to sit here and without any consideration for the people who are drawn from that

section of our society, who are bound to labour if they must live, who are called upon to pay high prices for food, clothing and all the other necessities of life, vote \$40 per month as the salary of a warder who is appointed to Glendairy Prison—a post that is not only a responsible one but the person who is appointed to it must be a man who has got to see that prisoners are taken care of, a man who must be above bribery and corruption in every form. You are going to say that in a modern day like to-day £100 per annum—\$40 per month—is enough for him. Then you come to the baker instructor—a specialist in bakery; he has to teach people to bake and the Government of Barbados, without any qualms of conscience, is offering him \$44 per month, a salary that no good baker in Bridgetown would accept. It seems to me that we are just preaching one thing and practising the opposite. I think a Resolution of this kind, at a moment like this, ought to be definitely rejected as a mark of disapproval of the members of this House of the continuance of what is definitely a policy by which no living conscientious consideration is given to the dire needs of ordinary people who have to undertake these jobs for a living.

Mr. WILKINSON: Most honourable members who have spoken on this Resolution seem to have forgotten that there is a cost-of-living bonus attached to these salaries. I think it should be pointed out that these are only the salaries fixed by law. Honourable members will remember that we passed a Resolution a short time ago giving a cost of living bonus to these employees and at the present moment Mr. Adams, not the senior member for St. Joseph, is investigating the emoluments of all government employees. But what I should again like to call attention to—I did so on the occasion when the Resolution relating to the Hospital Staff was before us—is paragraph 3 of the Resolution. It seems to me that this gives the Governor a lot of power. As I understand it, he can, if he thinks fit, jump the increments of these employees, that is to say, instead of an officer getting an increment of £5, the Governor can say that the increment should be £10 and that does, in my opinion, leave the door open to favouritism which is very undesirable in the Government Service. I presume that the House will pass this as it has passed similar Resolutions but, personally, I do think that paragraph 3 is a little too elastic.

Mr. WARD entered the House while Mr. Wilkinson was speaking and took his seat.

Dr. CUMMINS: I want to say that the junior member for St. James has adequately answered the criticism as far as wages are concerned. The wages that are set out in this Resolution are nothing new; they are the wages that are being paid now. It is only on account of this change in policy, as far as appointments are concerned, that they have been brought before the House but as the junior member for St. James has said, these are the basic wages and a cost of living bonus is attached to them. As far as the point which the junior member for St. Lucy raised about the working hours per week is concerned I am sorry that I cannot say that the hours have been reduced to forty as he was hoping but there has been a considerable reduction. For instance, the chief warder's working hours have been reduced by 43¾ hours a week. His actual working hours before were 106.25 hours per week but with the increase in staff they have been reduced by 43¾ hours. The Steward's working hours are now 42½ hours per week and there are reductions

all down the line—in some cases to 46½ hours and in others to 53½ hours. I think that the average number of working hours per week in industries to-day is 48 hours, and as I have pointed out, in some cases the working hours of people employed at the Prisons have been reduced below 44 hours or even 48 hours. But the point I want to make is that there has been a considerable reduction in the number of working hours owing to the increase in the staff. It does seem that a case has been made out on behalf of the baker instructor and the carpenter instructor, as far as their salaries are concerned, and that some adjustment is necessary. I promise the senior member for the City who raised the point and other honourable members who supported him that in due course the Executive Committee will give attention to it.

Mr. RAMSAY: I am sorry that I have to speak on this Resolution and I was hoping that previous speakers would have gone a little further. Years and years ago, the wages of the Warders were not at all comparable to those of the Police. I'll put it another way. The Police used to have a better grade of salary. Unfortunately it seems to me as if full value is not put upon the class of person who has to be a warder. I am afraid that I do not quite agree with the way in which this is being done. When we are appointing warders at the Prisons we ought to give the matter very great consideration. A warder is an officer who is in an entirely different class from a policeman. Policemen, as we all know, run around and catch prisoners or fail to catch them sometimes but warders have to be with the prisoners all the time. They take care of the prisoners and I am afraid that due consideration is not given to them. I must not say that the warders feel that because they are not strong enough in numbers politically they are not given due consideration. As regards the carpenter instructor and the baker instructor, it really does not seem to me as if the Government takes due cognizance of their positions. Does the Government seriously consider that these men are going to give of their best for these small salaries of £120 and £100 per annum respectively? Furthermore, we are doing wrong in this respect. We are waiting on someone who has been sent to us by the Imperial Government to put our house in order and we should not do that. We should not wait for Mr. Adams to come and tell us how we should regulate our affairs. The worst feature about this Resolution is contained in paragraph 3. We are shirking our responsibility. For the past few years we have been giving up our rights and shirking our responsibility. We do not want to do what is right for fear of criticism and that is altogether wrong. These people are our servants. I as a householder would not wait for the neighbour next door to come into my house and tell me how to pay my servants. The senior member for St. Thomas who has introduced this Resolution said that he feels that things are not right as far as the carpenter instructor and the baker instructor are concerned; that their salaries need adjustment. Can't somebody at the Executive Committee tell the Executive that these people are not treated fairly? They are putting these people within the reach of bribery and corruption. These people should be paid much better salaries. The whole set-up, in my opinion, is entirely wrong. Some weeks ago, a first-class criminal escaped and up to now they cannot find him despite the fact that a reward of \$100 was offered for his re-capture. These employees at Glendairy Prison are not to take bribes and it must be borne in mind

that all sorts of people go to Glendairy, some with money and others without money, some with affluence and influence. To leave the adjustment of these people's salaries to Mr. Adams is entirely wrong. These people are our servants, and we ought to do what is just and fair to them without having to wait until somebody from England or Honolulu comes and tells us what to do.

Mr. ADAMS: For the benefit of the junior member for St. James and the junior member for St. Peter I should like to say that the principle contained in paragraph 3 is no new one; it exists now in the Clerical Service Act which this House has passed. When we passed the Schemes relating to the secondary schools we adopted this principle; so it is nothing new. As regards the personal emoluments, if Mr. Adams, as the result of his experience in other colonies, recommends that certain adjustments should be made, this House has to say whether or not it agrees with that recommendation. At the same time we are running our business and are not leaving everything to Mr. Adams, as will be seen from the Estimates for the next financial year, the consideration of which, I hope, will begin on Tuesday next.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for Christ Church,—To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Regulations entitled the Travelling Allowance (Amendment) Regulations, 1948, made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the 29th January, 1948, under the provisions of sections 3 of the Travelling Allowance Act, 1932 (1932-5).

Mr. TALMA: Honourable members are aware that when this matter was discussed on the last occasion the point at issue was the allowance for officers who travel by motor cycles and it was pointed out that the rates for travel by motor cycle were out of all proportion to the rates for travel by motor car. Since then, the matter has been reviewed by the Executive Committee and they have excluded the rates for travel by motor cycle from these regulations. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE BOATMEN, CARTERS AND PORTERS (FARES) REGULATIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas,—To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Regulations entitled the Boatmen, Carters and Porters (Fares) Regulations, 1947, made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the 29th day of November, 1947, under the provisions of section 12 of the Boatmen, Carters and Porters Act, 1891 (1891-10) as contained in section 3 of the Boatmen, Carters and Porters (Amendment) Act, 1947 (1947-25).

Dr. CUMMINS: This Resolution, Mr. Speaker, speaks for itself. It is the result of an amending Act which was passed in October, 1947, to increase the fares charged by boatmen, carters and porters

on account of the cost of living; that amending Act also gave the Governor-in-Executive Committee power to make these regulations which are at present before us and which were laid on the table of the House on the 9th December last. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. GALE: I do not know if I am in order but I am wondering if the Government, now that it is making fresh regulations for boatmen, carters and porters, considered the question of revising the regulations in respect of taxis. The regulations relating to taxis have not, as far as I know, been changed since 1941 or 1942 and they should certainly be brought up to date just as these have been brought up to date.

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

SUSPENSION OF RULE 60.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to move the suspension of Rule 60 in order that Orders Nos. 6 and 7 may be taken out of their respective places and dealt with as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Rule 60 be suspended in order to take Order No. 6 as the next Order.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

THE MATRIMONIAL CAUSES (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for Christ Church,—Second reading of a Bill to amend the Matrimonial Causes Act, 1935 (1935-9).

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker,—This amendment to the Matrimonial Causes Act was passed in England in 1937. It is an amendment whereby divorce may be granted on more liberal lines and not only on the ground of adultery which is a very difficult ground to establish in any Court and which has worked a great hardship in the past, so far as matrimonial matters are concerned. In 1937 Mr. A. P. Herbert, a member of the House of Commons, saw fit to introduce amendments to the Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Act whereby not only the difficult ground of adultery should necessarily be established but that also cruelty, desertion for three years and incurable insanity should be grounds for divorce. Whereas in England there are four grounds for divorce, in Barbados there is only one ground—adultery—which is extremely and extraordinarily difficult to establish in a Court of law; so we are attempting, by this Bill, to bring the Divorce Law in Barbados into line with the English Law. This hardship in Barbados is experienced by both sexes, in so far as the Divorce Law is concerned; the fair sex is even harder pressed than the type of individuals whom we find in this Chamber. I know as a fact that the public in this country have been awaiting the passage of a Bill of this nature for quite a number of years. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph, the Leader of this House, has tried to get a Bill of this nature passed about two years ago and honourable members will remember that I attempted to follow in his footsteps about a year ago with a Bill of this sort.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member should adduce some argument to justify the passing of the second reading of the Bill. What the honourable member has said so far has nothing to do with the second reading. The honourable member should keep to the merits of the Bill.

Mr. TALMA: This Bill has a history attached to it, so I am just giving a little reminder about that history. This is the third occasion on which a Bill of this nature has been presented to this House and I hope that it will be passed to-day and adopted in the Other Place. It was first introduced by the senior member for St. Joseph, then by myself and it is not even law yet; that is all I am saying on that point. If two parties are married and one leaves the other and goes to the U.S.A., that party who is gone can secure a divorce in the U.S.A., on trifling grounds but the party who is left behind has to live an immoral life and is looked down upon by his relatives and friends and acquaintances. We are simply trying to bring the law in this island into line with the English practice whereby divorce will not only be granted on grounds of adultery which is a difficult ground to establish. Your Honour is much more conversant than I am with a Bill of this nature. You know the difficult grounds which one has to establish in order to succeed in getting divorce. If members around this table had your experience and knowledge in a matter of this nature I know that the passage of this Bill would be very easy. There is only one point which has not met with the Government's approval and which I deeply deplore, that is, that divorce proceedings are not allowed to be brought free gratis and for nothing by humble folk and the rank and file. Despite the fact that the ones who handle a little money want to feel that they are higher—the ones who imagine themselves as big bugs—I can assure you that many in the humbler walk of life are the ones who live decent lives (Hear, hear) and I sincerely hope that I would live to see the day when a Law Society is established in this island and the solicitors in our country will see fit to assist poor, indigent, humble and benevolent folk in securing divorce free gratis and for nothing. Divorce is a luxury to a special few. It calls for £75 or £100 at least to put any Divorce Court in motion; and where can a poor person find £100 to pay a solicitor to set a Divorce Court in motion? That is an omission which this Government has made and about which I am unhappy because in the Bill which I introduced, provision was made to enable everybody to obtain divorce free gratis and for nothing. The Government still has that in mind and if I have the good fortune to be handling a Measure of this sort again I can assure honourable members that I will use my best endeavours to include a provision whereby divorce will not only be obtained more easily but freely by all.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the honourable member has said enough on that point although I do not see anything about it in the Bill.

Mr. TALMA: For the past six or nine months a Committee has been sitting in England on amendments to the Divorce Law. That Committee was in touch with our Chief Justice and that is the reason why the Bill which was passed in this Chamber a short while ago was not approved by the Other Place. They were awaiting the recommendations of that Committee, as they thought it best not to have two bites at the cherry. One of the recommendations was that the period between the granting of a Decree Nisi and the granting of a Decree Absolute should

be reduced from six months to six weeks; so that a party has not got to wait for six months to get a Decree Absolute, during which time great harm and destruction might occur. Now, Sir, as regards the principle of this Bill I can hardly expect a Labour House, such as this is, to deny human beings the right and privilege to live in a happy, orderly, free and simple manner such as we are all expected to live. I can hardly expect any honourable member of this Chamber to overreach himself, so to speak, in a matter of this sort. I feel that the passage of this Bill should be a simple matter. There are three new grounds for divorce which I am attempting to introduce to this honourable Chamber. The first of these new grounds is Desertion for a period of three years. If one party should leave the other for three years, then the party who has been left is entitled to divorce on the ground of Desertion. That, in my opinion, will fill the breach because any normal human being would feel that if two parties cannot get on well together, the logical thing to do and the only reasonable course to adopt would be for one party to leave the other, so as to avoid bloodshed, so as to avoid prison, so as to avoid the gallows or committing suicide. The second new ground is cruelty and the third is insanity for a period of five years. Well, I believe the principle of the Bill has been thoroughly established. It is a Bill which should commend itself to honourable members and I beg to move that the second reading of it do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

The question that the second reading of this Bill do now pass is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

Clauses 1 to 14 inclusive are read and are agreed to.

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

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

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

REPLIES LAID

On re-assembling,

Mr. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to lay on the Table of the House the replies to questions No. 41 standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. James, and the reply to question No. 2 standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Philip.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to lay the replies to questions No. 37 standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Peter.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (A)

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (a) in order to deal with three matters, namely, the Resolution for carrying on the organisation for banking the compulsory savings of Barbadian workers in the U.S.A. and the Resolution to authorise the Governor-in-Executive Committee to adopt and give effect to the recommendations of the Conference on Oils and Fats. This is a pressing matter now inasmuch as some of the other islands are

asking us to decide in one way or the other because they are being held up with regard to the matter. I should also like to deal with the Petroleum Bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I object; this is the time allotted to Private Members' Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is now Question Time.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I appreciate that, but we can use the time for the purpose for which I intend to use it under Private Members' Business.

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

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: MESSRS. SMITH, F. L. WALCOTT, COX, FOSTER, TALMA, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, GALE, and DR CUMMINS—9.

Noes: MESSRS. RAMSAY, BRANCKER, CRAWFORD, MOTTLEY HAYNES, DOWDING, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON, and WARD—9.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has resulted in a "tie", nine honourable members voting each way. I vote with the "Noes".

WEIGHING OF PEASANTS' CANES AT SUGAR FACTORIES

Mr. SPEAKER: At Question Time on the last occasion the honourable junior member for St. Lucy was speaking on a motion for adjournment made in order to discuss the reply given to his question No. 10 relative to scale beams at sugar factories.

Mr. BRANCKER: I have very few remarks to add to what I have already said on this matter because the House is very much in sympathy with the observations which I have made relative to the testing of factory scales during the crop in view of that very notorious incident which took place at Spring Hall when a lorry load was re-weighed and found to be a quarter of a ton out to the detriment of the seller of the canes and thereby to the advantage of the factory which weighed them. I have already dealt with the question of testing the factory scales regularly and testing them to capacity by proper weights and by proper officials who know what they are doing. I have already pointed out that the Police should use adequate weights when they are carrying out tests and not as they have been doing in the past. The Police carry around small weights which are not of much use in ascertaining whether the scales are working properly or not. When we are dealing with a factory which pays \$1 per ton more for plantation canes than for peasants' canes, then the peasants should be satisfied that they are getting the correct weights in respect of their canes, these canes being produced in the same area with the same amount of rainfall and with perhaps more money spent on them in the supply of foreign manure than the plantations spend on theirs. Not very long ago when the amendment to the Police Act was under consideration so as to provide additional constables to perform duties on the waterfront, I felt that it might become necessary to provide some additional policemen for the inspection of certain of these scale beams; because it is only by means of the exercise of a superabundance of vigilance that there is any chance of getting a square deal for the peasants who have no alternative but to send their canes to factories which are run by private enterprise in this colony. I think that the Government should give consideration to taking over one or two sugar factories in this island and there is one in St.

Lucy which might well be taken over. Until that takes place we have to do all we can in this Chamber to protect the interests of the peasants who have no alternative, so long as they continue to grow canes, but to send their canes to the factories of capitalistic exploiters. One other point which should not be overlooked is the question of the licensing of cane-weighers. When certain instances occur at these factories it is all very well to blame the scales and the vagaries of mechanical contrivances but when anything goes wrong with the scales, when it is a question of peasants' canes, it is never out of favour of the factory. In 1945 when Professor Shephard was here it was agreed with respect to the weighing of canes that the Police would be equipped with standard weights and would check before the beginning of the crop the accuracy of every cane-weighing machine, and carry out check tests of the accuracy of the weighing of canes at frequent but irregular intervals during the crop and without prior notice being given. I hope that these irregular intervals are not too far between and it would be of interest to find out how often what I have just mentioned has been happening. I do not think it has been happening very frequently; the matter has been left to the itinerant Inspectors the number of whom is inadequate for the amount of work which they should be doing simultaneously during the reaping season at the sugar factories of the island. Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that it was agreed that every cane-weigher and every check weigher should be required to possess a license from the Labour Commissioner who should be given the right to revoke the licence of any cane-weigher who abuses the confidence placed in him. If cane-weighers are reminded of the power of the Labour Commissioner to revoke licences and an incident such as that which occurred at Spring Hall last year is proved to have occurred, then it should be ensured that the factories do not employ people who make mistakes of this kind.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to second the honourable member's motion. It is undeniable that the matter to which the attention of the Government has been drawn by the question tabled by the honourable member is worthy of the greatest consideration. It is absolutely essential that the greatest measure of protection should be afforded peasants in ensuring that they receive equitable treatment at the hands of the sugar factories during the reaping season. To say the least, it is nothing short of a scandal that the information revealed by the question tabled by the honourable member disclosed that in the particular instance under reference, an unfortunate cane-grower was being robbed of as many as 500 pounds of canes in a single lorry load. I quite agree with the honourable member that nothing which can be said in this Chamber can over-emphasize the seriousness of the position, nor can we stress sufficiently the absolute essentiality of Government taking all possible steps to ensure as far as is reasonably possible that such an incident does not occur again.

Mr. HAYNES: I have heard criticisms made with regard to the various scale beams, especially that at Spring Hall, by the honourable junior member for St. Lucy. I do not know whether the honourable member thinks that what he mentions is of general effect in the whole island, because from what I have been told by various cane growers they are all fairly satisfied with their weights. What I myself think is that the system of testing scale beams is wrong. The Police go around and test scale beams with a ton weight or so and those scale beams are expected to weigh anything up to eight tons. To my mind, there should be a standard five-ton weight or there-

abouts in certain districts for the purpose of testing scale beams and I am sure if that is done no mistake such as that which occurred at Spring Hall would have occurred. I should like to draw the attention of the honourable member to another point and it is this: would a factory owner take the risk of teaching cane-weighers to rob people when he himself is also delivering canes? The same sword with which he wants to cut somebody else could quite easily be turned back on him. I think that any factory owner who encourages anything like that is asking for trouble and he would never know when he would catch it. If what I am suggesting is taken to the proper quarter and put into effect, scale beams would always be tested properly and when the Inspectors come around they will find everything as it should be.

Mr. KAMSAY: I want to speak generally on this question. I think that those who are interested in the purchase of canes at a time like this ought to take this opportunity to give information generally. I do not think that any sane individual would undertake to express the opinion or would believe that it is generally thought or suggested that in various factories they practice certain irregularities such as taking from the weight of people's canes. This question comes up every year, it is a hardy annual and although it is difficult for an individual who is personally interested in the matter to speak on his own behalf, I think it is imperative on him to say something in connection with it. I remember when working at the Pine plantation that I heard the then owner speaking to the persons employed at the scale beams and telling them that if there was any irregularity practised to his advantage he would fire them. I was not a politician then: I was a carpenter getting about fifty cents or sixty cents a day. I cannot associate myself with any remarks to the effect that it is a general practice for factory owners to allow certain irregularities to go on. I know that there was a certain factory in St. Thomas where there was some irregularity going on and it was discovered that the cane-weigher was at fault. Sometime ago in St. George somebody had to run away from a factory which was being robbed. I know that there was some misunderstanding between the chemist and the cane-weigher at a factory: the cane-weigher felt that the chemist was not doing his duty because he asked him how many tons of canes he received for the week so as to arrive at his tonnage of sugar. I heard that the cane-weigher was trying to cut off a certain amount of canes so as to upset the chemist's calculations with the hope of putting back the amount during the next week. It is a very dangerous thing in a place like this for it to be said that the people who purchase canes are in collusion with the cane weighers to carry on any dishonest practices. I think that hon. members who are personally interested in this matter should, in the interest of the peace, tranquillity and goodwill of this place, get up and say: "As far as we know this thing does not happen." I have always heard it said that silence gives consent, and when the honourable junior member for St. Lucy gets up here and states as a fact that a quarter ton of canes was out from every individual's canes weighed at a factory in St. Lucy, it is a charge against factory owners some of whom are here. I say that it is their duty to get up and say: "As far as we know, we are not associated with that kind of thing." If they do not say anything people are going to say that they were so much ashamed when this truth came out that they could not defend themselves. It is the British law that a person is innocent until he has been found guilty.

I reverse it and this is French law; they are going to be considered guilty because they did not defend themselves on this serious charge. (Laughter). Peasant proprietors are very suspicious; I send canes to Bulkeley and to Lower Estate and I do not ask what the amount is because I feel that it costs me more when I enquire. I tell them to cut my canes, take out the cost of the freight and the tonnage and give me the balance. When a question of this nature is brought up, the factory owners are charged with general dishonesty and it is incumbent on them to defend themselves. They in this House should at least say that in their area they are sure that no such irregularity goes on with the consent or knowledge of the factory owners. If they do not say that then whatever happens is laid at their door.

Mr. WARD: It has been proved that the scale beam at Spring Hall was 500 pounds out. (Cheers) and the honourable senior member for St. Andrew has given us the anti-dote for that. He says that the scale beams should be tested up to a capacity of five tons. A machine or scale beam is naturally iron, and if you have a scale beam working for a certain number of years normally, it may eventually give a flaw at certain points. I have been told that this scale beam had a small defect on one side of it. I would have to accept that statement because it was made by the engineers. I do not believe that the scale beam was working wrong for a whole year because Spring Hall takes a number of tons of canes to make a ton of sugar, and to-day she is well above other factories; so that if the scale beam was wrong that year it would also be wrong this year. The Police Department should keep these scale beams in check and in my opinion the Government should have weights up to a capacity of about ten tons. A scale beam may be all right up to two tons and it may be wrong at three tons. It may be 500 pounds out in ten tons and that is a matter which nobody can control. From what I have found out, the factory manager did not really know that the scale beam was working wrong in one way or the other and therefore he could not do anything with it. It was only after the itinerant inspector came up that it was discovered that the scale beam was working correctly on one side but wrong on the other side. From what I have been told it was only a matter of chance that this particular load of canes was re-weighed. I have been told that the engineers said that there was a defect at one edge of the scale beam and I do not lay any charge against Spring Hall for robbing individual peasants. The particular load of canes was the property of Spring Hall and I cannot see that an individual was going to rob himself because he would be a big villain. I feel that if the peasants are dissatisfied about the weighing of their canes, the Government should employ a cane-weigher at each factory so as to satisfy them that their canes are being properly weighed. The honourable junior member for St. Peter has told us what has happened at a factory; we cannot control these things but I feel the Government should have the scale beams tested properly and if there is nothing wrong with them and any irregularity is discovered, the individual responsible for it should be jailed. It is hard for a person to send his canes to a factory and then be robbed. In this case there is nothing to be defended because it is a fact that the incident did take place, but the reason for it should be explained. The engineers claim that the scale beam had a defect on one side and that was outside the knowledge of the factory manager; therefore no direct charge can be laid against the

factory. As the owner of a factory myself I do not think that any factory owner would risk to put himself in any cane weigher's hands because the cane weigher would eventually feel that the factory owner is a bigger crook than he is.

Mr. COX: Judging from the remarks of the honourable senior member for St. Lucy it would appear as if the scale beam records different weights at different places, but unfortunately no place on it happens to be in favour of the people who are selling canes to the factory. I would like to say that this is a matter which should not be easily dismissed as some honourable members might feel because the honourable junior member for St. Lucy has told this House that the cane-weigher reported to the factory owner early in the morning that the scale beam did not seem to be working properly; and yet when the itinerant Inspector visited the factory in the afternoon he found that canes were being weighed as if everything was all right. The honourable senior member for St. Lucy has said that the canes in respect of which this error in the weight was made, belonged to a plantation probably connected with Spring Hall, but that is of little importance in so far as we are concerned. The fact is that there were many people who had to deal with these canes and they were being robbed; in the first place there was the cane-cutter, then the people who loaded the canes, the people who transported them and so on. I am not interested in a plantation owner robbing his brother; I am interested in the working people who do not share in the profits of this industry being robbed. I remember that there was a man called Pontifex who used to check scales and if he went to a shopkeeper's premises and found that the scales were 1/64ths of an ounce out he would carry them into the Market and the shopkeeper would be fined for having defective scales whether he was conscious of it or not. It is a much more serious matter for an individual to be robbed out of a quarter of a ton of canes than for him to be robbed out of an ounce of meal or sugar. I feel that the chances of these things being discovered are so few that when they are discovered the individuals involved should be dealt with just as any shopkeeper would be dealt with when his scales are found to be defective. I would not say that this discovery was a matter of luck because the Inspector was doing his job just as any sincere person would be doing his job. I feel that as soon as the cane weigher reported to the factory owner that something was wrong with the scale beam, that factory owner, if he wanted to be honest, should have told the cane-weigher not to carry on weighing canes until the scale beam had been adjusted. I do not know who is responsible for this incident but I feel that whoever is responsible for it should be prosecuted and heavily fined so as to prevent a similar thing happening again. This is a bad case. If a quantity of manure comes into this colony the factory owner can get as much as he wants and the peasant has to try and get what is left because he has to endeavour to increase his production. Everybody knows that the cost of labour has gone up and the peasant proprietor does not get as much per ton out of his land as the plantation owner gets; therefore the peasant proprietor is faced with the hardship of having to produce his canes at a loss. I feel that the Government should take drastic steps so as to ensure that there will not be another occurrence of this sort.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I am also concerned about sugar factories and I can say that I have not heard any complaints about weights being wrong. I cannot defend Spring Hall because it was found

that the scale beam was wrong. We have been listening to an electioneering speech for three meetings in connection with this incident and I would like to say that if the factory owner knew that the scale beam was working wrong in a certain place he would not have allowed the canes to be weighed in the correct place if he wanted to rob anybody. The Government is making a mistake in not getting proper weights. The itinerant Inspectors are doing their work most conscientiously. The inspector in this case discovered that something was wrong and as soon as it was discovered it was put right. I think that all this propaganda has done Spring Hall a lot of good because it is the only factory in St. Lucy which cannot deal with its canes. The peasants are so pleased with the factory that they send their canes there all the time.

Mr. DOWDING: I do not intend to make any electioneering speech but I am asking that the greatest effort be made now to get the type of weights that can test the scale beams to capacity. A scale beam is a mechanical contrivance and it is quite possible for it to go wrong. If these scale beams are carefully checked to capacity as often as possible I do not see any reason for doing anything else, because the people who are inspecting at the factories daily are doing a thorough job but there is nothing by which they can have a proper checking of the scale beams. These scale beams can be tested to capacity if a little trouble was taken by the Government.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: This is a very serious matter, a matter which affects the vital industry of this colony. I take full responsibility as a member of the community for saying that although there might have been some malpractices taking place in the past, it would be an indictment on certain people's character to say that all cane-weighers are dishonest. I have travelled about the island and I have met with some of the overseers at these factories and I would vouch for their honesty; I feel that they would have the same feeling with regard to peasants who send their canes to the factories as any member of this House. I therefore do not associate myself with any wild remarks in which everybody is embraced. In any community we have vicious people, we have liars and we have dishonest people. We have them in low places and we have them in high places, but it does not follow that everybody is dishonest. I repeat that I cannot associate myself with any wild remarks.

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

FURTHER REPLIES LAID

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to lay on the Table of the House some further replies; they are the replies to questions No. 43 standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Michael.

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

MOTION RE GOVERNMENT'S POLICY RELATIVE TO INDUSTRIALISATION

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move the adjournment of the House for a brief moment in order to discuss—

Mr. SPEAKER: I think you had better state the period of time for the adjournment.

Mr. CRAWFORD: For half an hour in order to discuss the following motion:—

That in the opinion of this House the failure of the Government to formulate and declare its policy with regard to the assistance it is prepared to afford new industries is disadvantageous to the best interest of the Island.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes because if we do adjourn it will not be convenient to adjourn for half hour.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I agree. I therefore beg to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes in order to discuss this motion. I offer no apology for introducing this motion today for more than one reason. In the first instance it is generally conceded that the solutions to our greatest economic problem are emigration and industrialisation. In the second instance it has been said by members of the Government that manufacturers in the United Kingdom and in the United States are willing to establish branch industries in this island if they can be given assistance. The Colonial Secretary has publicly stated that there have been enquiries from Great Britain and elsewhere with a view to establishing new industries in this island. A member of the Legislature of this colony has told me that an American industrialist showed him a bank account of a million dollars which he is prepared to invest in this colony in the establishment of a textile factory if the Government is willing to grant certain concessions. Only about five weeks ago I was asked over the telephone to meet a prominent Texan who was spending a few days at the Marine Hotel and who was willing to enter the textile field both in Puerto Rico and in Barbados. In view of the fact that these efforts have been made in this colony, and in view of the fact that there is so much unemployment in the colony, I offer no excuse at all this afternoon for raising this question on a motion for adjournment; neither do I pay any attention to the fact that it will be said, as it is being said, that members utilise this procedure for preventing the Government from getting business done. This is the time allotted to Private Members' Business and if the Government chooses to use its time in endeavouring to get commissions as Justices of the Peace for its members or—

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that the honourable member should reflect on any previous debate.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If the Government chooses to waste its time in dealing with inconsequential matters, I feel quite justified in having this matter discussed as fully as possible this afternoon. Incidentally, this matter was discussed last Tuesday and honourable members will recall that instead of some fundamental declaration of policy being made by the Government spokesman, all we were treated to was the same sort of thing to which the public is treated occasionally. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph, the senior spokesman in the House, talked all around the question and endeavoured to misrepresent the observations made in connection with the matter and ended up in traditional style by suggesting that if you discuss this question from this point of view, if you suggest that the Government should formulate some policy and declare it with regard to setting up new industries, you are being used as a tool by the capitalists and you are representing the interests of capitalists in this country. These misrepresentations never perturb me in the slightest; when it comes to the allegations about being used as a tool of the capitalists in this colony, I have been able in the past to satisfy the people of this colony as to who really are the tools of the

capitalists and I am sure that I shall be able to do it again.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion which we are discussing is the absence of any policy on the part of the Government for industrialisation. I take it that you are going to show that there is nothing being done in this connection.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am endeavouring to prove that nothing has been done and it is essential that something should be done; and if I am permitted to develop my argument I am sure that you will agree with me when I am finished.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not want you to bring in any former debate. You can show that nothing is being done without bringing in any previous debate.

Mr. CRAWFORD: As Your Honour pleases. When I suggested that it was imperative that this matter be paid due attention we were told by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph that, with regard to this question of industrialisation, there were three possibilities. The first was outright nationalisation, the second was the control of profits and wages and the third was the participation by the Government in the new industries which it is proposed to establish.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is again referring to a previous debate.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I want to ask: What have these things got to do with the specific matter of a declaration of policy by the Government with regard to whether or not it is prepared to offer the customary concessions which industrially backward countries offer in order to attract capital and in order to promote the industrial development of these countries? As a matter of fact we were told that the Government is not prepared to allow anybody to go in for industries unless they could control the profits and prices and, in certain instances, participate in the industry. I ask again: What is that to do with the declaration of policy which the Government should make in this matter? If you want to control profits and prices—

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that not a declaration of policy?

Mr. CRAWFORD: We want a declaration of policy with regard to offering specific concessions to potential investors. I am suggesting in the motion which I have made that the Government should formulate and declare its policy with regard to the assistance which it is prepared to afford new industries which may be established in the country. I repeat; we were told that the Government is not prepared to allow anybody to go in for industries unless the Government can control the profits and prices and in certain instances participate in them. That, Sir, is in the report appearing in the newspaper of which the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is the editor, and on page 6 of the last issue the words which I have quoted will be found. The position is this: How do you control profits and prices of industries? The Government have it in their power to see that industrialists subscribe to the revenue of the country, and they have it in their power to tax every available cent of profits made if they want to do so. They also have the Trade Union Movement which is very well established and which regulates the wages and conditions of workers in any industry in the colony. But it is the practice for people to use in this Chamber the same tactics they use on the soap-box outside. Instead of dealing with the matter specifically under discussion you bring in a lot of side issues in order to becloud the main issue and confound your listeners so that when you are finished they may possibly believe that you have made out a case either for or against the matter under discussion according to

the side on which you are. With regard to this question of affording specific concessions to new industries in these colonies I want to quote from the Report of the first West Indian Conference held in Barbados in 1944.

Mr. SPEAKER : Has that Report been laid on the Table of the House?

Mr. CRAWFORD : Yes, Sir. On the agenda of that Conference was the matter of industrial development and the Conference recommended that the Governments of these Colonies should help, create and foster desirable new industries and assist in the development of desirable existing industries in five ways which were cited. I propose to quote only two of them—by permitting the free entry of machinery and whatever desirable materials for factory processing and by granting some relief from taxation in order to encourage industrial expansion. That was recommended by the West Indian Conference in 1944 and in 1946 the Conference met in St. Thomas and the hon. senior member for St. Joseph was a delegate from this colony to the Conference. This is what he and other delegates agreed on with regard to this question of industrial development; this is what the Report says : "We endorse the recommendations regarding industrial development appearing as Part VI," from which I have just quoted, "of the Report of the West Indian Conference, First Session." And the Report to which the hon. senior member for St. Joseph subscribed went on to state : "We wish to express our satisfaction that the recommendations on industrial development adopted at the Conference, First Session, were in the main accepted by the Governments of the United States of America and the United Kingdom as set forth in the joint statement of the Governments of the United States of America and the United Kingdom regarding recommendations made by the West Indian Conference held in 1944".

Mr. SPEAKER : Your motion reads : "That in the opinion of this House the failure of the Government to formulate and declare its policy with regard to the assistance it is prepared to afford new industries is disadvantageous to the best interests of the island." I quite agree that you can show that the Government has done nothing, but quoting these things that have been recommended does not carry your motion anywhere.

Mr. CRAWFORD : I am establishing contradictions between the views which were expressed by the Government spokesman in the House last Tuesday and the views which he expressed at the Conference. If you are making out a case for urging the Government to declare its policy you are justified in quoting these things. In 1944 the West Indian Conference recommended such and such a thing, in 1946 the honourable senior member for St. Joseph endorsed that and in 1948 you are told that you are the tool of the capitalists if you endorse the same thing.

Mr. SPEAKER : You are simply saying that these things have been recommended by the Conference but the Government has done nothing about them. The Government has not declared its policy as to whether it will adopt these recommendations or not. It seems to me that you should show that these things have been recommended, nothing has been done and the Government is not going to do anything.

Mr. CRAWFORD : These recommendations of the Conference in 1944 were endorsed by the Conference in 1946 and were ratified by the United Kingdom Government. What I want to ask to-day is this : What are the real objections or reasons which stand in the way of a declaration of policy by the Government with regard to this matter? In this connection I should like to say that less than two

months ago the Governor of British Guiana in his speech at the opening of the Legislature declared this as regards new industries, and he also included the development of secondary industries; "The Government of British Guiana will seek your approval of a substantial concession in regard to income tax and is also prepared to grant relief from Customs Duties on imported capital equipment in order to stimulate the growth of these new industries and to give them practical assistance in the early and risky stages of their development." If the Government of British Guiana can come out less than two months ago and state in clear, precise terms that it is prepared to afford these particular concessions in order to stimulate the growth of industrial development in the country, the public want to be told and I want to be told why the same thing cannot be done in this country with greater need for providing employment for a large number of unemployed people, and in a country which, according to the Colonial Secretary, the Government has been approached by industrialists and we have been asked by people in Great Britain and elsewhere what concessions we are willing to offer. People do not make these enquiries merely because they have secretaries or the time to sit down and write letters. We have in this country a good labour supply, labour which can be easily trained to do skilled work. In another Caribbean colony, the colony of Puerto Rico, which from the point of view of population has a similar problem to ours, the Government has already stated its policy in this matter and is not only granting relief from Customs Duties to people who want to establish industries there, but is also granting exemptions from income tax for a period of 15 years. The industrialisation of Puerto Rico is proceeding apace and textile manufacturers from Canada and the United States are putting down plants and United States manufacturers are transferring their business establishments from the United States to Puerto Rico. Nobody is suggesting that we should do everything that Puerto Rico or British Guiana has done, but I submit that people appreciate the fact that there are only two solutions to our problem, either the establishment of new industries or emigration. We should not merely pay lip service to this important question but we should take every possible step immediately with a view to attract potential investors to come here and assist in increasing the national income. The Government should declare its policy and so attract these people. If we declare our policy we will attract people and that will result in providing work for the unemployed people of this country who are badly in need of work. Perhaps it would be advisable if I make these observations at this stage. In my opinion there are several industries which should be created and controlled by the Government. I personally believe that the Government should establish a cement industry in this colony. The Government are large users of cement and they would be well advised to cut out the profits made by private manufacturers and middlemen who establish their own cement factories. It does not necessarily follow that every type of industry which should be established in this colony should be established by the Government. We were told last Tuesday by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph that Lord Trefgarne who is the head of the Colonial Development Corporation had agreed with him that it would be advisable for the Government to participate in new industries, and he was glad to have a pronouncement like that, and he preferred to err with Lord Trefgarne than with those who feel that the Government should not participate in new industries. But Lord Trefgarne also said in Barbados that his Organisation capitalised at one hundred mil-

lion pounds, money put up by the British Government, was being run and controlled by businessmen. While we have every reason to believe that the British Government will see to it that the industries which are established from this fund are properly controlled, managed and operated in such a manner as to afford the best possible returns to the state and the people engaged in them, yet we have not been told that the present Labour Government refused to put up one hundred million pounds for the establishment of the Development Corporation unless and until the British Labour Government will be participating in the industries which are set up. As a matter of fact, it is significant in this connection that the big ground nut scheme which has been set up in East Africa is completely under the control of a private company although the money for its establishment has been completely furnished by the British Labour Government. As a matter of fact, the scheme was proposed by a private company to the British Government. (A MEMBER: The British Government refused that). Where, Sir, is the justification for claiming that there must be participation by the Government in the industries?

Mr. ADAMS: I must interrupt the hon. member if he continues to misquote me. I never said that; I could have interrupted the hon. member before.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Philip has moved the adjournment of the House in order to discuss the question of the failure of the Government to formulate and declare its policy with regard to the assistance it is prepared to afford new industries. He has quoted the British Guiana Government as to what it is doing but what I am trying to get him to do is to prove that the local Government has done nothing corresponding with what British Guiana has done. The hon. member is really arguing that certain things should be done and I do not think he is following the matter of the motion.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do not think it is necessary to prove that nothing has been done.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are blaming the Government for not declaring what its policy is, but you are going a long way beside that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am also endeavouring to show the evils which have arisen in consequence of its failure to declare its policy.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are quoting things that have been done in Puerto Rico and what I am pointing out is that you should prove that this Government has done nothing.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do not think it is necessary to prove that; it has already been proved. When the matter was discussed last Tuesday instead of stating specifically whether or not these particular concessions would be offered, the question was talked around with the result that nobody knows exactly where he is in the matter. I cannot see on what grounds any Government should refuse to adopt the policy of granting concessions in an industrially backward country like this. If, for instance, it is claimed that because the present Government professes to be Socialist it does not find it in conformity with its declared political principle to offer these concessions to would-be investors, if that argument is advanced, then in reply I would quote a small paragraph from an eminent Socialist who says this: "Socialism involves no more than there shall be adequate guarantees that all kinds of enterprise shall be carried on in accordance with the public advantage, and under conditions which ensure conformity with the requirements of public planning for the best use of the available resources of production——"

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member quoting from a book?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am quoting from an eminent Socialist. He goes on to say: "And for the fair treatment of those engaged in the various enterprises and of the consumers of their products." Those are the words of Mr. G. D. H. Cole, an eminent British Socialist. If it is claimed by the present Government that it cannot declare its policy with regard to offering concessions to investors because it is Socialist, it is misrepresenting what Socialism means or failing to interpret it correctly. In other words, there is no justification on grounds of socialistic ideology for refusing to offer exemptions from Customs Duties and to go further and offer exemptions from income tax to people who want to run the risks involved in coming into your country and experimenting with new industries. If, for instance, the present Government were doing what is implied in an Address tabled here by the honourable junior member for St. Philip and it is setting up an Industrial Development Corporation as the Puerto Rican Government has done and running the risk involved in making this industrial experiment, or if it were taking young men from Barbados and sending them abroad to be trained to acquire industrial skill as Japan has done, or inviting technicians from abroad to come here—if the Government had shown that it was willing to advance money for industrial development, there might be some justification for refusing to offer these inducements to private enterprise to come in. The Government has done none of these things. As far as the question of industrial development is concerned, up to now the Government has confined its efforts to assisting the pottery industry, and we were told by a former Government spokesman that the Government was doing some work by way of agricultural development in the country districts at a few Experimental Stations. Can it be suggested that they are sufficient in themselves to provide work for the thousands of our unemployed in this country? Can it be suggested that they will be able to support the expenditure to which this country is committing itself every year? We had a perfect example this year as to what it means to be putting our eggs in one basket. The drought has completely ruined our prospects from sugar this year with the result that the country is faced with unemployment, a decrease in revenue and considerable other disadvantages. In addition to that one has to bear in mind that there is increased mechanization of the only industry which is increasing the unemployment in the country. With regard to that question I should like to say that I believe it is time that the Government should cry halt to the increased mechanization of the sugar industry until such time as we shall have been able to establish additional industries which will absorb the people who will be out of work. As a matter of fact——

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that is outside the motion before the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Four years ago I tabled an Address in this Assembly warning the Government of the dangers involved——

Mr. SPEAKER: That is nothing to do with the motion for adjournment.

Mr. CRAWFORD: This incidental observation is necessary at this time. I tabled an Address relative to the dangers of wholesale mechanization of the sugar industry without previously taking steps to absorb people who would find themselves out of work in consequence of this mechanization. I want to say that if the Government refuse to make

its position clear in this matter, we shall find ourselves, as it was stated last Tuesday, in the position in which unemployment will continue to be our greatest problem for years to come. In my opinion, it is our duty to take the steps now which will guarantee that although unemployment is our pressing problem to-day, it will not, in the words of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, remain our greatest problem for years to come. That Sir, is a negation of Socialist planning; to carry that argument to its logical conclusion will mean that in every country under any given conditions you must always have unemployment. I prefer to think that at this particular stage, perhaps we may express our problem of over-population in terms of non-industrialisation. In other words, if we can establish sufficient new industries in this country we may be able to bring ourselves to the point at which work and proper wages under satisfactory conditions can be provided for the greater part of the population if not the entire population. Little Puerto Rico is now not only satisfying her needs in many directions but is also planning to increase her export trade and industrialists there are considering the possibility of capturing the West Indian market. Are we to be told in this country that all the Government is prepared to do with regard to this question of industrialisation is to consider outright nationalisation or participation in some industries or the necessity for controlling profits and wages? That is not enough. If we are not really paying lip service to this question of industrial development, bearing in mind the fact that people with the money and the "know-how" are actually knocking at our doors and asking us to let them come in, I think it is almost criminal, it is absolute indifference and incompetence to refuse to take every possible step we can—as a matter of fact, in my opinion, Barbados in its present position should even go further than a country like British Guiana where there is no question of over-population or unemployment and where there is sufficient work for the people there and they are asking people to come in and help them to do it. But in order to develop the economic resources of the country so as to make it more self-sufficient and increase the national income to the point where a reasonable standard of income will be provided for the people, they are willing to take this step. I do feel that those of us who feel strongly in this matter should make our position clear. I personally am not concerned with whether or not any local manufacturer wants to establish a canning industry or whether he wants to put more money in his pocket. I do feel that when it comes to the question of affording an opportunity for millions of dollars to be invested in the country, we should be ashamed of ourselves if we refuse to grasp that opportunity. We have available in this country—no one knows to what extent—a source of power for running industries; I refer to natural gas and there are several other colonies in the Caribbean which would be only too grateful if they possess this natural advantage because it is well known that the question of fuel power is very important to the setting up of a new industry. We have been lucky enough to have a natural source of power right at our very door, and coupled with that advantage, as I have previously mentioned, we have highly intelligent labour forces and a large supply of labour. Do you want to tell me that the people of this country will be satisfied to have denied them the erection of a textile factory or to know that British or American or Canadian manufacturers would have started to operate in this country this year or next year

if the Government would only say: "I am willing to do what other Caribbean colonies are doing; I am willing to allow you to bring in your machinery or raw materials free of duty, I will grant you income tax exemption for five years because by your presence here you are providing work for my people; your export trade is increasing my revenue and this increase of revenue will enable me to raise the standard of living of the people of this country to the point at which it can compare favourably with the standard of living in far more advanced colonies?"

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. senior member for St. Philip has not finished speaking you will be interrupting him.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Within five minutes I shall have finished. Other countries which find themselves in the position in which we find ourselves have gone even further than what I have suggested this afternoon. When the young American continent, for instance, decided that it should become more self-sufficient and less dependent on the Mother Country, the Government not only gave every possible inducement to potential manufacturers but it went further and created special protective tariffs in order to protect the new industries which were established. Although I do not propose at this stage to develop any argument about the desirability or not of free trade, still I think it is a universally accepted principle that colonies which find themselves under-developed economically take the most drastic steps in order to be developed industrially and to afford protection to those industries in the early stages against competition from similar products from outside. Honourable members are apparently anxious that the House should be adjourned at this stage and if I am in order I should like to move the adjournment—

Mr. SPEAKER: I want to point out that this is an extraordinary position. The honourable member wants to have a big debate on this question, but he does not go about it in the way in which he should go about it, and that is to move the passing of an Address. I do not see that anything is gained even if the motion for adjournment is agreed to.

Mr. CRAWFORD: This is a matter of importance to the country and if I had brought in an Address in connection with it, the Address would have been placed at the bottom of the Order Paper and there would be no opportunity to discuss it probably for the session.

Mr. SPEAKER: You can move the suspension of Rule 60 and if the House want to hear you they will agree to the suspension of the Rule. Otherwise you can take advantage of a motion for adjournment.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If you do not get a majority vote with regard to the suspension of the Rule, you cannot discuss the matter and the position will remain as it is. There are many important matters on the Order Paper and they will mean a lot to the country if they could be discussed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The matter is in the hands of the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable junior member for St. Philip, at the beginning of the session, tabled an Address calling for the establishment of an Industrial Development Corporation in this country and you yourself ruled that there should not be any indiscriminate moving about of Orders—

Mr. SPEAKER: I say that it cannot be done without the suspension of Rule 60. The Rules are there for the benefit of the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD : We have more or less agreed on the principle that matters relating to pensions for parochial employees and Vestry matters will be given priority to other matters on the Order Paper under Private Members' Business—

Mr. SPEAKER : That is when hon. members do not want to deal with any controversial matter and they want to leave the House early.

Mr. CRAWFORD : Sometimes they want to leave early and they do not want to discuss matters of importance. If Your Honour suggests that I should table an Address relative to this matter and endeavour to get priority for it, I will do so next Tuesday. However, if hon. members want to leave at this stage, any hon. member can move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER : It seems to me that I shall have to treat this motion in the same way as a motion for adjournment made in order to discuss the replies given to questions dealing with a particular matter where the debate continues from meeting to meeting. A motion for adjournment is made during Question Time, the debate is stopped at 3.30 o'clock and continues at the next meeting of the House. I think that that is the only way I can deal with this motion. The hon. member will have to make a motion for the adjournment of the debate. Of course the difficulty about that is that the motion for the adjournment of the House will have to be seconded.

Mr. CRAWFORD : Shall I withdraw the motion and introduce an Address dealing with the matter for consideration as the first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business?

Mr. SPEAKER : You had better do what I have already decided should be done. If you make the motion for the adjournment of the debate, you will have the right to speak again assuming that your motion will be agreed to.

Mr. CRAWFORD : I beg to move that the further consideration of this motion be adjourned.

Mr. SPEAKER : I think you will have to get your motion seconded; you have moved the adjournment of the House for five minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD : I am quite willing to finalise my remarks so that the motion can be seconded although there is the likelihood that the member who seconds the motion might be willing to make a speech next time.

Mr. SPEAKER : If the motion is not agreed to, you cannot speak again.

Mr. CRAWFORD : In order to facilitate hon. members who want to leave, I will close my remarks at this stage and make any additional observations when I reply to hon. members.

Dr. WILSON seconded the motion for adjournment which was agreed to.

Mr. CRAWFORD : I now beg to move that further debate on this motion be adjourned.

Dr. WILSON. I beg to second that.

The question that the further debate on this motion be adjourned was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. SYMMONDS, BRANCKER, SMITH, MAPP, F. L. WALCOTT, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, CRAWFORD, MOTTLEY, DOWDING, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON, WARD and Dr. CUMMINS—16.

Noes: Messrs. RAMSAY, TALMA, FOSTER and Cox—4.

PROPOSAL TO REVERT TO GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. ADAMS : I ask leave that the House do now revert to Government Business for the purpose of dealing with the Resolution for carrying on the organisation for banking the compulsory savings of Barbadian workers in the U.S.A.

Mr. WILKINSON : I object.

Mr. SPEAKER : An objection having been taken, I shall have to put the question. The question is that leave be granted the honourable member to revert to Government Business. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No." I think the "Noes" have it.

The following division was taken:—

Ayes: Messrs. RAMSAY, SMITH, F. L. WALCOTT, FOSTER, MAPP, COX, TALMA, ADAMS, BLACKMAN and Dr. CUMMINS—10.

Noes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. SYMMONDS, BRANCKER, CRAWFORD, MOTTLEY, DOWDING, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON and WARD—10.

Mr. SPEAKER : The question has resulted in a "tie", ten honourable members voting "Aye" and ten honourable members voting "No". I vote with the "Noes".

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Mr. ADAMS : When I move the House into Committee on the Estimates I shall ask that it be an instruction to the Committee to deal with the Report of the Select Committee appointed to prepare a draft reply to His Excellency's Message No. 36/1947 relating to the emoluments attaching to the office of Governor of Barbados. I shall also ask leave to move the suspension of Rules 61 (a) and 61 (b) so as to deal with the Estimates. The Other Place has intimated that we send up the Estimates to them sometimes with only one Tuesday to spare at the end of the month, and the Government is hoping that honourable members will sit twice a week if necessary in order to finish the Estimates within a few meetings and so remove the old reproach from the shoulders of the House. I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to this day week, the 2nd day of March, 1948, at twelve o'clock noon.

Mr. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER accordingly adjourned the House to Tuesday next, the 2nd day of March, 1948, at twelve o'clock noon.