

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1950—51

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 21st August, 1951.

Pursuant to adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 3 o'clock p.m. to-day.

Present

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., MESSRS. M. E. COX, L. E. SMITH, (*Chairman of Committees*), R. G. MAPP, W. W. REECE, K.C., F. E. MILLER and J. A. HAYNES, B.A.

Prayers were read.

Messrs ADAMS and ALLDER entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meetings which were held on the 26th and 30th July, 1951, respectively, having been circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

Messrs GILL, GODDARD and BRYAN entered the House and took their seats.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR THE CLERK.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I spoke with the Clerk this morning; he is obviously ill and he has asked that the House grant him leave of absence for to-day's session. I therefore beg to move that the Clerk be granted leave of absence for to-day's meeting.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS: In view of the fact that the Deputy Clerk will be acting as Clerk for to-day's meeting, I beg to move that Mr. D. A. Banfield be appointed to act as Deputy Clerk for this meeting.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

MESSAGES FROM THE GOVERNOR

Mr. ADAMS: I have the honour to present from His Excellency the Governor Messages as follows:—

MESSAGE NO. 26/1951

*His Excellency the Governor
To
The Honourable the House of Assembly*

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to refer to the Address dated the 5th of June, 1951, from the Honourable the House of Assembly on the subject of the East Coast Road, and to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that as soon as the fiscal survey of the Colony, which, it is hoped, will shortly be available, has been received and examined it is proposed to determine an order of priority for all the outstanding schemes which it is intended to carry into effect during the course of the next few years. The merits of the project known as the East Coast road will then be considered in relation to those of other outstanding urgent schemes.

2. A temporary crossing has been provided for the people of Lakes and Corbins.

ALFRED SAVAGE,
Governor.

Government House,
Bridgetown,
3rd August, 1951.

MESSAGE NO. 27/1951.

*His Excellency the Governor
To
The Honourable the House of Assembly*

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to refer to the Message dated the 22nd May from the Honourable the House of Assembly, and to point out that it is not the policy of Government to extend the facility of loans for the purchase of motor vehicles to officers whose employment is purely temporary.

ALFRED SAVAGE,
Governor.

Government House,
Bridgetown.
21st August, 1951.

MESSAGE NO. 28/1951.

*His Excellency the Governor
To
The Honourable the House of Assembly*

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable House of Assembly that the Secretary of State for the Colonies is sponsoring an application by the West Indian Students' Union for financial support from British West Indian Colonies for the establishment in London of a non-residential club and centre for students from the Caribbean area. In his despatch the Secretary of State has pointed out that the West Indian Students' Union has the support of the majority of the 1,200 West Indian students now in the United Kingdom, of whom more than 600 are in London. It has been represented by the Executive Committee of the Union that besides providing a centre which West Indians could look upon as their own to help them foster healthy social activities, the proposed club would offer facilities where, apart from West Indian students meeting each other, they could return the hospitality which they have received from friends in the United Kingdom and could meet people from the West Indies and elsewhere.

2. According to tentative estimates, it is expected that the initial Capital Expenditure for acquiring a property and for conversion and adaptations would amount to between \$48,000 (£10,000) and \$72,000 (£15,000) and that the deficit on maintenance would probably be \$9,600 (£2,000)—\$14,400 (£3,000) per annum. In respect of maintenance, the students themselves would be expected to contribute by means of membership dues, and the management would be expected to seek ways and means of raising revenue. It is not anticipated, however, that the establishment could be completely self-supporting. The Secretary of State is also giving consideration to a proposal that West Indian business interests might be willing to make financial contributions to the establishment of the Club and Centre.

3. At this stage, however, the Secretary of State wishes to learn whether West Indian Governments would agree in principle to the establishment in London of such a club for West Indian students, and if so whether they "would now give sympathetic consideration to contributing towards capital expenditure and maintenance, possibly on a basis proportional to the number of students from each territory at present in the United Kingdom and having regard to the general financial position of each Colony." On this "Student basis" the Barbados contribution towards the capital cost would be in the region of \$5,500 and that towards maintenance expenses would be \$1,000 per annum. If it is agreed that contributions should be assessed on a population rather than on a "Student basis", Barbados' share would be under 6.6% as opposed to approximately 7.8% on the "Student basis."

4. Accordingly, the Honourable House of Assembly is invited to indicate whether it agrees in principle with the proposal to establish a Club and Centre in London for West Indian Students and whether it would be prepared to approve a contribution towards the capital and annually recurrent costs.

ALFRED SAVAGE,
Governor.

Government House,
Bridgetown.
21st August, 1951.

PAPER LAID

Mr. ADAMS: I also have the honour to lay on the Table of the House the following Paper:—

Annual Report on the Organization and Administration of the Barbados Police Force for the year 1950.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to approve of the compulsory acquisition by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of one rood seven perches of land adjoining the lands of St. Christopher's Girls' School in the parish of Christ Church for increasing school buildings and furnishing playgrounds for St. Christopher's Girls' School.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to make it lawful for the Executive Committee to sell all that parcel of land containing by admeasurement one rood thirteen perches situate in the parish of St. Andrew, site of the former Chalky Mount Boys' School.

Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution to place at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee the sum of \$1,625 to supplement the Estimates 1951—52, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1951—52, No. 21, which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution to place at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee the sum of \$11,000 to supplement the Estimates, 1951—52, Part II, Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1951—52, No. 20 which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

Dr. CUMMINS: In connection with this Resolution, it is my intention to ask for leave to proceed with it in all its stages to-day. This sum of money is required for replacing wireless equipment for the Police. Having regard to the recent happening in our sister colony, we are still in the hurricane zone and it is considered necessary to deal with this Resolution as a matter of urgency.

Dr. CUMMINS: Bill to amend the Factories Act, 1947.

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

PRIVATE MEMBER'S NOTICE

A Private Member's Notice was given as follows:—

Mr. HAYNES: Of the following Address:—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Governor*

The House of Assembly view with grave concern the cost of replacing the approximately 40,000 small houses in the Island, which in the event of a hurricane would probably be destroyed, considering the present very high cost of building materials.

In view of this immense increase in replacement costs the House of Assembly consider that the Government should carry a Comprehensive Hurricane Insurance Policy on these houses as most of the owners are not in a financial position to insure themselves against Hurricane risk.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. Cox, the Bill to amend the Factories Act, 1947, was read a first time.

LEAVE TO PROCEED WITH AN ADDRESS

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker,—Owing to the urgency of the Address of which I have just given notice, I am asking leave to proceed with it later in the day.

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

Messrs. CRAWFORD and E. K. WALCOTT entered the House and took their seats.

EXPRESSION OF SYMPATHY WITH JAMAICA IN RECENT DISASTER

Mr. ADAMS: Before the Orders of the Day are entered upon, I am asking leave to move the passing of a Resolution in connection with the recent disaster which has befallen the island of Jamaica.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I think it is unnecessary for me to speak at any length in respect of the catastrophe which has befallen the island of Jamaica. While some of us may have special reasons for deploring the occurrence of this disaster and its effects, I think most of us as West Indians will agree in the expression of our sorrow and sympathy with the island of Jamaica. None of us know the magnitude of the disaster; I have been informed that the University College has suffered greatly, and I suppose that having regard to the death of human beings and destruction of private property, we, as other West Indians will regret very much that this calamity, which is so great a blow to the rest of the West Indies as well as to Jamaica, has taken place. I do not wish to give the appearance that I am looking at the matter in the eyes of non-Jamaicans, but I am sure that we, in this colony, will feel that we have a personal loss along with other losses in the island of Jamaica. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass:

The House of Assembly places on record its profound sense of sorrow at the catastrophe which has befallen the island of Jamaica and its willingness to consider sympathetically any Resolution for financial or other help which the Government may send down to it for its consideration.

The House requests His Excellency the Governor to send to His Excellency the Governor of Jamaica a copy of this Resolution.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Messrs. GARNER and MOTTLEY entered the House and took their seats.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: This does not seem to be the occasion for any lengthy speech. Obviously we are in agreement with what the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said realising that we are, and always will be, in the same danger. When such a disaster has befallen an island we cannot but sympathetically consider the feelings of those who are in distress, having had the misfortune which we have not had.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I make bold to say that there can hardly be a single person in this colony who does not have the most profound sympathy for the people of Jamaica in the disaster which has befallen that colony. It is my view that this sympathy should be expressed in the most practical terms and therefore I feel that nobody in this colony would begrudge any reasonable support financially or otherwise, which we might extend to Jamaica in this her hour of stress. It is extremely regrettable that at this time when Jamaica has just begun to recover from the effects of a similar catastrophe, the colony should have again been visited by a disaster of this sort. Our most sincere

sorrow goes out to Jamaica and we hope that her recovery from the damage will be speedy and complete.

Mr. REECE: I am in agreement with all that has been said in connection with this matter. There is only one thing which I regret, and it is that the Government has not sent down a Resolution to assist Jamaica at once. We know that help in every possible form is welcomed in Jamaica; unfortunately, we are not in a position to send material help and therefore I think that it would have been better if the Government could have sent at once monetary help of such sum as we could afford. There is ample precedent for such action; I think we should help Jamaica and do not let us delay in the matter. The sooner that help is given, the more useful it will be.

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

CONSIDERATION OF ORDER POSTPONED

Mr. ADAMS: I regret that the amendments of the Other Place to the Representation of the People (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill have not been circulated. It is regrettable, to put it mildly, that these amendments are not before the House at the present moment because the carrying out of the arrangements for holding the next Election may suffer because of the postponement of this Bill becoming law. In the circumstances, I am asking leave to postpone the consideration of the first Order of the Day.

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

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS TO THE PUBLIC UTILITIES BILL, 1951

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas:—To move the consideration of the amendments of the Honourable the Legislative Council to the Bill intituled an Act to provide for the regulation of the Public Utilities.

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to take charge of this Order.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I hope that honourable members have these amendments before them. I wish to say generally in view of the misconception which may arise or which has arisen, that this Government has a policy with regard to every Bill which it sends to the House, and above all, it seeks to be realistic; it does not believe that, constitutionally, the Other Place has the right to re-write a Bill, in effect, to change the principle of a Bill or essential portions of it, which would destroy the main principle of the Bill. On the other hand, the Government agrees, so long as there is a two-Chamber system, that the Other Place has the right to suggest amendments which will endeavour to carry out the principle underlying the Bill as passed by this House. If therefore, at any time I as representing the views of the Government, should say that we are accepting these amendments rather than have the whole Bill lost, it is clearly to be understood that this Government considers that it is its right and duty to make a pronouncement of the sort whenever it becomes necessary to do so in order that it may not be thought that the Government is being forced to accept a different view of a principle from that which has actuated the Government in sending a Bill to the Legislature. I wish to reaffirm what I have had occasion to say more than once already

in this session; some amendments we will accept because it is better to swallow them than to lose the Bill entirely, but at the very first opportunity which the Government has to bring forward an amendment which will restore the principle on which the Government originally acted in bringing down the Bill, the Government will do so. I am saying that it is better to put this Bill on the Statute Book with amendments with which the House does not fundamentally agree but which we will accept rather than lose the Bill. In dealing with these amendments I am pointing out that they are amendments which the Government would not normally accept, but which the Government is suggesting to the House to accept temporarily.

If honourable members will look at these amendments, they will see—I hope I do not offend against any Rule with regard to the respect which is due to the Other Place—that some of them are verbal and therefore necessary, but some others seem to be entirely meticulous and yet some others are an expression of a point of view different from that which actuated the Government in bringing down the Bill. The first amendment is to Clause 5 of the Bill; as passed by the House, this Clause provided that the members of the Public Utilities Board shall hold office for a period of five years from the date of their appointments; provided that (a) a member may at any time by notice in writing to the Governor resign his office and (b) the Governor may declare the office of any member vacant on the ground that he is from any cause unfit to continue in office. The Other Place has seen fit to put in the word “just” before the word “cause”. The word “cause” means a just cause and I am therefore suggesting to the House that they approve of that amendment. Perhaps Your Honour will direct as to whether we should take these amendments separately and agree to a vote or whether we should go through the whole lot and then let a motion be made that they be agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member may proceed as he is going on.

Mr. ADAMS. The second amendment is to Clause 11 of the Bill; in effect, the amendment is only the addition of a fourth Sub-clause which says that the expenses of the Public Utilities Board shall be included in the general expenses of the public utility. That makes it clear that in the opinion of the Other Place, for purposes of income tax, the Board may add to its expenses the expenses which are allowed as expenses of the business. Honourable members will remember that the expenses of the Board must be borne by the several utilities carrying on business in proportion to the earnings of those utilities, and this amendment provides that each of these utilities should be allowed to include the expenses of the Board in its business expenses. The House may well agree with that. The next amendment is a verbal one in Clause 12, the words “Colonial Treasurer” having been changed to the words “Accountant General.” The next amendment is in Clause 13, the changing of the plural to the singular, the word “members” has been changed to “member”. The next amendment is in Clause 18; instead of the words “section seven” occurring at the end of Sub-clause (3), the words “section twenty” should have appeared. That is also a verbal amendment. The next amendment will be found in the separate document which has been issued to honourable members; apparently an omission was made in Clause 20 in the original amendments as circulated and the amendments were re-printed. Clause 20 (2) as passed by the House gave the Board authority, if it considered that a public utility was charging too much, to establish a temporary rate

while it was examining the position fully. As that sub-clause left this House, it read as follows:

“Whenever the Board, upon examination of any annual or other report, or of any papers, records, books or documents or of the property of any public utility, shall be of the opinion that any rates of such public utility are producing a return in excess of a fair return upon the fair value of the property of such public utility, used and useful in its public service, the Board may, by order, prescribe for a trial period of at least six months, which trial period may be extended for one additional period of six months, such temporary rates to be observed by such public utility. . . .” In respect of the trial period of six months, the Other Place used the wording “not exceeding six months;” but it is a matter of indifference as to which expression is used. There is an additional amendment to this Clause. Sub-clause (4) as passed by the House read as follows:

“If the rates as finally determined are in excess of the rates prescribed in such temporary order, then such public utility shall be permitted to amortize and recover, by means of a temporary increase over and above the rates finally determined, such sum as shall represent the difference between the gross income obtained from the rates prescribed in such temporary order and the gross income which would have been obtained under the rates finally determined if applied during the period such temporary order was in effect.”

The effect of that Sub-clause is that, if for instance, the Board think that a shilling a unit for electricity is too much and they prescribe a temporary rate of a sixpence a unit and finally decided that 16 cents per unit is enough, the Electric Company would have the right temporarily to raise the rate so as to recover the difference between sixpence a unit and sixteen cents a unit. The Other Place has amended that Sub-clause to read as follows:

“If the rates as finally determined are in excess of the rates existing prior to the filing with the Board by a public utility of a tariff stating a new rate under the provisions of subsection (2) of section 18 or of the rates prescribed in such temporary order then the public utility shall be permitted to amortize and recover by means of a temporary increase in the rates finally determined the sum which represents the difference between the gross income actually received by the public utility during the period commencing with the date on which under the notice given to the Board the new rate was to have come into effect and ending on the date on which the rate finally determined became effective and the gross income which would have been received during the same period if the rates finally determined had been in effect.”

The Other Place dealt with the matter in respect of the existing rates and not merely in respect of the temporary rates. If the existing rates are one shilling and after examination the Board decided that the rates should be 30 cents, the excess is provided for by the amendment. That is a point which we did not cover and therefore we might well agree with that amendment; we did not conceive of the possibility of the rates being too low.

Clause 24 of the Bill gives the Board the right to order a public utility to make an extension to its service, if in the opinion of the Board, after a hearing either upon its own motion or upon complaint, such extension would provide sufficient business to justify the construction and maintenance of such extension. When this Bill was before the House the Government pointed out to its backbenchers that while it was in agreement with the principle of nationalisation, it was better to pass this Bill for many reasons; we did not want to buy a pig in a poke and

paying for it possibly more than what it is worth. After an examination of the books and accounts the working and machinery of a public utility we will be told what it is worth before we buy it. On the principle of nationalisation we would like to carry electricity down to Pie Corner or Crab Hill; on the principle on which this Bill was passed in this House, a rich district would pay for a poor one although there would not be any discrimination in charges. As regards this Sub-clause, the Other Place did not consider it good enough and they added a proviso which reads as follows:

"Provided always that for the purposes of this section "sufficient business" shall mean such business as will yield such gross revenue within the extended area of supply at the rates for the time being authorised as will produce a sum not less than the cost of maintenance and depreciation and will produce a reasonable return on the capital outlay in respect of such extension."

That is a very bitter pill for this Government to swallow, but it is swallowing it purely temporarily; to say that electricity must not go to St. Andrew or St. Lucy or the hinterland of Christ Church because Sargeant's Village cannot afford to pay or that Strathelyde or Belleville will pay, is anathema to this Government. However, we will swallow that and get this Bill on the Statute Book; it is of no use talking about the extension of public utilities if the extension has to depend upon good business. The darkness will continue in St. Joseph and St. Peter as long as the test is whether it will pay the Electric Company to carry their lines down there; I think all honourable members will agree that that should not be the test; Honourable members will agree, I think, that we have to accept that amendment temporarily until we can bring forward our amendment which will be passed in this House.

The next amendment deals with securities and it is difficult to say that this amendment is up to the standard which one expects of a branch of the Legislature. Think of the Electric Company, which is registered in Great Britain, having to run the gauntlet of examination by the Capital Issues Committee before it can raise new capital! That having been pointed out to us, the Government added this proviso to Clause 27 of the Bill:

"Provided that in the case of a company registered in the United Kingdom the approval of the Board for the proposed issue shall not be required where the prior permission of any body recognised by the Board for such purposes has been obtained."

The Other Place did not think that that was sufficient and it has amended that proviso to read as follows:

"Provided that in the case of any proposal

- (a) for the raising of any Capital that may be necessary for the development of the Undertaking, or
- (b) for the underwriting of any stocks, shares or debentures, the approval of the Board for the proposed issue shall not be required if such issue is subject to and has complied with the Regulations and requirements of the proper authorities in the United Kingdom."

The proper respect for the Rules of the House alone prevents me from commenting on that amendment, but it is not as good English as was passed by this House; a second Chamber must do something to prove its existence.

The next amendment is the addition of a third Sub-clause to Clause 28 which deals with complaints; it is a reasonable amendment which reads as follows:

"The Board may require any person, or company or public utility making any complaint to give

security for the costs of the hearing and investigation of the said complaint."

People may run before the Board with all sorts of complaints and this is a reasonable way of making sure that the complaints have something behind them. People may complain that their voltage or pressure is low and it is with what you may call such comparatively minor things that the Board is concerned in Canadian Provinces which have Public Utility Acts of this sort. In any event, it cannot do any harm if we say that the Board should have the right to cause people to deposit something as security for costs in respect of any investigation which might be carried out.

The next amendment is to Clause 35 of the Bill. That Clause provides that the Board may take over a company and run it in the enforcement of any order made by the Board. The Clause sets out how the employees would have to work with the Board, but no provision was made as to the length of time during which the Board might remain in possession of the property of the company affected by the order. The Other Place has placed that time at six months at the end of which period steps will be taken to have the company wound up by the Court, which is all set out in the next Clause.

The next amendment is to Clause 36. As passed by the House, this Clause reads as follows:

"Where a public utility has failed to comply with any order made by the Board, if the Board is of the opinion that no effectual means exist of compelling the company to comply with the order, the Board in its discretion may transmit to the Colonial Secretary a certificate signed by the Chairman and the secretary, setting forth the nature of the order and the default of the company in respect thereof and upon publication in the *Official Gazette* and a daily and at least one weekly or tri-weekly newspaper of a public notice of the receipt of the certificate by the Colonial Secretary, the default of the company so established by the certificate of the Board shall be ground for proceedings to dissolve the public utility."

There is a member of the long robe and a Solicitor in the Other Place, but it does not seem to have occurred to them that changing the words "so established by the certificate of the Board shall be ground for proceedings to dissolve the public utility" does not really alter the principle that if the Board cannot get its order complied with, the Company will be wound up. That Clause has been amended to read as follows:

"(1) Where a public utility has failed to comply with an order made by the Board, if the Board is of the opinion that no effectual means exist of compelling the public utility to comply with the order, the Board shall transmit to the Colonial Secretary a certificate signed by the Chairman and the secretary setting forth the nature of the order and the default of the company in respect thereof and such certificate shall be published in the *Official Gazette* and a daily and at least one weekly or tri-weekly newspaper.

(2) Upon publication of the certificate the Board may apply to the Court of Common Pleas to have the public utility wound up and the Court shall order the winding up of the said public utility as though it were a company registered under the provisions of the Companies Act 1910."

It is better to agree to these amendments than to lose the Bill.

It is better to agree to these amendments than to lose the Bill.

Clause 43 which deals with the right of appeal, led to more discussion in this House than any other Clause, as honourable members will remember. It is absurd to give the right of appeal to a Court

on questions of fact; in two provinces in Canada—Newfoundland and British Columbia—there is the right of appeal to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, which is reasonable. Concessionaires to-day do not appeal to the Chief Justice; they appeal to the Governor-in-Executive Committee. The Schoolmasters appeal to the Governor-in-Executive Committee—not to the Judge. In matters of law you appeal to the Law Courts, but in matters of fact you do not appeal to the Law Courts. The honourable junior member for Christ Church can tell the House that the Other Place has not effected any change in the working of the Act; an Appeal Court does not interfere with any finding of fact unless the Court below was manifestly wrong; an Appeal Court only reads the evidence and it is a fundamental principle that it does not interfere with any finding of fact where the Court below saw the witnesses and their demeanour and decided whether they were truthful or not. Therefore, to alter this Clause and give the right of appeal generally to the Chief Judge does not effect the purpose which the Other Place and some of the members of the Opposition think they would effect in giving the right of appeal on questions of fact. You complain that your voltage is not good enough; you bring in an electrician and he says that the voltage is poor; you telephone the Electric Company and they send in their man who says that the voltage is all right, there is nothing wrong with it. The Trial Judge sees both these people and he believes "A" rather than "B"; you appeal and the Appeal Court is not in as good a position as the Trial Judge to say which side he believes. That is the position; the Board has power to summon other people and listen to them and arrive at a decision after hearing the evidence. When the the Other Place gives the Chief Judge power to hear an appeal from that evidence, they are not putting him in as good a position as the Board was in. The Other Place thought they would help the Chief Judge in matters which would be technical, and they agreed that he may be assisted on any question arising before him. With great respect for the Rules of the House I would not make the comment which I would make outside; but we shall have to agree with these amendments temporarily.

Clause 44 has been deleted because it has been dealt with otherwise: in Clause 45 as passed by the House there is a verbal amendment, the words "Court of Error" having been changed to the words "Chief Judge". In Clause 47 the words "its opinion" have been changed to the words "his decision". The other amendments are merely verbal or consequential like the re-numbering of Clauses and I do not think it is necessary for me to spend any time in considering them. The word "rules" which we used in Clause 59 has been changed to the word "regulations"; that was an oversight on the part of the House. Any amendment after Clause 57 is purely verbal; the amendments which appear in the Schedule to the Bill are also consequential like the changing of the figures "1950" to the figures "1951".

I have gone through all the amendments. Some of them are very useful in that mistakes of ours, chiefly grammatical ones or misplaced commas, have been corrected. Some of the amendments are fundamental and they might prevent the operation of the Bill for some time; but for the reasons I have given, I am asking the House to agree to these amendments. I have spent a longer time in putting these amendments before honourable members than I usually do in dealing with amendments of the Other Place; but it is essential that I do so because, as I said when the Bill was first introduced in the House, the Bill might appear to be

a departure from the principle of this Government that public utilities should be nationalised. The Government had the best possible reason for sending down this Bill; there are so many important financial measures which are of greater importance than the nationalisation of public utilities, that the Government decided that it is better to have this half-way house of setting up a Public Utilities Board to regulate the price and efficiency of these public utilities than to spend money on their nationalisation. Rather than pay half a million pounds for the Electric Company, the Government felt that faced with the construction of the East Coast Road and the Deep Water Harbour, it would be better to control the price of electricity, telephone and gas than to attempt to purchase these undertakings. We have never departed from the principle of nationalising essential things as the only salvation of every modern community; I take the opportunity of repeating that this Bill is a temporary measure only until this Treasury can afford to purchase those public utilities which we deem to be essential to the public life of the community. When we have built enough houses and effected the necessary social services, when we have improved public health, then it will be time to buy the Electric Company, not until then. (A MEMBER): We do not need to have the cash. After the next election we may be able to follow the advice of the honourable member on my left. I apologize to honourable members for having spoken at such length on these amendments, but I thought I should say what is the reaction of the Government to the amendments before I ask honourable members to agree to them. I now beg to move that these amendments be now read a first time.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. DOWDING entered the House and took his seat while Mr. ADAMS was speaking.

Mr. HAYNES: I think it is fitting that I should say something about these amendments. Some time ago I brought forward an Address asking for the nationalisation of the Electric Company. After all, it does not matter who owns the concern provided that everybody got satisfaction from the service. However, as far as this Bill is concerned, I only hope that it will be strong enough, giving the Public Utilities Board the power to force the various public utilities in Barbados to do their duty. As long as they select all the flesh and leave the bones you will never get any satisfaction from any of them. I am hoping that the Government will see that there are appointed to this Board people who are not going to stoop to the various companies, but that they will take proper action in respect of these companies.

Mr. GARNER: I remember supporting the honourable member who has just sat down when he brought forward his Address; to-day he is a satisfied man. Apparently the particular Company took heed and they have not only enlightened this House, but they have enlightened the honourable member; perhaps I have not spoken loudly enough or they would have done likewise to me. I have to speak on behalf of the people who have not got electric service in their houses; I am sorry that the Government has found it compulsory to accept not only the amendments to this Bill, but also to acquiesce in the appointment of a Public Utilities Board, rather than nationalise certain public utilities. The Government has had to acquiesce in this matter, but I still remember the days when we promised the people that we will see that these essential services are given to them and not merely enjoyed by a small minority of the inhabitants. I still feel that electricity should be made cheap

enough so that any person who is living anywhere should have that service. I do believe that the activities of this Company should be extended; in a very enlightened parish like St. Philip there are only a few parts served with electricity! You cannot see a ray of light in certain parts of the parish; whenever you see a crowd, it is somewhere near a shop with a kerosene lamp flickering. The Electric Company has a monopoly and these people should be told that they must electrify this island; this is an island 21x 14 and they cannot find enough money to electrify it! With the use of electricity the housewife could use her toaster and get her little dainties; she could just plug in her iron and get things done in a short space of time, and the service is so clean! Many children who are now attending the schools are getting their eyes ruined by having to read late at night with the use of kerosene oil lamps; it is time that this Company put its house in order. You must let people have their electricity; there is the difference of chalk and cheese between a cup of coffee prepared by means of a stove and one prepared by electricity. It is time that we see about this matter; electricity is a necessity, it is no more a luxury and what the Electric Company have lost sight of is that if they were to extend their service some of the small wage-earners would use it; when you replace a chimney which has been broken, you have almost paid for electricity. I have been using kerosene oil lamps for all these years and I now have to wear glasses; perhaps if I had electricity my eyesight would have been saved.

I am sorry that the Leader of the House has acquiesced in this matter; I feel that he has taken the best of the bad, but I still feel that he should not sit down and say: "This is all we expect." I am not sure as to what will be the personnel of the Board; this House will not have any say in the matter, and if we get ultra-Conservative people on the Board, this House will be just as it is to-day. (A MEMBER. We can pass an Address demanding their removal from the Board). We should be very strong in this matter; we want to have the electricity service extended, we want the people in the far districts of the country to have this service. There is on the Statute Book an Act under which the Electric Company brings in everything duty free and I think it is wrong to ask people to erect poles so as to give them service; the erection of the poles should be a part of the Company's capital expenditure, and it is time that we see about that matter. If I live two miles from the nearest electric pole, you cannot expect me to make an arrangement with the Electric Company for extending their mains to me, which might cost me about £200 or £300, and then I have to pay for the service. The Act under which the Company operates is an old one; the Conservatives were scratching each other's back at the time, but I do not think that Socialist-minded people can go along with that state of affairs; I have to pay you for your service and you must put down your pole and run the service. The poles are not mine after I have paid for them; that is not a sound business policy and these people should be told: "Get away with that sort of thing." It is wrong for the Electric Company to call upon people to erect poles and then they run their mains. We will not be satisfied either with this Bill or with the amendments; when the people feel that the time is ripe to take matters in their own hands and force somebody to do something, because they are suffering, then we will wake up to find that we have been a little too lenient in this matter. I know that the cure for all things is time and it is only a matter of time before the people of this colony will feel

that they should have electricity in their homes. This Company has money which it proposes to keep for its reserve fund; these people have a monopoly and if they cannot make money something is wrong with them. This Company should have the whole colony electrified and they would make money; if they refuse to extend their service and make more money, we should only do to them what Christ did to the fig tree—get rid of it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: This is a very complicated Bill, but in the final analysis its utility to the public will depend entirely upon the personnel of the Board; how the members of the Board interpret their duties and carry them out, will be the test of the Board's value to the colony. I want to repeat to-day what I said when the Bill was first considered by this House; and it is that the utmost caution will have to be exercised in the selection of members of the Board; we want people who know something about the material needs of all sections of the community. With regard to the question of nationalisation, I do not propose to say very much. The people of this colony have had a number of promises made to them; three years ago they were told that within six months after a certain Party was returned to power, electricity would be nationalised, and three years after they are promised this nationalisation at some distant date in the unknown future. That is a matter on which much time need not be wasted to-day, but inasmuch as both Houses of the Legislature have agreed to the creation of a Public Utilities Board, the main thing now is to have the most suitable persons on the Board, get the Board functioning and see what will happen. In so far as electricity is concerned, we have to pay regard to two things: one is the extension of the service, and the other is the provision of the service at the cheapest possible rate. In so far as the extension of the service is concerned, I submit that the primary duty of the Board is to consider the possibilities of the Electric Company embarking at once upon an island-wide extension of its service; that is a crying need to-day. It is an easy thing for a Company like this which enjoys a monopoly to extend its service.

There is a final point I would like to make. Under the original Act the Governor is empowered from time to time to grant any local authority the right to supply electricity for any public or private purpose within any given area. This Act has been subjected to one or two amendments and I am not in a position to say what the position is today. I know that the parochial authorities are permitted to supply their own buildings with electricity; I do not know exactly what the position is with regard to the Vestries having the right to electrify areas, but I feel that the position should be reconsidered. In many of the West Indian colonies the rural areas owe their electricity not to the fact that the Central Government has an island-wide service, but that the local authorities have their own municipal electric concerns. In Grenada I know that the local authorities used to have their own independent electric company which supplied light to rural areas completely independent of the Electric Company in the City itself. In bigger countries it has been found necessary for the municipal authorities to supply light to the areas which they control; where you have the waterfalls in America, the local authorities electrify their areas with electricity completely independent of the Central Government operating in the metropolitan area. When the franchise was originally granted for the supply of electricity, the Government might have considered the possibility of the local authorities undertaking the supply of electricity in the rural

parishes and whether the Electric Company now has the exclusive right to supply electricity to the whole island or not. I think this matter should be reconsidered.

Mr. REECE: Everyone on this side of the House will agree with the principle that public utilities, especially electricity should be controlled; we advocated the establishment of a Public Utilities Board. I warn hon. members not to run away with the idea that the nationalisation of any public utility will, of necessity, bring to them the wonders which they think are contained in the principle of nationalisation. I would just mention that for many years water in this colony has been nationalised and yet there are certain parts of this island in which people are crying out for water; they are in exactly the same position with respect to the water supply as that in which they have been ever since. The mere fact that there is Government ownership does not mean that you will get things done overnight; the Waterworks Department is owned by the Government, but we cannot get a proper water supply at the moment. When hon. members say that the nationalisation of public utilities will mean that the people of this colony will get the benefits of those utilities within the near future, they are just making an error. On this side of the House we feel that it is better for companies who own these utilities to retain ownership of them, with the expenditure which that ownership entails, and let them be regulated by a Bill of this sort to serve the people. As the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has said, the acquisition of public utilities means the expenditure of money, and unless you have money in the Treasury you cannot acquire these utilities. The hon. member has rightly said that the Government is thinking, first of all, of the many social amenities which are needed, having in mind particularly the East Coast Road and the Deep Water Harbour. When it comes to the question of the Deep Water Harbour there is no member of this House who will not agree with the hon. member, because a Deep Water Harbour is the lifeblood of this community. It is absolutely essential for us to have a Deep Water Harbour if we are to continue to occupy our position in the shipping life of the Caribbean; recent figures have shown that we are slipping from the position which we occupied for all this time. Every member of this House will agree that money would be better expended on things which affect the life of each and everyone of us in the community rather than on the nationalisation of public utilities. Let the companies which own these utilities see that they develop them and provide proper services for the people.

The amendment of the Other Place to Clause 24 of the Bill as it is worded really defeats the object of the original Bill as passed in this House. I feel that a company should not only develop a particular area if there is a reasonable prospect of the return of money, but it should be forced to develop areas and the losses in any area will be offset by the profits made in other areas. I repeat that it is all right to talk about nationalisation, but if you have not got the money in the Treasury, you cannot nationalise anything; it is much better for companies to retain the ownership and have the expenditure of maintenance of these public utilities, but they must carry them into the districts which need them; at the same time the prices which are charged must be controlled. One can readily realise the extent to which the taxpayers would be involved if the principle of nationalisation were adopted.

Sneaking for myself, I do not agree with the amendment to Clause 35 of the Bill which provides that the Board can remain in possession of the property of a company for a period of six months in respect

of the enforcement of an order made by the Board before taking steps to have the affairs of the company wound up. Bearing in mind conditions obtaining in the world to-day, one can easily see that through no fault of the company it might be impossible for it to comply with an order of the Board. It is easy to place an order in England, but it is not so easy to get that order executed. As a matter of fact, only a short time ago an hon. member said that the Waterworks Department was unable for a complete year to get its orders from the Crown Agents in England. Therefore, let us face facts; under existing conditions and under which we have no control, a company may not be in a position to carry out an order of the Board. I say that the Board is being put in a rather invidious position; I think that in that amendment we have to take into consideration the state of affairs which exist in the world to-day and where the Board has to give an order to a company a proviso should be attached saying: "If you can get these goods within a certain time, then we expect you to do so and so." I say that it would be much better if this Clause remained as it was passed in this House, which gave the Board authority to take care of the affairs of the company until such time as the goods arrive, instead of putting in this period of six months.

There is one other amendment with which I should like to deal and it is the amendment in respect of allowing an appeal on questions of fact and on questions of law. When the matter was before this House originally, there was considerable comment for and against allowing appeals on questions of fact, but the position is this: unless there is reason for interfering with a decision on a question of fact, the Appeal Court will not interfere with the decision. Sometimes a Trial Judge accepts evidence given by some person, but evidence which is outweighed by that given on the other side; and I have often heard a Court of Appeal say: "If I had tried the case in the first instance I would have done so and so." I am not a Judge, and I have no intention of becoming one; be that as it may, a case may arise in which a Court of Appeal will have the courage to say: "If I had tried the matter in the first instance, I would have done otherwise." Therefore the necessary provision should be left in the Bill.

I agree with the hon. senior member for St. Joseph that the Other Place should not so alter a Bill passed by this House as to change the principle underlying it. If the members of the Other Place do not agree with a Bill they should throw it out, provided of course, that it is not a money Bill. As soon as the Other Place made that amendment to Clause 24 they did something which we, in this House, did not want done. The idea behind this Bill was to give the Board sufficient power to compel a public utility company to extend its service regardless of whether or not the extension was made to districts from which the company would derive profit; I think that that principle should have been adhered to; there are certain districts of this island which will never be profit bearing, but, as the hon. senior member for St. Philip has said, water and electricity are so essential to the life of the community that the question of cost should not be considered. These amenities should be taken to the poorest districts, every person being entitled to water and light. If that principle had been left in the Bill, the Bill would have been workable; but the amendment is not really workable. The position of the Electric Company was gone into and it was pointed out that the Company could not issue any capital for any purpose unless it had authority from the Capital Issues Committee; but in these days, whether the Government in England be Conservative or Socialist, do

you think any Government would not agree to the principle which was in this Bill originally, allowing light to be taken to both the poor and the rich districts, the cost of the one being offset by the cost of the other? The Capital Issues Committee would not have refused to grant permission to do that. When the time comes for the hon. senior member for St. Joseph to introduce his amendment to put back this Bill where it was when it was passed by the House, each and every hon. member will vote for it. We do not accept amendments of the Other Place simply because we want a compromise on principle and if the Other Place really appreciated the position with respect to this particular Clause of the Bill they would have backed down from that amendment. I am perfectly willing to vote against that particular amendment; the Other Place should know that this House does not agree with it and that the Bill is not workable with it. The matter is entirely one for the hon. Leader of the House. As the hon. senior member for St. Philip has pointed out, if that provision remains in the Bill, the position will be exactly the same as it is to-day; you will not be able to compel the Electric Company to go to a poor district and give people the benefits which they should get under the provisions of this Bill. As regards the other amendments to the Bill, whether we agree with them or not, they do not go to the root of matters; but this particular amendment really changes the whole complexion of the Bill and it would have been better if the Other Place had said: "We do not agree with the principle of this Bill and we reject it" rather than put in an amendment which, in my view, changes the whole complexion of the Bill.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Before these amendments are agreed to, I think I should add my quota to this discussion, because I played some small part in the debate when this Bill was first before the House. I must say that I always recognise the Other Place as a part of the Legislature of this colony and feel that it is right to make amendments to legislation as passed by this House, provided that those amendments do not destroy the principle of the Bill. I view this Bill today in the same light as that in which I viewed it when we first dealt with it; this is a compromise having regard to nationalisation, and I think democracy survives by reasoning and compromise. I am dealing with the amendment to Clause 24 of the Bill; I will say that I am not going to be like other people who feel that when we pass legislation the Other Place cannot find something which is wrong. We have had to hurry through Bills in this Chamber and in respect of this Bill, we had to take a lot of advice. Anyone who is interested in the welfare of this colony must admit that the amendment to Clause 24 destroys the principle of this Bill, and I pledge my support to taking out this Clause and putting it back as it was. How can you think of accepting this amendment when you are thinking in terms of a monopoly? If you had no monopoly, then, of course you could put in this amendment, but how can you have a monopoly in this colony and then say that you will extend your business to a district provided that such business "will yield such gross revenue within the extended area of supply as will produce a sum not less than the cost of maintenance and depreciation and will produce a reasonable return on the capital outlay in respect of such extension?" I say that that amendment should be thrown away. How could any body of men who faced the electorate in this 20th century and got elected to this House, be satisfied with this amendment which says that a company should only run its service where it can make a handsome profit? Do the members of the Other Place not realise that in all kinds of business you must mix

the fat with the lean? This is an ignorant amendment; what do they mean by it? This is only drawing a red herring across the trail. If you have a monopoly in a country and somebody comes along and says: "I am developing my area. I want you to supply electric light in it" and you charge him £5,000 or £6,000, that is all well and good. But in an area where people cannot afford to pay, should you say: "Unless I can see gross revenue within the extended area of supply I cannot run my service there?" I say that there is nobody on this side of the Table who could be so stupid in this age as to agree to such a proposition. We have said that public utilities should be controlled for the benefit of the consumers, and having said that, could we agree to this amendment which provides that electricity should only be run in an area where the company can make a profit? We have to accept this amendment, but I say that the Bill should be amended to put this Clause back where it was. It is correct to say that in the first instance, we made an error, but we do not claim to have all the wisdom; we passed Clause 24 saying that where the Board found that an extension by a public utility of its existing business would, in the opinion of the Board, provide sufficient business to justify the construction and maintenance of such extension, the Board may order the public utility to make such extension to its service. We should not have used the term "provide sufficient business"; that matter should have been left to the discretion of the company. Sometimes you may have to run your service along an area in which, for miles, you cannot hope for the provision of sufficient business: we wanted to pass something which is workable. The amendment by the Other Place would have been a good one if we had five or six electric companies, but not where there is only one company. I say that when the members of the Other Place are making amendments, they must consider that there are those of us in this Chamber who have to look after the interests of all sections of the community. I am supporting this amendment with the reservation that at the earliest opportunity that the Government ask to have the Bill amended I shall be the first to put up my hand, because where you have a monopoly you must think of the service which you give to the people.

Mr. MILLER: I have a few remarks to make; in connection with this Bill. I still feel in the same way as when this Bill was first before us, and what is worse, the Bill as amended has been reduced to a farce. The amendment to Clause 24 destroys the underlying principle of the Bill; this Clause as amended has really taken the entrails from that for which we had hoped. This Bill has been regarded as a compromise to nationalisation, but there is no such thing as a compromise to nationalisation; the setting up of a Public Utilities Board to control public utilities will never be a compromise to nationalisation, which is separate and distinct from the Public Utilities Board. With this amendment to Clause 24, some sections in this island will never have electricity; I say that the idea of compromise to nationalisation is purely farcical. In this matter of providing utilities for the people, there should not be any compromise and I do not see why we should have to accept what is now before us. With this amended Clause, if you want any extension of the service of the public utility you will have to prove to the Board that a profit will be made.

The Electric Company today enjoys a monopoly but the word "monopoly" is one which should be removed. What you find is that an individual cannot supply electricity manufactured at his own place to his neighbour next door, he has to wait on the

Electric Company. For all the years you are told that there is no hope of an extension in the area where there is no hope of making a profit, and in this amendment we are being told that the Public Utilities Board will not have any power to compel the Electric Company to extend their service to a district where it is regarded as unprofitable to do so. The honourable Leader of the House has said that this Bill will have to be amended; that will probably happen in the next session, but I do not think that a Socialist Government should be willing to accept this Bill on the grounds of this amendment. If the Board is without the power it should have, it can only be a farce.

As regards the amendment to Clause 28 under which the Board may require any person who is making a complaint to give security for costs, I should like to say that a person may have a justifiable complaint, but because of the mere fact that it will entail costs to investigate the complaint, he does not make that complaint. I do not think he should be required to pay the costs of the investigation.

Mr. ADAMS: I am sorry to interrupt the honourable member. I just want to explain that if a man brings a complaint he does not have to pay anything; but if he brings a frivolous complaint and he loses he has to pay the costs, otherwise people will bring frivolous complaints. He must give security for costs and if his complaint is frivolous he pays costs.

Mr. MILLER: With all due respect to the honourable Leader of the House I am not accustomed to legal phraseology, but I am saying that this matter should not be left to the Board. A man may have a complaint which appears to be frivolous and because he understands that the Board may require him to pay the costs of the investigation he does not bring it. However, I can quite see that the Government is anxious to get this Bill through and any Bill is better than no Bill at all. In connection with the amendment to Clause 35 of the Bill where the Board can remain in possession of the property of a company for a period of six months where the enforcement of an order is concerned, at the end of that period one might find it impossible to make the change he anticipated in the first place. That is another matter about which I am, to some extent, unhappy; but I would really like to hear the honourable senior member for St. Joseph reply on the question of the extension of service as proposed here, which would remove the idea of electricity not being extended to the whole island.

The question that these amendments be now read a first time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On motions of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS in each case, the amendments were read a second time and agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS: At this stage, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

On re-assembling

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker—On behalf of the honourable senior member for St. Peter I am asking leave to table the Reply to Question No. 5, standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Michael.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS TO HOLIDAYS WITH PAY BILL ACCEPTED.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph—to move the consideration of the

amendments of the Honourable the Legislative Council to the Bill intituled an Act to make provision for holidays with pay.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—As with the last Order, there are certain amendments to this Bill which may not find favour with honourable members. But they do not make the Bill differ so much from how it left this Place as would justify the Government in asking honourable members not to accept them. I propose to refer briefly to the amendments, therefore, and then to ask the House to accept them. This is not as good a Bill as the Government would have liked; but it is a sort of beginning, which, when we put it on the Statute Book, can be improved and added to. I say that, because while it is a good step forward for a small island like this to take in going ahead of other parts of the Empire in this sort of legislation, it is not as comprehensive as some labour codes that exist in some parts of the world—not the British world—but some parts of the world, covering relationship between employers and employees. The first two amendments are verbal and trivial. For some reason or other, the word “requires” was spelt “required”, “1950” becomes “1951” and the word “respectively” was put in. The definition of “employer” is altered by changing the word “includes” to the word “means”. I think that that is one of those amendments which were passed in spite of the insistence of the legal men in the Other Place, and which may prove to be unhappy. But it is not of great importance at the present moment. Lawyers know the reason for putting in the word “includes” rather than “means” which is more restricted. The Other Place seems to think that it is better to put the words “in whole or in part” after the word “payment”. All those amendments are verbal. The first important amendment is where the Other Place considered that overtime payments, commissions and bonuses should not be included under wages. In one respect one might defend it in the case of overtime generally. On the other hand, until you have a perfect shift system working, you may find some classes of employment in which overtime is normal work, in which, in the absence of shifts, you cannot get through. Therefore, some classes of workers, if overtime is left out, may rightly feel that an injustice has been done to them. Similarly with commissions. It seems to me that one can easily imagine occupations or callings in which a man's fixed salary is so fixed because he is going to get commission as well. For example, instead of giving a man £1,000 a year, you may give him £200 and then 20 per cent. commission on the orders that he brings in. Therefore, it may be a hardship if you give that man holidays with pay on the basis of £200, and not the other £800. But the Other Place has seen fit to put it that way. Bonuses are somewhat different except in cases where a salary is fixed low because it is a regular practice to give bonus. The Other Place has seen fit to put it that way. When they did that, I do not think that they saw the points that I have enumerated, or they would have realised that they were working a hardship. The next amendment is the one regarding the definition of “year of employment”. Their definition is: “Year of employment in relation to an employee means any period of twelve months during which the employee has actually performed labour or rendered services for the same employer for an aggregate of at least 250 days in the case of employees employed on a weekly, fortnightly, monthly or yearly basis, and at least 150 days in the case of any other employees.” Mr. Speaker, it is when you come lower down in Section 6 that you see that this amendment may conflict with that Section. May I remind the House, Mr. Speaker, that

in an agricultural community especially, holidays with pay are not always that; sometimes you have to give a bonus. As soon as you get seasonal employment it is impossible to get holidays with pay. A cane cutter could not get such a holiday because he may not work even half of the year. Therefore you have holidays with pay for permanent yearly employees, and a system of bonus for those who are not permanently employed on the principle of holidays with pay. The Other Place accepted that principle in passing this Bill. With this amendment they refer merely to people who are in employment for 250 days, or 150 days within a period of 12 months, which is the period that an employee has to work for the same employer. Personally, I do not see how the nature of the appointment has anything to do with the length of time for which you might be employed during 12 months. But the Other Place has seen fit to put it that way. There are employees to whom you might refer as permanent casuals. They are people who are not on a regular pay roll, but on overtime. When you want extra work done you bring them in. For example, some people who work for the Public Works Department. Over a year you will find certain painters not employed permanently from January to December but so often during the year that they can be looked upon as almost in the category of permanent employees. Therefore this period of 150 days was fixed for them. That is the reason for this amendment. A new sub-clause numbered (2) has been inserted in Clause 3 and reads; "Every employee not being in employment at the time of the commencement of this Act but thereafter being in employment shall, at the end of each year of his employment, be entitled to an annual holiday of at least two weeks." The next amendment to Sub-clause 3 is the deletion of our words "two consecutive periods" and the substitution therefor of the words "in one period of two weeks." The House passed "two consecutive periods" meaning two consecutive weeks. The next amendment is merely re-numbering. Then we come to Section 4. They have deleted the words beginning with the word "year" in line 4 of sub-clause 1 of Clause 4, and substituted the following: "period of employment with such employer during the period of 12 months to which such annual holiday relates." The amendment uses the word "such" apparently in order to show that only the employer with whom he works for 12 months is to pay the employee; similarly with Section 5. The next amendment is verbal. Then we come to Clause 6 which has come back to us as it was passed in this Chamber, after what I believe was an attempt on the part of Government members in the Other Place to have an amendment. That was specially put in to cover the crop season. When the crop ends in say, 14 weeks, workers of that class are intended to be covered also. If his employment is terminated after three months he is entitled to a quarter of what he would have been entitled to if he had worked throughout the year. In paragraph (a) of Clause 9 the Other Place apparently thought that the word "fails" was too wide, and substituted the word "refuses". That raises a smile among legal men; because if a man fails to carry out the provisions of the Act it can only be construed as if he wilfully failed, which is the same thing as refuses. However, for reasons best known to themselves, the Other Place left in the word "fails" in other parts of the section. There are two other amendments which are matters of indifference. One is the insertion of a Clause 10 which reads: "No prosecution for any offence under this Act shall be instituted after the expiration of one year from the date of the commission of the offence." The second one is the

insertion of a Clause 11 which says: "This Act shall come into operation on such date as the Governor shall by proclamation in the Official Gazette appoint." I do not see the reason for the last bit, because it conflicts with the section which says that your year starts to run as from the passing of the Bill. It can only mean, as far as I can see, that the proclamation in the Official Gazette should be made as swiftly as possible. As I have said, sir, these amendments to this Bill are not of such importance that the House should cavil at any of them, and therefore I now beg to move that these amendments be read a first time.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

The motion was put to the House and carried *nem. con.*

On separate motions of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS the amendments were read a second time and agreed to.

FURTHER GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker,—I am asking leave to proceed with the Address of which I gave notice earlier.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—It is usual for the person conducting Government Business to say that that Business is finished before you start Private Members' Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Government proceeding with further Business?

Dr. CUMMINS: Yes, Your Honour. Government is proceeding with Order No. 4.

On Order No. 4 being called:

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Dr. CUMMINS: In seconding that, sir, I will remind the House that I gave notice of a Resolution today saying that I intended to ask leave to proceed with it today. I think that before going into committee I should move the suspension of Rules 88 and 89.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are out of order.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg leave to withdraw my motion in the wording in which I made it.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Mr. ADAMS: I now beg to move that Rules 88 and 89 be suspended.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker,—I would be glad if one of the fans could be turned off. I cannot hear a word that honourable members are saying.

The motion for the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 was put to the House and carried *nem. con.*

On the Order being called:

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction to the House when in Committee of Supply to deal with the Resolution for \$11,000 of which notice was given earlier to-day.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

The motion being put and carried *nem. con.*, His Honour the Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

RESOLUTION TO PURCHASE RADIO EQUIPMENT FOR POLICE DEPARTMENT.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman,—As I intimated earlier today, this Resolution is for funds required to purchase urgently needed radio equipment for the Police Department. The present wireless equipment,

as the Addendum shows, is completely unserviceable. We have just entered the hurricane period, and with the unfortunate example of Jamaica before us, I think we should try to acquire this new equipment as soon as possible. I am sure that honourable members would like to hear the individual items which it is proposed to purchase. They are as follows:—

Four Pye 15 watt fixed stations, Simplex type, P.T.C. 703 W, O.F. 77 mcs., complete with unipole aeradio and 120 feet each coaxial cable and pedestal type microphones. Price—\$950.40 each—\$3,801.60.

Two Pye 15 watt mobile stations, S.T. P.T.C., 114 A for six volt D.C. operation 77 mcs., complete with all accessories, and Public Address loudspeaker. Price—\$876.72 each—\$1,753.44.

One (a) Pye 15 watt transmitter, Simplex, P.T. No. 920062, O.F. 77 mcs., including pedestal microphone.

(b) Fixed receiver, Simplex, P.T. No. 920062

(c) Link transmitter, Simplex, P.T. No. 920063, O.F. 77 mcs. for operation in conjunction with (a). for operation in 156—184 Mc/s Band (frequency to be notified).

(d) Link receiver, Simplex, P.T. No. 920063 for operation in 156—184 Mc/s Band.

(e) One six-foot double enclosed steel rack for above.

(f) Unipole aerial, complete with 120 feet of co-axial aerial feeder cable, O.F. 77 mc/s.

(g) 6-element Yagi type aerial, complete with 120 feet co-axial aerial feeder cable. Operating frequency to be notified. Price—\$2,120.60.

Pye 17 watt fixed station, Simplex type, P.T.C. 704, for operation in 156—184 Mc/s Band, modified for link control of Items 3, complete with pedestal type microphone. 6-element Yagi type aerial, 120 feet co-axial feeder cable together with extension control unit and panel and 300 feet of cable. Price—\$1,322.88.

One set of Pye spares including valves etc. Price \$500.00

Total \$9,499.52.

SUMMARY

(a) Estimated cost in U.K. of Pye equipment	\$ 9,499.52
(b) Add 10% for Crown Agents, freight etc.	949.95
(c) Installation of aerial masts etc	500.00
Grand total in B.W.I. dollars	\$10,949.47

Sir, I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. GILL: Mr. Chairman—Before the question is put, I would like to enquire whether this equipment is available locally at the moment, and if it is not, when can we reasonably expect to receive it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is—

Mr. MOTTLEY: Oh no!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will not allow the honourable member to jump up and shout "Oh no."

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am not attempting to be disrespectful, sir. But apparently you did not seem to recognise that the honourable junior member for St. Andrew asked a question which we over here would like answered. You attempted to put the question without waiting. I hope that now you will allow the honourable member's question to be answered. That is all I rose for, sir. I go a little further sir, since I am on my feet. I would like to know in the meantime what will the Government do if this equipment cannot be obtained rightaway.

Dr. CUMMINS: This equipment is to be obtained from the U.K. It is estimated that it will take about three months to get here. In the meantime, honourable members must have noticed an advertisement in the Press offering to rent local equipment for the purpose of the Police Department. I think that I have answered the questions.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman—Once again I must register my objection to the manner in which items of this sort are placed on the table of the House, and dealt with the same day. Here we are, called upon to give our decision on an expenditure of \$11,000 of the taxpayers' money, at a moment's notice. Now, sir, we have been told that this equipment is to be purchased from the U.K., and that the firm is Pye. Being unable to gather any information in the time allotted by Government to consideration of this matter, I cannot say whether Pye is the only firm which can supply this equipment in three months, or if there are any other firms that could supply it at a lower price and things of that sort. It seems ludicrous that any department should allow equipment to reach such a state, that they have to come to this House with the statement that it is completely unserviceable. I do not know if that is correct or if it is a misprint, or misinterpretation. It is sad that those responsible for this equipment have allowed it to deteriorate to such a degree, especially now that the hurricane season is on us, and new equipment cannot be obtained within less than three months. It is such a sad state of affairs that I am willing to read between the lines and believe, on the little information that we have been given this evening, that the disability of this equipment has only just come to the knowledge of those responsible, and that that particular type must be Pye. I leave it to anyone who wants, to read between the words that I have spoken. I think it is a very irresponsible way of doing business, and very unreasonable also, to expect honourable members to debate matters of this sort without even a day's notice. I shall continue to voice my objections, Mr. Chairman, so long as this manner is adopted.

Mr. REECE: Mr. Chairman—No one regrets more than I do, the fact that this Resolution has been brought at a moment's notice. But we have to look facts in the face. We are in the middle of the hurricane season, and we must do everything possible to get this, or other equipment in order to prevent any catastrophe from taking place. One can well understand what position we will be in if we have a hurricane in this country and all the telephone lines and poles are destroyed, and we did not have wireless equipment with which to maintain communication with the various parts of the island. For that reason I am supporting this Resolution. In the matter of the Police Force I would like to say that nothing which comes before this House has got more criticism than those asking for money for the Police Force. But it is not the Police Force that we are looking at; but the welfare of the entire community. Therefore, although this Resolution has not been brought in in time, we should vote for it. The Government cannot escape blame in this matter, because they must have known for a long time that this equipment was deteriorating. It was therefore their duty to have had it replaced before the hurricane season was on us. But although they are to blame, we must, as I have said, look at the welfare of the community and vote this money. Now, Mr. Chairman, there is one aspect of the matter which I think should be gone into by the Government. I think the urgency of the need for this equipment should be explained to the Crown Agents, and if that is done, they, with their knowledge of conditions in the West Indies at this time of the year, will, I think, take every step possible to see that this equipment is shipped here before

the expiration of three months. If it cannot be shipped, it can be sent by plane. We need it. For many years we have been dependent on this equipment. It is absolutely essential, because as I have said, if we are unfortunate enough to get a real strong blow in this island, it will be absolutely impossible to maintain communications throughout the length and breadth of the island without wireless equipment. If we do not impress upon the Crown Agents the urgency of the matter, this equipment may only arrive in time for the next hurricane season. I know that this equipment is used for other purposes, but its primary use is in the event of a hurricane. Let us get it as soon as possible.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman—As far as the question about Pye equipment is concerned, I think it is fair to say that Pye has gained for itself some reputation in recent years for being good equipment. As far as this equipment mentioned in the Resolution is concerned, if it is a question of needing it for the hurricane season this year because a calamity might befall us just as it has befallen Jamaica, then it is a question of whether or not it will arrive in time. I think it is correct to say that you will hardly find two other colonies feeling the need of it. I think that the officer who will be in charge of using this equipment was attached to the Wireless Department of the Trinidad Police, and he is interested in having an efficient local Police Force as far as wireless is concerned. I must say that bringing in the example of Jamaica is a powerful persuasion to vote for this Resolution. If I vote against it, and there is a blow and lives are lost, it will be on my conscience. What I would like to be satisfied about is whether this equipment will arrive in time for the hurricane season or not. We have a good telephone service covering all the police posts. I do not know if it is correct to say that this equipment will not be of much service except in a case of emergency. In the first place it will not be economical to run generating plants to operate a little radio station when you can use the telephone. I do not know if anyone can persuade me that the equipment which was brought down in 1937 ever did anything. Some of it was arranged for use with the Morse Code; but some of the policemen who handled it knew nothing about Morse. I understand that the proposed equipment is to be used more or less like the telephone arrangements for ship to shore communications for the Harbour Police. What I know about high frequency equipment like this is, that if it is allowed to lay down idly until next hurricane season it will be more or less useless by then. Another question is whether my view of the fact that we have gone along without it for the last 300 years, we cannot defer it until the prices come down; we might perhaps be able to get some war equipment at a lower cost. It is a tidy sum that this resolution is asking for. I feel that it has just been pressed on us to-day because Jamaica has suffered. I doubt that we can get it in three months.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Chairman—In view of the fact that the addendum stresses the presence of the hurricane season, I think that this entire committee should vote for this Resolution. But we should not vote this money to replace these transmitters without bringing it to the attention of the Government that someone, obviously it must be the Commissioner of Police, is to be blamed for the situation that has developed. If the wireless equipment is found to be completely unserviceable, it must have been becoming so for sometime. Knowing that these things take some time to reach the colonies, the Head of the Department should not wait until the beginning of the hurricane season to say that it has become unserviceable. This equipment could not deteriorate in one

day. Everyone knows that the hurricane season begins in August. Therefore, it does not take much vision to see that if you want to prepare for the hurricane season, sometime before that season the Government should have been told about the state of the equipment, and allowed steps to be taken to replace it. I do not see how we can pass this Resolution without criticising the Police Commissioner. As far as I can gather from the speech of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas, it seems to me that a special type of this equipment has already been selected. I would like to ask the honourable member who made the selection. If it is being ordered through the Crown Agents, why not leave it to them to say what equipment they would recommend, and not leave the selection in the hands of the Commissioner of Police. I may say that if there is one department that has satisfied us as to the value of their work on behalf of the Colonies, it is the Crown Agents. As I was saying, sir, I do not think that we should leave the choice in the hands of the Commissioner of Police who cannot be a radio or wireless expert.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, while it may be true that this equipment was installed during 1937, I think it was sometime last year or year before last that we were presented with a Resolution to make provision for replacement of wireless equipment at the Volunteer Department. I know for a fact that they have to take wireless operators up there to see after that equipment. The Police Department also seems to have a lot of equipment there that is no use. While all these things may be good—we hope that in time of disaster we will be able to cope with the situation,—we have to consider whether this equipment is definitely necessary. You cannot get down hurricane equipment the moment you order it. It will not arrive until the hurricane season is over. I do feel that in view of these facts it is unnecessary to spend this amount of money. I think we should see if we can make use of the equipment at the Volunteer Department. This island is not so mountainous as some of the others of the West Indies, nor is communication so difficult that we could not leave out this proposed equipment with the hope that fortune will be on our side. We would then have this amount of money to spend on more necessary things. This Resolution sounds good because it has something to do with hurricanes; but if you take the matter from a broader aspect you will see that there is nothing wrong in economising as far as this is concerned. As you know, sir, we might have to wait a longer period than three months before this equipment comes down. Take the example of the Waterworks Department that have been saying that orders have been made for over a year and they have not been able to get delivery. Sir, I would certainly like to know what has happened to the wireless equipment at the Volunteer Department.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman—I would like to tell honourable members that because of the hurricane a few days ago in Jamaica, this Resolution was urgently brought down today. But since the 12th of June the Commissioner of Police drew to the attention of Government the complete breakdown of this wireless equipment, and at the same time we investigated the possibility of repairing it. We soon after got a reply that it could not be repaired. We were also informed that new equipment would take about three months to reach here from England. So we have been moving in this matter before the hurricane season started. In view, however, of the fact that we are in the season now, and in view of what has happened in Jamaica, we decided to move as swiftly as possible in order to acquire this new equipment.

Motion that the Resolution do now pass was put and carried *nem con.*

RESOLUTION FOR TRADE COMMISSIONER SERVICE

Mr. ADAMS : Mr. Chairman — The next Order is a Resolution that the sum of \$13,792 be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1951-52, Part 1, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1951-52, No. 18, which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

The Resolution, Sir, is under Head 28, Subsidies and Grants, and the amount of money represents the colony's contribution towards the Regional Economic Committee. As honourable members will see from the Addendum, Resolutions 5 and 9 of the Montego Bay Conference, 1947, relating to the setting up of a Trade Commissioner Service and a Regional Economic Committee have now been implemented. The Regional Economic Committee has been set up, and will take over and extend the existing Trade Commissioner Service in Canada and will establish a Trade Commissioner Service in the U.K. The Regional Economic Committee has drawn up estimates within £30,000 which should be contributed by the participating Governments, etc. I move the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Chairman—I do not follow the honourable introducer of this Resolution very clearly. I see it stated in the Addendum that the Regional Economic Committee will take over and extend the existing service in Canada. What I would like to know is how do they propose to extend this service. I am quite in favour of the Trade Commissioner Service in the U.K. although it is felt in some quarters that what is wanted in the U.K. is a West Indian House. A thing I would mention is that all over England you see Jamaica rum advertised. It cannot be compared with Barbados rum, but you do not see rum in Barbados advertised. But no one who tastes Barbados rum wants to taste Jamaica rum afterwards. I want to know how this service will be extended. I would also like to ask the honourable senior member for St. Joseph if British Guiana has decided to participate in the establishment of this service. As far as I can gather, British Guiana can see no benefit from it.

Mr. GODDARD : Mr. Chairman—I agree that we should be represented by someone in the U.K., whether Crown Agents or the West India Committee. In establishing this service we are only keeping pace with other colonies like Trinidad and Jamaica. It is true that these other colonies have more to sell than we. But we have our sugar, and the secondary industry, rum, and then, of course, the tourist trade. You cannot establish a tourist trade unless it is known abroad that you have something to offer. It is a good step to establish this service in the U.K.—a service that we already have in Canada. I take it that you are going to develop it, and let them do more to advertise this little place in the West Indies. We are so apt to believe that these colonies are the centre of the universe and that everyone knows about us. But we only have to go abroad to hear persons asking where is Barbados. We are surprised to find that these people do not know their geography. Barbados is very important to us, but we have got to let the markets of the world where we sell our produce know where we are, and what we have to offer. We may not see immediate returns from this service, but in the long run it will pay handsome dividends, if these services are properly run. They will create a connection between London, Ottawa and Montreal with the West Indies, and will be of immense help both to the Governments

and commercial interests in the West Indies. I heartily support the Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD : Mr. Chairman—Our contribution to the Regional Economic Committee is appreciable, and I sincerely hope that the expenditure will be justified. There is ample room for the setting up of a committee of this sort at the moment. One hopes that in view of the conditions in the West Indies, the committee will primarily concern itself with industrial developments throughout the islands and get down to some blue print for industrial development throughout the Caribbean, so as to make these colonies more self sufficient, and less dependent on getting essential commodities from abroad. I think that the committee can also render some valuable service by giving some attention to the vexed question of a proper price for West Indian products as well as a proper price for the goods that we import. In so far as major West Indian products for export are concerned, the situation at the moment is none too rosy. Sugar is by no means in a happy condition, and although we are not affected by the market to the extent that the price of fruit and tobacco is affected, we have to concern ourselves with the general situation. We do hope that this Regional Economic Committee will be able to lay the foundation of economic independence for the British Caribbean. It is all to the good to have a Trade Commissioner service in the U.K. just as we have one in Canada. It is even better to have this committee working and planning for the interest of the economy of the West Indies. There is a lot of work to be done. The members who have been appointed to sit on this committee are busy men in their respective areas, and they find it difficult to devote the time that they should. One hopes that in view of the importance of the committee to the area, that even if some sacrifice is entailed the members will devote as much of their time as possible to this programme, and in the near future submit some far reaching, practical recommendations to the various colonies who are financing the scheme. This committee is more or less the economic basis on which political federation must rest; and the success or lack of success that attends it will be the yardstick by which the ability of the British West Indies to govern themselves may well be gauged. Speaking for myself, sir, I know that much is expected of this committee. Even the U.K. Government itself will give steady and scrupulous attention to everything done by this committee. What it accomplishes or even suggests is in itself the foundation of whether or not the West Indies are advanced enough for complete political freedom. If we cannot stand on our own feet economically, then we are not in a position to assume complete political freedom and run our own destiny. I repeat, sir, the task that this committee has to perform is to lay a blue print for the future economic security of the West Indies. One devoutly hopes that it will prove itself worthy of the task to which it is committed.

Mr. REECE: Mr. Chairman—As the last speaker said, I think it is essential that this colony should work together with the other colonies for the economic stability of the West Indies as a whole. I think that we in Barbados stand to gain as much as anyone else in the area. It is true that our sugar is bought in bulk; but we have subsidiary industries such as rum and tourism. Our rum is largely unknown in the U.K. I hope that it will be soon as well known as rum from Jamaica. Similarly, sir, few people from the U.K. come to Barbados. I feel that in respect of the two subsidiary industries that I have mentioned that we stand to gain very much indeed. In respect of Canada, the situation is different. In Canada, Barbados is well known. Canada buys our molasses. I think I am correct in saying that we have

a good export trade in rum to that dominion, and it is not only due to the Trade Commissioner there, but to Trans-Canada Airlines that our tourist industry there is flourishing. But I think that from one point of view we have much to gain. We only have one major industry, and as I have said, we have subsidiary industries—rum and tourism. But as it has been well pointed out by the hon. junior member for St. Philip, we in the West Indies have to work for the economic future of the area. That ideal was expressed in a resolution passed at the Montego Bay conference, and I do not think that this committee will be of much use if we do not honour their resolutions and do our utmost to see that in the future—perhaps nearer than we expect—there is economic stability in this area.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman—There is not much that I can say. The honourable junior member for St. Thomas asked a question. I think that I pointed out earlier that while Mr. Stollmeyer is doing good work in Canada, he is really overworked and needs more staff. The Regional Economic Committee had a sub-committee that went into that question. Mr. Stollmeyer happened to be here for the meeting, and we decided that he should have more staff. Mr. Stollmeyer does quite a lot. One of his activities, the latitude of which may have to be modified—it may have to be done in a different way—is seeing after West Indian students in Montreal and other parts of Canada; principally Montreal. It is amazing, you might say, how much in many parts of Canada, Mr. Stollmeyer means in business circles in the West Indies. If we can get a Trade Commissioner in the U.K. who will mean as much there to the West Indies as Mr. Stollmeyer means in Canada, then the West Indies are in for a more prosperous commercial future in Great Britain. Both hon. members for Christ Church have spoken. I regret that they have both caused me to say what I am going to say now. It is amazing both in Canada and the U.K. how lacking in imagination the commercial world of Barbados is. The vilest stuff is lapped up as Jamaican rum in the U.K.—stuff that we would not even give members in an opposing political camp, but which the Electors' Association might give to electors whom they thought were going Labour. On every bus in every tube station in London you see Jamaica rum advertised. If you go into a shop you get a booklet with the whole history of Jamaica rum. The praises of Jamaica rum are thrown at you from every shop in London. But you get a man who knows rum and if he can get a bottle even of Vat 19 from Trinidad let alone Gold Braid—I am sorry that I have to give Gold Braid a gratuitous advertisement—he will forget Jamaica rum. Two or three bottles of Gold Braid are worth 100 bottles of Jamaica rum. I see with surprise that Vat 19 is beginning to get up to J & R. I think that there is a great lack of initiative on the part of Barbadian rum exporters. The position is similar with the molasses trade in Canada. There are some of us who would not travel by bus. Mr. Chairman, I have never seen you in a bus. Some of us who have grown out of the horse and buggy stage travel by car. So more and more young Canadians no longer want to buy molasses from the puncheon. They want to buy it in packages just as they buy preserved fruit. That is a tip for the Barbadian exporter and producer. Then they should get up and advertise more in Canada. I do hope that even at this late stage our Barbadian merchants will try to do better. They have something good to sell, but it is only a lack of initiative that causes us to lag behind in these two items. The honourable junior member for St. Thomas

has just come back from an extended tour of the U.K. and he will tell you that Barbados rum is better liked than Jamaican rum to those who know it. Although the honourable junior member for St. Philip may be surprised at what I am going to say now, I think it is only fair to say that he must have been hearing some of us think aloud.

He has made the best contribution to this debate so far. I agree with what he said about the Regional Economic Committee. Writing a new constitution alone cannot make the West Indies more prosperous. We want political federation; but we also need a sound economic background; and unless the members of the Regional Economic Committee realise that it is an economic committee and not a debating society they will not help the West Indies, I hope that other honourable members will bear in mind what the honourable junior member for St. Philip has said: that it is the duty of all of us who have the good of the West Indies at heart to watch this organisation, and as far as those of us who are not members of the committee are concerned, it is our duty to see that it does useful work and not merely makes speeches especially when the Press is there; but to get down to business and plan for the region's prosperity in every way so that the West Indies will be able to get a place among the other dominions of the British Commonwealth.

The motion that the Resolution do now pass was put to the Committee and carried *nem con.*

RESOLUTION FOR PURCHASE OF CHAIRS

On the next Order being called for Mr. Adams to move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution that the sum of two thousand five hundred and twenty-five dollars be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1951-52, Part 1, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1951-52, No. 19, which form the Schedule to the Resolution:

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution, as honourable members will see is in respect of a new item—purchase of chairs. As the Addendum explains, Government from time to time has found it awkward to get seating accommodation on certain public occasions, and it is now proposed to purchase 250 chairs etc. It is known that the next opening of a new Parliament is likely to attract a great crowd, and it has been represented to the Government that seating accommodation is not all that it should be, and it is proposed to provide these chairs for that occasion and other public occasions. I want to assure honourable members that the Government is not unmindful of the fact that there are numbers of other things to be done, but this being a comparatively small sum, and it having been represented to the Government that it is cheaper to buy its own chairs, and more convenient to avoid the difficulty which there is sometimes in getting chairs to rent, the Government decided to send down this Resolution. I therefore move that the Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman—I do not as a rule oppose Resolutions, but really this one does not appeal to me. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has admitted that there are many things to be done, and here we are, being asked to spend this amount on 250 chairs, when the Government can rent chairs at three or four cents a piece any time from various sources. Renting chairs only costs the Government about ten or twelve dollars on each occasion, and we are being asked to spend \$2,525 on the purchase of chairs, especially at a time when there

are so many necessary social and other amenities to be provided. For that reason I shall oppose this Resolution because I do not think it is necessary at the present moment.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman—we are being asked to pass a large amount of money to purchase these chairs. If Government can rent the necessary number of chairs for \$10.00 an occasion, it means that it will take 250 occasions before we expend the sum asked for in this Resolution. If these chairs are available for rent, it is a matter for consideration whether we should purchase. There are hardly more than five occasions a year when the Government has to provide seating accommodation. At that rate if we bought these chairs, it means that the money we would be spending at one time we would have taken 50 years to spend, and I am sure that we would have to replace them long before the end of 50 years. The only solution I see is for the Government to decide to hire them out occasionally; but that would necessitate so much red tape that eventually no one would get them. I am going to move that we postpone further consideration of this Resolution. I do not think that we are justified in spending this money, even if we pay four cents a piece for rented chairs. There are some official bodies that hold functions and need chairs, but I do not think that it is the duty of the Government to provide chairs for them. I hear someone talking about school Speech Days. It is the duty of the Governing Body of the school to provide seating accommodation for those functions. As I have said, sir, it will take over 40 years for us to expend this amount in renting, and these chairs will hardly last longer than 10 years. I move that further consideration of the Resolution be postponed.

Mr. ADAMS: If what the honourable junior member for St. Philip said is right, this Resolution would never have seen the light of day. An increasing number of Police Concerts at which such chairs are necessary are being held. It is not true that these chairs are rented at three or four cents each. Maybe the honourable member can get them for that price, but others have to pay eight cents each for them. Again, it is not true that Government only needs these chairs on five occasions in a year. Government has considered that it is cheaper to do this than to continue to rent these chairs. Not only do you have to pay the rent, but you are also liable if any are lost or damaged. These chairs break easily. Sometimes you can get chairs to rent from Mr. Dash; at other times you can get from Queen's Park; but sometimes occasions clash, and that is where the difficulty comes in. I do hope that honourable members will see that it is not just five occasions a year when we need these chairs, and that it is cheaper to purchase these than to go on renting. They may only last ten or fifteen years if you take a mallet and beat them.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman,—I think that honourable members should agree to the passing of this Resolution. Rented chairs invariably cost eight cents each. It is true that actual rent may come to four cents, but you also have to provide for transportation forward and backward, plus breakage. There is a great need for these chairs at the moment. All the chairs available are in bad condition. I do not think that this amount for 250 chairs is unreasonable. We have just arranged a Memorial Service for Father Hopkins, and we will need a thousand chairs. We have to go to the Globe and pay for a thousand chairs. The amount asked for is a small amount when you think of the convenience it will give to the general public.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman—At the first look one might be inclined to think that this \$2,525 is worthwhile spending. But there are two questions that arise in my mind. I wonder what has been the Government's expenditure for the past number of years for rental of chairs. It does seem to me that even if the occasions when these chairs are necessary are increasing, it does not necessitate a capital outlay of \$2,525. The second point is that collapsible chairs of the type used at the Drill Hall have been in service there for years. Of course they break on occasions, but their repair was reasonably cheap. What exactly is the Government's objections to chairs of that type I do not know. I think they are suitable for public functions, and the fact that they are collapsible makes transportation easy. Another point is that the chairs which the Government proposes to get will be imported. Has the Government explored the possibility of obtaining chairs — not necessarily of steel, but also of wood — from local sources? I think that that is a point which it is worthwhile to consider. These chairs for which this Resolution seeks to provide will, according to Government's calculations, cost about \$10.10 each. I hope that these figures are correct, because I remember recently buying chairs known as the Stackabye which cost about seventeen dollars and some cents each. So while I might be inclined to agree if I can get some information as to whether local sources have been investigated, I would still like to know whether a quotation has been received that these chairs can be obtained at \$10.10 each.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman — Not as regards these specific chairs, but the question of furniture came up at the beginning of this year, and I asked that comparative figures be prepared with reference to desks, chairs etc. for various departments of the Government Service. Figures showed that it is cheaper to have steel desks and steel chairs than to have wood ones from Fogarty's or Harrison's. But I could picture honourable members getting up and talking about the large number of local artisans out of work. I cannot give the comparative figures off hand, but I do know that it was proved that it is cheaper to buy these steel chairs. It seems that the honourable junior member for St. George is objecting that he had to pay \$17.00 for a chair while we are getting them at \$10.00 each.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I had intended to vote for the Resolution, but after listening to certain remarks from honourable members on my right, I must say that I think that the suggestion that we should explore the possibility of getting these chairs locally demands some consideration. As a matter of fact, there is too much importation of cheap chairs which can be made locally. We all know that a lot of these hardwood chairs from England that cost us 17/- landed here are imported from Canada at 5/- each. Some of them have been known to go to the London Docks and come straight here. A board chair would not last as long as one of steel, neither would it cost as much. A hardwood chair can hardly cost more than \$5.00. I believe that these chairs can be made locally. You can get a hardwood collapsible chair which will give good service for \$5.00. You can buy a rush chair made locally for \$3.36. Even if you paid \$10.00 for a hardwood collapsible chair made locally, you would be putting the money in the pockets of the people who are going to spend it here. Half of the chairs that we import should be made locally, even if we imported some of the hardwood from British Guiana. Government could easily explore the possibilities of getting locally made hardwood collapsible chairs before hurrying to buy

these steel chairs. I will stick to my motion for postponement of further consideration of the Resolution.

Mr. DOWDING: I rise to second the motion for postponement.

The question that the Resolution be postponed was put and resolved in the negative, the Committee dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. CRAWFORD, DOWDING, GILL and HAYNES—(4).

Noes: Messrs. MILLER, MAPP, BRYAN, REECE, COX, ADAMS, GARNER, BRANCKER, GODDARD and Dr. CUMMINS—(10).

The Resolution was then passed.

Mr. ADAMS moved, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS that the Chairman do now report the passing of three Resolutions and the postponement of two.

The motion was put and carried *nem. con.*

The Chairman reported, and Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the three Resolutions passed in Committee of Supply were read a first and second time and agreed to.

On motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the House adjourned for three quarters of an hour.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION BILL, 1951

On re-assembling,

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to take Order No. 13 as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas:—To move the second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to provide for the constitution of a Public Service Commission and matters incidental thereto.

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to take charge of this Order.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I am sorry that the House is comparatively thin, but this Bill is of too much importance to be postponed any further. I do not think that honourable members will need me to make any long speech on this matter; it is essential for orderly Government anywhere that the permanent staff of the Civil Service should have security of tenure of office, not only because of the necessity for having continuity of policy, but also because of the primary system of government where governments may change from year to year. While the business of the Administration is continuing it is necessary that there should exist a body of men who feel that they should give conscientious work to any political party which might be in power, in order that the general administration of a colony may be continued. It is obviously essential that that should not depend on the fear of the Government or favours which may be granted by the Government; instead of having a system whereby a Civil Servant comes in and goes out with a Government, there should be security of tenure of office and the bosses or masters in the Civil Service should be independent of political allegiance. The method of having a Public Service Commission has, in the process of time, proved to be the best means of securing Civil Servants; they have not got to look at any member of the Government that might be in power in order to ensure that they will remain in their jobs. In so great a

country like the United States there is a system whereby even judges come in and go out with a political party. It is essential for those who have been brought up in the British way of life, who see that the temptations at graft, bribery and corruption are lessened by the British system—it is essential that we should adopt a similar system if we want to make progress. It is therefore proposed by means of this Bill to establish the machinery by which what one might call the Government body of Civil Servants should be independent of the particular Party which is running the Government.

This Bill seeks to provide for the constitution of a Public Service Commission which will be only advisory because essentially the power of selecting and controlling the Civil Service must rest, in the last resort, with the Head of the Administration. This Bill is a comparatively short and simple one, but it covers the essentials of a service like that of the Public Service Commission. The Governor is not bound to accept the advice of the Public Service Commission, because he has a personal responsibility as Governor; but it is obvious that in matters in which the Governor may not have an exact knowledge of the Public Service he must rely, to a great extent, on the advice tendered by the Public Service Commission. As is stated in the "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill, "The main purpose of setting up a Public Service Commission is to ensure that the Governor is afforded suitable advice on the selection and appointment of local candidates for the public service, as well as (inter alia) the interdepartmental transfer of officers, their dismissal, disciplinary control and retirement, and the award of study leave to officers."

The Governor will be afforded advice as to the selection and appointment of local candidates because, obviously, in the case of important appointments above a certain level, the Governor can only make recommendations to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and it is for the Secretary of State for the Colonies to make those appointments. However, the bulk of appointments, as in most British Colonies, would be primarily those of local people.

I do not think that there is anything more I can say except to mention for the benefit of the general public, that even with a complete ministerial system, the Minister of a Department can only see that that Department carries out the policy of the Government. Even in Great Britain there is the equivalent of a Public Service Commission which is responsible for appointments, dismissals, transfers, promotions, discipline and conditions of service in the Civil Service, so that even if we had complete ministerial status it would not fall to the lot of a minister to make appointments or effect dismissals, because we would be back at the old system of political patronage. I see that honourable members are looking at me as if they have never heard that expression before; both honourable members for Christ Church are looking at me and they may have heard that expression in Christ Church before. But honourable members will agree with me in saying that it is essential for the Civil Service and the community generally that Civil Servants be taken out of politics as far as their getting our conditions of service is concerned; otherwise you will find political Parties competing against each other in respect of the Civil Servants, and the poor Civil Servants will not know where they are. In the parish which I have just mentioned the Poor Law Inspector and chief canvasser were

interchangeable, but that unhappy state of affairs is coming to an end. I have much pleasure in moving that this Bill be now read a second time.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. REECE: I rise to support this Bill; it seeks to give the Governor power, on the advice of a Public Service Commission, to make appointments and to carry out the various matters mentioned in Clause 9. I think that in a colony like Barbados, the advice of a Public Service Commission should be of great value to the Officer administering the Government on matters such as the selection of members of the Civil Service, the transfer of officers from one Department to the other, and so on, and I am glad to see that in Clause 9 of the Bill provision is made whereby officers can go abroad on study leave. I think the House will realise that this Bill will not change any fundamental principle; it is the duty of the Governor to make all appointments and see that things are properly done, but now he will call upon members of the Public Service Commission whose local knowledge will be of great value in assisting him in making these appointments and carrying out the others matters which are set out in Clause 9. As the honourable introducer of the Bill has said, this is a forward step and I am glad to feel that we have never adopted the American system by which the higher officials in the country are dependent upon the success of a particular Party for their appointment. I cannot think of any method of appointment which is more likely to do harm in a community. I would like to congratulate the Government on having introduced this Bill and I know that members of the Civil Service are very glad indeed to know that at long last the Governor, in making the selection for appointments, will be advised by persons who know local conditions well, and not only local conditions but in many instances the applicants themselves and their merit.

Mr. MAPP: I have not had much opportunity to discuss this Bill with members of the Civil Service; I assume that the Civil Service Association has been consulted in this matter and that the members of that Association are in favour of this Commission being set up. I attach great weight to what the honourable Leader of the House has said about keeping Civil Servants from the trammels of politics and from pressure by any politicians. The conditions of the Civil Service under our system of government are such that we would expect Civil Servants to be free from political pressure and be able to serve any Government which is in power regardless of its political persuasion; we would expect them to be free from corruption and to serve the island efficiently. If that is so, then it is necessary that a Body like a Public Service Commission should be set up. On the other hand, I think honourable members will agree that what is absolutely necessary is to ensure that the Commission is composed of people who will judge matters affecting the Civil Service impartially, people who will be free from bias or prejudice. I think honourable members of every shade of political opinion in this House will agree that that is a very necessary prerequisite to the successful functioning of a Commission such as this. I stress that because while it is very sound to argue that this Commission should be free from any political persuasion or political pressure, yet there is nothing that assists the cause of a Civil Servant who feels that an injustice has been done to him like the knowledge that a Body like this has been able to bring his views to the attention of the public and they

are given a public hearing in this House. This House has acted in the past and it can act in the future, as a great barrier to any Administrator coming to this colony and inflicting any kind of treatment or perpetrating any kind of injustice on Civil Servants; the very fact that we can bring matters to the attention of the public is a big measure of restraint on how far an imported official might go in matters of this sort. It is only recently that in a matter affecting a Government Department in this colony, the Head of the Department acted with some sort of secret investigation and his methods with regard to that matter were open to severe criticism. The Civil Servants have felt that although it might be argued that a Public Service Commission is very necessary and that this constitutional change should be brought about in the near future, yet they hope that the politicians will retain some measure of control whether directly or indirectly over their destiny. This is a matter which we must take seriously because a contented Civil Service is an asset to the good working of any country, and we as legislators must pay due deference to the wishes and feelings of Civil Servants, and see that our opinions and views count in matters in which Civil Servants need representation and proper representation. I hope that in the setting up of this Commission people who are capable of approaching matters with a real sense of justice and impartiality will be appointed. It may happen that a Civil Servant might find himself dismissed in circumstances which, in the opinion of the Civil Servant and other Civil Servants are unjustifiable, and the public might feel that whatever might be said in respect of the Public Service Commission, the Minister in whose Department that Civil Servant served, should have some say by being appealed to as a final Court or arbiter; it might be felt that that Minister should be able to protect a Civil Servant in a case like that and do justice to him. It is absolutely necessary that a Minister in control of a Department should establish a sense of confidence and relationship between the Head of a Department and those serving under him if the Department is to be properly administered. If the Minister is unable to act as a final arbiter in matters which vitally affect a Civil Servant where his work is concerned, then the relationship between Minister and Civil Servant must be seriously undermined. I throw out the hint to the Government that however logical the step which we are now taking might seem to be, yet a Bill of this sort can work in two ways: we may free Civil Servants from politics, but I am afraid that if a Civil Servant feels that he has been dismissed wrongly and he cannot get proper representation from the Minister in charge of the Department, that personal relationship which exists between them might be marred to some extent. I have in mind a case in respect of which I asked a question in this House and from all the evidence which was put before the Body which considered the matter, I am not convinced that the particular teacher was rightfully dismissed and that, in the circumstances, he should not have been dismissed at all. I am not saying that that teacher found it impossible to work with other teachers: he might have been a difficult teacher to work with. If the Head of a Department reports on you adversely, that does not mean that you cannot serve efficiently in another Department. In this particular case, the teacher was said to be unable to get on with the Head of the Department: I could not see the justification for his dismissal and I feel that if the members of this House read the evidence given before the Commission they could not come to the

conclusion that that teacher was dismissed on reasonable grounds. Some of the remarks were denied by some of the teachers at the school.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to remind the honourable member that he should not refer to a Civil Servant who cannot defend himself.

Mr. MAPP: I am not referring to a Civil Servant who cannot defend himself; I have just brought up that case as an illustration of the fact that in this matter before us it is really necessary for a minister to see that the personal relationship which should exist between the Head of a Department and one who is serving under him is not marred by the working of a Public Service Commission. Anybody will realise that a Civil Servant will easily feel that a Minister is not representing him as he should represent him, and that is the danger to which I am referring. It might be that my fears may prove to be unfounded, but that is something which we cannot foresee. I speak as a former Civil Servant; until we get full ministerial status, I think it is necessary to throw out the warning I have thrown out to the Government..

Mr. CRAWFORD: Before the question is put, I should like to say that the legislation proposed in this Bill has been urged for quite a long time by various sections of the Press, by the Civil Service Association itself and by the Commissioner who enquired into the Civil Service of the colony. The functions of the Public Service Commission will be purely advisory, as is set out in the "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill, and it has been found that Commissions of this sort can perform an admirable public service in colonies, which, like ours, are advancing constitutionally from the stage of mere colonialism to some sort of self-government. I am informed that before the grant of the new Constitution to Malta, Ceylon, Singapore and Hong Kong it was found to be very useful and advisable to set up Public Service Commissions of this sort in order not only to give local Civil Servants some more direct say in the administration of the Service, but also to ensure that the Service was more or less free from political interference. In this colony we have had within recent years several instances which would justify the establishment of a Public Service Commission, and now that legislation is being considered for the creation of that Body, we should regard it as our duty to express our satisfaction that the matter has reached the present stage. If and when a local Civil Service Commission is set up I have no doubt that it will find a variety of very important matters with which to concern itself; it must be useful to the Civil Service itself and the public generally, and if, as we envisage, further constitutional changes take place in the island, the establishment of this Body must contribute to the proper functioning of the general machinery of Government. I am in complete agreement with this Bill and its provisions and I hope that it will have a speedy passage through the Legislature.

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

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

Clauses 1 to 21 inclusive were respectively read and passed.

The Schedule was read and passed.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. Cox, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

BILL TO ENCOURAGE PIONEER INDUSTRIES

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker—I beg to move that Order No. 19 be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. BRYAN: I beg to second that.

The motion was put and carried **nem. con.**

The order was called for Mr. Cox to move the second reading of the Bill intituled an Act to encourage the establishment and development of new industries and to make provision for the granting of certain relief from package tax on customs duty and income tax to persons establishing factories in connection with such industries and for purposes incidental to, or connected with any of the foregoing purposes.

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker—the House will remember that sometime in 1949 this House passed a Bill for the encouragement of pioneer industries. At that time the Government did not see fit to insert a clause granting relief from income tax, and members of the House criticised the Bill in that connection. The Bill was passed in this Chamber but it did not pass the Other Place. Government has now reconsidered its decision, and has inserted that clause in the present Bill. Honourable members will see that this Bill now falls into line with the 1950 Act of Jamaica as well as the 1950 Act of Trinidad. I think, therefore, that honourable members should be quite satisfied to know that the facilities granted in other colonies are now provided for in this Bill, and there may be a likelihood of our getting new industries in this island. I move, sir, that the Bill be read a second time.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that, sir. I hope that in view of what the honourable member has said that he will move when we go into committee on this Bill that the clauses be taken as read. This whole question has already been threshed out on the floor of this House.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker—Before the question is put, I want to say that it is unfortunate that we are doing this Bill tonight. There are members who are not here and who would like to speak on it. This legislation has been approved in principle with the exception of the clause relating to income tax. When the original bill came down, the view was expressed that the Government was leaving out the most important part if they wanted to attract capital into this country. The Government whether Labour or otherwise, must realise that if they want to attract new industries for the purpose of giving jobs to the unemployed they must on all occasions give relief from income tax. Jamaica did it in 1944 and we are doing it in 1951. I make bold to say that during that time we have lost golden opportunities by not having this Bill on the Statute Book. We cannot do it too soon. As I said, sir, other honourable members want to speak on it, and I am sorry that an opportunity is not being given to them. Government must realise that capital is something to be sought after and not to be turned away; because capital creates jobs, and to create capital you must give these concessions. I commend the Government for having put in this clause relating to relief from income tax.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker—I am suggesting that this Bill should not be done to-night. It should be postponed. I think that everyone is in agreement with the principle of it, but it is a Bill that we should be given an opportunity to discuss, to express our points of view and go into it carefully. It is now twenty minutes after ten.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now 10.15.

Mr. MOTTLEY: We differ a bit, sir. I agree with the principle of the Bill and so do my colleagues. But I appeal to the Leader of the House to give us an opportunity to discuss it. I am moving, therefore, that the second reading be postponed until this day week.

Mr. HAYNES: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that the second reading of the Bill be postponed until to-day week. I think the Noes have it.

On a Division being called for, the question was resolved in a tie, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs MOTTLEY, GILL, HAYNES, GODDARD, GARNER, REECE and CRAWFORD—(7).

Noes: Messrs SMITH, MILLER, BRYAN, MAPP, Cox, Dr. CUMMINS and Mr. ADAMS—(7).

Mr. SPEAKER: I will vote with the Noes.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—May I point out that the motion for the second reading should have been put first.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am indebted to the honourable member. He is quite right. The motion for the postponement was lost, however, and the question now is that the Bill be read a second time.

Mr. REECE: Mr. Speaker,—I am going to vote for the second reading. I think that the time has come when this Bill should be on the Statute Book. As I understand it, when this Legislation was originally before the House, there was no provision for relief from income tax. It has been rightly said that failure to put that provision in the Bill has prevented capital from coming into the island. But I do not feel that we are too late with this Bill. I am one of those who feel that despite the fact that Jamaica and Trinidad already have Bills of this sort, Barbados will still be able to attract capital particularly in view of the fact—

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot hear the honourable member who is speaking.

Mr. REECE: —in view of the fact that we have a cheap source of fuel in this island. There can be no doubt about it that we have natural gas in sufficient quantity for any industry started in this country. All the West Indian islands are in the same position as regards raw materials. For the most part we have to get our raw materials from abroad. We in Barbados have an advantage over the rest of the other islands in that we have cheap fuel at our disposal. I hope, sir, that the day is not far distant when we will be able to get that fuel in sufficient quantities to enable it to be utilised in our factories, particularly factories which have pioneer industries in mind. Under Clause 3 of the Bill the Governor-in-Executive Committee is given power to declare an industry a pioneer industry. I think that is a good step. I think that it is better that that power should be vested in the Executive than in any other body created by the Bill, or even an officer administering the Government. The Executive Committee is the body that is really responsible for the finance of the colony under the Executive Committee Act. Clause 8 allows for relief in the matter of income tax, and I think it is Clause 9 which gives the Commissioner of Income Tax power which makes it incumbent on the proprietors of the Pioneer Industry to satisfy him that expenditure has been properly incurred, and comes within the provisions of the Bill. These clauses are essential to the proper working of the Bill. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that we will be able to use natural resources like British Guiana to attract industries of great magnitude. But there are certain industries such as shoe-making, the manufacture of cotton goods, etc. which will be well suited to Barbados. Here we have

already established certain small industries which employ people. It is capital that gives employment to people, and the more the capital, the greater the number of people employed. I want honourable members to bear in mind that we in Barbados with our lack of natural resources will never be able to do what is done in British Guiana and Jamaica. But we can develop small industries which will meet the needs of this island, and create employment for a large number of people, particularly young women. I personally do not feel like postponing this Bill. The last time that it was before the House all the principles underlying it were fully discussed. There was only the question of relief from income tax which really held it up. Everyone has agreed in principle to this as distinct from aid to hotels. You will remember that the question of aid to hotels came before the House and the honourable senior member for St. Joseph had much to say. But this Bill is entirely different. If we can give to a small industry a period of five years in which to recoup itself from the expenditure necessary for the establishment of the industry, then it will have a fair measure of success. I do not think there is need to say anymore. I see no need for a full dress debate on this Bill.

The motion that the Bill be read a second time was put to the House and carried.

On the motion of Mr. Cox seconded by Dr. CUMMINS His Honour the SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

Mr. Cox moved, seconded by Mr. ADAMS that the acting Clerk call the clauses of the Bill by numbers instead of reading same.

The motion was put and carried *nem con.*

Clauses 1 to 10 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On motion of Mr. Cox seconded by Dr. CUMMINS the Chairman reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Mr. Cox seconded by Dr. CUMMINS the Bill was read a third time and passed, and the title was read and agreed to.

ADDRESS RE ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENTS OF U.K. AND U.S.A.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,— I ask leave to take Order No. 25 as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day now stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas:—To move the consideration of the Report of the Select Committee, appointed to prepare a draft Reply to His Excellency's Message No. 19/1951 relating to the Economic Co-operation Agreement between the Governments of the United Kingdom and the U.S.A.

Dr. CUMMINS: The Select Committee which was appointed to reply to this Message recommended the passing of the following Address:

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor*

The House of Assembly has the honour to acknowledge the receipt of Your Excellency's Message No. 19/1951 relating to the Economic Co-operation Agreement between the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

2. The House is of the opinion that this Government should remain a party to the Agreement and

that the exchange of notes should also be extended to Barbados.

The Address speaks for itself and I beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Address do now pass. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it. I ask the hon. senior member for St. Thomas to present this Address to His Excellency the Governor.

Dr. CUMMINS: As Your Honour pleases.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day week, the 28th day of August, 1951, at 3 o'clock p.m.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion, which was agreed to, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.