

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1950—51

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 6th February, 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*),
His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS (*Deputy Speaker*)
Mr. L. E. SMITH (*Chairman of Committees*)
Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., Messrs. D. A. FOSTER, F. E. MILLER, R. G. MAPP, M. E. COX, F. L. WALCOTT, G. H. ADAMS, B.A., J. E. T. BRANCKER, J. H. WILKINSON, O.B.E., and E. L. WARD.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the 23rd January, 1951, having been circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

MESSAGES FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a Message from the Honourable the Legislative Council returning the Bill to make provision for the division of the Parishes and the City of Bridgetown into Registration Districts for the purposes of the preparation and revision in relation to each such parish and the City of Bridgetown, of registers of all persons entitled to be registered as voters at an election of a member at the General Assembly for such parish and the City of Bridgetown, for purposes connected therewith and incidental thereto with amendments.

I have the honour to inform the House that I have also received a Message from the Honourable the Legislative Council returning the Bill to suspend the provisions of the Representation of the People Act, 1901, requiring a Register of Voters to be prepared in the year 1951 and for purposes incidental thereto with amendments.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO THE DEPUTY CLERK.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr Speaker,—I am instructed that the Deputy Clerk has been unfortunately called away on urgent business in the neighbouring colony of

Trinidad. I understand that he will be returning to this colony in time for the sitting of the House next week. In the circumstances, I beg to move that the Deputy Clerk be granted leave of absence for today.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Mr. D. A. Banfield, Solicitor, be appointed to act as Deputy Clerk for today's sitting.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

PAPERS LAID

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

Quarterly Return of Transactions in Rum to 31st December, 1950.

Post Office Advances for payment of Money Orders to 31st December, 1950.

List of Plantations and Factories in Barbados owned by absentee proprietors. (Laid in reply to Mr. Crawford's Question No. 61).

Report of the Commission on the establishment of a Customs Union in the British Caribbean Area.

NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution to place the sum of \$6,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1950—51, Part I—Current, No. 39 which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$337,735 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1950—51, Part I—Current, No. 40, which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

Mr. COX: Resolution to place the sum of \$2,500 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1950—51, Part I—Current, No. 41, which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$1,300 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1950—51, Part I—Current, No. 42, which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

In connection with this Resolution I would just like to say this. Honourable members will remember

that we passed a Supplementary Resolution in which was included an amount of \$12,000 to pay the salary of an expert to advise the Government on matters relating to petroleum and gas, and that expert was coming out from Canada. At the time when I introduced the Resolution I was not aware of the fact that one of the terms of the Agreement which he put forward to the Government, and which was later accepted, was that his expenses should be paid from the part of Canada where he was living to Barbados. He is living in Edmonton and that meant that this Government would have to pay the expenses of getting him from Edmonton to Montreal and from Montreal to Barbados. On the very day on which I was asking the House to agree to the amount for the salary of this expert, information which I have just given to honourable members came to us and we had to accept the position. In the Other Place last Tuesday the information was given by the Colonial Secretary that we would have to pay these added expenses. This Supplementary Resolution now is to pay the passage expenses of this expert from Edmonton to Montreal and from Montreal to Barbados, which amount to \$1,257, say \$1,300. Although the addendum does not say so, I understand that the expert's wife will also be coming. The addendum says:

In the Supplementary Estimates No. 35 of 1950—51 authority was given for the engagement of the services of a Director of Petroleum and Natural Gas and provision was made for the payment of his salary for the remainder of the financial year and for his passage expenses from Montreal to Barbados. A further amount of \$1,300 is now required to meet the following additional expenditure:—

(a) Passage for officer's wife from Montreal to Barbados			\$ 335
(b) Passages for the officer and his wife from Edmonton to Montreal			\$ 472
(c) Baggage expenses, hotel bills and incidental expenses			\$ 450
			\$ 1,257
			say \$ 1,300

I mention that so that honourable members will know beforehand that the only reason why we did not come down for this sum of money before was that at the moment when I introduced that Resolution, the Government was not then aware of the fact that this expert was living in Edmonton and that his passage for himself and his wife from Edmonton to Montreal would also have to be paid.

Messrs. GODDARD, CRAWFORD, ALLDER and GARNER entered the House and took their seats.

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

Other Notices given were as follows:—

Mr. MILLER: Of the following Address:—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor*

The House of Assembly respectfully draw to Your Excellency's attention that in their opinion the following privileges should be accorded the civil servants of this Island, and would ask Your Excellency to give the same your earnest consideration:—

(a) That all established and un-established civil servants should be allowed to stand for election at the General Assembly of this Island.

(b) That should an officer be not successful at the polls, he be automatically reinstated to his former position in the service.

(c) That if he is elected and serves for one session only, the same provisions shall be obtainable; but Government's responsibility towards an officer should cease after the officer has completed two legislative sessions.

2. The House would also request that when permission is given to civil servants, that the several Vestries of the Island should be invited to extend this privilege to their employees.

3. The House would further ask that the text of this Address be forwarded to His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies.

QUESTIONS

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

What, if any, action has been taken by Government to implement the Address passed by this Chamber on July 5th, 1949, in connection with the establishment of a Government Printery in this Island?

(2) Is it a fact that it is possible to obtain locally all apparatus necessary (if not new, in excellent condition) for the erection and maintenance of such a printery?

MR. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Senior Member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of this House:—

Is Government aware that dissatisfaction exists amongst the casual and other labourers employed by Departments of Highways & Transport and Public Works in connection with their (a) scale of wages, and (b) the fact that many such labourers are not, as is the case with weekly and monthly paid employees, in receipt of remuneration for bank-holidays?

(2) Will Government, in preparation of Colonial Estimates, 1951-52, bear the above in mind with a view to budgeting for a reasonable increase for such labourers?

MR. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Senior Member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of this House:—

Whether Government will take the necessary steps with a view to putting female and male teachers on an equal salary scale basis.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to present the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill to amend the law relating to persons of unsound mind and for purposes connected therewith.

Mr. BRYAN entered the House and took his seat.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1951

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas:—Second reading of a Bill to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1943.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—This Bill seeks to amend an error which was made in the Workmen's Compensation Act of last year; while increasing the amount of money to be granted in case of death or total disability, yet that Act reduced the number of weeks. That is an error which will affect the family of a workman who had the misfortune either to be

totally disabled or to lose his life. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, before the question is put, I want to enquire of the introducer of this Bill if, in his opinion, fixing a minimum wage rate on which to base the computation would not be a safer method of dealing with this matter. Last year we reduced the alternative weekly wages equivalent from 156 weeks to 130 weeks and from 208 weeks to 182 weeks respectively and we then increased the maximum weekly wage rate allowed for computation purposes. Well it was discovered that in spite of doing that, the lower paid workers still received less compensation in respect of death or disability than was the case before. It appears to me, Sir, that it should have been fairly easy to have discovered that what happened would have happened, and that if we had a minimum wage rate on which to base the computation, what is taking place now would not have been possible. I might have something further to say on the Bill in this connection, but before I say it I should like the honourable senior member for St. Thomas to answer the question as to whether or not, in his opinion, it would be advisable to have a minimum wage rate on which to base the computation instead of dealing with the matter in this way.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—This amendment is really to revert to the original figures in so far as the number of weeks' wages for compensation in case a person might have been disabled or lost his life are concerned. The legal Draughtsman drafted this Bill in conformity with other Acts in the Caribbean area, which work on a basis of 130 weeks and 182 weeks respectively, and this amendment is necessary so as to bring the number of weeks back to 156 and 208 respectively as the position was in the original Bill. In that Bill all workers were not affected, but we do not want to make any worker get less compensation in respect of death or disability than he was getting before. The question of fixing a minimum wage rate on which to base the compensation does not arise, because this is a question of putting the amendment where it should have been put. In other words, the number of weeks should not have been changed. We are the only colony which carries 156 weeks and 208 weeks' wages for compensation in case of death or total incapacity respectively; other colonies carry 130 weeks and 182 weeks respectively.

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

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

Clause I, the title Clause, was read and passed.

Clause 2 was read.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman,—Before you put the question, I should like to say that it should be fairly evident that in this matter of workmen's compensation, you should have your minimum wage rate below which no worker could fall, so to speak. In other words, if a minimum wage rate is used for any worker in assessing the compensation which he should be paid, the present difficulty would be settled once for all. I am not at all sure that when we should have passed this amendment which is before us today, we are going in reality to put the position of the injured worker who is in a certain category, in any better position than what he is in today. As a

matter of fact, in so far as this Bill is concerned, it seems to me that all of this tinkering with this question every now and then is so much time wasted. The matter gets more complicated, and, to judge from what we did last year, the position of the worker, instead of getting better, gets worse. I think, Sir, that this whole Workmen's Compensation Act which is based on the old English Act, should be repealed in the same manner as the British Act has been repealed. Other West Indian colonies which have the same Act are taking steps either fundamentally to amend it or to substitute something else for it. There must have been something fundamentally wrong with all the Workmen's Compensation Acts in the British West Indies that as far back as 10 or 11 years ago the Royal Commission recommended most seriously that the Governments concerned should take the earliest possible steps to repeal the existing Acts. This local Act is no exception and the position of the injured worker under it is certainly not what it should be. There are many interpretations by the lawyers of various sections of the Act, and in so far as the average worker is concerned, if this Act is to continue in operation much longer, I think the Government should attach to the Department of Labour, some legal advisor whose duty it will be, among other things, to advise workers who need legal advice with regard to their position under the terms of the Act when they are injured. Many a worker who has got injured and who has no money to pay a lawyer's fee is at a great disadvantage because he does not know the slightest part of the benefits to which he is really entitled under the terms of the Act. In England when this Act was in operation the various Trade Unions represented the injured workers who were members of these Trade Unions and provided legal advice and even advanced the cost of litigation which arose out of any dispute; but here, the position is entirely different. If the Act is to remain in its complicated form, bearing in mind the incapacity of the average worker to obtain any legal advice as to his rights under the provisions of this Act, it does appear to me that the least that could be done is to attach to the Department of Labour some legal officer whose business it should be to advise injured workers as to their rights and what not, under the terms of the Act. That, of course, is only one reason why the Act should be repealed; there are dozens of other reasons. It is highly possible, for instance under this Act, for a worker who has definitely sustained an injury to be awarded an empty judgment in the Law Courts, and, Sir, I do not think that that should be at all possible under any proper system of workmen's compensation. Some time ago, for instance, I drew attention to the position with regard to the half-monthly payments. There is a sub-section in the Act, subsection 2 of section 6 which says: "Any half-monthly payment may, on review under this section, subject to the provisions of this Act, be continued, increased, decreased, or ended, or if the accident is found to have resulted in permanent disablement, be converted to the lumpsum to which the workman is entitled less any amount which he has already received by way of half-monthly payments."

That could mean that, in actual practice, if the total assessment for damage finally is not in excess of the amount already received by the worker by way of half monthly payments when the case is actually concluded, instead of the employer owing the injured worker, the injured worker would be owing his employer. That is one of the fantastic sort of things possible under this Act, and the Royal Commission of 1939-40 must have had very sound reasons for

recommending the wholesale abolition of the Act. I am firmly convinced, and I am never tired of saying it, that we really want to be fair to the injured worker in this colony; we should do something to put workmen's compensation on a more satisfactory basis and obviate the necessity on the part of an injured worker for having to apply to the Law Courts with their complicated procedure, undue delay and the heavy expense involved. Sir, workmen's compensation is not a matter that should give rise to all these difficulties in so far as the injured party is concerned; the Government of any country should regard it as its fundamental obligation to assist in rehabilitating the injured worker, and it should be regarded as the obligation of the State itself to render such compensation as the need arises. In other words, Sir, the position of the injured worker should be guaranteed by the Government under some comprehensive insurance fund to which the Government itself should contribute as well as the employer and the employee. Until something like that is done, or until some fundamental alteration is made in the existing legislation, it should be fairly obvious that in many cases people are going to be injured—sometimes slightly, sometimes very gravely—and for one reason or another, they are not going to get the compensation to which they are rightly entitled; or they might get it after undue delay and such painful experiences that one half the value of the compensation might more or less be lost. I repeat, Sir, that, in so far as this particular matter is concerned, either reducing the alternative weekly wages equivalent or doing what we did last time—increasing the maximum weekly wage rate allowed for computation purposes—will not, in my opinion, have the advantages which the insertion of a minimum wage rate on which to base the computation will have. I shall not at all be surprised if, after this amendment is in operation for some time, the position which we hoped it would bring about, has definitely not been achieved.

Mr. GILL came into the Committee and took his seat.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—It is quite obvious that members of this House have pet schemes and when matters come before them contrary to what their pet ideas are, they know absolutely nothing about them and they may support them at one time and dismiss them at another time with an air of authority on each occasion as though they know all about what they are doing. Now Sir, this amendment which was read three times and passed by this House on the 13th December, 1949, while it gave greater compensation, it would seem to reduce the length of time for computing the compensation, and therefore some persons got less compensation; and the amendment which is now before us is for the purpose of putting back the Act where it was before. To-day we have heard that the Royal Commission recommended that the Act should have been repealed or abolished. The Royal Commission came here in 1939 and the Act was put on the Statute Book in 1943.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I hate to interrupt the honourable member because he is all the oracle that the normal person can be; but on this occasion—

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I sat because I thought the honourable member was going to make some explanation, but he is making a speech.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Continuing where I left off—

Mr. LEWIS: Is the honourable member making an explanation? I have the floor and the honourable member is too old a member of the House to get on with this nonsense. If he is not making an

explanation he must allow me to finish what I am saying.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Continuing where I left off, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. LEWIS: If the honourable member is not making an explanation he must take his seat. I call upon you, Mr. Chairman, to ask him to take his seat.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable member speaking on a point of explanation?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Of course I am. The time will come when we shall have the honourable junior member for the City occupying your Chair. I continue where I left off, what I said was that there must have been something fundamentally wrong with the Workmen's Compensation Acts in the West Indies that the Royal Commission recommended their wholesale abolition. If the honourable member knew anything about this matter he would have known that our Act is based on the Trinidad Act and all we did was to make improvements on the Act in line with the English legislation.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—The honourable member says now what he should have said then, and he should thank me for having raised the point. He has recommended the wholesale abolition of this Act and the Acts in the West Indies and he has said that the disadvantages from which people would suffer under this amendment would be obvious. This is what the honourable member himself said on the 13th December, 1949, when this matter was being discussed: "What I sincerely hope, Sir, is that now that an attempt is being made to make the compensation more adequate"—the same compensation which is today not adequate—"the lawyers will not increase their fees proportionately and take more from an injured workman." In order to get at the lawyers the honourable member said that we were increasing the compensation of the workers. We know that the honourable member has a pet scheme—the Ontario system—but because he has that system he should still assist with legislation in the House and not blow hot at one time and cold at another in the same key. I do not think that the honourable member should get up and pose as an authority on Workmen's Compensation just for the purpose of attacking some other honourable member, or putting forward some pet scheme.

The question that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS TO THE SPECIAL REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (GENERAL ASSEMBLY) BILL 1951

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, that the amendments of the Other Place to the Bill to provide for the division of the Parishes and the City of Bridgetown into Registration Districts for elections to the General Assembly and for purposes connected therewith be taken forthwith under Rule 262.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

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 to make provision for the division of the Parishes and the City of Bridgetown into Registration Districts for the purposes of the preparation and revision in relation to each such parish and the City of Bridgetown, of registers of all persons entitled to be registered as voters at an election of a member at the General Assembly, for such parish and the City of Bridgetown, for purposes connected therewith and incidental thereto.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,— These amendments—I hope honourable members have had the chance of looking at them over the weekend — are all, as far as I remember, of a verbal nature. Honourable members will remember that we made one amendment to the designation of the Bill in one place; where the figures “1901” appeared we substituted for them the figures “1950.” The Learned Attorney General feels that the best method of describing the Act is “The Representation of the People Act, 1901, as amended by the Representation of the People Act, 1950,” and the amendment of the Other Place is to that effect. The other amendments are the changing of the alternative to the fine; it was felt that if six months’ imprisonment is the alternative to a fine of \$500, it should not be the alternative to a fine of \$100. The Other Place has therefore left six months’ imprisonment as the alternative to a fine of \$500, but has made three months’ imprisonment as the alternative to a fine of \$100. The Other Place has considered canvassing by an assistant Registering Officer while he is registering persons as a most serious offence and has changed the penalty sanctioned by this House from \$100 to \$500 with the alternative of six months’ imprisonment. Those are the main amendments made by the Other Place to this Bill. If honourable members take the Bill as printed, they will see that the interpretation section has been changed, and there is a similar change in section 3. That is the section we changed but not the others. As passed by the House section 22 has the present tense “cease” and the Other Place has changed it to the past tense “ceased”; in three instances in this section the word “six” has been changed to the word “three” and there is also either the insertion of a word or a grammatical change. In section 26 the word “purposes” has been changed to “purpose”; in section 27 the word “everyone” has been changed to “every person”; in section 28 the words “the purpose of” have been inserted between the word “for” and the word “engaging” and in section 29 the Other Place with a meticulous regard for living or what they consider orthodox English, has changed the word “rules” to “regulations”. In short, the Other Place has, if I may say so with great respect, confined itself to the duties of the Other Place, that is, to correct all the grammatical mistakes of the lower House. As honourable members will see, these are not amendments at which they should cavil; they are necessary corrections of oversights in this House. I beg to move that these amendments be now read a first time.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

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

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS TO THE REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE (REGISTRATION OF VOTERS) (SUSPENSION) BILL, 1951

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that the Amendments of the Other Place to the Bill to suspend the provisions of the Representation of the People Act, 1901, requiring a Register of Voters to be prepared in the year 1951 and for purposes incidental thereto, be considered forthwith under Rule 262.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order also 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 to suspend the provisions of the Representation of the People Act, 1901, requiring a Register of Voters to be prepared in the year 1951 and for purposes incidental thereto.

Mr. ADAMS: As regards the amendments to this Bill, the first is the changing of the figures “1950” to the figures “1951”. Relative to the other amendment, we put in a new section saying that the Act shall come into operation on such date as the Governor shall appoint by proclamation published in the *Official Gazette*, and the Other Place has used a capital “P” in the spelling of the word “proclamation.” I beg to move that these amendments be now read a first time.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

COMMISSIONS OF ENQUIRY (AMENDMENT) BILL 1951

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order also stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph:—To move the second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to amend the Commissions of Enquiry Act, 1908 (1908—3).

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—The Commissions of Enquiry Act, 1908 gives power to the Governor-in-Executive Committee whenever he shall deem it advisable to issue a Commission appointing one or more Commissioners and authorising such Commissioners or any quorum of them therein mentioned to enquire into the conduct of any officer in the Public Service of the Island, the conduct or management of any department of the public service or of any public or local institution which receives any money from the Public Treasury, or into any matter connected with such department or public or local institution in which an enquiry would, in the opinion of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, be for the public welfare. I do not wish to use strong language especially at the present moment when some of the protagonists of these unhappy troubles are among us; but in the past when the conduct of Vestries had to be enquired into and the Government attempted to make use of this Act, the legal advisers of the Colonial Office seemed to think that the Vestries were not covered by the Act — an amazing decision. Apparently the Government of that day was advised that it could do nothing in respect of Vestry matters under the words “local institution.” In any event the present Government is of the opinion that the wording of this Act is too restricted, and it has come to the conclusion — and it is asking the House to support it in that conclusion — that an enquiry should be held into any matter in which, in the opinion of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, an enquiry is in the public interest. The

amendment which I am therefore moving, Mr. Speaker, is to change section 2 of the Act in the manner set out in this proposed Bill, that is, by deleting the words from "to enquire" occurring in line five thereof to "local institution" occurring in line ten thereof and substituting therefor the following words:—

"to enquire into the conduct of any officer in the public service of the Island, the conduct or management of any department of the public service or of any public or local institution or into any matter in which an enquiry would, in the opinion of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, be in the public interest."

I will anticipate possible questions or comments by saying that there are many colonies in which the wording of the Commissions of Enquiry Act is as wide as the amendment which the Government now proposes. In the Bahamas the Act reads:

"Whenever it shall appear to the Governor-in-Council that it will be for the public benefit so to do, the Governor may issue a Commission appointing persons, no less than three in number, to enquire into and report upon any matter stated in such Commission as the subject of enquiry."

The Bermuda Act reads:

"The Governor may, whenever he shall deem it advisable, issue a Commission appointing one or more Commissioners authorising them, or any quorum of them therein mentioned, to enquire into the conduct of any civil servant, the conduct or management of any department of the Public Service or into any matter in which an enquiry would, in the opinion of the Governor, be for the public welfare."

The Act of British Guiana reads:

"It shall be lawful for the Governor, whenever he shall deem it advisable, to issue a Commission appointing two or more Commissioners and authorising such Commissioners or any quorum of them therein mentioned, to enquire into the conduct of any public or local officers or the conduct or management of any department of the public service or of any public or local institution, or of any municipal or local authority or into any matter in which an enquiry would, in the opinion of the Governor, be for the public welfare."

The Act of Hong Kong reads:

"The Governor-in-Council shall have power to nominate and appoint Commissioners under the public seal for the purpose of instituting, making, and conducting any enquiry that may be deemed advisable and for reporting thereon."

In short, this proposed amendment, I suggest, is not only a reasonable amendment in itself, but it has the authority of precedents in other colonies of the British Empire. I therefore have much pleasure in moving that this Bill be now read a second time.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—I must say that a public enquiry into any matter that is of public interest, is a matter that no honest man should obstruct or in any way impede or be afraid of, because it is something in the interest of the public. I would like to say that we have waited until we might get ministerial status — until the day when members of this House might be in charge of Departments to give permission for public enquiries to be made into the conduct of those Departments. I take it that these words which are to be substituted are new and are not any repetition of what is already in the Act. We have to be very careful in a matter of this sort, because you may start an enquiry in the public interest, and the moment you start that enquiry you throw suspicion on an officer or a depart-

ment. The mere fact that you conduct an enquiry on charge a man in a Court of law, might leave a stigma on him no matter how great his defence is. I find it strange that now we are advancing towards ministerial status, when we can have our own ministers in this House — which I hope will be very soon — we are giving permission for a public enquiry to be made into the conduct of departments. We have enquired into the conduct of a public department already, but I do not feel like being too free in extending these matters at this particular time. I expect that, with the coming into being of ministerial status in this colony, we will have the very highest standard of conduct existing in the various departments. As far as the Vestries are concerned, I believe that we are going to modernise local government in this colony very soon. I feel that a public enquiry is a necessary thing and, possibly, it is unfortunate that it is the rule rather than the exception in the conduct of our public life. I am giving this Bill my support, but I take it that with the responsibility of the representatives of the people in this House, it will not be necessary to have any public enquiry.

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 Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

The two Clauses of the Bill were read and passed.

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

IMMIGRATION OF PAUPERS (PREVENTION) (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1951

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas:—To move the second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to amend the Immigration of Paupers (Prevention) Act, 1909.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—As is set out in the "Objects and Reasons", this Bill seeks to amend the Immigration of Paupers (Prevention) Act, 1909, so as to transfer the responsibility for the control of immigration from the Harbour and Shipping Master to the Commissioner of Police. This would give effect to one of the requests put forward by the Commissioner of Police in his recommendations for a new Immigration Act, and would be in keeping with practice elsewhere. The provisions of the Act are also made applicable to passengers arriving by aircraft. The Commissioner of Police feels that that state of affairs which exists in other West Indian Islands, would give a greater measure of control over pauper immigrants. This amendment seeks to give the Commissioner of Police authority for the control of immigration by transferring the examination of these immigrants from the Harbour and Shipping Master to him. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—I am hoping that with your indulgence I will be able to get some information as to the re-arrangements in so far as this colony is concerned, since we have agreed to adhere to the Intercolonial Repatriation Agreement. It

would appear that this matter of Barbados joining in the Intercolonial Repatriation Agreement has been going on since 1927; there is a Message No. 6/1948 from the Governor, which refers to Message No. 22 of the 1st September, 1927, from the then Governor and inviting the views of the House on the subject of the repatriation of distressed Barbadians, and the Reply of the House dated the 25th October, 1927, on the subject. Well, Sir, it would seem that since then the Immigration Laws of Trinidad have been changed; the Immigration Authorities in that colony are at liberty to demand of a visitor from Barbados or any other West Indian Colony an amount, whether it is \$100, \$200, or \$300, that would be necessary should he become a charge on the public of Trinidad. This matter of the Intercolonial Repatriation Agreement was discussed in this House on the 1st March, 1949, when the honourable senior member for St. Joseph asked us to send a Reply to the Governor's Message No. 1/1949 in that connection. The Order was the consideration of the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and prepare a draft reply to His Excellency's Message No 1/1949 relating to the Intercolonial Repatriation Agreement. In moving the passing of the Address in reply to the Message, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph said this.

"Speaking plainly, if we do not agree, Barbadians will have to continue to be in possession of a return ticket or pay a deposit of \$100 in order to go to Trinidad, which is really for the third class type of visitors. If we agree, it will mean that the Trinidad Government would not have to have that deposit to be used by way of supporting destitute Barbadians."

From the Address which we passed on the 1st March, 1949, to be sent to the Governor in reply to his Message, it would seem to me that money is being demanded illegally of Barbadians in Trinidad. There must be something wrong about this matter because this House has been asked to agree to the Intercolonial Repatriation Agreement and right at the same time Trinidad can demand \$100 from a visitor there. There must be something wrong somewhere; we were particularly asked to join in this Agreement and Trinidad was the one Island behind the Barbados Government from 1928 until 1949 when we agreed to join the Agreement. Now Trinidad has given the Immigration Officer the power to demand \$100 or more from a visitor to Trinidad! If we have subscribed to this Agreement, then I claim that from 1949 the Trinidad Government has been collecting deposits from visitors from Barbados wrongfully, and insisting upon the possession of return tickets wrongfully. I repeat; something is wrong somewhere. It is for us to see that *bona fide* visitors to Trinidad go there, or that people who would not necessarily become a charge on this Government go out of this island. The Trinidad Government has no responsibility for any Barbadian going there now; if he obeys the law it is O.K., but if he disobeys it they put him in jail. If he becomes destitute, they are nothing to do with him; but if we have subscribed to the Agreement, then they must send him back at our expense I agree however that responsibility for the control of immigrants should be transferred to the Police.

Mr. MAPP: I am one of those members who welcome this Bill. Some time ago I put Questions to the Government concerning the immigration of people from other West Indian Colonies into Barbados when Barbados could not freely emigrate to those Colonies. The Government, in reply to my Questions, said that they were taking steps to strengthen the control of immigration of paupers into this colony, and I take it that this one of the steps which they are taking—the transfer of the responsibility for such control from the Harbour Master to the Commissioner of Police

who would be more in a position to make enquiries from immigrants as to their circumstances. Sir, in spite of the fact that we have not finished the debate on the Replies to those Questions, and that sentiment in this House was in favour of the purpose which prompted me to put the Questions, I want to say that I am hoping that the Commissioner of Police will take strong steps as far as this matter of the control of immigrants into this colony is concerned. I am bearing particularly in mind the practice of East Indians who come in here; I think it was the honourable senior member for St. John who brought up the matter most forcefully in that debate and urged in no uncertain terms, and I hasten to add my support, that we should do what the sister colony of Trinidad has done in her recent move towards controlling the activities of these traders who take advantage of the poor people especially those in the country areas. I understand, Sir, that these East Indian traders charge any price for their goods and that is not a matter to be taken lightly; other colonies are not taking it lightly. In other colonies steps are being taken to control the activities of these itinerant traders, these East Indians, and we should also take steps to stop them from defrauding the poor people. If the Government have not treated this matter as it should be treated before, then I suggest that they should treat it as it should be treated now. The problem has not been as acute in the past as it is today; any honourable member who pretends that he does not know about it is not keeping his ears to the ground. I welcome this Bill because we will thereby be able to keep a stricter control over these people than we have been able to do in the past.

Mr. ADAMS: It is rather amusing to listen to the honourable member who has just sat down. We are always interested in listening to him; he is young and in the energy of youth we hear a lot of novel ideas from him. This island runs over with Barbadians and it is absolutely essential for us to go into the ends of the earth and help to populate the empty spaces. I am speaking without any inhibitions today and if any non-Barbadian listens to me, he must reflect that I am a Barbadian. We claim that we go abroad and hold big positions in other colonies and even in big countries; is it not the height of stupidity—the honourable member will pardon me for the use of that word—for us to express our views against the immigration of other people to our shores? I say nothing more on that point. It is silly to give occasion to other people to set up barriers against Barbadians when it is essential for Barbadians to go abroad and make good. That is a perfect answer to the implication of the honourable member's speech; as soon as you set up immigration barriers against people, they will set up immigration barriers against you. Barbados is the last place in the world to make objections to other people coming in here.

My next point is this: since when in the history of Barbados have we been afraid of people coming in? In Great Britain you can see a wave of immigrants, and there are countries which, far from being afraid of immigrants, welcome them. The immigrants add to the potential wealth of those countries and the countries absorb them. There are thousands of English families which are of French or Dutch origin. I speak of England, but in the United States there are people other than native Americans. If you take the history of Barbados, you will find that Jews came to this island about 200 years ago; in the days before real estate agents were so flourishing the Jews acquired a substantial portion of Swan Street, but the native Barbadians ran them out and are continuing to run them out. They are coming back and we do not mind them coming back and building up

businesses; but in time, as a distinguished commercial man who is not so far removed in building from the honourable senior member for Christ Church once remarked; "We will buy out your business". That is the reaction of the average Barbadian. We should be friendly and hospitable towards people and eventually show them that Barbadians are still like all creation. I hope that the honourable junior member for St. Thomas will not give the impression to non-Barbadians that Barbadians are afraid of their coming here. Let us take the honourable junior member for St. James; the honourable member came here and he is a successful commercial man. Nobody would suggest that we do not welcome him, and nobody suggested that when the honourable member came here he was going to lord it over us, or that we were going to lord it over him; and he is as good a Barbadian as any of us who has been born here. Therefore I appeal to the honourable junior member for St. Thomas to see that if people are determined to contribute to the good of this island, and are determined to be one of us, we should be the same to them. I hope the honourable member will not give the impression from his speeches in this House, that we are afraid of or hostile to people coming into this colony. Whether it is an East Indian who happens to be born in India or a Chinaman who happens to be born in China, what does it matter to us whether he comes here? I do not see that we should follow what is done in another colony in this matter of immigration; I hate to think that the time would come when we would have to follow the example of some other West Indian colony. Other West Indian colonies should say that Barbados does so and so and therefore we are going to do it.

It was not only the remarks of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas that brought me to my feet. I am speaking now not as a member of the Government, let alone being Leader of the House; I am speaking as a Barbadian and a member of the House. I have been attacked and the Government has been attacked in connection with the recent legislation in Trinidad relative to immigration; it has been suggested that the Government deceived this House or the people in a remark which I made some time ago as referred to by the honourable junior member for the City. I can only say that the documents are there for people to see. We were led to believe that if we came under the Intercolonial Repatriation Agreement the payment of this \$100 deposit would come to an end. Trinidad has not done anything illegal, because the law passed there the other day says that any immigrant to that colony has to deposit his return fare whether that is \$100 or \$20. It is perfectly legal to pass these Regulations, but we must see that this Government was led to believe that if we came under this Agreement which we turned down in 1928, the payment of this deposit would cease. I remember the argument used by the late Mr. Walter Reece who, I think, was in charge of affairs in those days; "We go all over the world, therefore do not let us set up any barriers against people coming here." In any event, in those days, the House did not think it necessary to come under the Intercolonial Repatriation Agreement; it was not until 1949 that we, on the insistence of Trinidad came under the Agreement, and we were given the impression that we, having come under the Agreement, it would no longer be necessary for Barbadians to deposit \$100 on entering Trinidad. The new Constitution in that colony seems to have produced this new legislation. I just want to say in conclusion that it has been argued that in a federated West Indies, the Federal Government would have to control

emigration from one colony to another. On one of these days the honourable junior member for St. Thomas will suggest that we should have immigration laws between St. Thomas and St. Joseph. That was an argument adduced in Trinidad and I hope that none of us will make that mistake. I apologize to the junior member for St. Thomas if I have taken more notice of his remarks than it was necessary for me to take.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker,—Since it has been admitted that our population overflows the boundaries of Barbados, I feel that any measure which prevents undesirables, whether colonials or otherwise, from coming in here should be brought into force. I am glad that the responsibility for the control of immigration is going to be turned over to the Police Department. I would like to stress here that this Government should give the Police Department authority to clean up the streets of Bridgetown which are now congested with a certain type or with certain types of undesirable elements. I think, Sir, that the title of this Bill is wrong inasmuch as it is a fact that the real paupers cannot and do not travel. There are some people who come here from the colonies, people whom you cannot consider as paupers, but they come here for some reason or other and you will find that they do not contribute to the national wealth of the colony, nor do they contribute to the upkeep of the culture at which we are aiming; their presence here contributes to the contrary to the state of affairs which should obtain. As one of the fathers of West Indian Federation, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, has made a wonderful speech in support of that ideal; but we are not thinking in terms of preventing persons from coming in here and bringing their American dollars or English pounds and setting up business here so as to remove much of the unemployment which we have now; we are not thinking of prohibiting the entry of such persons when we say that we must bring about controls; we are thinking in terms of a certain type of people who hear about Barbadian life and who are attracted here. They want to live here and you can see the reason why the honourable junior member for St. Thomas and I have become so uneasy about the present situation. I have noticed that many of these people have become members of the unestablished staff of the Government when many of our people are willing to get a job.

Mr. Speaker, I see that it is now 5 o'clock and I daresay that honourable members would like to have their tea. I therefore 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.

REPLIES LAID

On re-assembling,

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to lay the Replies to Questions No. 29, standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Philip, relative to Island Constables being called upon to do special work during the disturbances of 1937. On behalf of the honourable senior member for St. Peter, I beg to lay the Replies to Questions No. 61, also standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Philip, relative to the total number and acreage of sugar plantations and/or sugar factories owned by absentee proprietors in Barbados.

DISSATISFACTION AMONG EMPLOYEES AT DODDS PLANTATION

Mr. GARNER: Mr. Speaker,—Before we begin the other part of the day's business, I wish to bring to the notice of the House a matter of public importance. I beg to move that the House do now adjourn for five minutes in order that I might discuss the matter. It has been brought to my attention that there has been a little trouble in respect of the property owned by the Government, known as Dodds Plantation and as now run by the Government on account of certain conditions which the Management has to face. I should preface my remarks by saying that it was a good omen when the Government acted wisely in divorcing the Institution from the Plantation, and I think that things have worked very beneficially all along. I am not passing any remarks as to the working of the Institution, because it goes without saying that that Institution is being well run. (Hear, hear). We have as the Head of the Department a very kind-hearted person who really takes a very fatherly look into the affairs of the inmates. But what has been reported to me is this—one might ask why I did not inform the Government about it, and my reply to that is that I was asked to bring the matter to the notice of the members of the House, so that it would get a quicker despatch. That is why I have taken this course. It is a recognized fact that all the plantations in this colony and even the factories are paying their employees some sort of bonus on the overall profits out of the crop, but up to now that particular system has not operated at Dodds Plantation. The agricultural employees were told by some members of the public that they are classified as Civil Servants; that is erroneous, of course, but I am stating how the matter was brought to me. These employees have been told that Civil Servants do not get any bonus and therefore they are not entitled to any bonus. It is incumbent upon me to draw to the attention of the Government that there is grave dissatisfaction existing on the part of these employees because they have not received any bonus just as employees at other plantations have received theirs. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that just before the crop season began, a cane fire took place at this particular Plantation, and I think it has amounted to a total loss because the canes were burnt before the crop started; and since the crop began another fire has taken place, which really points to the fact that there is grave dissatisfaction among the employees there. I can only do what has been asked of me to do, and that is to air the matter on the floor of the House, so that it can be remedied very expeditiously, and now that this matter has been brought to the notice of the Government today, I am sure that it will move so that this dissatisfaction which now exists at Dodds Plantation will be remedied very expeditiously.

I want to reassure those people who are suffering under this hardship that I share their views; I believe just as they do, that the Government should be the first to set the example in such profit-sharing benefits. I am not accusing the Government of anything, but I am bringing the case of the parishioners to its notice in this manner. The Government is supposed to set an example, and I need not remind it of this because it runs a Union—perhaps the only Union in this colony—and therefore some of the members should know what are the benefits to be derived from sharing in the profits of this Plantation. The onus is on the Government to set its own house in order so that this dissatisfaction will no longer exist, but the Government will go one step further and eliminate what grievances now exist at the Plantation.

I think I have said enough on this question because

everybody knows that the agricultural labourer today is a wide-awake man, and he is clamouring either directly or indirectly for some of the profits which the plantations or factories are making. I want to point out that the Labour Union has done much to awaken the people of this necessity; it has agitated for remedying the evils which existed, but this matter has passed the Union by. This particular Plantation is the property of the Executive Committee; they have the policy which operates there in the palms of their hands and it is therefore up to them to move quickly and see that both the Management and the employees get what they justly deserve out of this Government Plantation. Heretofore such a problem could not exist because the boys and girls did whatever work was to be done in the field with the exception of a little transient labour; but since they have divorced the Institution from the Plantation, they have to depend upon labour from the neighbouring villages. Some of the people who are now permanently employed at Dodds feel that an injustice is being done to them because when they work at other places they share in the bonus which is paid at Christmas time. Since they have heard that they are Civil Servants—and there is a big question mark behind that—they feel that being Civil Servants they are excluded from getting this bonus. I tried to explain to them that by no stretch of the imagination could they be called Civil Servants, that an oversight had taken place and the Government will put into operation the policy which exists at other plantations no sooner than the matter is brought to their notice. I feel that the Government should take notice of the dissatisfaction which exists at Dodds and which has brought a loss to the Plantation by the burning of the canes, because there is nothing like co-operation. Those of us who have had the great experience of being employees before we became employers, will know what great satisfaction a person gets when he knows that he is going to be squarely dealt with, when he knows that a little extra something is coming to him. Perhaps he has incurred bills and depends upon that little extra something to square them off. In this case when an employee asks the Management about the little extra something which should come to him, one of the Management will say: "We have no right to do it". Some of the people who complained to me told me that the bookkeeper used to give them something out of his own pocket at Christmas time when it was only a few of them; but now that the use of the inmates of the Government Industrial Schools has been discontinued, the staff is too big for the bookkeeper to give something to all of them. Therefore they want the whole policy revised and the policy of the Government must be to do the same thing which the plantations generally do, that is, to give their employees that extra something either at Christmas time or during the year, out of the profits derived from the plantations. I think that this is a case for a little enquiry by the Government to find out from the Management at other places what obtains at those places, and see to it that whatever benefits employees get at the private plantations, the employees at Dodds must also get.

While I am speaking on this matter I want again to remind the Government that it is high time that we save the travelling allowance which is paid to the Manager of Dodds and build a house for him on the spot. From what I have seen of his work, he is an efficient man; from what I have gathered, the tonnage at the plantation has gone up tremendously, and the figures which have come before us have proved beyond the shadow of doubt that the Plantation is now making money instead of being run at a loss. Therefore if the Government is making money, I am sure that

the Government as it is now comprised, will not think hard to pass on some of the profits not only to build a house for the Manager on the spot, but also to give the people who work at the Plantation a share in the profits which are made by the sweat of their brow.

I think I have given a clear picture of what is happening at Dodds and I would like the matter dealt at once. Complaints will be made, but as soon as they can be remedied they should be remedied. I do not want the people of this Island to feel that the Government is not willing to do for its employees what it is preaching to private individuals to do for theirs. These employees deserve to get whatever bonuses are being shared out; they deserve to get every advantage that is given to employees in similar circumstances. I want to say that there is nothing like co-operation. I had a chat with the bookkeeper who does not live on the premises and who also draws travelling allowance. I want to draw to the attention of the Government that after a certain time in the evening everybody leaves Dodds Plantation and that is wrong; the Government must put some responsible person to live on the Plantation. Seawell is many miles from Dodds and the greater area of land is at Dodds. If you have an efficient manager of Dodds and he is miles away, he can be far more efficient if he is on the spot. It has been drawn to my attention that sometimes during the crop season a lorry breaks down late at night, and due to the fact that the people are not getting any extra remuneration, they do not want to co-operate; they say: "My time is up and I am off." When you lose co-operation, you upset the Management tremendously; that goodwill which should exist between employer and employee is destroyed and that is what I am seeking to regain here now. The Management would like to do things to the satisfaction of the Government; they would also like to do for their employees on whom they have to depend for carrying on their work, the same thing that is done for similar employees at other plantations; so let the Government get a policy for the people who work on their plantations. Not only should the Government see that Dodds is run properly, but its policy must also be to own more plantations in this colony. Whether it is a question of profit sharing or not, there must be some sort of experimenting in this colony because, as everybody knows, the population of this colony is land hungry. People who have recently owned a few dollars, want to buy homes; they want to feel independent of the plantation system, they want to have some pride in having their own land. I think that the Government should have a proper proportion of peasants satisfied; I know the pride which one takes in owning his little plot of land without having to look at anyone to see if he is pleased or not. Such a person will not have any fear of being given a seven days' notice. The great thing is to have the will to do things, and if you once develop the will to do anything the opportunity must arise for you to do it. Some of us are creatures of circumstances and some of us are creators of circumstances; I happen to belong to the latter class. (Cheers).

Mr. Speaker, I am not saying anything more at this point; I repeat that I was asked to bring this matter on the floor of the House to-day. As a matter of fact, I was asked to do it two weeks ago, but I could not get here. However, I have taken the opportunity to raise the matter to-day, feeling confident that it will be adjusted at once. I repeat that since the Labour Government came into power, they do move at once when a genuine complaint is made on the floor of this House. So long as they continue to do these things, they will find seats in this honourable House; but the day they refuse to do

these things, the pace will be made hot for them. (Laughter). I have implicit confidence in the members of the Executive Committee that they will expedite this matter, that they will get in touch with the Management at Dodds and see what is wrong. We do not want to lose that co-operation which is necessary for the good working of the place. My advice to the Government is to set their house in order along the agricultural line, so that when they make demands on private planters to do things, whether through the Union or from the floor of the House, those planters will not be able to point their fingers at the Government and say: "You are trying to take the mote out my eye and yet you leave a beam in yours." I hope that the myth from which people now suffer, because they have been told that they cannot get this bonus and share in the profits, will be exploded in a short time, and the Government will state its policy as to the working of this Plantation.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second the motion for the adjournment of the House and I wish to congratulate the honourable member for the moderation which he has shown in his remarks. The honourable member has not thought fit to say that the Government is the worst Government he has known, and he has told us what we expect of him. I hope he will not blush if I say that members of the Government have come to look upon him as one of their sincerest supporters, as a supporter of all good government and as one of the greatest champions in bringing to the notice of the Government such grievances as exist in this island. The honourable member's method of approach will always bear fruit, because, human nature being what it is, if you have a point to make and in making it you approach the subject as if the person to whom you are appealing is the greatest villain on earth and you have to use language of hyperbole, naturally you will not do any good. The honourable member little knows what a compliment he was paying the Government when he said that in the past when he brought things to the notice of the Government, the Government acted very expeditiously in relation to those things. In this case, the Government is actually working on the matter. The honourable member's speech reminds me of the account about how invention is progressing, and it ends up by stating that the rate of progress is such that eventually you reach the stage where you actually get the answer back before you post the letter. That has happened today. Earlier today the honourable senior member for St. Thomas gave notice of a Resolution for the sum of \$6,000 and I will read the addendum to that Resolution. It is as follows:—

The amount provided in the 1950-51 Estimates for Labour at Dodds Plantation is \$20,760. This amount is insufficient to meet the expenses of the 1951 sugar crop which has just begun and supplementary provision of \$6,000 is now requested to meet expenses to the end of the financial year. Extraordinary expenditure during the year included the payment of—

- (a) 12½% increase in wages arising out of the Ministry of Food Price for Sugar in 1950; and
- (b) 7% Crop bonus arising out of an agreement between the Sugar Producers' Federation and the Barbados Workers' Union; for every 5,000 tons over 120,000 (which is considered an average crop) a bonus of 1% is paid—the 1950 sugar crop amounted to 165,000 tons.
- (c) The usual bonus paid to labourers on the same basis as is paid by owners of private estates.

In short, the honourable member got the answer before he raised the question. Even if the honourable member knew about this Resolution, I thank him for raising this matter on the floor of the House; it is a matter of public interest. In respect of every point which the honourable member has made, I am happy to say that the Government is going into the matter; we are acting on the principle that the Government should set an example to private persons. I am not being critical; I believe that this bonus is called a Christmas bonus, but a person is entitled to a bonus on the work which he does whether it is Christmas time or not. Not only is it right to pay people bonuses on the work which they do, but the Government agrees with the principle of profit sharing. We are actually going into the figures in respect of Seawell and Dodds and we are prepared to ask the House to accept the principle of profit sharing where agricultural enterprises are concerned. We are hoping that private interests will do the same.

As regards purchasing plantations and running them on a profit-sharing basis, that is also the active policy of the Government. (Cheers). It is true that when we come to purchase places like Lower Estate and others like that, we may be asked to pay tremendous prices; but at any rate, the Government has under contemplation the settlement of people in a co-operative way on land purchased by the Government, and running proportionate profit farms on the Puerto Rican model. The Government has had that as part of its programme for years and now that the matter has been brought before the House, the House may rest assured that the Government is coming down with the proposal. At the present moment the Government has someone employed in the examination of figures affecting Dodds and Seawell as regards the question of profit sharing the principle of which the Government has accepted.

In connection with the Manager of Dodds being shifted from Seawell, equally that is a principle with which we agree, and the Government is at present engaged in going through the Estimates, which are coming before the House, with regard to that question. The extra land has been taken up and the Government has accepted the principle that the 30 acres should be used for allotments to vegetable crops, and so on, rather than have the Manager working between Seawell and Dodds. The Government agrees, as regards the question of travelling allowance, that the Manager should not be shifted between Dodds and Seawell when there is only the small acreage of 30 acres at Seawell. The good points which have been made by the honourable member are engaging the attention of the Government; there is not one thing which he has mentioned with which we are not dealing. I hope that honourable members will adopt the sane and sober methods of the honourable senior member for St. Philip, and when they know of a good plantation which the Government may purchase comparatively cheap, they will let the Government know about it. If we can get people to sell their land at a reasonable price, the Government will very soon implement the policy which we have in mind—to start co-operatives and profit sharing in agricultural enterprises. In that way we will make a beginning towards what we must eventually do—nationalize the sugar factories and the sugar industry.

Mr. REECE: I am very glad to hear the remarks of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph in connection with Seawell. Only this week I was approached by people who live in that area and the suggestion was made that the Government should purchase land and work it on a co-operative basis. As a result of the extension of the runway, Seawell

has been reduced to about 30 acres. When one considers that that plantation is worked in conjunction with Dodds, the plantations being seven miles distant from each other, the difficulties which the honourable senior member for St. Philip has mentioned, must operate. I am very glad to hear the honourable senior member for St. Joseph express himself as he did and I hope that the Government will abandon the idea of working Seawell as a part of Dodds and allow peasant farmers to settle on Seawell and work either on lease or on the co-operative plan as the honourable member has mentioned. As the honourable senior member for St. Philip has said, the people of this colony are land hungry; and if the Government has land at its disposal, there are many people who are willing and ready to settle upon the land and allow it to produce what it is best suited for producing, whether it be vegetables, or cotton or canes; so that the idea which has emanated from the mind of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph is the right one. I do think that these 30 acres of land at Seawell should be divided among peasant farmers and allow them to do farming on a co-operative basis. It is only today that the Government has laid on the Table of the House the Resolution which gives the actual answer to the points which have been raised by the honourable senior member for St. Philip; but I would like to say that I have been informed by no less a person than the honourable member on my right (Mr. WARD), who is interested in the sugar industry, that the plantations not only pay the percentage which is set out in the Resolution, but they also make a Christmas gift to the workers. Only a few days ago I was reading a Labour newspaper and in that newspaper a writer stated that he was not in agreement with the system of paying bonus. Of course, the writer was dealing with a particular type of manufacture, and he says that the worker should be paid his wages from week to week. No one can estimate the length of the crop and perhaps it is better to work on the percentage basis. I am very pleased indeed that the Government has adopted the principle as mentioned by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph; the Executive Committee is bound by the Agreement which has been made between the Sugar Producers and the Union.

Mr. GARNER: I wish to thank the honourable Leader of the House for his assurance and I want to state emphatically that I was not in the House when the Government gave notice of that Resolution nor did I know anything about it. I have every confidence that the points I have mentioned will be looked after. I also want to thank the honourable member who has just spoken for stressing the point that it is not only that the plantations give the workers a bonus on the crop, but a certain amount of money is set aside for a Christmas bonus to which the workers are accustomed. When the Christmas season comes along, whether it is the cook, the messenger or other employee, he or she looks for some little token of the employer's appreciation of his or her services which were rendered during the year. Everybody knows the significance of Christmas time; Christmas means that we catch the spirit of goodwill, we forget differences and we are willing to give. Those who have more than others are willing to bestow something on others. I think the Government should earmark a certain amount for giving a Christmas bonus to the employees at Dodds Plantation; it is not too much to expect of these employees, they deserve that bonus. I know that the Government will spread Christmas cheer and they will not do anything to deny the good people of St. Philip a good Christmas dinner. Mr. Speaker, I now ask leave to withdraw my motion.

Mr. CHAWFORD: Before the honourable member is granted leave to withdraw his motion, I should

like to make a few remarks. I was not here at the beginning of this discussion, but I sincerely hope that the suggestion has not been made that a deduction should be made during the year from the actual increase in wages to which sugar workers are entitled, in order to give them a bonus at Christmas time. The practice has grown up in this colony within the last two or three years to give a certain percentage of increased wages to sugar workers during the crop and then at the end of the crop, to give them a bonus based on the actual production of sugar for the year. That is all well and good for the simple reason that many a worker gets a few dollars at the end of the crop, for which he is particularly glad. On the other hand, it is far better for the workers in the sugar industry to get at one time the total amount of any increase in wages to which they are entitled as a result of the increase in the price of sugar, rather than make an arrangement to give them a bonus at the end of the crop based on the output of sugar, and based also on whether or not the worker has worked for the entire period of the crop. As we all know, many of these workers work at more than one place during the crop, and if they are hamstrung with an arrangement which only entitles them to bonus if they work at one place, the result will be that many workers who are not settled at any estate during the crop will not get any bonus at the end of the crop. I repeat therefore, that it is far better from the point of view of the workers, if the total increase based on estimated production or what not, is paid to them from week to week as the crop goes on. With regard to the actual bonus which was paid last year.—

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. I draw Your Honour's attention to Rule 78; the honourable member is out of order. When the honourable senior member for St. Philip has asked leave to withdraw his motion, no negative voice is to be heard. The Rule says:

"A member who has made a motion may withdraw the same by leave of the House, such leave being granted without any negative voice."

It is for Your Honour to put the question for the withdrawal of the motion to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member has asked leave to withdraw his motion, but that leave has not yet been granted him.

Mr. ADAMS: As soon as the honourable member asks leave for the withdrawal of his motion the question is put to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member may proceed.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am sure that I am not out of order, and I am really wondering why the honourable member on my right is so apprehensive of what I have to say. I was saying that with regard to the actual bonus paid last year, the workers in the industry got a 12½% increase during the crop and then the final 7% was paid for the period of the crop. I hope that the decision to pay employees at the Government plantation bonus at this same rate does not mean that the Government feels or expects that the 12½% and the 7% increases actually represent all that the workers were entitled to in the industry as increases in wages during last year; because this Christmas bonus which was paid by the sugar plantations last year, this additional 5% which the workers felt they were entitled to, was paid because it was felt that the total increase in wages paid last year was 5% less than the total increase to which the workers were entitled for the year, bearing in mind the price of sugar. I want to make it perfectly plain that the Christmas bonus is one thing and the demand for an amount which workers feel is due to them in wages is an entirely different matter. I have nothing against

the proposal to pay a Christmas bonus, and I am glad to hear that no speaker had in his mind the idea that this bonus should be a part of the wages to which the workers are entitled during the year. Bonus is a special gift of an employer to employees as a gesture of goodwill at the end of the year. I believe that most reasonable private employers in any industry give some sort of Christmas bonus to their employees and I see no reason why the practice should not apply to all workers in the sugar industry. However, no employer or sugar industrialist should be allowed to labour under the delusion that any deduction in wages can be made during the year from the reasonable increase to which the workers are entitled with the excuse that the workers are going to get what has been deducted at the end of the year in the form of a Christmas bonus. I am surprised that the people on the plantations owned by the Government have not received both the increases which workers on the ordinary plantations got last year, especially bearing in mind, as I said earlier, that those two increases do not represent the total increase which should have been paid to the workers in the sugar industry.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, — You have heard a lot about this bonus. The honourable member who has just spoken does not represent the workers, and he is liable to make a mistake.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. Is the honourable member objecting to leave being granted the honourable senior member for St. Philip to withdraw his motion?

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. Philip asked leave to withdraw his motion. The honourable junior member for St. Philip prefaced his remarks by saying that before such leave is granted he wanted to make some remarks, and the question for leave being granted the honourable senior member for St. Philip to withdraw his motion has not yet been put to the House. When that question is put to the House, then the procedure is obvious. The position is as clear as anything else can be.

Mr. WARD: I would like to correct the statement of the honourable junior member for St. Philip to the effect that the percentage which is given to workers in the sugar industry at the end of the year is not given to all workers in the industry who work during the crop season.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I never said that. What I said that with regard to this 7% bonus which is given on the crop, the worker should not be hamstrung by the arrangement that it would be paid if he were employed from the beginning to the end of the crop, and as many workers do not work at one place, they would not be entitled to it.

Mr. WARD: If a worker works for two weeks or for one day he is given his percentage. The honourable member has made a very misleading statement and I want to correct it. As far as the 7% bonus is concerned, a worker is paid that percentage provided that the crop is of a certain size; if it is less than 150,000 tons he will probably get 5% or 6%. Another point is that no agreement was made to give any Christmas bonus; that bonus is nothing to do with arrangements made with the Union for a man's pay. All estates do not give a Christmas bonus, although the majority of them do; some of them give the labourers three, four or five days' pay. I want to let the honourable member know that he is wrong when he says that workers are hamstrung by an agreement to pay them a certain bonus. As far as I know, the Christmas bonus is a free gift to the workers; it is nothing to do with the arrangement made with the Union for the workers' pay. The honourable member made a mistake unintentionally and I am sorry

that the honourable senior member for St. Peter is not here to make the position clear.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member has asked leave to withdraw his motion. If there is no objection, leave will be granted the honourable member. (After a pause). There being no objection, the honourable member is granted leave to withdraw the motion.

IMMIGRATION OF PAUPERS (PREVENTION) (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1951

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment, the honourable senior member for St. John was speaking on the motion for the second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to amend the Immigration of Paupers (Prevention) Act, 1909.

Mr. ALLDER: When the House was adjourned, I was trying to suggest that we cannot look at this policy of immigration lightly. The transfer of the responsibility for controlling immigration from the Harbour and Shipping Master to the Commissioner of Police will help us to correct mistakes: People do come here from other colonies without the means of maintaining themselves. It is a fact that we are getting in this colony too many young women of an age at which they cannot protect themselves against what befalls young women of tender ages when they are strangers in another colony. It is also a fact that strangers come here and practise what we hate to know is being practised in any place whatsoever; they come into the colony as traders in fruit and when they sell the fruit they continue to live here. What is worse is that they do not become servants in the homes of people who are in need of servants, nor do they enter into any kind of industry which would help the national income of the colony. Of late it has been the practice that if a Barbadian goes down to Trinidad he or she is expected to make a deposit; he or she has to state the time during which he or she might be in that colony. In case an individual does not leave the colony at the stated time, the Police go in search of that individual and he or she is put in prison until the necessary means is obtained to have him or her repatriated. Many people have come back here recently and have testified to that fact. It is also prohibitive for our people to leave here and go to Trinidad in search of work; if they are found in employment there, they are told that they cannot keep such employment, and they are branded and sent back here. We know that the resources of Trinidad are immensely greater than our own, and if a colony like that can see fit to make it difficult for people to enter its shores, a colony with little or no resources should be very careful as to how it allows immigrants to come in. While we are arguing about federation, and while it is considered that Trinidad should be made the headquarters of the federated states, it is Trinidad which is erecting barriers which, in themselves, might retard the acceptance of any federal scheme which may be brought about. You take England; some honourable member has said that England rescues even political exiles, but England has sent out to her colonials saying that while she does not put any immigration barriers against her colonials, she has to stipulate that those who are in search of employment must not leave their homes or their colonies to come there at all. That shows that England is telling her colonials not to come there in search of work. Although we have said that Barbadians have so populated the colony that it is overflowing, yet we are saying that we should not prevent others from coming in. Every individual who comes into the colony does not bring the means of main-

taining himself and that preys on the limited resources which we have. As regards the question of housing, when high offers are made for what available houses there are, it means that rents are put up beyond the income of Barbadians. The methods which the strangers adopt in their homes are such that they can afford to make these high offers for houses and that automatically forces the cost of living to go up, having regard to the local population. As regards the statement that Barbadians are found in every other colony, we must not forget that that is so because the Barbadian has something to offer which many of the people of the other colonies do not have. We should not say that because Barbadians are abroad, whosoever likes to come in here can do so without any difficulty at all. It is time that we become less sentimental on this issue and face the facts as they should be faced.

I am not going to mention the parasitic practices which are adopted by some of those who are newcomers. Not only do they exploit our people by giving them low salaries when they employ them, but by virtue of their religious dogmas and their system of home life they are bringing about a state of segregation which we do not want to spring up in this colony. I have already made this point in this House with reference to the Indian community. I would like to know that within a short time from now, the Police will go around and search out all those strangers who cannot show that by their stay here they are helping the colony industrially; and all those who are not employed should be asked to leave the colony within a reasonable time. I am sure that if such a step were taken, within a short time from now we would see that some of the problems have been removed, especially those in the City of Bridgetown. I know, and honourable members know too, that there are a few hundred of these people who would be eligible for repatriation. If we do not take such a step, when these people become unable to carry out their private practices in maintaining themselves, the taxpayers of this colony are going to be asked to make provision for them either by way of giving them Old Age Pensions, or maintaining them in the Almshouses or other Institutions which we have here. I feel that we should take similar steps in relation to these people as are taken in Trinidad. I am glad that the Police Department is going to take over the control of immigration, and I hope that this Department will not fail to carry out what is expected of it from the point of view of controlling the entry of strangers into this colony, unless they can show that they are capable of contributing to the national income of the colony, and so uphold that culture which we have been trying to uphold before so many of them came here.

I also want to make a point about another kind of immigrant, that is, the wealthier kind.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member will not be allowed to do that.

Mr. ALLDER: However, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the points I have made have not fallen on deaf ears.

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

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, 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 and 2 were read and passed.

Clause 3 was read as follows:—

3. Wherever in any of the provisions of the principle Act set out in the Schedule to this Act the words "Harbour and Shipping Master or his Chief

Clerk" occur there shall be substituted therefor in each case the words "Commissioner of Police or such other person as the Governor may appoint".

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Before the question is put, Mr. Chairman, I would like the members of the Government to know that I voted for the principle of this Bill because of the last two lines in this Clause, which are: "Commissioner of Police or such other person as the Governor may appoint." I feel, however, that it may not always be desirable to have the Commissioner of Police as the Immigration Officer; the Police may have to investigate the behaviour or character of a person whom they have let in, and they may feel that they have let in that person and now they have to let him out. It is not the principle to have the Commissioner of Police as the Immigration Officer in every colony in the West Indies; it may be more desirable to set up an Immigration Department so that people who are going to make a study of the subject as a vocation can do so, and not necessarily to regard people who are coming to the island as criminals. I welcome the last two lines of this Clause and I say that although the Police have let in people, they may find themselves in the dilemma that they now have to get them out. I do not see why we could not have an Immigration Department in this colony. We are now going to deal with the examination of people of unsound minds and we are trying to remove them from the atmosphere of the Police Court so as to get away from the criminal appearance, and there is no reason why people who are coming to this colony should be dealt with as if they are criminals. I made a speech on the motion for the second reading of this Bill and I thought that it would not be out of place to clarify the position now.

The question that Clause 3 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 4 was read and passed.

The Schedule was read and passed.

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

TRADE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1951

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Michael:—To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Trade Act, 1910.

Mr. COX: This Bill is quite a simple one as honourable members will see from the "Objects and Reasons" in which it is set out that Section 111 of the Trade Act, 1910, provides for a drawback of duty paid on any goods brought to the Island by a bona fide visitor and taken away by him within six months thereafter.

This Bill seeks to amend the section to authorise the Comptroller of Customs to extend the time in respect of motor vehicles imported by bona fide visitors, for a further period not exceeding six months on such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by regulations.

This Bill seeks to amend the Act by deleting the word "six" and inserting the word "twelve" in order that persons who bring their motor vehicles into the

island may be able to keep them for twelve months. Honourable members will see that a drawback of duty is paid to visitors who bring goods to the island including motor cars and which are taken away by them within a period of six months. It appears that a hardship is caused to bona fide visitors as a result of this Clause of the Trade Act, and this Bill seeks to amend that Act in the way I have mentioned so as to give relief to these visitors. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have listened very carefully to the honourable mover of the second reading of this Bill and the reason given for this amendment. The reason given by the honourable member for the amendment is that these visitors should be allowed to bring in their motor vehicles and keep them for a period of twelve months, and in order to give effect to that proposal, the word "six" should be deleted in order to insert the word "twelve" because a hardship is at present created on people who are coming into the island. I would be more interested in the hardship which will be created if everybody who is coming into the island is allowed to bring his motor vehicle and those who work with these vehicles are prevented from getting hire for their vehicles. I am not satisfied that this amendment is the correct thing. With our population as it is to-day, with unemployment in this island as it is at present and with the number of persons holding licences as chauffeurs and people who rent out their cars and so on, I prefer to err on the side of the unemployed than allow these people—although I want to encourage people to come here—to bring in their cars and keep them for twelve months. I think that the period of six months is quite enough. If these people come here for longer than six months, all they have to do is to buy a car; but if they are allowed to bring in their cars and keep them for period of year, I see a great hardship being created on taxi drivers and small taxi owners. These small people who realise a little saving will suffer as result of this amendment, and I therefore beg to move that the consideration of this Bill be postponed. The honourable introducer of this Bill knows the plight of the people for whom I am speaking, and I cannot see him seriously contending that rich people who come in here from Canada, America and the United Kingdom should be allowed to bring in their cars and keep them for any period of twelve months. I voice my sentiments in this matter if I stand alone.

Mr. ALLDER: This is one occasion on which I fail to agree with the honourable senior member for the City; I think he is only raising a hornet's nest. Honourable members will know that strangers who come here on vacation and spend six months or even a year, do not bring in motor cars because it would be too expensive to transport cars just for the purpose of giving service for a period of six months or a year. It is mainly the people who intend to live here for the balance of their lives, who bring in cars; the Governor or the Colonial Secretary sometimes brings in his car, but no tourist or person on vacation will bring in his car. If a visitor brings in his car and is remaining here for six months or twelve months, he would bring more income into the colony. The car has to be brought from the ship, and the porter, and the mechanic will get work; perhaps a chauffeur might also get work. Nobody earns anything if the cars are not brought in. I could more understand the honourable member questioning the position of people coming here and using "drive yourself" cars; because if a person drives himself all over the country, nobody gets a job. If people are willing to bring in cars, that

is a question of bringing more wealth to the colony: I therefore cannot agree to postponing the consideration of this Bill at all.

Mr. LEWIS: I think it is incumbent upon me to thank the honourable senior member for St. John for representing the City; I share his views on this occasion, and I do not think that this is the first occasion on which the honourable member has disagreed with my colleague. This is not a question of extending from six months to twelve months the time in respects of cars which are brought into the colony by visitors; it is a question of the period of six months remaining, but if you wish an extension of that period you have to bring evidence to warrant that extension. The Comptroller of Customs is authorised to grant the extension, but you cannot say that you are bringing in a car for twelve months in the first instance. I take it that the Comptroller of Customs would not allow the six months' extension if there are no good grounds for making the application. I can assure honourable members that the Comptroller of Customs in Barbados would be very exacting in evidence that this concession is necessary to be granted. I am perfectly willing to vote for this Bill as it stands because I take it that what I have just mentioned will be done.

Mr. MAPP: The only danger I see in this Bill is that a visitor might bring in a car and compete against the local people. I suppose that the honourable senior member for St. Michael will be able to tell the House whether that is so or not. I should like to ask whether the Regulations have been made or not and whether they are to be laid on the Table of the House. If the Regulations are to be laid on the Table, I hope they will be laid in the near future.

Mr. MILLER: I feel that this discussion is unnecessary. This is a question of permitting a person to bring in a car and use it for six months. He can go to the Comptroller of Customs and ask for an extension of that period, but that extension will not be granted if the Comptroller of Customs is not satisfied that it is warranted. That is all there is in this Bill and I hope that the debate will end here instead of being taken to the Lower Green.

Mr. GODDARD: I would like this period to be made two years; I see no objection to that. As a matter of fact, I am always in favour of removing any inconvenience that might be caused to visitors to this colony. As the honourable junior member for the City has said, this amendment is purely to allow an extension of the period of six months if the Comptroller of Customs sees fit to allow it; it is not a question of deleting the word "six" and inserting the word "twelve". The period of six months remains, and if for some reason or other, a visitor cannot get his car out in time, he can ask permission for it to remain for another period of six months. Anything like this which is done to facilitate visitors to these shores will have my approval.

Mr. BRANCKER: At least this debate should serve the useful purpose of drawing to the attention of the Comptroller of Customs, if this Bill should become an Act, that this House will be expecting him to exercise his discretion in a most judicious manner. The power which it is proposed to give him under this Bill—the power whereby he may extend this period of six months for a further period—is one which he must exercise with very great restraint and after very careful consideration. There is a lot in what the honourable senior member for the City has said: if an individual arrives in this colony to remain for six months and he is not allowed any extension of that period in respect of his car, he will have to hire one from some local person. Of course the honourable

senior member for St. John seems to be envisaging visitors using "self-driven" cars; I am also thinking of the taxi drivers and small taxi owners in this colony. We must not take any chance of ever endangering their source of livelihood. I trust that the Comptroller of Customs will realise that this power which is given to him is to be exercised very carefully, otherwise the matter will have to be dealt with by the House.

Mr. COX: I regret I did not make it quite clear that in this Bill it is proposed to authorise the Comptroller of Customs to extend this period of six months for a further period of six months in respect of cars brought in by visitors to this colony. I also regret that the honourable senior member for the City did not read the Bill.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of explanation. I listened carefully to the honourable member who did not read the Bill, otherwise he would not have said that the word "six" is to be deleted in order to insert the word "twelve". I thought the honourable member was accurate, but he was misleading the House.

Mr. COX: That goes to show that the honourable member did not read the Bill. As honourable members will see, the proviso in Clause 2 says:

"Provided that in the case of a motor vehicle brought into the Island by any such visitor, the Comptroller of Customs may extend the period of six months for a further period not exceeding six months on such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by regulations made under section one hundred and seventy seven of this Act".

The position is that the Comptroller of Customs is given the power to extend the period of six months, but he cannot extend it outside the Regulations which will follow this Bill. When it comes to the point made by the honourable senior member for the City about rich people coming from Canada and America and being allowed to keep their cars for twelve months, I did not say anything like that at all. This Bill applies more to American and Canadian cars because you cannot bring them into the island as you can bring in English cars; and it is not a question of encouraging rich people to bring cars into the island at the expense of poor chauffeurs. I know a man—he is not rich—who brought a car into this island and he had to pay his duty pending his taking away the car within the limited time. I think that the honourable member's remarks would have been better made in Queen's Park. In reply to the honourable junior member for St. Thomas, there is no need to fear these cars being hired in competition with the local people; there will be a regulation to the effect that "the motor vehicle while in the island shall not be lent, sold, hired, given away or exchanged, or used for the transport of persons for remuneration or for the industrial or commercial transport of goods with or without remuneration." That makes the position clear.

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. Cox, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

The two Clauses of the Bill were read and passed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

**RESOLUTION TO SANCTION THE
PETROLEUM (AMENDMENT)
REGULATIONS, 1951**

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Michael:—To move the passing of the following Resolution:— Resolution to sanction the Regulations entitled "The Petroleum (Amendment) Regulations, 1951," made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee under the provisions of Subsection (2) of Section 2 of the Customs Tariff Act 1921 (1921-3).

Mr. COX: This Resolution seeks to amend Regulation 8 of the Petroleum Regulations. The Petroleum Marketing Company through their agent has asked that Section 8 of the Petroleum Regulations 1936, be amended so that it will be unnecessary to pay duty on aviation spirit which is imported solely for delivery to planes at Seawell. When this aviation spirit arrives, it is bonded and duty has to be paid on it; but as soon as this spirit is delivered to the planes, a drawback is received on the duty. The Petroleum Marketing Company wants to avoid the unnecessary payment of duty, and it has therefore asked that this Regulation be amended. Regulation 8 of the Petroleum Regulations says this:—

"The storers shall, as soon after the arrival of the tanker as is practicable and where possible prior to landing any petroleum products pass the usual warrant inwards for not less than 90% of the cargo intended to be landed in Barbados and pay the duty thereon to the Colonial Treasurer and shall whenever possible within eight days after the completion of the landing, pass the post-warrant for the balance of the cargo as ascertained by measurement and pay the remainder of the duty to the Colonial Treasurer."

It is proposed to amend that Regulation by the addition of the following provision:—

"Provided that this Regulation shall not apply to the petroleum product commonly known as aviation spirit."

If this Resolution is approved, it will be unnecessary for the duty to be paid. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. ALLDER: I am in favour of this Resolution, but I must draw attention to what has taken place in the past year. During the past year the price of gasoline and oils was increased every few months and no reason was given to the public as to why the increase was made. We know that the people who are concerned with the sale of gasoline deal with that commodity as a monopoly, and it is very disappointing that when you go to a gasoline station, the people tell you that the price of gasoline has gone up; the price has gone up overnight and no proper reason is given as to why it has been decided to increase the price of the gasoline. Only recently the price of certain brands of oil was carried up to 30 cents per pint; I hope that the sellers of this oil will satisfy the Government that the increase in price is justified.

Mr. LEWIS: I see the necessity for the amendment to these Regulations; it must be inconvenient to pay duty on this aviation spirit which is imported for supplying the planes and as long as this spirit is being taken out, the people are entitled to a rebate on the duty. It has been drawn to my attention that a storage tank for aviation spirit has been placed at Seawell, and I take it that the Government has given permission for it to be placed there. I did not see any public announcement that the Shell people would be erecting a building at Seawell; the land at Seawell is the property of the Government and scrupulous people will want to know something about this

building being put there. I think that a public announcement should have been made so that all of us would know what is being done. As far as I am concerned, the Government might have got a building. However, the feeling is that if permission has been given to somebody to erect a building, permission might be given to somebody else to erect one too.

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

**RESOLUTION TO SANCTION THE CUSTOMS
(AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS, 1951.**

Mr. SPEAKER: The next order of the day also stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Michael:—To move the passing of the following Resolution:— Resolution to sanction the Regulations entitled "The Customs (Amendment) Regulations 1951" made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the Sixteenth day of December, 1950, and laid on the Table of the House of Assembly on the ninth day of January, 1951.

Mr. COX: This Resolution seeks to amend the last set of Regulations which were passed by this House relative to the time when work should cease in the Carenage. Honourable members will remember that some time ago we amended the Regulations in order that work should cease in the Carenage at 11 o'clock, p.m. Previously the Regulations demanded the immediate landing of goods brought into the Carenage irrespective of the time, whether it was night or day, and it was represented to the Government that after 11 o'clock, p.m. work deteriorated and, as a result, many hours were lost. The Barbados Workers' Union and the Mercantile Association had agreed on an hour at which work should cease and that hour was 11 o'clock, p.m., with which this House agreed. A further amendment to the Regulations is now being sought whereby work should cease at 10 o'clock p.m. instead of 11 o'clock p.m., and that is the purpose of this Resolution. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

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

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE EXTENSION
OF THE WATERWORKS IN ST. MICHAEL**

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Michael:—To move the passing of the following Resolution:—Resolution to approve the Book of Reference and Plan of the proposed extension of the Waterworks in the parish of Saint Michael.

Mr. COX: This is one of those formal Resolutions which must be passed by the House. We hope that a Bill will soon be brought before the House, which will make it unnecessary for such Resolutions to be brought here. The proposal in this case is to lay a 4" diameter cast iron pipe from the existing main of the Department in Beckles Road along and under the Bay Estate Housing Scheme's private roads and land for a distance of 234 yards and fix thereon two standpipes and three fire hydrants. The proposed extension is shown on a plan submitted by the Housing Board, by a blue line; the standpipes by blue squares marked G and H, and the hydrants by red circles. The cost of the proposed work is estimated to be \$2,500.00.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. ALLDER: I have been informed that a number of vacancies have occurred among the engineering staff at the pumping stations and no attempt has been made to fill those vacancies. That means that the present staff is asked to do the work of the whole number of employees who were there all along.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is nothing to do with this Resolution.

Mr. ALLDER: I have asked a question about this matter and I have not been able to get any reply to that question. Meanwhile the situation still exists and the men are unhappy about it. I hope that this situation is going to be remedied.

Mr. MAPP: I should like to ask the honourable senior member for St. Michael what is the position regarding the supply of material for laying water mains by the Department. I have been informed that material was in short supply, and we did not know when we would be able to get material so that water mains could be laid especially in the country areas. Now that new mains are being laid, I would like to know if the supply of material has improved. We are very anxious to get water; in my constituency there are about five districts in respect of which applications have been made for the supply of water. The honourable member can tell us if there is any improvement where the supply of material is concerned.

Mr. REECE: I want to join the honourable member in this matter. If material is coming into the island, the country areas want more attention paid to them where the water supply is concerned. In the back areas in Christ Church the people have been crying out for water for a long time. If the pipe is being supplied I hope that the Executive Committee will see their way to supply water to these areas.

Mr. MILLER: We are being asked to agree to this extension of the Waterworks in St. Michael, and for two years I have been asking for an extension of the water supply to certain areas in St. George. In two or three areas in that parish the people are suffering terribly from the lack of water. I must compliment the Government on having granted water to the Drax Hall district, but at the same time people in some other districts are suffering from the lack of water. I do not know if I can ask the Government to pay equal attention to St. George as is being paid to St. Michael; I see that it is proposed to spend \$2,500 for carrying out this extension. I am asking the Government to be sympathetic with my appeal; I hope the Government will realise that the miseries of the people of St. George will have to be mine. I hope they will be sympathetic with my constant appeal for the supply of water in places such as Roach Village and Roach Tenantry and grant the water supply at the earliest possible time.

Mr. COX: As regards the question asked by the honourable junior member for St. Thomas, I promise him that I will try and get all the available information by tomorrow and pass it on to him. In so far as the honourable senior member for St. John is concerned, honourable members will remember the discussion which took place on a similar Resolution which came before the House some time ago, when the honourable member stated that many of the employees at the Pumping Stations had died. He was asked to give the names of those who had died and he has not been able to do that; but all these people of whom the honourable member spoke only amounted to two. The question as to whether it will be necessary to have these people doing all this particular work is being considered, and as soon as the reply is received, the honourable member will be fully informed.

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

CUSTOMS TARIFF (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1951

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Michael:—To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921.

Mr. COX: This Bill seeks to give effect to an Address which was passed by this House some time ago, assuring the Governor that the House is willing to enter into the Economic Co-operation Agreement with the terms therein set out. The "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill state:—

"This Bill seeks to implement one of the terms of the Economic Co-operation Agreement to which this Island has acceded by amending the Customs Tariff Act, 1921, to exempt from duty any relief package containing food-stuffs, discarded apparel, medical supplies or soap sent by an individual in the United States of America to an individual in this Island.

There is already provision under the Customs Tariff (Amendment) Act, 1948, for the customs duty free treatment of relief goods sent to charitable organisations, societies and associations approved by the Governor and this will provide the necessary authority for the customs free duty treatment of the other types of consignments of relief goods under the Agreement."

Honourable members will remember that some time in 1948 a Bill was passed allowing customs duty free treatment of relief goods which are sent to charitable organizations approved by the Governor, and it is also one of the terms of the Economic Co-operation Agreement that the items which have already been mentioned and which are also mentioned in Clause 2 of this Bill can be sent by individuals to individuals. We have already agreed to the principle of this Bill in an Address which was passed by the House, and, I repeat, this Bill seeks to implement that Address. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I know that this Bill implements one of the terms of the Economic Co-operation Agreement, and I remember that the Select Committee which sat to draft a Reply to the Message from His Excellency the Governor had an indication concerning it. The paragraph which it is proposed to add to the second Schedule of the principal Act, reads as follows:—

"All relief packages not exceeding twenty-two pounds in weight sent by an individual in the United States of America by parcel post or through a commercial firm to an individual residing in this Island, and containing foodstuffs, discarded apparel, medical supplies or soap, which shall be proved to the satisfaction of the Comptroller of Customs to have been sent as *bona fide* gifts to such individual."

I am submitting to the honourable senior member for St. Michael that when we go into Committee on this Bill, the word "needy" should be inserted before the word "individual" occurring at the end of the paragraph. Relief goods can be sent to anybody no matter how rich he might be, and it is the poor people in the United States of America who would like to relieve their relatives out here. If Clause 2 of this Bill is passed as it is, *bona fide* gifts may be sent to some rich people who are able to buy the articles themselves. This is a question of giving relief to needy people; it is not a question of relieving people of the necessity of buying the articles

here if they are millionaires. I suggest that we should make it clear that this relief is for needy persons. This relief will be of great benefit to needy persons since their friends and relatives on the other side have things in abundance. I do not think it should be merely set out that these articles should be sent as *bona fide* gifts to people here; let us abolish customs duty if we are against that, but do not let us allow rich people to get goods free of customs duty under some flaw in the law.

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. Cox, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

The two Clauses of the Bill were read and passed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

ORDER POSTPONED

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Peter:— Second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to make provision for the registration and supervision of Quarries and for the safety of workers employed therein. The honourable member is not in his place.

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 13th day of February, 1951, at 3 o'clock, p.m.

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