

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1950—51

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 19th June, 1951.

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

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. T. O. BRYAN, J. E. T. BRANCKER, R. G. MAPP, M. E. COX, J. H. WILKINSON, O.B.E., H. A. DOWDING, J. A. HAYNES, B.A., F. C. GODDARD and E. L. WARD.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the 5th June, 1951, having been circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

Mr. ALLDER entered the House and took his seat.

PAPERS LAID.

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

1. Report of the Government Bacteriologist and Pathologist for the year 1949.
2. Report of the Public Librarian for the year ended on the 31st March, 1950.
3. Annual Report of the Director of Medical Services for the year 1949—50.
4. Annual Report on the Administration of the Fire Brigade for the year 1950.
5. Report of the Department of Education for the year ended on the 31st August, 1950.
6. Census of the Colony of Barbados 9th April, 1946—Part C.

Mr. MILLER entered the House and took his seat.

PETITION

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to present a Petition from the Westbury Cemetery Board praying the House to pass a Bill to amend the Westbury Cemetery Act, 1908. The Petition is respectfully worded and I ask that it be taken as read.

The petition was taken as read.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution to place the sum of \$3,700 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive-Committee to supplement the Estimates 1951-52, Part 1—Current, as shown in Supplementary Estimates 1951-52, No. 11 which form the schedule to the Resolution.

Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution to authorise the Governor to enter into an agreement with a person to serve in the Department of Science and Agriculture in the Office of Government Analyst, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule.

Dr. CUMMINS: Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at the next meeting to consider the money Resolution of which I have just given notice.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S NOTICE

Mr. GODDARD: Bill to amend the Westbury Cemetery Act, 1908.

Messrs. BETHELL and GILL entered the House and took their seats.

QUESTIONS

Mr. GODDARD: To enquire of the appropriate member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House:—

Is Government aware of the fact that there is intense dissatisfaction existing among the Elementary Teachers of the Island as a result of the working of the recent Salary Scales?

2. Does Government know that senior assistant teachers on being appointed to headships get the same salaries as headteachers who have served nearly twenty years as headteachers, one increment less than headteachers who have given twenty years or more of service, and one increment more than headteachers who were headteachers three years before the New Salary Scales came into operation?

3. Does Government realise that most of the senior teachers in the Elementary Teaching Service are seething with discontent because some of them have been relegated as a result of certain unjust stipulations in the New Salary Scales. Is Government aware that others who have given long years

of faithful, loyal and efficient service are now compelled to retire at the bottom of their Salary Scales.

4. Is Government conscious of the fact that these senior teachers were circularized and requested to state in advance whether they would retire under the Old or New Pension Bill?

5. Is Government aware that some of these teachers are being penalised as a result of having to retire under the new Pension Bill?

6. In view of the urgency of the matter, will Government take immediate steps to remedy this most unsatisfactory state of affairs?

Mr. MAPP: To enquire of the appropriate member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House:—

1. How many cases of discrepancies in the weights of cane at sugar factories have been reported by the cane weighing inspectors during the reaping seasons of 1950, 1951?

2. How many of these occurred with peasants' cane?

3. At what factories did these short weights occur?

4. Have there been recurrences of such weights at any factory during a crop season, and if so at what factories?

5. Have any prosecutions followed such reports of discrepancies?

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Westbury Cemetery Act, 1908 be now read a first time.

Mr. WILKINSON seconded the motion which was agreed to.

SELECT COMMITTEES DISCHARGED

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to discharge the following Select Committees:—

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;

The Select Committee appointed to consider and prepare a draft reply to Message No. 6/1951 from His Excellency the Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly relating to an invitation for two members of the Legislature to attend the Festival of Britain.

The Select Committee appointed to consider and prepare a draft Reply to Message No. 11/1951 from His Excellency the Governor relating to the establishment of a Creamery.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Dr. CUMMINS: I ask leave to take Order No. 8 on the Order Paper as the first Order of the Day.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day now stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas:—To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Colony.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY entered the House and took his seat.

VOTE FOR EMERGENCY RELIEF

Dr. CUMMINS: This Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is one to place the sum of \$10,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1951-52, Part 1, — Current, as shown in Supplementary Estimates 1951-52, No. 10, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

The purpose of this Resolution is to make provision for hurricane relief in case a hurricane takes place. The hurricane season is now approaching and we do not know if and when a hurricane will reach us, so we want to be prepared for it. As is set out in the addendum to the Resolution, a portion of this money is to be distributed to the various parishes; of course, the parish of St. Michael, being the most populous parish will be getting the lion's share. With this money, tools, equipment for shelters and medical supplies will be obtained and stored; the remainder of the money will be held by the Executive Committee to be spent, if and when a hurricane does reach us, in the manner in which the Governor-in-Executive Committee thinks fit. The reserve will only be expended if damage has been caused by a hurricane. As usual, we are taking time by the forelock and making preparation in the event of a hurricane. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

Mr. GODDARD: I should like to say that this is a beginning in respect of hurricane relief, but it is a very inadequate beginning. It is set out in the addendum to this Resolution that the sum of \$100 is to be placed at the disposal of the parishes, except the parish of St. Michael, to get on with the work of hurricane relief, and I say that that amount is infinitesimal. I speak of the parish of Christ Church because I know something of the Organisation up there; we have had to put certain funds from the Vestry at the disposal of the Hurricane Relief Committee so that they could get on with this really important work. With the provision of a few lanterns and other items this amount of \$100 will have been gone. The Committee have petitioned the Government from time to time for a greater amount of money and have told them in detail what they want to do with the money. This amount of \$100 is but a pittance to place at the disposal of the Hurricane Relief Committees and many of them feel a sense of frustration and have threatened to resign. We have some able, conscientious parishioners who are willing to do some work but they cannot do it with this amount of \$100. I think I have already spoken about this matter in this House; this sum of \$100 is very inadequate.

Mr. ALLDER: I would like to endorse the remarks of the honourable senior member for Christ Church as regards the inadequacy of this amount which is allocated to the various Committees for hurricane relief work. I do not think that these Committees should be appointed without being given the necessary tools with which to do the job. On the occasion of the flood damage the people in St. Michael were fortunate in getting their assistance, but in other areas the position was different; there was the situation where members of the Hurricane Relief Committee turned out at a very late hour to render assistance, and some of them said: "I am not leaving my home because my area is all right." That should not be so; members of a Hurricane Relief Committee should not be allowed to say: "Since my district has not been affected I am not leaving my home." That state of affairs obtained in the parish of St. John; that was told to me as late as 1 o'clock in the

afternoon. I should like to state that whenever Committees of this sort are set up in the various parishes, the representatives of the parishes in this House are always overlooked. There could be no harm done if you were to stipulate that the representatives of the various parishes be appointed as members of these Committees or that their services be utilized, because while a particular individual in a parish might say: "My district has not been affected and I am not leaving home", it must be remembered that these Committees have obligations in respect of the whole island. If you want the scheme to work properly you should appoint on these Committees people who are willing to work irrespective of where a situation has to be attended to. If you are setting up this machinery and you want it to work properly, you should not limit the activities of those who would render their services. In case of another flood I hope that we will not have cause to operate as we had to do in 1949; I hope that we will not have as many misunderstandings as we had on that occasion, when even members of the Committees expressed their disapproval of the general handling of the situation. There is another point I want to make and it is this: some weeks ago we passed a Resolution to give assistance to those who suffered as a result of the flood and up to today the money has not been released. The work has not been started as it should have been started and some of the sufferers might well discover that another flood will find them in the same position as that in which they now are, or in an even worse position than that in which they are left.

Dr. CUMMINS: I would like to explain to the honourable senior member for Christ Church that while this amount of \$100 does appear to be parsimonious, it will be remembered that a similar thing was done last year. Last year we accumulated a certain amount of stores, medical supplies and tools; this year we will accumulate more with the money which is allocated to the various parishes and the Director of Agriculture and the Director of Medical Services will have a certain amount of money in hand for dispensing food and medical supplies on the approach of a hurricane. The balance of the money will remain in the hands of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to be dispensed as is thought fit. The whole idea is to build up over a period of years, a certain amount of supplies; if more is needed more will be provided.

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

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

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. COX, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Mr. COX in each case, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

TRADE AMENDMENT BILL, 1951, NO. 2

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is to resume Committee on the Bill intituled an Act to amend the Trade Act 1910.

Mr. SPEAKER left the chair and the House resumed Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman,—The consideration of this Bill was postponed last Tuesday because honourable members wanted a statement to be

made in connection with revenue accruing from warehouses. I am commanded to say that the whole question of revenue including that accruing from bonds and warehouses is being reviewed; the whole thing is in the melting pot. We do not know what will eventually happen, but the policy of the Government is to remove all the anomalies. We are therefore asking honourable members to proceed with the consideration of this Bill.

Mr. WARD: I do not follow what the honourable member has just said. He has said that the whole question of revenue accruing from warehouses is under review, and if so, what is the good of dealing with this Bill at the present moment? Why should we give latitude to any individual when the whole question is under review? I think it is reasonable for us to further postpone the consideration of this Bill until the Government has dealt with the question as a whole and arrived at some decision. I do not see why we should try to single out one or two individuals from among so many others and give them certain privileges; that looks to me as being something more than normal and I feel that the Government should adopt a policy which they have not yet adopted. I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that motion. After hearing our argument last Tuesday explaining the position as it exists today, the Government ought to have been able to see the appearance of something being wrong. I should like to see the Government collect all the necessary taxation from these warehouses for the purpose of carrying out the necessary social reform. I cannot understand the Deputy Leader of the House requesting that we proceed with the consideration of this Bill and in the same breath saying that the whole matter is in the melting pot. If you say that the whole system of renting warehouses is in the melting pot, and then proceed to pass a Bill giving any particular firm or company a right which other firms or companies do not enjoy, that will appear as if you are passing partial legislation. I am sure that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas would not like it to be said that we, in this Chamber, attempted to pass partial legislation in respect of any individual, firm or company. If the honourable member can say that the statements which were made by the Opposition last week were reckless, then he would expect those of us who were not so fully acquainted with the matter to say that we are prepared to go on with the Government and pass this Bill; but if he says that the whole matter is in the melting pot and that certain anomalies do exist, how can we pass this Bill which will give the right to an individual company to barter unfairly with other companies? If an individual has an agency for any sort of tobacco and manufactured cigarettes in this colony, because he is unable to provide a warehouse, he has to put the articles in the Government warehouse and pay rent for it; now the British American Tobacco Company not only manufacture cigarettes here but they are agents for British goods which come in here and which they sell to other people. If they are allowed to put these goods in their own warehouse, do you not see that you are creating a system which will lend itself to unfair competition? If the whole question is in the melting pot, I am bound to agree with the honourable senior member for St. Lucy that the consideration of this Bill should be postponed. That will allow the Government the opportunity of going into the whole matter and in a few weeks' time they can bring back the Bill here. The principle of this Bill might be all

well and good but we cannot give preference to any particular firm or company in this matter.

Mr. LEWIS: This is not a matter in which the Opposition have exaggerated the position; they have said that the Government should not lose the rent which they would collect from the bonding of these articles. I do not see how the Government will be able to collect rent in these circumstances and these people who are manufacturing these articles be given this privilege as well. As far as the manufacturers of these cigarettes are concerned, I do not say that in the "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill, the name of this particular Company is not mentioned, but in the Bill itself no mention is made of any company. The name of this Company is mentioned in the "Objects and Reasons" of this Bill as the reason for bringing up the Bill, but the Bill says that anybody can occupy a warehouse if it is approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. I must say that I go a great part of the way in agreeing that if these matters are pending the final decision of the Executive Committee or if they are under investigation by the particular Department, it would be better to postpone the consideration of this Bill and bring in the other amendments which may be necessary.

Mr. COX: As honourable members will see, this matter is not of so much importance to the community neither is there anything political in it, and for that reason it is immaterial to me whether the consideration of this Bill is further postponed or not. However, in reply to the honourable senior member for St. Lucy who asked why should the Government single out this particular firm for this treatment, I will say that this firm has applied for this treatment. If any other firm had applied for this treatment, they would have been considered in the same way. The Shell Oil Company was given permission to erect a bond at Spring Garden and bond their own kerosene oil; when the oil arrives here, the Company pay the duty on it and then it is taken to the bond which they were given permission to provide. If that oil had been bonded at the Government bond the Company would have to pay rent for it; the same thing applies in respect of gasoline. Is it fair to give an individual permission to erect a bond in which to store his articles and then when he applies for permission to bond the articles you say: "Oh no, the Government is losing revenue; you must rent the Government bond?" I am sure that no individual in this House would like to be in that position: In my opinion, it is unfair for an individual to erect a bond and then have to pay rent as if he were renting from the Government. The Deputy Leader of the House has said that the Government is considering the idea of putting the whole matter on some uniform standard, and I do not see why this Committee should object to something which is reasonable. I think it was sometime in January last year that the House passed a Bill giving the British-American Tobacco Company the right to erect a bond in which to bond their stuff, and all they are asking for now is permission to bond the manufactured article on the same premises. I do not think that they are asking for anything which is unreasonable; what hon. members are talking about is the loss of revenue to the Government and they are saying that this firm should still pay rent although the Government can rent the space vacated by the firm to somebody else.

Mr. WARD: I quite agree that if an individual erect his own bond it would be reasonable to allow him to store his articles in that bond free of cost; but if the Government is adopting that policy, the Act should be amended to deal with the matter as a whole

and not in any piecemeal fashion. By virtue of the Act the Government still has to provide a decent warehouse for storing articles on which duty has been paid, and why should the Government keep a bond idling or only for the benefit of people who cannot do better than store their articles there? I think that the Government should formulate a policy to allow individuals the use of the warehouse rent free, but not deal with the matter in this piecemeal way. If the whole matter is under review there is no harm in postponing the further consideration of this Bill. I do not see why the Government should be so anxious in getting this Bill through, they are not losing any revenue, and if we pass this Bill they will lose revenue.

Mr. MAPP: The point has been made that the Government is discriminating on behalf of this Company. I think that the "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill should have been drafted differently, but I suppose they were drafted in that way to show that the "British American Tobacco Company" have taken the initiative in applying to have their tobacco stored at their bond. If honourable members will read Clause 96 of the Principal Act together with this Bill, they will see that far from this provision being limited to the British American Tobacco Company it is extended to anybody who imports many other items. The honourable senior member for St. Lucy is asking that other companies or individuals should be allowed to enjoy this privilege by an amendment to the Act; if the Opposition is putting up that argument for a postponement of the Bill, well, let them put it up, but do not let them put up the argument that the Government is discriminating in favour of this Company. The Bill itself destroys that argument; any individual or company can import wines, spirit or other articles and store them in the bond which that individual or company has erected for that purpose. I think that honourable members are concentrating too much on what is stated in the "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill, but if they read Clause 96 of the Act together with this Bill they will see that the opportunity is given to anybody to erect a bond and store articles therein. I hope that the Opposition will not press for a postponement of the further consideration of this Bill on the arguments which they have used; we have not heard any argument to convince us that the further consideration of this Bill should be postponed.

Mr. ALLDER: If all along people were compelled to use the Government bonds for the storage of spiritous liquors and so on, I do not see why Company. I think that the "Objects and Reasons" mission to store these articles at their own private business places. I think that that is a dangerous thing; if the practice is carried on whereby articles can be stored all over the island so that people can use them as they like, one can imagine what is liable to happen. There would be a great handicap as regards medical supplies which have to be controlled; I do not think that drugs should just be received at the shore and then the Government does not know what stocks are in the island, or what measures are being taken to dispose of such stocks. It is a fact that the Government bonds require a certain amount of maintenance every year and I cannot see that, because the British American Tobacco Factory have just erected a new bond and they feel that they must have their products stored in their bond instead of the Government bond as customary, they must be granted permission to do so. In that case, not only are you putting the control of certain important things out of your reach, but you are also agreeing to the loss of revenue to the colony. If

firms are forced to use the Government bond for storing their goods, there will not be any great handicap as to these goods being controlled.

As regards permission being granted to the Shell Oil Company to erect their own bond, everybody knows that the Government does not have the facilities for storing millions of gallons of spirit such as gasoline and kerosene oil; if the storage of gasoline and kerosene oil were as manageable as that of cigarettes or other goods, I doubt whether that Oil Company would have been given permission to erect their own bond. If a man is given permission to store in his bond something of a dangerous nature to the community, we know that fire is apt to take place and something important may be destroyed. I am not saying that fire or some destruction cannot take place at a Government bond, but past history has shown that there is a greater tendency for fires to take place at the premises of private concerns than at Government-controlled buildings. I want to ask: If this matter is of no great importance to the community, why do you want to carry it through? This particular Company has already have been granted great concessions by the Government; I am told that it can get in its raw material and machinery free of customs duty, and now you want to allow it a further concession. Honourable members know that if this Company is producing cigarettes here, the average trader cannot buy a box of cigarettes from the Company at all; he has to purchase them from the middleman; that is why the price of the cigarettes is kept up all the time. I feel that business houses should continue to pay whatever rental are paying for the use of the Government bond; you will find that the Government bond has greater advantage than what it appears to have at present. If you compare what rental business houses are paying the Government with what is paid otherwise, you will realise that the Government is losing much rent from that source.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The speech of the honourable member who has just sat down shows his ignorance of the matter about which he was speaking. The honourable member does not understand the Customs Act or what the practice is; if he knew anything about what he was talking he would not have made that speech. Does the honourable member think that people are allowed to import articles and then no check is made on them?

Mr. ALLDER: I did not say that the Government gives people permission to import goods and then they do not know what is happening. From the explanation which has been given by the honourable senior member for St. Michael it looks as if the Act will have to be amended.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Even if you are dealing with dangerous drugs you have to make a Customs declaration before you can put them in a private bond. The honourable member knows nothing about this matter; he feels that you can import goods and when they arrive you can just take them off the ship, bond them and the Government will not know what goes into the bond. Some honourable members make speeches for the love of making speeches, not knowing their limitations; the honourable senior member for St. John knows nothing about Customs practice and he thinks that somebody can import goods, put them in his private bond and the Government will not know what goods go into the bond or what goods come out of it. I am surprised at some honourable members on this side of the Table, who should know something about the Customs Regulations and Customs practice. As regards the honourable senior member for St. John he should learn not

to speak on matters about which he knows nothing.

Mr. GODDARD: This debate has degenerated into a matter of personality, but it can be brought back to the high level on which it was started. The Government's attention was drawn to the fact that they were losing revenue by allowing the British American Tobacco Company to have the privilege of storing tobacco in their own bond instead of paying rent for storing the tobacco. I agree that that privilege should be extended to this Company because it will facilitate the industry, but I do not see why the Government should forego the warehouse rent which this Company would normally have to pay if the tobacco were bonded in the Government warehouse which is provided by law; that warehouse has to be maintained whether the British American Tobacco Company use it or not, and they should pay for the privilege of storing the tobacco in their own bond. That privilege should be enjoyed in the payment of warehouse rent. In the case of the Shell Oil Company, everybody knows that the price of the product to the consumer was lowered as a result of the privilege granted them. I think that the Government is wise in its decision to review the whole matter of extending to people the privilege of bonding in private warehouses goods on which warehouse rent should be paid. I am voting for the postponement of the consideration of this Bill and I counsel honourable members to do so in the interest of everybody concerned.

The question that the CHAIRMAN do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. ALLDER, LEWIS, CRAWFORD, BETHELL, DOWDING, GILL, HAYNES, GODDARD, WILKINSON, WARD and MOTTLEY—11.

Noes: Messrs. MAPPE, BRYAN, COX and Dr. CUMMINS—4.

The CHAIRMAN reported that progress had been made in Committee on the Bill and that the Committee had asked for leave to sit again.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS TO THE BARBADOS FANCY MOLASSES PRODUCTION AND EXPORT (AMENDMENT) ACT

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas:—To move the consideration of the amendments of the Honourable the Legislative Council to the Bill to amend The Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export Act 1937.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—As regards these amendments, they are amendments to Clause 14 of the principal Act. Clause 2 of the Bill as passed by this House reads as follows:—

"2. Section fourteen of the Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export Act, 1937, is hereby amended by the insertion immediately after the words "fancy molasses" occurring in line 6 thereof, of the following words "if shipped in containers holding more than ten wine gallons each."

In the Other Place that Clause was amended to read as follows:—

"2. Section fourteen of the Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export Act, 1937, is hereby amended—

- (a) by deleting the words "provided that" occurring in line six thereof and substituting therefor the word "if"; and
- (b) by adding at the end thereof the following proviso—

"provided that in the case of fancy molasses which has been sterilized in air-tight sterilized containers not exceeding ten wine gallons in capacity, the Board may grant permission in writing to any person to export such fancy molasses at any time after such period of nine months."

There does not seem to be any alteration in the principle of the Bill; I therefore beg to move that these amendments be now read a first time.

Mr. COX seconded the motion which was agreed to.

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

MOTOR VEHICLES AND ROAD TRAFFIC
(UNITED STATES OF AMERICA CONSULAR OFFICER EXEMPTION) BILL,
1951

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas:—To move the second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to provide for the exemption from payment of motor vehicles tax or licence of United States of America Consular Officers.

Dr. CUMMINS: This Bill deals with the exemption from taxation in connection with the motor vehicles of representatives of the United States of America in this colony; it is the result of a Convention between the United States and Great Britain, but that Convention has not been ratified in Barbados. The reason why the Convention has not been ratified here is that it has to be dealt with legislatively. The American Government is still undecided, as far as this Government is concerned, about one or two things but meanwhile it was thought, and it has been recommended by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, that American Consular officers stationed in this Island should be exempted from the payment of taxation on their motor vehicles. Hence this Bill is before us. I understand that that is the practice existing in other West Indian Colonies which have adopted this Convention between the United Kingdom and the United States of America. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I agree that if this concession is granted to United States Consular Officers in other West Indian Colonies it would be a good thing for us to fall in line; but it looks a bit strange to me that the Head of the Administration in Barbados is still required to pay taxation on a car used by him, whereas the representative of a foreign Government is exempted from that taxation.

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.

The two Clauses of the Bill were 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.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (AMENDMENT)
BILL, 1951

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also 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 Executive Committee Act, 1891.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—This Bill seeks to amend the Executive Committee Act so as to give the Executive Committee the power to sell or exchange lands owned by the Government. Not so long ago the Act was amended to give the Executive Committee the authority to lease land, but the Government is now seeking the power for the Executive Committee to exchange or sell land. Honourable members will remember that when the runway at Seawell was being extended, an exchange of land was made between Seawell and Spencers so that the runway could be extended, but the matter had to be referred to the Legislature. At the present moment an exchange of land at Bay Street is pending — land which is situated near what is known as a "Window" opposite the General Hospital. The owner of some land adjacent to the "Window" is willing to exchange that land for the portion owned by the Government in order that the road in the particular area might be widened and improved. The Government feels that whenever a situation such as that arises, they should not have to come to the Legislature for authority to deal with it, hence this Bill is before the House. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILKINSON: I think that honourable members of this House are averse to giving away any of their present authority. This Bill does not propose to give away any authority because it says that any lease, sale or exchange of land must have the approval of the Legislature; but it seems to me that the Government will be in much the same position as it is in today when this Bill is passed. If the Executive Committee think it advisable to sell a certain spot of land today, they have to send down a Bill to that effect. When this Bill is passed what will happen? I presume that the Governor will send down a Message to this House pointing out the desirability of making this exchange or sale of land and the Executive Committee will send down the necessary Resolution. I am not opposing this Bill, because it is not taking away any power from this House; but I do not see that by passing this legislation the position will be very much different from what it is now.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not quite follow this Bill myself. The "Objects and Reasons" state:—"By virtue of the Executive Committee Act, 1891, as amended by the Executive Committee (Amendment) Act, 1950, the Governor-in-Executive Committee may lease Government-owned lands but cannot sell or exchange such lands without special legislation in each case." We know that Government-owned lands are vested in the Governor-in-Executive Committee, and it is felt that if you want to dispose of any land which is the property of the people of this colony, you can do so by an Act of Parliament. That seems to be the correct procedure. The "Objects and Reasons" of this Bill go on to state:

"To avoid recourse to special legislation, this Bill seeks to confer the powers of selling or exchanging such lands with the approval of the Legislature."

That means that if the Government made an arrangement to sell land at the Wharf, for instance, or if an application was made to the Government for the purchase of land at the Wharf, they would come down to this House to get the feeling of the House, I suppose, before bringing down a special Bill to obtain permission for the sale or purchase of the land. The Governor-in-Executive Committee can actually enter into negotiations in these matters and then get the approval of the House. The proposed amendment is the repeal of Clause 12 of the Act and the substitution of the following:—

The Executive Committee may, with the approval of the Legislature, lease, sell or exchange any lands which they may possess."

I would like that part of the Bill explained to me; I do not want to vote for something which I do not understand.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the House goes into Committee on the Bill, the honourable member will have ample opportunity for having any intricacy in connection with the Bill explained to him.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Your Honour is anticipating that we are going into Committee on the Bill. What I want explained is the procedure to be followed in getting the approval of the Legislature. The Authority to whom you have to make application for the purchase of Government-owned land is the Governor-in-Executive Committee, but the Legislature must be acquainted of the matter by way of a Message or whatever it might be, and if approval is given to the matter, a Bill must follow. The mere sending down of a Message to the Legislature would not seem to give the authority to the Executive Committee to sell or purchase land, having regard to the Statutes of this colony. I should like the honourable senior member for St. Thomas to explain the procedure to me; we should be very cautious in dealing with land which is the property of the people of this island and do not let us think that the present Governor-in-Executive Committee will always be in power. I counsel the members of this Chamber to see that what existed previously and still exists is the correct thing: I see no reason why we should depart from the present procedure. Let the Governor-in-Executive Committee apprise this honourable Chamber through a Message or otherwise of what is proposed to be done and let the necessary Bill be passed in this honourable Chamber. That gives ample opportunity for obtaining the views of the people on the particular matter as to whether or not a particular portion of land should be maintained or sold for the benefit of the people. I will reserve the right to vote one way or the other on this Bill; I cannot support it unless I am given a satisfactory explanation of it.

Dr. CUMMINS: The position is this; as I said when I referred to the exchange of land at Seawell which took place not so long ago, a Bill had to be brought down to the House to give effect to that exchange. This Bill seeks to avoid the Government having to send down special legislation to deal with such matters whenever they arise. This Bill will be a general Bill and there will be a simpler way of dealing with the sale or exchange of land than coming down to the House with special legislation in respect of every case. Instead of a special Bill being sent down to the Legislature each time, the Governor-in-Executive Committee will apprise the Legislature by means of a Resolution as to what is proposed to be done, and effect will be given to whatever we decide.

Mr. MILLER: I am supporting the remarks of the Deputy Leader of the House. This Bill seeks to give the power to the Executive Committee to

lease, sell or exchange lands. I happen to know the spot of land which the Government is exchanging for another spot and I do not know that honourable members should be uneasy about the matter since it can only be done with the approval of the Legislature. I did not hear the remarks of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas in the first place and I would like him to give some explanation as to the land which it is proposed to exchange; this Bill is only for the purpose of giving authority to the Executive Committee to lease, sell or exchange land and none of these things can be done without the approval of the Legislature.

Mr. ALLDER: The purpose for which I think this transaction is to be gone through is noble inasmuch as the Government intends to widen the area in the vicinity of the General Hospital; but as regards giving the Executive Committee absolute power to lease, sell or exchange land, I must express my fear. I agree that sometimes you are liable to find yourself committed to doing things. I think a case in point is that during the discussion on the Estimates for the financial year, we were asked to vote a sum of money for the purchase of some land at Clineketts; no member of this House knew anything about that matter until provision was made for it in the Estimates. I do not know if the Executive Committee had already committed themselves to purchasing this land, but the House knew nothing about the matter. However, the money was released. I agree with the proposal in this particular case because it is a question of removing the hazards at the Hospital.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: When the honourable member says that we want to pass a Bill to give the Executive Committee absolute power to lease, sell or exchange land, does he understand the meaning of the term "absolute power?" In the "Objects and Reasons" of this Bill it is stated: "This Bill seeks to confer the powers of selling or exchanging such lands with the approval of the Legislature." But the honourable member speaks about the Executive Committee being given absolute power; for the sake of making another speech and pointing out to the House what they do not understand, the honourable member, in his wisdom, has found a new interpretation of this Bill. It is true that we have no control over the mentality of human beings, but at least honourable members should read what is put before them before attacking the Government.

Mr. LEWIS: I must say that I welcome this Bill because, although it looks a little confusing, it clarifies the situation. When the Amendment Bill of 1950 came before this House I was the only member who opposed it because I said that the Executive Committee should not do what was proposed in the Bill without the approval of the Legislature. Now the Government has come back with this Bill to restore the power which this House had. On that account I welcome this Bill. I feel that if the Executive Committee want to engage in these matters they should only do so with the approval of the Legislature. Another point is this. An amendment to the Executive Committee Act was assented to on the 10th July, 1950, the Legislature has not been prorogued and I do not know if it is in order to pass another amendment to the Act now. I should also like to say that on two occasions since I have been a member of this House, properties belonging to the Government have been exchanged, and I do not think the exchange in either case was done by means of any Bill; in each case the exchange was made by means of a Resolution. I congratulate the Government for restoring in this

Bill the provision that in dealing with these matters they should obtain the permission of the Legislature.

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

On the motion of 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.

The two clauses of the Bill were 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.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded the motion which was agreed to, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

On re-assembling:

Dr. CUMMINS tabled Replies to Question No. 51 standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Philip, Mr. Crawford, and Question No. 72 standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Michael, Mr. Bryan.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas—to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Apprenticeship Bursaries Act, 1928.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker—This Bill seeks to increase the number of scholarships granted by the Board of Industrial Training under the Apprenticeship Bursaries Act of 1928. At the moment, 24 bursaries are allotted to boys from Elementary Schools. The Board of Industrial Training has recommended that this number be increased to 48. But the Government feels that instead of confining themselves to 48, the Act might be well amended, giving them power to increase these bursaries from time to time as they think fit; because it is hoped that as time goes on the number will increase, and it will be necessary to increase these bursaries also when we reach the point of implementing the scheme for technical training which the Government has in mind. Secondly, it is felt that it would be better to amend the Act in this manner than to have to come to the Legislature from time to time whenever there is the desire to make an increase in the number of bursaries. I beg to move that the bill be now read a second time.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded.

Question that the bill be read a second time was put and agreed to *nem. con.*

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, His Honour the SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. L. E. SMITH in the Chair.

Clause 1 of the bill was read and agreed to.

Clause 2 was read.

Mr. J. H. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman—We all, I think, welcome this idea of training our population to be useful members of the community; but I do hope that the Government has not forgotten the value of a technical school for which I think that these bursaries are only a substitute. I speak from experience when I say I welcome the idea of having these boys properly trained at the apprenticeship stage. I knew a master workman—I will not mention his name, he is dead—who worked at my home and elsewhere. He did not seem to me to give any of his knowledge

to his apprentices. It was just a question of handing him the saw, the hammer, etc. I am therefore heartily supporting this bill, and I repeat that I hope the Government has not lost the idea of encouraging the building of technical schools.

Dr. CUMMINS: Government has not abandoned the idea. I said in my opening remarks that the Government hopes soon to have technical schools going. The increasing of these scholarships will be a means of getting an entrance to these schools.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman—I did not have an opportunity of making a second reading speech on this bill and I know, sir, that you do not allow anyone to make a second reading speech when a bill is in committee stage. This is an occasion when the Government should be commended for making the amendments it is making to this Act so as to increase the number of bursaries. Those of us who are in contact with parents and children know how often we are approached day after day and asked by parents to help their boys find some means of employment. There is only one thing that I would have liked to see: not only the increase in the number of bursaries, but as I suggested during consideration of this year's Estimates, an increased lunch allowance for the boys. I think that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph said on that occasion that he would note my suggestion. What a boy could do with 10/- or \$5.00 a month ten years ago, would cost him three times as much to do today. I understand that this allowance is given for the purpose of assisting these boys with lunch, and in many cases it helps boys who live in the country to defray their travelling expenses. I throw out that suggestion for the consideration of the Government. I am sure that the honourable senior member for St. Thomas will note it carefully for consideration when he comes to deal with the Estimates. It is not a question of giving more to the workmen who train these boys, but giving more to the boys themselves; because those of us who know what it is realise that a number of these boys who go to work at these trades come from homes where the parents have not got the wherewithall to give them the appropriate amount of money to buy lunch. You will agree with me, sir, that an increase in this respect would be something that every honourable member of this House would be in favour of. I thank you for the latitude you have given me, sir.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Chairman—I want to know if my colleague could tell me if it is intended to extend not only the number of bursaries, but the scope of the bursaries. Sometime ago a questionnaire was sent around to many establishments and commercial places in Bridgetown. Has there been any definite recommendation that these bursaries be extended in scope? The object of this bill is a very good one, but I feel that it will be defeated to a great extent if we do not extend the scope of these bursaries.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman:—It is quite good that the number of these bursaries should be increased, but it is definitely a sad reflection on our outlook towards the youth of this colony with a population of 200,000 and with an increasing demand for our skilled and unskilled workers in other countries, that we are making provision for the training of so few. I hope that this increase does not mean that the Government does not intend to go further than that. For many years now the Government has been pressed by various bodies and individuals to set up a technical school whereby a larger proportion of the children could be given an opportunity to learn the trades of their choice. But we are only making an increase of 24. While it may be somewhat expensive, it pays in the long run. The Government should follow the advice

of the same committee which recommended that a department of such a nature should be attached to Combermere School. Even if they did not want to attach it to Combermere School, there are other suitable places owned by the Government. For instance there is Summervale. I am told that there are only about half a dozen girls there, and it has been thought advisable that the Government turn that institution into a technical school. I too think that that would be advisable, because that department costs the Government a large amount of money annually, and during consideration of the last Estimates I suggested that the few girls there could be taken away and put in some other institution for the same training that they now get, and Summervale could then be used as the technical school which the Government has been asked to set up. I have always felt that in view of the fact that we have a limited land area and a rather large population, more young people should be afforded an opportunity of learning the trades. Why? We have here a large number of people who are unable to pay a high price for work like carpentry, masonry etc. But there are so few craftsmen that whenever you call on one of them to do a job you have to pay him a price which you might not have had to pay if there were more persons qualified to do such jobs. If there were more such persons, supply and demand would come into play and produce some balance. As I have said, it is a matter for regret that there will be only 48 bursaries if this bill is passed, and when you compare the amount that is being spent in this respect with the amount that is being spent on the Barbados Scholarships which are won by just a few, you will realise that everything is being done for the few as against the majority. I prefer that if money is to be spent to educate and qualify people, to see it spent in the channel where the majority would benefit. That is a point which should be considered. But I have a feeling that since we are now increasing these bursaries to 48, we will have to wait another couple of years before anything further is done towards this end. If industries are to be built up in Barbados, then before that time comes we will have to do something whereby the people will be qualified and efficient to play their part in building up those industries. Government has got to take the lead in such a programme because the economic conditions of the island are such that parents cannot afford to pay master workmen to learn their sons the trades. As a result, such children have to go directly where they can get something in exchange for the energy they put into any work that they may do, and it is definitely bad that so many of our boys and girls have to walk about asking for a job here and there. I feel that a technical school would absorb a lot of them. I take it that some of them would be resident pupils of the school. There is another point that I wish to stress as regards these bursaries. There are many boys reared in the almshouses whose parents died before the children matured. As far as I know, the Vestry Act does not permit the almshouses to keep a boy or girl beyond the age of 14 years. When they reach that age they have to leave the institution. Many of them leave unequipped to do any trade at all. I would like the Government to see to it that these children in these institutions are taught trades so that whenever they have to leave they will leave qualified to work for themselves. As a matter of fact, it is one of these same boys that suggested that point to me. It is good for an individual to be so mindful of his own plight and that of others, and it would be a good thing for the Government not only to increase the scholarships by 24, but also to extend the scope and give the people concerned the opportunity that they really deserve.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman—Again I have to rise. Parts of the speech of the last speaker might have been made with a measure of sincerity if they had been made in 1851. The purpose of a technical school is not to train craftsmen so that the employment situation would be such that people would be able to get cheap labour. Here is this Labourite crying over the people who are suffering. Those poor suffering workers are asking for wages which certainly cannot be considered princely, and he is saying that if you have these technical schools one would be able to get the services of these workers cheaper because supply and demand would come into play. Imagine a man who professes to be a Socialist urging the building of technical schools for the main purpose of providing cheap labour. That is what you get. The true man must show himself at sometime or other. He talks about the Barbados Scholarships. It is the products of the Barbados Scholarship that will run these technical schools. Does he not realise that these technical schools must be staffed by brilliant people? I do not know if his idea of a technical school is that it is a glorified carpenter's or mason's shop. But as far as I know it is much more than that. Some of the honourable members on the other side of the table who run factories know that the benefit of a technical school is not from the point of view of cheapening labour, but from the point of view of employers not having the task of training labour. They know very well that the more you train workmen the higher the cost will be. You cannot take a trained man and ask him to give cheap labour because of supply and demand. That is the old time system. If we followed that system in Barbados our wages would be the lowest in the British West Indies if not in the world. I rose to show that some people in their anxiety to criticize, show themselves up. I challenge any man who knows anything of what he is talking about to say that the purpose of a technical school is what the last speaker said—cheap labour.

Mr. ALLDER: I would like the honourable member to know that I am capable of hitting back in a logical and reasonable way. When I suggested that you should train more workmen, I did not mean that the employing class should be able to exploit them. What I did mean was that when carpenters, masons etc. are few their services are much in demand and their wages have to be higher. While that might be right if only the monied class were employing them, it would not be right when, numerically speaking, the majority who have to employ them are poor people, and many people have to pay these craftsmen more for a day's work than they themselves receive. What I am thinking about is a long term policy which would benefit the community generally. The honourable member can be cheap and misleading when it suits him, but the only reason why he represents Labour is because he gets remuneration and patronage. His general outlook will convince any intelligent eye that he is not the type who would sympathise with unfortunate people.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking you to stop.

Mr. ALLDER: You should have stopped the honourable member also.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking you to stick to Clause 2.

Mr. ALLDER: You sat here this evening and on three occasions you heard the honourable member make unnecessary remarks towards me. He said that I did not understand this and that. I hope that the day will never come when I will find myself boasting to be a genius in every respect. I am still learning, unlike the honourable member. The only thing he falls down in is proper manners and decency.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member attacked your speech. Attack his. Do not attack him personally.

Mr. ALLDER: My argument is that we have a large population, and an increasing one, and it is therefore regrettable that we are only making provision for 48 bursaries. I will repeat—and I am not ashamed to do so—that if you have few workmen you have to pay them more, and that creates a hardship on those of slender means. That is a fact that any political economist will support. I also mentioned the Barbados Scholarships. Everyone knows, Mr. Chairman, who gains these Scholarships, how much is spent on them, and what exploitation they practise when they come back as professionals. They all forget the good which the poor of this community has done for them. They come back here, and because their services are in demand they demand every pound of flesh. Then you get nothing in return from them. I am saying that we are spending a large amount on the Barbados Scholarships, definitely more than we are spending to qualify many of our children whose parents can never hope to send them to win a Scholarship and to have such money spent on them when they go overseas. I say that whatever is done you should see that the majority benefit. Why is that? When you get some shortsighted individuals who are partial, they are very partial indeed, and what is worse, their partiality goes towards those who are in a position to protect and provide for themselves. I still feel that these problems are not being solved by those persons who say that they are people of responsibility. These problems call for level headedness and an impartial approach. I am not surprised at the honourable member attacking me. I am surprised that he has not yet attacked me physically. I am told that he is beating everybody now. You see, Mr. Chairman, when we are certain that those in responsibility are not trying to solve the problem we have to do our best to try to save Barbados. I will try. However, Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Government will consider the advisability of making provision for a greater number of our unemployed sons and daughters to become qualified artisans and craftsmen in the various classes of occupation which would put them in greater demand, so that greater benefits would accrue to this community.

Clause 2 was passed.

On separate motions of Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, the CHAIRMAN reported, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported the passing of the bill in committee.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER FARM INSTITUTE PROPOSAL

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker—that clears the Order Paper as far as I am concerned. But there is one thing I would like to deal with—a Reply to Message No. 15 of the 27th of April, 1951, in connection with the establishment in Trinidad of a Farm Institute for the Eastern Caribbean. We have not yet replied to that Message from His Excellency the Governor, and a reply is urgently required. I am now asking leave to move the passing of an Address in reply to that Message.

There being no objection leave was granted.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move, Sir, that the following Address do now pass:—

The House of Assembly To His Excellency the Governor

The House of Assembly respectfully acknowledges receipt of Your Excellency's Message No. 15/1951 concerning the establishment of a Farm Institute for the Eastern Caribbean in Trinidad.

The House of Assembly in response to Your Excellency's request beg to state that they approve of the Barbados Government participating in the said scheme.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker—This is another of those things which the Colonial Development and Welfare Organisation and the British Government are forcing on these poor colonies. The expenditure of this amount of money does not mean that we are going to be in any way assisted with greater production. \$20,000 capital expenditure and then a recurrent annual expenditure of \$6,039 is what we will have to face, and I cannot see the benefits that will accrue from it. C.D. & W. have been running around for the past number of years. There are all these agricultural stations that cost a lot of money per year; and what increase in food production has resulted from it all? We spend a lot of money at the Pine Livestock Station, and the island is still suffering from low milk production. We still have to import large quantities of condensed and powdered milk. British Guiana is a bigger country than we are, and they have refused to participate in the scheme. Probably they have seen the wisdom of not joining in. I cannot see how it will help us. I say that if we take all this money we are spending on these high falutin schemes and help the peasants to get ahead with food production we will be helping the island a lot more. When we spend all this money, will we see an extra pint of milk, or an extra pound of yams, or an extra head of cabbage produced? No, not one. You will not see another peasant with a cow grazing by the side of the road, assisted by the Government to supply a couple gills of milk to his neighbours. But we will still be able to console ourselves with the fact that we have joined this scheme.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker—The idea of a farm institute in Trinidad is an excellent one, because people would be trained in agricultural methods, and when they go back to the various colonies that participate in the scheme, they will be able to give of their knowledge to the natives of those colonies. Obviously, the extent, to which we can benefit is limited. Therefore, while we should be willing to participate in the scheme we should be willing to do so to the extent to which we can derive some benefit. Originally, we were asked to contribute \$14,000 towards the capital cost. On the basis of that contribution the Legislature felt that the return we would get justified the expenditure. Now we are being asked, because British Guiana has defected, to increase our contribution. The question now is whether the benefits to be derived justify that increased expenditure, and speaking for myself, I believe that the matter needs a little more consideration. The expenditure of \$20,000 towards the capital cost and \$6,000 recurrent annual expenditure is a bit high, and would go a long way in Barbados towards the establishment of our own agricultural technical school. In these matters, it is of course a very good thing for the West Indies to act federally, so to speak, because if they act unilaterally, the benefit to be derived by the region is more limited. But in the matter of an agricultural and technical school it can hardly be said that we are duplicating our activities if each of the larger colonies had its own

institute. In view of the necessity which exists in this colony for proper agricultural and technical training—we discussed the latter just now in the Bursaries Bill—I think, sir, that we might with advantage give a little more consideration to this matter which is before us now. It is evident that the institute must confer practical benefits on the participating colonies; but the question is how do the advantages compare with the amount of money that we are going to spend. I do believe that we should postpone consideration of this until next meeting so that we can give it a little more attention. We contribute to the Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture, and we derive from it benefit to the extent of our contribution, and probably more. It is possible that the farm institute may repay us more than we spend; but no harm will be done if we consider the matter a little further. The agricultural products of the area are similar. British Guiana, apart from its well known attitude towards isolationism as far as West Indian federation is concerned, must have had fairly good reasons for not agreeing to participate in the scheme. I think we should consider the matter further. We may decide to expend the increased amount, or we may decide that it would be far better to use this money towards the establishment and maintenance of our own agricultural and technical school. I therefore move that further consideration of this Address be postponed.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Speaker—The last honourable member who spoke has to my mind approached this matter from a more reasonable standpoint than the honourable member who spoke before him. But it seems to me that he defeated the first part of his speech by the second part. In the first part he said quite definitely what to my mind is the most important consideration—that the scheme will be of benefit to us. Having said that, he goes on to speculate as to how much the scheme will benefit us, saying that while it might be all right to pay the amount originally asked for, it might not be worth our while to pay the extra amount.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of explanation, sir—I said nothing of the sort. I said that while we agreed to the original suggestion to participate in the scheme at a cost of \$14,000, we might be well advised to consider the advisability of increasing our contribution to the extent asked for in the revised Message.

Mr. MAPP: The honourable member uses the same words. It is the extent to which we might benefit that he is not clear about. My point is that it is not a matter about which you can speculate. How can you measure in terms of money the benefits to be derived or not from spending this extra money? If you say that it will benefit us by sending back students with agricultural knowledge which they will spread among others in the various participating colonies, then it seems obvious to me that the obvious thing to do, having already agreed as to the desirability of this institute, is to put the money up. It does not seem logical to argue that we should postpone consideration of this because we do not know to what extent it will benefit us.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable member seems to be suggesting that we cannot benefit at all if we do not participate in this institute. Originally we were asked to put up \$14,000 and we agreed on that. The point is whether or not it will be more beneficial to spend the amount now asked for on our own institute.

Mr. MAPP: When we considered the first Message we agreed that this scheme would benefit the colony. It is not a matter of to any certain extent. The first cost has not been extended. The entire

scheme will cost the same. But it is costing Barbados more because British Guiana does not want to participate in the scheme. You cannot speculate as to the extent that any scheme of this sort will benefit us. The point is that we have already agreed that it will benefit us. Having come to that conclusion, it is our duty to participate in the scheme, as the entire scheme is not costing us more. You will either have to put up the \$6,000 a year, or upset the whole scheme and say regardless of the fact that it is going to benefit us, we will not pay the extra amount. I feel, sir, that the question which we must decide is whether the scheme will benefit us or not. We have already decided that it will. If we know that this colony depends on agriculture, if we agree that it is a good thing to train local people in agricultural methods, we should go on with the scheme. It certainly seems as if this Chamber does not know its own mind, if after saying a short time ago that we agree to participate in the scheme, we now say that we do not agree. If we were willing to put up \$14,000, why not put up the extra \$6,000 to-day? If we participate in this scheme we will have properly trained people to help us with our agriculture on which our economy is based. We will be training people to teach others. There are some people who just get up and talk their mouths off, and that is all. Some people want progress, and when you show them it they oppose it.

Mr. MILLER: It is unnecessary, Mr. Speaker, to ask us to postpone this.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion has not been seconded.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker,—All day we have been discussing questions of technical schools, training children in the almshouses etc. We are agriculturally minded, and we must rely on any agricultural skill that will help the country to produce more food. I must agree that the Agricultural Department has paid great dividends. This year we have a peak crop, and for that we can point with pride to the scientific help given by that department. Now you are being given an opportunity to help people who cannot help themselves. You must admit that in this island it is the peasantry who produce most of the food that is consumed. Every factory owner will tell you to-day that he cannot grow pigs for slaughter. The cabbage, beets, and the other vegetables that are consumed locally are almost entirely produced by peasants. Now there is this opportunity by which the colony can benefit, and you heard to-day all the talk about technical schools and learning people this and that. But here is an opportunity to do something and we are asked to postpone it. We will achieve nothing until this Chamber realises its responsibility, and realises that politics is not the only medium through which you get anything. I wish that honourable members would realise that this is one of the occasions when we can do something to help the country.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker—I do not think that this is a matter that calls for the engendering of heat. I think it is a matter that calls for commonsense. I do not think that anyone in Barbados with a sense of responsibility would object to participating in any scheme that would train people to help with the improvement of our agricultural methods. But in a democratic country because some people may express a view that is contrary to the view expressed by others, it should not be thought that they are necessarily opposed to the principle of the idea. I speak for all on this side of the table when I say that we so much realise our re-

sponsibility that we could not think of opposing a scheme of this sort. But it must be borne in mind that when you have to decide on a thing like this, something which must go to the benefit of the West Indies and not Barbados alone, is it asking too much if one asks for a postponement? Is that saying that you are against it? There is a lot in what some honourable members have said. If you are going to build technical schools in an agricultural community, you cannot create schools that will merely train carpenters and masons. How can you have a technical school unless some part of it is attached to the Agricultural Department? We have agreed with the principle of this scheme. Is there anything wrong in having a Select Committee to give it further consideration? It is all very well to say yes we agree to vote this money. But British Guiana seems to have backed out, and as a result we are asked to put up \$6,000 more. This is a first class scheme, and I cannot see anything wrong with it in principle. I did not hear the speech of the honourable junior member for St. Philip, but I am sure that he has not said that he is nothing to do with it. Any person of responsibility in this country would agree that we should go into anything that means the development of agricultural skill and farming. But I do not see why the Government should oppose sending it to a Select Committee. I am therefore going to make a motion that this matter be referred to a Select Committee. I do it in good faith, and I hope that the Deputy Leader of the House will accept it as such. I need fear what no man will say when I discharge my conscience both inside and outside this Chamber. If some honourable members think that another is talking nonsense because he expresses a different view, that is their business. Perhaps we will learn other views in select committee, and perhaps the Government will be able to give us more information. I now formally move, sir, that this Address be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. HAYNES: I beg to second that, Mr. Speaker. I am only doing it for the simple reason that it is very difficult to get information on these matters behind the bar of the House. When you go into select committee you can get full information, or at least you have a chance of doing so; and if you do not get it, you know what you are laying yourself open to. I personally think that it would be a very good scheme; but I would like to know more about it. I was not in the House when the first Message came down, and I do not know what the debate on that occasion was. I cannot be satisfied in my own conscience until I get more information about it, and that is why I am seconding the motion that it be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker—This is a scheme from which we cannot say exactly what benefit we will get. It is something that has already been considered in this House as something good. The original scheme has not been changed, and therefore if we pass this Address now we will be only joining the same scheme that we agreed to join before. British Guiana has already decided not to join. They must have their own reasons for doing so. Whatever their reasons are, we have already agreed in this House to join. I do not think any honourable member can accuse me of not wishing things postponed for further consideration. I am always saying that there are things on which we should go into in committee. Having already agreed to the principle of the scheme, there is only one question that we have to decide now—whether we can afford to pay this extra \$6,000. I believe that the colony will get extra student places

for the extra amount. British Guiana was to have had four places, and now that she has backed out, there will have to be a dividing up of those places. As I have already said, the only question that the Select Committee, if it is appointed, will have to decide is whether we should spend this extra amount. I am not saying that you cannot buy gold too dear. But the time has passed when this House can turn the scheme down and still have its reputation, its reputation for being a responsible Chamber. Trying to get out of a thing after we have agreed to it is not going to do the name of this Chamber any good. If we had an opportunity of reviewing all the resolutions that we have passed this session, we might come to entirely different conclusions from those we reached when we passed those resolutions. I do not think that this House is competent tonight to say whether or not we can afford this extra amount. The Governor-in-Executive Committee are the only people who can say that, because they are the only people who know what the financial position of the island is. If I felt that there was any good to be obtained by sending this to a select committee I would vote with the members who proposed it. But if we get into the habit of agreeing with something and then turning it down it does not look to me that that is a good position for this House to take up. A member of the House went to Trinidad for the celebrations of the Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture. I think they heard all about this scheme down there. As far as I am concerned, and I was going to turn it down, I would have turned it down ever since. But I think that it is going to be a very beneficial scheme I understand that students will learn and become *au fait* with up-to-date agricultural methods. I have said what I have said merely to show honourable members that I am not against the select committee proposal; but I do not see what else can be decided.

Mr. REECE: Mr. Speaker—The last honourable member said that the House cannot judge the financial position of the island. But every member of the House receives every quarter a financial statement showing the financial position of the island, and if that it is a faithful and accurate account, he will be able to say exactly —

Mr. LEWIS: On a point of explanation, sir—what I really meant was that the Governor-in-Executive Committee in addition to knowing what revenue is collected, will also know what schemes it has to send down to us.

Mr. REECE: He also seems to be suggesting that the only thing we can do is to reject the scheme or accept it, and that the additional expenditure should in no way influence the House. Then, if all the other colonies dropped out, we would have to carry the whole scheme on our shoulders. Up to now only one has dropped out. Let us hope that no one else will. It has been agreed by all on this side that the scheme is a good one. But we want a little more information. Is there any provision by which these students will have to return to Barbados and serve a number of years so that we will receive the benefit of the knowledge that they have gained? There is one other thing. The honourable senior member for St. George is always accusing the members on this side of a lack of responsibility. I would like to assure him that the members on this side are as alive to their responsibility as any member on that side, not even the honourable member excepted, and the honourable member must know; because he is the son of a man who was a die hard conservative, and for that reason he must appreciate the sense of responsibility that exists on this side of the House. Furthermore, the

honourable member can only be characterised as a capitalist, and he knows that a man who has to expend a large sum of money must look to see exactly how his money is going to be expended.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker,— No one can question the fact that a scheme of this sort will be of benefit to agriculture throughout the West Indies. But the fact that British Guiana has now dropped out puts a different light on it. While the over-all picture is the same, the individual ratio has increased. When we look around the West Indies to-day, and hear of the economic situation in many of the islands, it is wise for us in a matter of this sort to give the greatest consideration possible. That, sir, is my first reason for agreeing that the Address should go to a Select Committee. My second reason is this: at this stage our ratio having increased, it will possibly be worth our thought and investigation to find out whether an establishment within our own shores with this amount of money would not be more beneficial to us. We have the Pine Livestock Station and the Pine Agricultural Station. We also have throughout the island several stations connected with agriculture. We have, too, a first class Department of Agriculture, and I am wondering whether it would not be more beneficial to us rather than expend this money in the shores of Trinidad, our ratio having been increased, to spend it at home in Barbados. There are other things which I could mention sir, but I think that others who have spoken in favour of sending this Address to a Select Committee have given sufficient reasons.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,— As someone said to-night, this is a democratic House, and we are living in a democratic age. I do feel, therefore that the majority opinion should carry weight. (Cheers). Of course, I may feel that there is no point in sending it to a Select Committee or postponing it. But if the majority wishes to send it to a Select Committee, I will accept the suggestion. It is true that the scheme was accepted by the House. They accepted it under certain conditions, and those conditions have now been changed, and therefore the House is asking for more time to examine the new situation. I personally do not feel that they are going to back down. I do not think that anyone has expressed that opinion. I accept the motion that the Address be referred to a Select Committee. (Cheers).

The motion that the Address be referred to a Select Committee was put and carried *nem. con.*

Mr. Speaker with the approval of the House appointed the following members as the Select Committee:—

MR. MILLER, MR. LEWIS, MR. CRAWFORD, DR. CUMMINS, MR. MOTTLEY and MR. HAYNES.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,— I am addressing the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: In connection with what? With the personnel of the Committee?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am asking that the name of the honourable junior member for St. George be added because of his experience in such matters as the subject of this Address.

Dr. CUMMINS: I have no objection, sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to add the name of the honourable junior member for St. George (Mr. Dowding).

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Speaker,— I am going to move that we go to Private Members' Business; that we resume committee on the Bill to amend the Gas Works' Act, 1911. On the last occasion that we

discussed Private Members' Business, I have a recollection that the first Order was an Address in the name of the Honourable Senior Member for St. John. Had the Order Paper been fixed, it would have occupied its rightful place.

Mr. SPEAKER: The fixing of the Order Paper is the responsibility of this House. If it is not fixed it is no individual member's fault.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable member began to discuss the Address. It was before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Order Paper not being fixed is no individual member's fault.

Mr. ALLDER: I asked that it be made the first order of the day on that particular occasion. That made it No. 1 on the Order Paper.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE ON GAS WORKS BILL

On the order being called for the House to resume Committee on the Bill to amend the Gas Works' Act, 1911. His Honour the Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. Smith in the Chair.

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman,— When we were last in committee on this Bill we got as far as Clause 3. When we reached that clause, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph intimated to me that there were one or two points that he wanted to discuss with the Attorney General before proceeding. As you will remember, sir, since that date the company's solicitors have met with the Attorney General, and they have had a meeting with the Colonial Secretary. As a result of the conversation with the Attorney General, the solicitors were asked to submit a new draft. That new draft was submitted, and certain amendments were suggested by the Attorney General and the Colonial Secretary. These amendments were eventually agreed upon last Saturday, and I have in my hand a letter from the Colonial Secretary informing me—owing to the illness of the introducer of the Bill the honourable senior member for St. James—informing me that they are in agreement with the amendments put forward with the exception of two clauses which are still to be agreed on. The first definition is that of Calorific Value which I am afraid is beyond all of us. The second point concerns the price which has been reduced. I would like to explain that this discussion started two years ago when the Gas Co. had been paying 60 to 72 cents per thousand feet for natural gas. Unfortunately for the Government and everyone else, the price of natural gas was based on the price of Gulf oil, and Gulf oil has increased, and now for the last two months the price of natural gas instead of being 60 cents per thousand feet has gone up to \$1.069. When the House was discussing this Bill two months ago, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph—I am sorry that he is not here today—had agreed to support me. But the mere fact that he seconded my motion on that occasion will show his intention to support me. It was agreed that the price of natural gas to the wholesaler should be fixed at 77 cents. Unfortunately, it was discovered, and probably just in time, that under the license to the British Union Oil Co., which had been extended from time to time and which was extended up to the 15th of last month, Government could not fix any price. It was entirely a matter for the B.U.O.C. But the Government having now taken over the duties of distributing natural gas, have agreed that the price will be 77 cents, in other words, roughly 7 per cent more than when the figures which were placed before the committee were discussed. The company on their part have agreed

that the surcharge which was put on gas bills on account of the price rise to \$1,069 that surcharge of 10 per cent would be deducted, or rather taken off until such time as this Bill comes into force. Some honourable members may think this peculiar. But the Bill does not come into force when it passes this House. It has to go to the Other Place, then await the Governor's signature and the approval of the Secretary of State for the Colonies. After that adjustments will have to be made to the old burners so that they will consume natural gas only. At the moment they are consuming a mixture of natural gas and coal gas. All that takes time. Now the Attorney General has pointed out that most of the clauses of this Bill will be unnecessary as soon as the Board is appointed under the Public Utilities Bill. That Board will have full power to adjust prices and see that fair charges are made, and that there is no over-profiting. But the only clause that I think is really for the Utility Board to enforce is the clause altering the system of charging by measurement to charging by heating capacity. I understand that the Public Utilities Bill with amendments was passed by the Other Place this evening. It will probably be three weeks before we get those amendments here, and then they will have to be considered by the House. It has been suggested that we should try to get this Bill passed at once, so that the consumers of gas will get the benefit of natural gas in the near future. We are getting some benefit to-day, because there is a mixture of natural gas and coal gas being used; but when this Bill is passed it is expected that we will get the full benefit of pure natural gas which has a very great heating capacity. I propose, sir, with your permission, first to re-commit Clause 2 of the Bill with the definition of "calorific value". The Director of Natural Gas and Petroleum has preferred the definition used in Canada to the definition used in England. To the honourable senior member for St. James and to me, and I am afraid, to most members, the definition is double dutch. But after all we have imported experts, and I suppose we must accept their definitions. I have here several typed copies of the Bill which I will ask the Clerk to hand out to honourable members. I am now moving, sir, that Clause 2 be re-committed.

Mr. F. C. BETHELL seconded.

The question was put and agreed to *nem. con.*

Mr. WILKINSON: I now ask leave to withdraw the old Clause 2 and to substitute and have read Clause 2 in the typed copy of the Bill.

There being no objection leave was granted.

Mr. WILKINSON: I move that Clause 2 in the typed copy be Clause 2 of the Bill.

Mr. BETHELL seconded.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman—this calls for expert knowledge. We have had a strenuous fight which has gone on too long. I think that the price of gas to the Gas Co. is something like 66 cents per therm. They were asking 48 cents. The point in the alteration of the system of measuring gas which goes to consumers is that rather than having a meter that will measure the rate by the volume of a therm of gas, it is now proposed to base it on the combustible units in that volume of gas. This will mean a tremendous saving to consumers. They will be paying for the gas that they actually consume, and not for an unknown quantity. After 76 years of operation by this company we find only 19 miles of pipe line to supply this community. All the bakeries could use natural gas with great advantage. Since the Bill has been before us I have been very scepti-

cal about it. Now I have been assured that some agreement has been reached, and the Public Utility Board will take over soon. What I want to see is gas being sold at a price that is within the reach of the man who wants it. Why should we have to import kerosene oil and other forms of fuel when nature has blessed us with natural gas? I hope that the honourable member who is in charge of the Bill will appreciate my feelings. This matter has been delayed for two years. What I am concerned about is that we have two wells. I think that the greatest thing in the history of the present Government is the nationalisation of these two wells. Today we have a well being used and another that can be used to the benefit of the community. What are we going to do now? Wait for more mains and let the gas evaporate? I think it is just due to mercenary motives that this gas has not been utilized. I shall await with great interest to see the Public Utility Board decide whether the price we are going to fix tonight should continue. Natural gas costs nothing. It is not like water that you have to pump. The gas itself will produce the pressure. I think that this Bill has been delayed for unnecessary reasons. I would like this to be passed. In Clause 2, something has been produced that the country should be grateful for.

The question that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill was put and agreed to *nem. con.*

Mr. WILKINSON: I am now asking leave, sir, to withdraw the balance of the old clauses in the Bill and substitute therefor the ones in the typed copy supplied.

There being no objection leave was granted.

Mr. WILKINSON: I would now like to move that the new Clause 3 stand part. I appreciate the remarks made by the honourable senior member for St. George, and I can assure him that it is the intention of the Government to endeavour to put natural gas within the use of everyone. I must draw this to his attention. The price of natural gas to the consumer must naturally depend on the price charged the company by Government. I think that I mentioned before that the Government is not yet in a position to arrive at a figure which would be economical to the Natural Gas Corporation. As they say—and I appreciate their point of view—they do not know yet the amount of compensation that will have to be paid to the British Union Oil Co. Naturally, when that is fixed, they will endeavour to recover it over a period of years by adding something to the price of gas. In the meantime, consumers will have to pay what is charged. I might mention that in Canada the price of natural gas is 20 cents. I am sure that the Government will endeavour as soon as possible to fix a price so that as many consumers as possible will be able to benefit from what I call God's gift to the island. The time will come when the Government will be able to reduce the price of gas, and then the company will be also bound to reduce the price to the consumer. At any rate the Public Utility Board will be there to compel the company to do that. Until then the only alternative is the price of 1/8 and 1/6 per therm which is the price agreed to by us and the Director of Petroleum and Natural Gas. I now beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

Mr. GODDARD seconded.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman—What I would like to know is what has caused this great change towards this Bill by honourable members. I was one of the members of the committee for fixing the price of the commodity, and the company was represented by the manager and auditor. We had a

technical officer in the person of Mr. C. A. Coppin to go through the details and recommend the price that should be asked. After going into the annual cost of buying gas, the loss which takes place through the pipes as they claimed, the amount for depreciation of the plant etc., it was agreed that if they were given permission to sell at 25 cents per therm they would make money. The committee decided that since it was claimed that through the war years they lost a couple of thousand units through leakage from the pipes, they would at least permit them to sell at 30 cents a therm. Now we hear that it is decided to sell at 1/8 per therm. The honourable junior member for St. James has raised the argument that the company is now paying more. But if you take it on a percentage basis you will see that they should still not be charging 1/8, taking into account that their management agreed that they would not lose money if they sold at 25 cents, but the committee agreed that in view of the war time loss they would be allowed to charge 30 cents. Now this ten cents over has been suddenly added. The percentage in the initial cost has not been increased commensurately with what they have added. But everyone seems to be enamoured of the Bill. Natural gas is a natural product in the bed of the earth. It is like the air that we breathe. The company is permitted to charge for tapping the gas and putting it into the homes of consumers. Mr. Chairman, I do not see why this ten cents was allowed to be added. A battle royal went on over the fixing of the price, and that is why this Bill has been on the Order Paper for two years. Now there has been definitely a *volte face*. I just wanted to bring that point to the notice of this committee. I know that the Bill will go through. But I am not convinced that the consumers could not have got this gas at a cheaper rate.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman,— I happened to be one who made a stand for 30 cents a therm. The last speaker has talked about a change of mind, and I take it that he is referring to me. But the honourable member often fails to examine a thing before speaking. It is true that we made a stand for 30 cents; but at that time the company was paying 66 cents for gas, while to-day they are paying over a dollar. The company originally asked for 48 cents per therm when they were paying 66 cents. To-day they are paying over a dollar and they ask for 34 cents and the honourable member calls it a *volte face*. Does the honourable member realise that this is a serious Chamber?

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,— I do not think we need join the price fight in here. If we compare the 40 cents charged when the company wanted to charge 48 cents and were paying 66 cents with the figures to-day, that is one dollar being paid by the company and they asking 34 cents, it seems to me that you must have an extraordinary mind to call it a *volte face* on the part of those who agree with it. With regard to sub-clause (2) of Clause 3 that contains a provision with which I cannot agree, because to my mind it is entirely against the socialist way of running a public utility. According to this sub-clause the company may charge a price greater or less than the basic price, but shall not declare any larger dividend in respect of the ordinary capital of the company than at the rate of 7½ per cent per annum, which is the basic rate of dividend. But they are allowed to declare a larger dividend if the average selling price of gas is less than the basic price, when to the extent of every penny reduction in the average selling price of gas below the basic price, the

company may increase the basic rate of dividend by one per cent. In ordinary terms, if the company reduces the price of gas, it means that they are making sufficient profit on their outlay to justify or allow such a reduction to the consumer, and they are allowed to increase the basic rate of dividend by one per cent. They are allowed to increase the rate of dividend to the shareholders, but they are not allowed to reduce the rate to the consumer. There is a safeguard which we should insert in every Bill of this sort. I feel that the Company should not be allowed to increase the price of gas before they declare a less dividend. I am sorry that I did not know that the honourable member was bringing up this to-night. I would like to have a postponement to get an amendment drafted even if it was defeated. I am told that the Public Utility Bill will attend to all of this. The honourable member who introduced this says that the Public Utility Bill passed the Other Place this evening. The Public Utility Board will have full power to fix charges. But if we agree with the amendments made by the Other Place the Board will not have full powers; they will have less powers. It is the Chief Justice and the big experts who will have the power. I think that now is the time to safeguard the consumer in a Bill of this sort. I know that the other side has the members but I am still going to put my motion because I believe that my case is right and proper. It is done in other countries. You do not allow a public utility company to charge more for its product unless they reduce the dividend. The only way to show that they are losing is when they reduce the dividend paid to the shareholders. I am very glad that the Government took the advice of the expert. We on this side of the House forced an adjournment, and it has resulted in a benefit to the consumer. It shows you that capital is never willing to give in on anything reasonable when it affects people not directly concerned with them. I am moving, sir, that consideration of this section be postponed.

Mr. ALLDER: I beg to second that. I think it would be a good thing to do. These new clauses were only put into our hands to-night, and we certainly did not have time to study them. Not long ago when the Other Side wanted the Farm Institute Address postponed, there was talk of democracy. I am making the same appeal to them now, to postpone this and give us a chance of going through it.

The question that further consideration of the clause be postponed was put and resolved in the negative the Committee dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. MAPP, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. ALLDER, and Mr. MILLER—(4).

Noes: Mr. WARD, Mr. DOWDING, Mr. BETHELL, Mr. GILL, Mr. HAYNES, Mr. GODDARD, Mr. WILKINSON, Mr. MOTTLEY and Mr. REECE—(9).

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Chairman,— Before the question is put for the passing of the section, I want to say that I did not hear the introducer of this Bill explain why in sub-clause 3 it is necessary to wait two years after the passing of this Act for it to be shown to the satisfaction of the Governor and both Houses of the Legislature etc. that the cost and charges of and incidental to the giving of a supply of gas have substantially altered since such date for the Governor-in-Executive Committee to revise the basic rate. Why make it two years? Why not make it one?

Mr. WILKINSON: The original Bill had three years. The period of two years was agreed upon between the Government and the company. The Attorney General stated last Saturday that when

the Public Utilities Bill comes into operation that Board could do it in two weeks.

Mr. MAPP: The explanation is a reasonable one. It shows the willingness of the company to compromise. But I would have gone a step further and reduced it to one year. The only argument that makes me sit down is the argument about the Public Utility Board.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,— I would like the assistance of the honourable junior member for Christ Church. I do not understand the last couple of lines of sub-clause 3, "as shall be approved by the Governor and Legislature." I do not understand that. I have never seen it before. Is it redundant?

Mr. REECE: Mr. Chairman,— Perhaps I can explain it. While the Governor-in-Executive Committee will make amendments, the Executive Committee itself is a statutory body, and these amendments will have to be submitted to the Legislature for approval. The Legislature consists of the Governor, the House and the Other Place. The Executive Committee is purely a statutory body.

Mr. LEWIS: Therefore the word "Governor" is redundant if the Legislature includes the Governor.

The question that Clause 3 stand part was put and agreed to.

Clause 4 was read and passed.

Clause 5 was read.

Mr. WILKINSON moved seconded by Mr. GODDARD that Clause 5 stand part.

Mr. MAPP: I would like to question this penalty not exceeding 40/- to be charged for each day the company neglects to do certain things. Forty shillings would not make some individuals change their minds, far less a company. Is it 40/- or is that a mistake for £40.

Mr. REECE: I would like to draw the attention of the honourable member to Section 21 of the Principal Act which carries the same penalty.

Mr. MAPP: The Principal Act we know was made in 1911, three years before the first World War. I move that the word "shillings" be deleted and the word "pounds" substituted therefor.

Mr. ALLDER: I beg to second that. I cannot see how you are going to punish a big concern by a penalty of 40/-.

The question that the word "shillings" stand part of the clause was put and decided in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. WARD, Mr. DOWDING, Mr. BETHELL, Mr. GILL, Mr. GODDARD, Mr. WILKINSON, Mr. MOTTLEY and Mr. REECE—(10).

Noes: Mr. MAPP, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. MILLER and Mr. BRANCKER—(5).

Clause 5 was passed.

Clause 6 was read and passed.

The following was passed as Clause 7:—

"Where in the principal Act or in any Act amending the same, reference is made to pounds shillings and pence, the principal Act and such amending Act shall have effect as if for such reference there were substituted a reference to an

equivalent amount of dollars and cents computed at the rate of four dollars and eighty cents for every pound, twenty-four cents for every shilling and two cents for every penny.

Clause 7 now 8 was read and passed.

The Preamble was read and agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. WILKINSON seconded by Mr. GODDARD, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee with amendments, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

BILL TO AMEND VESTRY'S COST OF LIVING ACT

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker—I am asking leave to take No. 53 standing in my name as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection leave was granted.

The order was called for Mr. Dowding to move the second reading of the Bill to amend the Vestries (Cost of Living Bonus to Employees) Act, 1947, as amended by sundry Acts.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker—This is the usual Bill brought to the House every year. It has been brought on previous occasions by the honourable senior member for the City; but the Vestry of St. Michael have consolidated their salaries. Other Vestries have to get permission to pay cost of living bonus to their employees. Honourable members are well acquainted with this Bill, and I now move that it be read a second time.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman—I am going to suggest to the honourable member to see if there is not some means of getting this Bill on the list of expiring laws.

The question that the Bill be read a second time was put and agreed to *nem. con.*

On motion of Mr. Dowding seconded by Mr. MOTTLEY His Honour left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

The two Clauses of the Bill were read and passed.

On separate motions of Mr. Dowding seconded by Mr. MOTTLEY the Chairman reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

On separate motions of Mr. Dowding seconded by Mr. MOTTLEY the Bill was read a third time and passed and the title read and agreed to.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the House do now adjourn until this day fortnight at 3 p.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to *nem. con.*, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.