THE

# House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1950—51

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

*Tuesday, 2nd October*, 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*), Messrs. G. H. Adams, B.A., E. L. Ward, Dr. H. G. Cummins, M.D., C.M., His Honour Mr. A. E. S Lewis (*Deputy Speaker*), Messrs. M. E. Cox, L. E. Smith (*Chairman of Committees*), F. L. Walcott, R. G. Mapp, E. K. Walcott, K.C., F. C. Goddard, O. T. Allder, L. E. R. Gill and J. A. Haynes, B.A.

Prayers were read.

### MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the 18th September, 1951, having been circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

### MESSAGES FROM THE GOVERNOR

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

MESSAGE NO. 33/1951

*His Excellency The Governor*

*To*

*The Honourable The House of Assembly*

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that he proposes to prorogue the Legislature of this Island with a view to the dissolution of the General Assembly on Tuesday, the 6th of November, next, and to open the Legislature on Tuesday, the 18th of December, next.

2. His Excellency the Governor desires to notify the Honourable the House of Assembly of the following dates in connection with the holding of the General Election:—

Issue of Writs—Thursday, the 8th of November.
Nomination Day—Thursday, the 22nd of November.
General Election—Thursday, the 13th of December.

ALFRED SAVAGE,
Governor.

Government House,
Bridgetown.
25th September, 1951.

MESSAGE NO. 34/1951.

*His Excellency The Governor*

*To*

*The Honourable The House of Assembly*

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to refer the attention of the Honourable the House of Assembly to a Memorandum of Agreement dated the 13th September, 1951, which, in accordance with its terms, has been submitted to the Sugar Producers' Federation of Barbados and the Barbados Workers' Union for their consideration and which, it is understood, has been confirmed by these organisations. Copies of this Memorandum of Agreement are being laid in the Honourable the House of Assembly today.

2. Legislation is being urgently prepared to implement

(1) that portion of paragraph 1 (c) of the Memorandum of Agreement which refers to the payment ,when the sugar crop of any one year (in the years 1951, 1952 and 1953) exceeds the average of the five preceding years, of an additional cess of $1.80 per ton to the Labour Welfare Fund;

(2) paragraph 1 (d) of the Memorandum of Agreement, which relates to the reduction, whenever the Island's crop exceeds 120,000 tons or its equivalent, of the present cess of $6.00 per ton payable to the Price Stabilisation Fund by 60c. per ton or $1.20 per ton according to whether the crop is below or exceeds the previous five-year average, and the increase by an equivalent amount of the present cess of $2.40 per ton payable to the Labour Welfare Fund.

3. It has been decided not to implement during the Calendar year 1951 that portion of paragraph 1 (c) of the Memorandum of Agreement which relates to the payment of a cess of $2 per

ton to a Harbour Fund. Further consideration is being given to the question and separate legislation will be prepared as soon as a decision has been reached.

4. His Excellency understands that the improved bonus scheme, to which reference is made in paragraph 1 (a) of the Memorandum of Agreement, is already being implemented.

ALFRED SAVAGE,
Governor.

Government House,
Bridgetown.
2nd October, 1951.

## PAPERS LAID

Mr. ADAMS: I am commanded to lay on the Table of the House the following Papers:—

The Public Officers' Loan and Travelling Allowances (Amendment) Regulations, 1951.

The Travelling Allowance (Amendment) Regulations, 1951.

Memorandum of Agreement concerning proposals relating to the Sugar Industry of this Colony.

Annual Report of the Department of Science and Agriculture for the year 1949–50.

## PETITIONS

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, —I beg to present a petition from the Vestry of the parish of St. James praying the House to pass a Bill authorising them to borrow a sum or sums of money not exceeding $4,320.00 for the purpose of replacing the roof of the Chancel of the Parish Church. The petition is respectfully worded and I ask that it be taken as read.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to present a petition from the Commissioners of Highways of the parishes of St. Joseph and St. John praying the House to pass a Bill authorising them to increase the salary and travelling allowance of their respective Inspectors of Highways. The petition is respectfully worded and I ask that it be taken as read.

In each case the petition was taken as read.

Mr. BETHELL entered the House and took his seat.

## NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of $370,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1951–52, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1951–52, No. 26, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of $16,330 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1951–52, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1951–52, No. 27 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of $300 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1951–52, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1951-52, No. 28 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of $26,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1951–52, Part I, Current, as shown in Supplementary Estimates, 1951–52, No. 29 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: In connection with these Resolutions I should like to explain that the first one is for the purpose of paying a cost of living allowance to the Civil Servants. The second one is for the payment of a cost of living allowance to teachers of First and Second Grade Schools who retired at any time between the 16th June, 1951, and the date of the passing of the Resolution—teachers who were transferred from the service of the island to the service of the Crown elsewhere between the 16th June, 1951, and the date of the passing of the Resolution. The other two Resolutions are for the payment of cost of living allowances to the officers of the Peasants' Loan Bank and Government Pensioners, respectively.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to pay with effect from the 16th day of June, 1951, a cost of living allowance to officers employed under Colonial Development and Welfare Schemes at the rates, and subject to the terms and conditions set out in the Schedule.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to pay with effect from the 16th of June, 1951, a cost of living allowance to officers in the full time service of the Savings Bank who receive their salaries from the funds of the Bank and officers who retired from the full time service of the Bank at any time between the 16th day of June, 1951, and the date of the passing of this Resolution in circumstances rendering them eligible for the grant of a pension or gratuity.

Mr. ADAMS: A Bill intituled an Act to amend the Government Scholarships and Exhibitions Act, 1949.

Mr. ADAMS: In connection with this Bill, I shall ask leave to deal with it in all its stages today. The results of the Barbados Scholarship this year being somewhat complicated, it is essential to pass this Bill today in order that Scholarships may be awarded. The object is to award five Scholarships this year; no girl has won a Scholarship this year, but five boys have come up to Scholarship standard and two have tied in Classics. Therefore the object of this Bill is to amend the Act so that in such a case in future both of these boys should be awarded a Scholarship. It is just possible that what I shall ask leave to do might be deemed to be taking money out of the Treasury, and I shall first ask leave to move for the suspension of Rules 88 and 89.

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

Other Notices were given as follows:—

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Bill to authorise the Vestry of the parish of St. James to raise a loan not exceeding $4,320.00 for the purpose of replacing the roof of the Chancel of the Parish Church.

Mr. ADAMS: Bill to authorise the Commissioners of Highways for the parishes of St. Joseph and St. John, respectively, to increase the salary and travelling allowance of their respective Inspectors of Highways.

## REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE PRESENTED

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to present the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill to provide for the notification of accidents and occupational diseases.

## BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the Bill to amend the Government Scholarships and Exhibitions Act, 1949, was read a first time.

Mr. MOTTLEY entered the House and took his seat.

On the motion of Mr. E. K. WALCOTT, seconded by Mr. GODDARD, the Bill to authorise the Vestry of St. James to raise a loan not exceeding $4,320 for replacing the roof of the chancel of the Parish Church, was read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. SMITH, the Bill to authorise the Commissioners of Highways for the respective parishes of St. Joseph and St. John to increase the salary and travelling allowance of the respective Inspectors of Highways, was read a first time.

## SUSPENSION OF RULES 60, 88 AND 89

Mr. ADAMS : I ask leave to move for the suspension of Rules 60, 88 and 89.

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

Mr. ADAMS : I beg to move that Rules 60, 88 and 89 be now suspended.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

At this stage, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

## GOVERNMENT SCHOLARSHIPS AND EXHIBITIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL 1951, No. 2.

Mr. ADAMS : Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I am asking leave to take the Bill to amend the Government Scholarships and Exhibitions Act, 1949, as the first Order of the Day.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The first Order of the Day now stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph:—To move the second reading of the Bill to amend the Government Scholarships and Exhibitions Act, 1949.

Mr. ADAMS : This matter is of the utmost importance; it is one of those things which happen very seldom. Perhaps if we had thought of the possibility we could have foreseen it taking place, but it is one of those things which, in my experience, I do not know has happened before. I remember that in the case of Mr. Freeman Boyce and Mr. H. A. Belgrave, the examiners said that they found it extremely difficult to decide between the merits of the two candidates, but, on the whole, they recommended Belgrave for the Scholarship. Belgrave died some time afterwards and, I believe, Boyce was awarded the lapsed portion of the scholarship. In this particular case two boys have been bracketed in Classics; it is extremely rare to be unable to distinguish between two boys in the same subject and they must be of an extraordinarily good standard. This year five boys have come up to Scholarship standard—two in Classics, one in History, one in Mathematics and one in Science; no girls have reached Scholarship standard. We therefore have the spectacle of five boys having been recommended for Scholarships, but only four can get Scholarships as the law now stands; inasmuch as this Bill does not involve any extra expenditure, I suggest that the Legislature can pass it at a gallop. What this Bill purports to do is that whenever a girl does not reach Scholarship standard, the Scholarship can be awarded to anybody who reaches that standard in some other subject. We have had to bring forward this Bill in a hurry and we realise that something like this may take place in the future; two girls may be bracketed, only one or two boys may reach Scholarship standard, and the girls would have to be given Scholarships. It is conceivable that five girls may reach Scholarship standard and no boys and the girls would have to be given Scholarships. If it did happen that three boys reached Scholarship standard and two girls were bracketed, five Scholarships would be awarded: the reverse of what has happened need not be covered to-day. I have great pleasure in moving that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

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

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

The two Clauses of the Bill were read and passed.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

Mr. DOWDING entered the House and took his seat.

## COUNCIL'S AMENDMENT TO THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION BILL, 1951

Mr. ADAMS : I ask leave to take Order No. 18 as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph :— To move the consideration of the amendment of the Honourable the Legislative Council to the Bill to provide for the institution of a Public Service Commission.

Mr. ADAMS : There is only one slight amendment to this Bill. In Clause 9 (I) of the Bill we said that the Governor acting in his discretion may refer to the Commission for their advice any question relating to certain matters such as appointments, transfers, and so on, and then in sub-paragraph (h) we said : "The entry into a salary scale whether on first appointment or on promotion of a public officer at an incremental scale higher than the minimum salary scale attaching to the office." The Other Place has deleted the word "scale" occurring after the word "incremental" and inserted the word "point". Well, if you put a person at an incremental point, you put him at an incremental scale : the Other Place thinks that the word "point" should replace the word "scale" and no harm can be done by that. Probably the Other Place is more correct in using the word "point" because when you use the word "increment" you mean a point. I therefore beg to move that this amendment be now read a first time.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

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

## COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS TO THE PIONEER INDUSTRIES (ENCOURAGEMENT) BILL, 1951

Mr. ADAMS : I ask leave to take Order No. 19 as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the honourable

senior member for St. Joseph :—To move the consideration of the amendments of the Honourable the Legislative Council to the Bill to encourage the establishment and development of new industries and to make provision for the granting of certain relief from package tax and customs duty and income tax to persons establishing factories in connection with such industries and for purposes incidental to or connected with any of the foregoing purposes.

Mr. ADAMS : I apologize to honourable members if they have not got copies of these amendments. In Clause 4 (I) of the Bill, there is the first amendment. As passed by this House it was stated : "The Governor-in-Executive Committee, on the application on or before the thirty-first day of December, 1952, of any person who is desirous of establishing a pioneer factory in this Island for the purpose of manufacturing any pioneer product, if he is satisfied that it is expedient in the public interest so to do." The year "1952" was put in when this Bill was before the House two years ago; we passed the Bill but did not change the year so as to give a two-year period in respect of the establishment of pioneer factories. The Other Place has changed the year to 1954, which was our intention. The other amendment could have been dealt with without bringing it before the House. Sub-clause (2) of Clause 8 reads : "No allowance shall be made under subsection (1) of this section in respect of any year of assessment later than the eight year after the year of assessment in which the capital expenditure was incurred." The Other Place has amended the word "eight" to "eighth". Those are the only two amendments; the first one is purely an oversight on our part and the other one is purely typographical. I am asking honourable members to agree to these two comparatively trivial amendments; I beg to move that these amendments be now read a first time.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

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

## COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. ADAMS : I beg to move that the House do now revert to the Order Paper in proper sequence.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph : 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 Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

### RESOLUTIONS POSTPONED

Mr. ADAMS : I ask leave to postpone the first two Resolutions—one for $480 relative to a loan to Mr. A. L. King, and the other for $7,800 in respect of the purchase of a car for the Governor's use.

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

### REPRESENTATION OF BARBADOS AT THE BRITISH INDUSTRIES FAIR, 1952.

Mr. COX: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is one to place the sum of $2,520 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1951—52, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1951—52, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

This sum of money is required for the purpose of enabling arrangements to be made for securing 150 square feet of space for Barbados to be represented at the British Industries Fair which takes place in 1952. On the last occasion the Chamber of Commerce was responsible for the expenditure in this connection, but on this occasion that Body has stated its inability to be responsible for the expenditure and the Government has decided to contribute to this Fair by paying the cost of a stand for Barbados. The Addendum explains the matter pretty clearly; it states:

"In 1951 the Chamber of Commerce met the cost of providing the Barbados stand at the British Industries Fair. The Chamber is unable to meet the cost in respect of the 1952 Fair. The value to Barbados of participation in the Fair may be considerable and it has been decided that funds to cover participation in 1952 should be provided by Government."

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, — I think that the matter of these colonies being represented abroad is a very important one and it seems strange to me that the Chamber of Commerce is unable to contribute a part of this money even if it could not meet the whole cost. I do not know if the Government asked the Chamber of Commerce if it would be able to contribute a part of this money if not the whole amount, and it would be interesting to know from the hon. member in charge of this Resolution if the Government has put that point to the Chamber of Commerce. After all, if the commercial bodies of Barbados want to advertise their products abroad, it is only fair and reasonable that they should contribute something in order to advertise their products and they should have enough pride in their products as to see them properly advertised on an occasion such as this one. This is an important occasion and I feel that even though it is thought that we were by-passed, there is still a gesture; we are made to feel that we exist in this world and in the commercial world we are trying to do something to to catch the eye of the public abroad. If the representatives of business interests in this colony cannot provide the entire sum of money, are they willing to contribute a part of it? Do they think that that will not bring any benefit to Barbados? In my opinion the Chamber of Commerce should be called upon to contribute a part of this money.

It has been said on more than one occasion in this House that in respect of Barbados rum we are far behind Jamaica in the matter of advertising abroad; Jamaica is known for its bad rum but Barbados is not known for its good rum. I say it is strange to find that while industrialists in this island want every possible concession from the Government—they want income tax exemption for so many years and duty free materials—they hate to contribute anything to advertise their products abroad. I do not see why the taxpayers of this colony should be called upon to provide this money for the representation of Barbados at this Fair when it is in the interests of the business people to advertise their products abroad. I would like to hear some reason as to why the Chamber of Commerce should not contribute this money.

Mr. GODDARD: Last year was the first year that Barbados advertised at the British Industries Fair; prior to that, other colonies have been doing it for many years. Last year when subscriptions were being sought for us to advertise at the British

Industries Fair, we were told that the Government was not prepared to contribute to it, that the commercial community would have to put up the whole sum and the matter would be dealt with through the Colonial Office. The commercial community through the office of the Chamber of Commerce raised the money and they hoped that they would have increased their sales of sugar, molasses and rum. In the matter of sugar, that is bought by the British Government in bulk, and the molasses community which contributed last year was not prepared to contribute this year. The British Ministry of Food gave a quota of 32,000 cases which is the equivalent of 500 puncheons for sale in the United Kingdom market, and that was a small quota for the molasses community. Apart from that, the price at which the British Ministry of Food was prepared to allow for molasses coming into the market was at the 1949 price, and the molasses community was not prepared to sell the molasses on the basis of the 1949 figure. We have experienced what is a form of using controls whenever possible to keep this product out of the market.

As regards rum, we have sent that product to England in increasing quantities, but what has killed that is the price; a bottle of rum in England costs in the vicinity of 30/- and a workman cannot afford to pay that price for rum. However, Barbados rum is excellent rum, the English people like it and they regard it as brandy. There is much Barbados rum in England today and we have had offers to buy back some of it rather than their having to pay the duty. I should like to say that the commercial community in Barbados has always been willing to do its part in advertising what it has to sell, and last year it provided every cent for advertising at the British Industries Fair: the Government got the space for us, but the Chamber of Commerce furnished the money. It is a fact that the molasses community discovered that there was no chance of selling their product in England. If we did not vote this money today we would be the only colony not advertising in England, and for that reason I heartily commend the Government for spending this money.

Mr. ADAMS: I think that it was only once in my life when I was more ashamed of Barbados than I was when we went to the British Industries Fair last year; that occasion was about 29 years ago when I was in England and the question came up about infant mortality in the Colonial Empire. The figures given for Barbados were the highest in the Colonial Empire—the highest in the West Indian area—and I remember a couple of my under-graduate friends asking me if I had come from Barbados. I replied: "No, I come from the West Indies, but I know of Barbados." (Laughter). I was so ashamed to think that Barbados was foremost on the question of infant mortality that I changed my nationality. At the British Industries Fair last year, there was Grenada, St. Vincent, Trinidad, British Guiana — all advertising their products—and when it came to Jamaica the stalls were well laid out. The Jamaica rum is good for washing down a race-horse; they make light type of rum and when you drink the Trinidad rum you cannot help admitting that you should give way to Barbados. The Fair is visited by people in business and not by the ordinary public who go to make purchases: the honourable senior member for St. Thomas and myself got an invitation because we were on the Sugar Delegation. The people who go to the Fair are agents, people who push your goods, and over and over again you could hear people asking for a sample of good rum; but there was no stall with Barbados rum! I felt utterly ashamed about that; it is shameful to think that the average Barbadian who is thought to be one of the most industrious people in all walks of life could be so backward in pushing his products. Last year in Canada I felt exactly the same way; people pushed their syrup product and if you ask the Canadians about the matter they will tell you that they like to think of the old days when they poured out fancy molasses on bread and ate it. We were asked: "What is wrong with your merchants? Why do they not push their products?" It is shameful to think that our Chamber of Commerce should let any opportunity for advertising our products slip by. Jamaica has had the name of being the best advertisers and we can blame ourselves if Jamaica has had a start ahead of us. But people have asked why can't they get better rum than the Jamaica rum? The English people were surprised to think that you could drink rum and buy a mouth wash to clear it out; that is what happens when you drink Jamaica rum. You go to any part of England where the people have once tasted Barbados rum and as soon as you begin to talk about it you are asked: "Why don't you put it on the market here?" I say that it is the fault of the Chamber of Commerce if they do not take long views. You put "Gold Braid" on the market in England and you will kill the Jamaica trade.

I have had some Demerara rum and it had on me an effect which I do not want repeated; It is a black, oily, thickish substance; it is the most evil smelling rum you can find. You could not get a waterfront worker to drink Demerara rum if you give him Barbados rum; but the waterfront worker will drink Demerara rum because he is accustomed to it. As regards fancy molasses in Canada and good rum in Great Britain, we have a good chance of letting the name of Barbados surpass all the rest. The Government knowing that Barbados would not be represented, felt that we should ask the Chamber of Commerce to see reason and do something about the matter; it is in their interest to do so: This is not like tourism, which will bring money to more than one class of person, because not only will hotel proprietors benefit, but the waiters will get tips and chauffeurs will get work if they can be reasonable and fair. When it comes to the question of rum, the rum manufacturers should be able, like the honourable junior member for St. George who has shares in everything.

Mr. DOWDING: On a point of explanation. I have absolutely no shares in anything in Barbados except Dowding Estates and Trading Limited.

Mr. ADAMS: I apologize; charity begins at home. We cannot as a Government, knowing that Barbados was let down last year, fail to ask the Legislature to provide this money; but we are asking the commercial community of Barbados to see that it is in their interest that this colony be represented at this Fair. They have the goods to deliver; they have the best molasses and the best rum in the world. Let them deliver the goods; nobody is going to buy your stuff if you do not advertise it. Next year we are going to move the passing of a Resolution for a small sum of money to help the commercial community, but they must put up the greater part of the money. We do not want Englishmen to go to the British Industries Fair this year and ask: "What about Barbados?" Our goods will be sold on merit, but merit must be helped by advertising. The Government is advertising Barbados products this year, but we hope that from next year the Chamber of Commerce will

advertise them on putting up the necessary sum of money.

Mr. GODDARD: I am very pleased to hear the honourable Leader of the House express that sentiment; I can assure honourable members that the Chamber of Commerce and the mercantile community are prepared at any time to do their bit in connection with this matter of advertising Barbados goods. Advertising goods at the British Industries Fair is really advertising Barbados and I am wondering whether the honourable member could cause anything to be done next year in the matter of the action taken by the Ministry of Food in relation to molasses. As regards advertising rum in England, I would like to let honourable members know that some years ago an enquiry was made by the rum merchants as to what that advertising would cost, and we were informed that no less a sum than $50,000 would be required for the purpose. The people of Jamaica have big industries and they can afford that; they have the money because they have enjoyed good markets in the past. We are now attempting to do something and we cannot raise so much money from the merchants here; there is also the question of the duty which is imposed on rum.

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

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

## RESOLUTION TO APPROVE "THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) No. 2 ORDER, 1951"

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph:—To move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 2 Order, 1951" made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the 30th day of August, 1951, under the provisions of section 3 of the Civil Establishment Act, 1949.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—Honourable members will see that this Resolution is to amend "The Civil Establishment (General) Order, 1949" Inasmuch as the Clerk will have to read the Order, I am suggesting that it might be a good idea to read the Addendum to the Resolution, which is not generally done. The Addendum sets out clearly what the "Objects and Reasons" of the amendments are If honourable members have before them not only the Resolution but also the Order, they will see that the amendments are for the purpose of bringing up the staff to what the Heads of the various Departments deem requisite to bring it up to, and also to have a different rate of salary in some cases. The first object is to increase the number of porters on the permanent establishment of the Post Office from three to four, and another object is to put the writservers in a position where they will have a quicker means of promotion by changing the grades of officers and equating them with persons in the Police Force. To explain those two items a little further, in respect of the first item, the Addendum states that the object of the amendment is "to increase the number of porters on the permanent establishment of the Post Office from three to four. The services of an additional porter have been employed on a temporary basis since the transfer of the Parcel Post Branch to the Wharf in November last for the performance of duties which it was realised from the start would be of a permanent nature."

The new Branch Post Office at Welches—I hope honourable members have seen it—is practically finished; the building itself is finished and it is just a question of planting grass around it. Those who thought that this building is in the wrong place might probably change their minds. Owing to the existence of that Branch Post Office. it will be necessary to have an additional Postmaster or Postmistress; therefore the number of these Officers will have to be increased from 12 to 13.

As to the other item, there is one Chief Writserver at a salary of $1,104 rising by an annual increment of $48 to $1,248, and 36 Writservers at a salary of $624 rising by the same annual increment to $960. The Addendum states:

"The proposed amendments, which have met with the approval of Whitley Council, would provide a greater avenue of promotion for Writservers by creating four grades of Officers with the equivalent status and remuneration of Station Sergeant, Sergeant, Corporal and Constable in the Police Force. No increase in the number of Writservers is involved. It should be mentioned that the revision in status of these officers was overlooked by the Reorganisation Committee and that the present proposals are designed to place their conditions of service more in line with those of other members of the Police Force."

I should like to point out that Writservers have been considered as Policemen for years; they have been made Policemen by the Act and really, in accordance with the terms of the Act, they can be called upon for service in case of emergency just as Bandsmen are called upon for service. Therefore one can readily see that the responsibility of a writserver and the duties which he has to perform, do not differentiate him in the scale from that of a Constable to that of a Sergeant in the Police Force. The Government considered suggestions which were made to us by these men and we put the whole matter before the Whitley Council. We did not agree with what was put up at first, but we did what we thought should be done and sent back the proposals to the Whitley Council for their approval. Therefore, as far as these proposals are concerned, the rank and file of the men themselves plus the Whitley Council agreed with them and not merely the Government: I do not think honourable members will feel that this is a case in which the Government has arbitrarily made changes in the status of writservers without their knowledge and approval. I see that honourable members realise it was superfluous for me to say that, knowing that this Government does not do things without reference to the people whom the things will affect.

As regards the next amendment, honourable members will remember that provision was made in the 1951—52 Estimates for the employment of an Inspector of Death Duties on the salary scale of $2,880 x 144 —$3,456 per annum. This employment will be on a permanent basis, and the only object of the amendment is to put this officer on that basis. The next amendment is merely a question of the change of title; if you use the title "Superintendent Mechanic" it might mislead would-be applicants

as to the nature of the duties which they would have to perform. It is therefore proposed to change that designation to "Superintendent Mechanical Engineer." That is under the Head "Department of Highways and Transport." The duties of the present Superintendent Mechanic are infinitely more important than what the title suggests, and a better title would be "Superintendent Mechanical Engineer." That is all it is proposed to do; there is no question of a change of salary or anything like that.

The next amendment deals with the Electrical Engineer who will have to see after the electrical affairs at the Waterworks Department. In July, 1950, the Re-organisation Committee recommended that such an Engineer should be appointed, but it was agreed that this office should not be created until the electrical pumps were installed. The work in this connection is progressing and it is felt that the time for creating this office has now arrived. Therefore all this proposed amendment affecting the Waterworks Department seeks to do is to carry out the recommendation of the Re-organisation Committee —to have an Electrical Engineer who will see after the electrical operations at this Department. The next amendment is in connection with Seawell Airport; honourable members will remember that the Report of the Seawell Airport Committee has been laid on the Table of the House. The Addendum states: "The Committee has recommended that the Airport should be open from 6 a.m. until 10 p.m. as soon as the establishment of Airport personnel has been increased to cope with extended operations. The additional staff mentioned in the amending Order will be necessary in order to extend the operational hours in accordance with the Committee's recommendation. These proposals also involve the abolition of the following unestablished posts:—

1 Grade "A" Mechanic
3 Supervisors (fire crew)
9 Attendants (fire crew)."

The additional staff mentioned in the Order will be:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 Assistant Mechanic | .. | $1,200 x 72—1,488 |
| 3 Crash Firemen | .. | $624 x 48—960 |
| 12 Auxiliary Crash Firemen | | $480 x 48—624 |

When the operational hours are extended, flights late at night will take place, and the T.C.A. planes can come in early.

As regards the last amendment, provision is made for an additional Stenographer and Typist, making the total number of these officers 42. As will be seen from the Addendum: "This addition in staff is required to meet the heavy and steadily increasing volume of typing duties in the Secretariat, which Department at the moment carries a staff of five Stenographer-typists."

I think that honourable members who have occasion to go into the Secretariat will know that these Steno-typists are constantly at work—sometimes at hours when honourable members are on their way to their constituents in the hinterland of St. Lucy or otherwise.

As regards the Clerical Service, as honourable members will see from the Addendum, the amendment "provides for an additional office of Senior Clerk at the expense of the Principal Clerk Grade. It will be recalled that it was agreed to reduce the three remaining posts of Principal Clerk as soon as the present incumbents retired from the service or received promotion to other posts. The proposal merely retains the number of Senior posts for which provision is made in the Estimates."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before the honourable member takes his seat, I would like to inform him that it has been drawn to my attention that the wording of this Resolution "and that the Legislative Council be invited to concur herein" is unnecessary and that it is not used by the Other Place; they pass their own Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: I do not know what the position is myself, but I suggest that we use that wording. They may say "We concur by doing so in our own way." I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. MAPP: With regard to item 2, I am glad to see that the Government has put the Writservers on the same basis as the Police. It is a long time that the Writservers wanted to be treated in that way and I am glad to see that they are being given this increase. I would like to say that the Warders at Glendairy Prison are just as important as the Writservers, and they too would like to be put on a basis such as this; they want to know if they are members of the Civil Establishment or not; they do not enjoy some of the amenities which the Police enjoy. They do not have the rank of Lance Sergeant corresponding with that rank in the Police Force; I can tell the Government that the Warders are dissatisfied in that they are not given the same advantage as the Police. I would recommend that just as the Writservers have been treated, the Warders be also dealt with before the House is prorogued.

Mr. MILLER entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. BRANCKER: It is stated in the Addendum to this Resolution that no increase in the number of Writservers is involved, but I would like to mention for the enlightenment of the proper authorities that this is a matter which deserves early consideration. There is no denying the fact that there is hardly a more over-worked and under-staffed branch of Government servants than the Writservers. What is happening in certain Courts is that uniformed policemen are being used to take the place of writservers in performing the duties of court criers. At District "E" it happened that one of the writservers was ill and no one was appointed to take his place; that was either an oversight or it is due to the fact that there is not enough staff available to relieve writservers when they are ill, and when witnesses are not summoned it is because there is no writserver to do the summoning. It is, of course, praiseworthy that writservers are now going to share the same salary scale as their brothers in the Police Force. If I had the option of being a policeman and being a writserver, I would prefer to be a policeman.

I should like to say that the practice of transferring policemen and writservers from one district to another should be indulged in as rarely as possible, because when they are so transferred it is difficult for them to find the people. Especially is that the case with the writservers, and when they cannot find the people the cases in Court have to be adjourned from time to time. The Writservers' Department is a very important one; it is a Department which needs a lot of consideration.

As regards the office of Superintendent Mechanic which is now being changed to "Superintendent Mechanical Engineer", I am wondering whether there is only a change in the nomenclature. I am wondering whether this officer will still perform certain duties at a Department other than the Department of Highways and Transport; I am wondering if this is only a change of title and the duties in connection with the Water Boats will be given to somebody else.

Mr. ADAMS: In reply to the honourable member who has just spoken, I would like to say that nowhere at any time has the Government known of any suggestion that the number of Writserves is not

enough. As regards this particular matter, when it first came before the Executive Committee and we thought that there should be some modifications of what was proposed, the matter went back to the writservers themselves; it went to the Commissioner of Police who had a chance to talk to the writservers, and it also went to their representatives in the Whitley Council. If there was any feeling of dissatisfaction among the writservers, you would expect that representations would have been made to that effect. The writservers had the opportunity through the Commissioner of Police to make any further recommendations which they desired to make: there was no question of the writservers not getting enough money or of there being insufficient people to do the work. With regard to writservers being removed from one district to another and not being able to find people to summon them to the Court, there are those who wait to summon one side on the day before the trial or on the morning of the trial of a case, but they summon their friends in plenty of time so that they can go down to the office of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy. It has been said that some island constables report their friends or erstwhile friends and then tell them which lawyer to go to for their defence; those island constables get a moiety of the fine and their friend, the lawyer, gets a fee. I am not pointing in any direction; but seriously there is nothing that we have been told which would make us feel that the writservers feel they have too much to do and they want their numbers increased. If that had been the case, we would have come to the Legislature in connection with the matter.

With regard to the remarks of the honourable junior member for St Thomas, I remember reading a detective story of a man who was extremely well off, and it was always a surprise to people that he would subscribe liberally to every Police bazaar; he gave the Government an extremely well-built police station. It was discovered later on that that man made his millions through fraud; when he was locked up there was a secret place by which he got out. It is a good idea to make friends with the Warders. (Laughter). Now that the honourable junior member for St. Thomas has told us that the Warders have a grievance I will tell him that we will go into the matter carefully; the Warders have presented a petition and we are considering it. I assure the honourable junior member for St. Thomas that we have not forgotten the Warders, but we have not yet made a complete decision as to what has been put before us.

Mr. SMITH: There is something which I want to say in connection with the Police. It has been drawn to my attention that some policemen have to sweep the yards, weed up the grass, clean W.C's and so on. I do not think it decent that policemen should be doing that work; I feel that some women are being robbed out of work. If you want a decent Police Force comprised of people from secondary schools and then they have to sweep the yards and clean lavatories and so on, I do not think that that is fair. That would be all right if you were picking up men who cannot read or write, but we want a decent Police Force. If these men have to do these things, then we will have to find something degrading for the Colonel to do as well. I sincerely hope that the Government will go into this question; I hope they will put a check to policemen doing that sort of work. It is no wonder that the men will not try to catch people who are at large.

Mr. MILLER: I have not been able to believe that policemen at this particular age should be regarded as yardsmen and people who take care of animals. I hope that the Government will pay special attention to this branch of the Police Force. Another thing is that they are not required to beat people; a policeman should be regarded as being a custodian of the law, and he is expected to look at things in the right way. I hope that the Government will pay special attention to my feelings in this matter; a policeman should always pay regard to what is his right and proper place in the community.

Mr. ADAMS: I am asking for permission to speak again.

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

Mr. ADAMS: What I am saying now I have said more than once; I cannot imagine anything more snobbish than to feel that manual labour is degrading. I see that the honourable junior member for St. Joseph is smiling; he has realised that unconsciously he was making a joke when he said that it is not decent to ask a man to do a job like that. That is the old argument that school children should not clean their desks; every girl at Queen's College should have to clean her own desk and every boy at Harrison College should have to clean his own desk. Mr. Churchill had to clean his own shoes; students have to sweep their rooms and so on. That is good training, but we are so Victorian that we find every type of individual in this island thinking it degrading to brush and clean his shoes or to flush his own W.C. What is wrong about doing that? What is wrong in asking a policeman to see about his own horse? Not only do elementary school children clean their desks, but I am told that some 10 or 12 years ago every girl at Queen's College used to clean her own desk at the end of the term. It is not therefore a question of the Education Board calling on one type of person to do manual labour and not on another type of person to do it. I will say that most men in this island have bad stomachs because their wives cannot cook. I want to make a protest against the type of argument which has been put forward today: I hope we will not hear that type of argument any longer. If you establish a principle in one Department you establish it in all Departments.

Mr. ALLDER: In this amending Order provision has been made for the appointment of an Electrical Engineer to be attached to the Waterworks Department. I want to say that there is a general feeling among the staff that some of them could be given the opportunity to study electrical engineering. A few of them are fearful, because they feel that if the steam boiler system is abolished they might be thrown out of their jobs; therefore I would like the Government to make it possible for some of these men to study electrical engineering. It is very important that if these men have been working with steam boilers for all these years, and you are changing over to pumping water by means of electricity, the men should be trained along these lines. Some people have been trying to attend the courses which are being held at the Evening Institute, but the hours are such that the people find it difficult to attend these courses; the people can only properly attend them when they do not have to work in the evening. They have to attend them in their spare moments and then hurry back to their work at night. Some of these men at the pumping stations are hoping that it would be made possible for them really to attend these classes and be able to handle the electrical equipment when it is brought into force. That is a suggestion to which I feel the Government should give some consideration, instead of having to bring down people from outside; although that has not been provided for in this particular Order, I hope that consideration will be given to the matter in the immediate future.

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

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

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

On the re-assembling —

Dr. CUMMINS laid the Reply to Question No. 59 by the honourable junior member for St. Thomas, Mr. Mapp.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT laid the Reply to Question No. 104 by the honourable senior member for St. James, Mr. E. K. Walcott.

## RESOLUTION TO APPROVE LEASE OF LAND TO ST. GEORGE VESTRY

Mr. SPEAKER The next order is in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Peter, Mr. F. L. Walcott—to move the passing of a Resolution that it shall be lawful for the Governor-in-Executive to lease to the Vestry of St. George that parcel of land formerly part of Carmichael plantation situate at Ellerton in the parish of St. George and containing by admeasurement five acres, two roods, for the purpose of establishing a playing field.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT : Mr. Speaker,—This Resolution is another of those formal ones which have been necessary since the House amended the Governor-in-Executive Committee Act giving permission to these various parochial authorities to have land leased to them by the Government for the purpose of establishing playing fields, or whatever they agree to do with funds from the Labour Welfare Act. This resolution seeks permission to lease this parcel of land at Ellerton. I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. Cox seconded.

Mr. LEWIS Mr. Speaker,—This Resolution deals with giving the Executive Committee permission to lease this piece of land to the parish of St. George, but from the wording of the Resolution we are unable to state to whom this land belongs at present. I think that for historical reasons — because a historian may want to look through the records of this House for reference to this matter— I think that the facts of the case should be stated in this Resolution. Perhaps it will occasion about a week's delay to amend the wording of the Resolution. but it is well that the facts should be recorded in the archives of the House. Naturally one could not expect the Governor-in-Executive Committee to lease land that is not theirs; but it is only by implication that we can assume the land belongs to the Government. As far as this particular piece of land is concerned, it is said that it was given by some old owner to the people of St. George for use as a playing field, and that when the donor died the Government had to buy it back. It has not been bought with Government funds. It is now vested in the Governor-in-Executive Committee having been bought out of the Labour Welfare Fund.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker,—There is one point that I would like to clear up. I agree with the last Speaker as far as the circumstances of the giving of this land are concerned. The land was originally given by Sir Laurie Pile to Barbados Welfare Ltd. That went into liquidation and had some debts which had to be paid. When the Vestry of St. George through Government channels started negotiating, the then owner, or attorney or acting attorney arranged that this land should be sold to the Government and the money credited to Barbados Welfare Ltd.

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

## BILL TO AMEND PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

Mr. SPEAKER: The next order is 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 public Health Act, 1908.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—This Bill seeks to amend the Public Health Act of 1908. As a result of the amendment to the Public Health Act in 1942 the Commissioners of Health in the various parishes were made responsible for the sanitary condition of all Public Elementary School latrines. In consequence of that, they were called upon to pay the cost of the water for such sanitation in the schools equipped with the water borne system. As a result of certain amenities being offered in these schools such as the supply of milk which call for the use of water for the washing of utensils, and in addition, due to the fact that water is used for gardening in the schools, the amount which is paid for water rates increased. In 1943 the practice was adopted of letting the Commissioners of Health pay for half of the water used, while the Education Board paid the other half. That is, that the Commissioners of Health considered that they used half of the water where the latrines were concerned, and the Education Department considered that they used half in the distribution of milk, the washing of utensils and gardening. That system worked very well until the parish of St. John and the parish of St. Joseph began to question it, and actually refused to carry on with the old practice. The matter was brought to the attention of the Director of Education who forwarded the question to Government for their consideration. The matter was then referred to the Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department. Previous to that, someone in one of those parishes suggested the installation of separate meters in each school so that the Education Department would know exactly how much water they used and the Commissioners of Health would know exactly how much they used. This point was referred to the Engineer of the Waterworks who said that first of all they did not have the number of meters — there are 125 schools — and secondly, it would not be possible to obtain that number of meters. The views of the D.M.S. were that the Government did not have the required staff to look after the cleaning and disinfecting of these latrines, and the Director of Education did not favour the change-over. Consequently, the Government has come down with this amending Bill which makes it obligatory for the Commissioners of Health to carry on as before. They will continue to pay for half of the water used, and the Education Department will pay for the other half. I move, Sir, that the Bill be read a second time.

The motion was put and carried *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.

Clause 1 was read and passed.

Clause 2 was read as follows:—

2. Subsection (2) of section fifteen of the Public Health Act is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following words:—

"For the purposes of this subsection, the amount of water used in this connection shall be deemed to be one half of the total amount of water used by the school for all purposes."

Dr. CUMMINS moved, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT that Clause 2 stand part.

Mr HAYNES: Mr. Chairman—This matter has come before various vestries. I think it is unfair to make the Commissioners of Health pay for half of this water because a lot of the water is used for the irrigation of school gardens and for other purposes. That is my view, and I think that most vestrymen and commissioners feel that way about it.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. .Chairman—Now that the Government is fully responsible for the education of children, I think that they should also have the entire responsibility for keeping the lavatories at these schools in a sanitary condition. If they do not have the staff they should use the services of the Sanitary Commissioners' staffs. I think that the cost of keeping these lavatories in sanitary condition should be borne by the Government. On that ground alone, I think they should not have come down with this Bill.

Dr. CUMMINS: I cannot understand what honourable members are saying. The last speaker talked about now that the Government has full responsibility for these schools. The Government was always fully responsible as far as providing money is concerned. Sanitation is one of the functions of local government. One or two parishes have lately got the idea that they are not to pay for this water. There are 11 parishes. Two have objected to paying for this water, while the others are willing to carry on. Both the honourable junior member for St. Andrew and the honourable senior member for Christ Church are men experienced in vestry matters. The practice has always been carried on. It is only now that these two parishes have objected that the Government has come to the conclusion that they should make it obligatory for the Commissioners of Health to pay it. One of the functions of local government is to look after the sanitary conditions of the parishes in which these schools are located.

Mr. HAYNES: I can give the history of this matter, and why the Commissioners of Health were made responsible for the cleaning of these latrines. Years ago the Government did it and there came disputes between the Commissioners and the Headmasters, and school managers were very nearly brought into court on one occasion. It was decided to allow the Commissioners of Health to look after the cleaning of these latrines. But now that the water borne system has become universal there is no need for that. The schools are run by the Government and they should pay all the expenses in connection with them. This is a very unfair thing.

Motion that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill was put and the question was decided in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:—

*Ayes*: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Allder, Mr. Miller, Mr. Mapp, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Garner, Mr. Cox, Mr. F. L. Walcott and Dr. Cummins — (9).

*Noes*: Mr. Dowding, Mr. Haynes and Mr. Goddard — (3).

Clause 3 was read and passed.

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

## BILL TO AMEND OLD AGE PENSION ACT

Mr. SPEAKER: The next order is in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas—to move the second reading of the Bill to amend the Old Age Pension Act, 1937.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker — The object of this Bill is to increase the fees paid to the Old Age Pension Commissioners from five shillings to ten shillings for attendance at each meeting of the Committee. This is a rather delayed amendment, because ever since 1947 it was recommended by the Social Welfare Officer of that day, Mr. Chase, and by Commissioner Adams that these fees be increased from five shillings to ten shillings. It is quite evident that St. Michael being a metropolitan parish where the most people reside, the committee of that parish will have to do more work than the committees of smaller parishes, especially with things as they are today. I move, Sir, that the Bill be read a second time.

Mr. Cox seconded.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker—I am not going to oppose this Bill, but I want to say something about these committees. Sometime ago, the Government circularised the various vestries asking them to consider changing at least one member of each of these committees yearly so that other members of the vestries would be able to gain some experience of the working of these committees. One particular parish thought that that should not be so. It was argued that you may not get men with the ability to serve. Because the members of that particular vestry lost in the fight, all three members of the committee resigned instantly. They resigned only because the Government asked that the members of the vestries should rotate as far as serving on the Old Age Pension Committees is concerned. I am not opposing the Bill because it is worth more than 5/- for a man to drive perhaps miles, to conduct this business. But I only wanted to point out to this committee the type of person that you sometimes get conducting these things.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker—I see that this Bill provides for a hundred per cent increase in the fees paid to members of the Old Age Pension Committees. I really expected to see some revision of the Old Age Pension rates. If the members of these committees deserve an increase in the fees for attending these meetings I dare say that the beneficiaries under this Scheme also deserve some consideration because the cost of living has gone up since the time that it was last considered. I am somewhat disappointed, Sir. I notice that we have legislation to increase the percentage of pensions to other pensioners of the Government. I have not noticed any similar consideration being given to Old Age Pensioners. I am hoping, Sir, that the Government will consider these Old Age Pensioners because the cost of living has gone up as much for them as it has gone up for the others who are to be considered in the not distant future. There is another point which I would like to stress. Sometime ago a promise was made that the Government would consider making it possible for deserving people to enjoy the benefits of this Old Age Pension Scheme at an earlier age than is provided for in the present Act. I have not heard of any change yet, Sir, and I do not know what is the intention of the Government in this respect. I hope the Government has not forgotten it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker—The sentiments expressed by the last speaker might appear to be a bit premature at this stage; but they are worth while considering. It is true that the cost of living in respect of which we will soon consider legislation, has not only affected employees but Old Age Pensioners as well. What I would say—because I am fully convinced that it is correct—is that these old people should be allowed to qualify for old age pension at the age of 65. That may not appeal to some people

because they will feel that they will have to contribute more by way of taxation. But I have always felt if people in the Government Service can to-day resign at the age of 50 and 53 and draw a pension, how much more should those people who have toiled for years, the great majority of them in the fields of this country. To wait to help a person when he or she is 68, is in my view, only helping them when they are about to die. If a pensioner under this scheme lives the allotted span of three score years and ten, he will only draw this pension for two years. I feel very strongly, although the present committee has invited me to attend meetings to convince me, I still feel that people should qualify at the age of 65. I think that one of the biggest tragedies in this island is the number of people who reach the age of 65 and are unable to work and have to beg alms. Every day I come across people who find it impossible at the age of 65 to work any longer, and who must wait another three years for Old Age Pension. If it costs fifty thousand or sixty thousand pounds extra the Government should spend it. You will be giving people who gave all their days in building this country. I am only suggesting this because this amendment deals with an increase of fees to members of the Pensions Committees. I do not think that Your Honour will rule in the circumstances that I should not be permitted to speak on any question in respect of Old Age Pensions. Without going any further, I say that there is no question of vote-catching in what I have said. It is from the bottom of my heart. Every year, as long as I can talk, I will tell the Government to make the qualifying age 65. Let it cost £100,000 Mr. Speaker. These people are people who have given all their days to this country. I hope that in the not distant future such an amendment will come down to this Chamber.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker—I want to say to the two honourable members who have spoken about increasing the Old Age Pension that the Government is not asleep where this matter is concerned. Government is actively considering such an increase. Of course, I too would like to see the qualifying age reduced to 65. I have said so already in this House. But all I can say at present is that the Government is considering increasing the weekly stipend.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker—What I would like to see is old age pension sent to the homes of the beneficiaries. If honourable members have ever been to the Old Age Pensions Office on paying day and seen the large numbers of the old people, many of them sick and infirm, who have had to walk miles to receive this pension, they would appreciate the necessity for doing what is done in some other parts of the world—sending the old age pension to the home or boarding house or lodging room. I remember that some years ago one Payment Officer, the postmistress of one of the rural parishes, told me that very often on payment day she had to put herself to the trouble of preparing some light refreshment for those old people because she was so sorry for them, considering the distance which many of them had to travel, the condition in which they got to her place and the distance they would have to travel to get back home. It does appear to me that it would be an easy matter for the Government to arrange to send a money order for the amount, or a cheque to be drawn on the Government Savings Bank. Any rural grocer or shopkeeper would honour such a money order or cheque, and that would save these people the trouble of walking miles to the payment office. I remember that years ago I was instrumental in getting the Government to agree to have two such offices for Christ Church. We were lucky because we actually had two sub-post offices in the parish, one at Worthing and one at Gall Hill, and it was easy for the Government to arrange that both of these should be payment offices. There is no other parish, as far as I know, in which this same arrangement could be made, an arrangement which would, to some limited extent, alleviate much of the distress attending people who in some cases have to walk through the length and breadth of the parish in order to reach the payment office. Perhaps I am more than interested in this matter because the parish which I represent is one of the largest in the island, and on some occasions people who live at the other end of the parish from the payment office have brought to my attention how distressing it is to have to traverse this distance before being paid, and after being paid to have to commence the journey back home. What I have suggested is perfectly feasible. It would save the Old Age Pensioner the trouble of walking on payment day to the office to receive the small amount. With regard to the amount, I imagine that honourable members are justified in assuming that since we are on the eve of the end of the Legislative Session, Government would not have introduced an amendment to the Act at this time if they proposed to further amend it before the session ends so as to increase the amount of the pension. One is justified in assuming that this is the last amendment which Government proposes to introduce this session, and therefore the inference is that it is not proposed to increase the amount of old age pension before the session ends. If it was proposed to be so there would be no reason for making two bites at the same cherry. There is no doubt about it that the amount is inadequate. There has been no increase of the pension itself for fully three years, and during that time the cost of living has gone up considerably. We are now considering a cost of living allowance for Government Employees. There is no reason why similar attention should not be paid to the Old Age Pensioner. The amount of 5/- is abnormally low, and the qualifying age is abnormally high. I think I am right in saying that it is the highest in the West Indies. The qualifying age in Trinidad is 65, and there was an attempt in the Legislative Council of British Guiana to have theirs even lower——60. I see no reason why we in this colony should not reduce the age to 60 or even 65, although I would prefer to see it reduced to 60. I think, Sir, that the qualifying age should be lowered, the pension should be at least doubled, and the means test should be abolished. There is no moral or other justification for the retention of the means test. It is an undignified investigation into the means of existence of the average old person. The applicant for pension has to expose all the details of his or her means of existence, and I do not think it is right. As regards what I said earlier about sending the pension to the pensioner's home by means of a money order or cheque, if the Government only realised the benefit and relief that would accrue to these old people, it would be done next week. It is a most depressing sight to go to a payment office in any part of the island on a payment day and see the condition of the people who gather there to receive this small pittance. If the suggestion that I have made were carried out, I imagine that the resultant saving in clerical expenses would do more than defray the small cost of posting these orders or cheques to these people.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker—I would like to support the remarks of the last speaker. I happen to represent a very hilly parish. All the people in that parish have to come down and then go back up the hill to the post office. I certainly think that the suggestion of the honourable junior member for St. Philip is a very feasible one. I hope that it will reach

the ears of the Government and that something will be done about it.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker—It would be well for the Government to realise that there is a large body of opinion in this country which favours a reduction of the qualifying age for old age pension to 65. Despite the fact that, as has been pointed out, it would cost £50,000 to £60,000 a very large number of taxpayers would be well satisfied to have that amount of their money expended on behalf of these poor people. If in their working days they had not been so shamelessly underpaid by the plantocracy, these old people would not be in the dilapidated condition that they are in. We have to face facts and realise that it is as a result of their almost killing themselves out for decades upon decades as agricultural workers that these people find themselves in the condition they are in to-day. But they are fellow Barbadians and they are human beings; and to wait until they are 68 before you give them this pension does seem to be waiting until they have reached their allotted span. Reduction of the age to 65 should be the next move, and then the Government could prepare some figures and see what is to be the next move, whether it is to be an increase in the present amount of pension or a reduction of the qualifying age below 65. After all, when it comes to Government Servants, we have fixed the retirement age at 50. Do not let us wait to help these old age pensioners when it is almost too late. That is what we are doing now. When it comes to abolishing the means test, what I am afraid of is this: if it is abolished, everyone irrespective of his means would be eligible to go and draw old age pension. I cannot support that. Although I agree that a lot of intimate questions have to be asked and answered, I am afraid this is a case where those enquiries are necessary. I would say too that as far as these enquiries are concerned, when there is a doubt it should be resolved in favour of the person making the application. Sometimes these Old Age Pension Officers resolve a doubt in favour of the Government, and perhaps they may feel that this increase we are considering to-day is their reward. There was another suggestion that the money should be sent to these people's homes. I think that that deserves sympathetic consideration. It might involve the taking on of auxiliary postmen; but that would help to relieve unemployment. What happens sometimes is that an old age pensioner has to pay someone six or twelve cents to collect the pension, so that the amount is depreciated. Obviously, no shopkeeper would refuse a Government note. The only thing is that he might not want to give back change. He might insist on the customer spending the whole amount in his shop. We cannot too strongly emphasise the desirability of reducing at the earliest possible time the qualifying age from 68 to 65. I have said that many times but I am not weary of saying it. That is of immediate consideration. Especially as we have reduced the age of retirement for Government Servants it makes it more incumbent for us to reduce this qualifying age for old age pensioners as soon as is practicable—which is now.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—If honourable members adopt this attitude of bringing important matters to the attention of the Government, the Government might do nothing by way of amending the Act. The point is whether it is worth 10/- for a member of the Old Age Pensions Committee to attend a meeting. If you look at the Order Paper you will see no less than 59 items. There is no item which deals with this important point which the House wants the Government to consider. But because the Government has brought down this Bill which we are now considering, honourable members have taken this opportunity to say these things. The honourable junior member for St. Lucy says that something should be done immediately about reducing the age. He says that every time the Estimates are being considered. These are vital things that we are talking about.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker,—I would like to ask where the honourable member got the idea that no question has been put to the Government as regards abolishing the means test for old age pensioners. He cannot have perused carefully the papers before the House.

Mr. LEWIS: I am talking about the present session.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am talking about this session also.

Mr. LEWIS: When it comes to vital things like these we should see that the expression of opinion on them is that of the whole House; because they are things we all agree about. But this sideway manner of doing things does not look businesslike. It looks as if you are making a political speech. These things are too vital. The whole House should let the Government know that we are in favour of reducing the qualifying age; that we are willing to increase the pension; and that we are willing to increase the number of people who draw the pension. The opinion of one particular member may not express the opinion of the House. These things are too vital to be brought in as a side issue. It is not fair to the old people to make them subjects of political campaigning. What I would like to hear from the Honourable junior member for St. Andrew is that instead of his letting people work for him until they are too old to work, and then changing them as he changes the machine in his factory and putting them on to me, he suggests a contributory scheme by which he, during the time that they are working for him, will contribute something to give them a decent pension instead of a pittance when they reach the age at which they are unable to work any longer. We are not doing these things in a businesslike way so that the Government could take us at our word. If the Government had not brought in this amendment, the session would probably have ended without our hearing anything about the points that have been raised until perhaps, during the consideration of the Estimates for the next financial year. Government has assured us that they are going into the matter. As far as this Bill is concerned, I have never been to a meeting of one of these Pension Committees; but I remember that some time ago we lowered the qualifying age thereby throwing more work on the members of these committees. If these people are dissatisfied some applicants will get too much while others may get more than they should. I will vote for it for that reason. There are many members of vestries who know something about this. I would like to hear an expression of opinion on the principle of the Bill, as to whether 10/- is the fee which should be paid, or whether it should be 7/6 or 12/6.

Mr. REECE: Mr. Speaker,—I agree with the last honourable member that these questions are vital ones; but I entirely disagree with him when he says that the Government is not cognizant of the value of these matters. These questions have been raised in this House from time to time, and each and everyone of us are agreed that the age limit should be reduced to 65. I think that there is also universal agreement that the amount of pension paid should be increased. The question raised by the honourable junior member for the City is one of great importance. He has raised the question of a comprehensive insurance scheme into which the employer

and employee would contribute funds out of which proper pensions could be paid. That is a scheme, Sir, which must be brought in by the Government; because under such a scheme the contributors might not all keep up their contributions unless the scheme had behind it the full force of the Law. I agree with the points raised by previous speakers as to the necessity of increasing the amount of pension and the lowering of the age. There is a matter on which I want to speak briefly. It has come to my knowledge that certain persons who have resided abroad and who have qualified for pensions in the countries in which they have resided, have, on their return to this country, found themselves unable, because of the laws of those countries, to draw the pension which they would receive had they remained in the land of their adoption. There should be some scheme under which those people who have been receiving old age pension in other lands of the Caribbean should be able to draw their pensions from those territories through the Treasury just as one who was a Civil Servant in some other island. There is an instance of a Barbadian woman who lived nearly all her life in Trinidad and who received pension under their Old Age Pension Scheme. She has found it impossible to draw that pension since she has returned here and she has not been living here long enough to qualify for pension under our scheme. I think the time has come when efforts should be made to inaugurate a scheme by which people entitled to Old Age Pension in other Caribbean territories should be able to draw it when they return here, and a similar provision should be made in the scheme whereby natives of the other Caribbean colonies would, on their return to their native land, be entitled to draw the Old Age Pension which they would have been entitled to, had they remained here. Such a scheme would not make any demands on this Treasury, and if the Governments concerned were approached, it is very likely that such a scheme could be devised.

Motion that the Bill be read a second time was put and carried *nem. con.*

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Mr. Cox, His Honour the Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

The two clauses of the Bill were read and passed.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

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

## BILL TO ENCOURAGE FISHING INDUSTRY

Mr. SPEAKER: The next order is in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Peter —to move the second reading of a Bill to encourage the Fishing Industry in the Island.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker—Sir, as the objects and Reasons of this Bill state, its object is to amend and consolidate the existing legislation for the promotion of the Fishing Industry in this island. I am sure that all honourable members will welcome this necessary bit of legislation. Any Government that spends as much as this Government spends on the Fishing Industry should endeavour to enact legislation for the protection of the people who work in that industry. Honourable members will be aware that Dr. Hickling visited Barbados and other Caribbean territories, and one of his main recommendations was that there should be provision for carrying out an investigation whenever a life is lost at sea in the Fishing Industry. I am sure that honourable members will agree with that. If a man dies suddenly at home an inquiry is carried out. Very often the fishing fleet comes back and it is reported that a man is missing, and no investigation is made into what caused the man to be missing and what happened to the boat. The other members of the fleet are not required to give any information. This Legislation seeks, among other things to provide for an investigation to be made when a life is lost at sea. The Objects and Reasons of this Bill are very comprehensive, and only need a little clarification here and there. The Bill deals with the question of registering these boats, and in that respect seeks to consolidate that aspect of the work of the Harbour and Shipping Master provided for in the old Harbour and Shipping Master Act of 1907. As a result of this registering, the Fisheries Officer will know the number of boats engaged in the Industry as well as the number of men. The skipper of the boat who is normally in charge will be registered as skipper. Dr. Hickling in his report says that to discourage the taking of unnecessary risks an inquiry should be made where there is a loss of life, and the skipper should be asked to explain what happened. It is not suggested that many inquiries would reveal wilful negligence, but the fact that the skipper will be asked to account for his actions might discourage fool-hardiness, and encourage the paying of better attention to gear. This Bill goes a little further than Dr. Hickling recommended. It was felt that this Bill should be put on the Statute Book to give general protection to the lives of these people. Honourable members might be tempted to raise extraneous arguments. But the primary object of the Bill is to protect the lives of these people. I feel that the Bill sets out in full how the fishermen are to be registered, how the boats are to be registered, and it sets out in the schedule how these things are to be prescribed for. In the main, I think that everyone will agree that it is not good enough that men should continue to go fishing without legal protection, or for a man to be able to lose his life without an enquiry being made. I will do my best to answer any question arising out of the Bill, but I cannot promise to answer any that are not connected with it. With those remarks, Sir, I move that the Bill be read a second time.

Mr. Cox seconded.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker—At the outset I am going to say that it is necessary to have a Bill which will give some sort of protection to the people who engage in the Fishing Industry. But, Sir, from the moment that I went through this Bill I discovered some things which I do not think would be palatable to fishermen. For years the fishermen of this country have pursued their trade unmolested by the Government. Now to suddenly bring in a Bill by which a man will be charged a dollar for a licence for the purpose of fishing seems to me to be a hard thing. I am talking about the man who is fishing for a living. Not only have you got to get a licence for the sale or transfer of a boat, but when you come to the definition clause you find that "fishing boat means any boat which is used for the purpose of capturing fish for gain." You have a lot of small people around the coast using a little "moses" boat, and that will be counted as a fishing boat. You know as well as I do, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill must take further study. It is true that we have had it for some time. The honourable member who introduced it said that he is willing to answer questions; but I am going to move that you send it to a Select Committee. The Fishing Industry is an important one. I feel that in view of the provisions of some of these clauses this Bill should be sent to

a Select Committee, and I now formally move that that be done.

Mr. GARNER: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to second that. First of all I think that before bringing in this Bill, after which I presume regulations will follow, Government at least should concentrate on building fishing sheds on the various beaches so that fish can be sold on the beaches. Sometime ago, Sir, this House or a previous House agreed to the principle of building fishing sheds on various beaches around the island where buyers could go and get fish without waiting until some of the hawkers come around. Before we pass this Bill establishing an Act which will impose certain controls on the fishermen, we should first see that certain amenities are provided for the industry. When you consider that for all these years people have been accustomed to go to sea and fish without having to pay anything, I think it will be a long time before they get accustomed to some of the provisions of this Bill. We should see that first things are done first. We should do those things before we put charges on fishermen. In the Objects and Reasons we read that "clauses 3 and 11 of the Bill provide respectively for the keeping of registers of fishing boats and of licences issued to fishermen." It goes on to say that "clause 4 provides for the application for registration by the owner, and for the inspection of fishing boats by the Fishery Officer or an inspector and the issue of certificates of registration on payment of a fee of one dollar . . ." I do not agree with that. These people have to work so hard for a living that I do not see why anyone should want to make money out of them. I have gone to the beach on many occasions and seen six or seven men go out and return with six or seven pounds of fish to provide them with a day's pay. I do not think they should be charged one cent. Every day is fishing day, but every day is not catching day. Sometimes for weeks they do not get a good catch. I do not agree with this at all. Four shillings to a fisherman means forty dollars especially with the cost of material what it is today. You will not be surprised to know, Sir, that the cost of gear has increased considerably. These fishermen are hardworking people who constantly risk their lives. Why tax them? It is not as if they were using the roads which we have to repair every year. The sea is God's boundary. What high falutin idea is this? If some Fisheries Committee has sent this to us I do not agree with them at all. Sir, I would advise——

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker—On a point of order—The Objects and Reasons of a Bill are not part of a Bill. Show me any part of Section 4 where it is said that a fee is to be taken. It is not in the Bill and the honourable member is labouring under a misapprehension.

Mr. GARNER: Mr. Speaker,—If the question of paying a dollar is in the Objects and Reasons and not in the Bill itself, something is wrong; and that makes it all the more necessary for the Bill to be sent to a Select Committee. How can you put one thing in the Objects and Reasons and another thing in the Bill? Mr. Speaker, for the reasons that I have given I am supporting the motion that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. REECE: Mr. Speaker,—I agree that everything possible should be done to foster the Fishing Industry. But when you look at some of the clauses in this Bill there can be no doubt that if the Bill is passed as it is it will inflict considerable hardship on fishermen. It is a good provision which calls for every fishing boat to be inspected in order to see if it is sea worthy. But when you make it imperative on every fisherman to obtain a license before he can engage in the business, I say it is going too far. As we know, Sir, there are many people who when they find it difficult to obtain a living on land automatically go to the sea, and work for their living in a hard manner. To ask these people before they engage in this business to make an application and then pay a shilling for the privilege of getting a license is really carrying it too far. Says Clause 9, "Every person desirous of exercising the trade or calling of a fisherman shall sometime during the month of October in each year apply for a licence from the Director etc." I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the Director would refuse any of these applications for a licence. The Bill simply says that every person desirous of exercising the trade or calling of a fisherman shall sometime during the month of October apply to the Director. Are we going to assume that that it is up to the Director to say who should be and who should not be a fisherman? Sub-section (2) of the same section makes it an offence for a person to engage in fishing without having made application to the Director. So it can be readily seen that if this Bill is passed and there is a strict application of the law, it will bring a great hardship upon a large number of persons, who, because of the economic conditions of this country, find themselves forced to seek a livelihood on the sea. If these people want to catch a few fish to sell, or if they even want to drop a fishpot, they must get a license, or pay the penalty. I think that this thing is beyond the bounds of what is reasonable in this country. A man has got to pay a fee of 24 cents if he wants to exercise the calling of a fisherman. Then under Clause 12 every person who is the skipper of a fishing boat has also got to register. What will be the position of a boat the skipper of which suddenly becomes ill. The boat will have to remain on the beach. Mr. Speaker, Clause 18 provides that,

"Whenever—

(a) any fishing boat is lost, abandoned, stranded or materially damaged at set; or

(b) any fishing boat causes loss or material damage to any other fishing boat at sea or

(c) by reason of any casualty happening to or on board any fishing boat at sea, loss of life ensues. it shall be lawful for the Police Magistrate of the parish in or near which such loss, abandonment, stranding, damage or casualty occurs to make enquiry respecting such loss, abandonment, stranding, damage or casualty.

I do not think that anyone will say that it is not proper that such a provision should be made today when so many fishing boats are lost at sea without any reason being given for the loss. But Clause 20 (2) says:—

"The Police Magistrate if satisfied that the skipper or any member of the crew of a fishing boat has been guilty of incompetency, negligence, misconduct or a wrongful act or default, may suspend the licence of such skipper or member of the crew for such time as he may think fit, and may also impose a penalty not exceeding one hundred and twenty dollars, or imprisonment not exceeding six months or both such fine and imprisonment."

We all know, Sir, that inquiries have a habit of lasting a long time, so even if the magistrate suspended the licences of the skipper and crew for the time that the inquiry is in progress, it may be that the skipper and crew——

Mr. SPEAKER: I will not allow the honourable member to deal with the Bill in detail now. He will have an opportunity to do that when the Bill is in committee stage.

Mr. REECE: Mr. Speaker,—I was only dealing with the salient points of the Bill. I was dealing with the main provisions which go to the root of the matter. I was saying that the Police Magistrate by suspending the licences of the skipper and members of the crew "for such time as he thinks fit" may be putting these men out of employment for an indefinite period. The more one looks at this Bill and studies it carefully, the more one dislikes the many restrictions that it is proposed to place on owners and skippers of fishing boats as well as on members of the crews. I am suggesting that in view of the fact that in this country we are unable to produce enough animals to give us enough meat, that nothing should be done which would tend to restrict or hamper the activities of those who are engaged in the Fishing Industry. This Bill has that tendency. It is one thing to see that boats are in a seaworthy condition before they go to sea; but to suggest that a fisherman should be restricted in the manner suggested in this Bill — making it compulsory for the skipper and members of a boat crew to obtain a licence before they can go fishing, and giving power to magistrates to suspend licences for such time as they may think fit—is in my humble opinion rather hampering than encouraging the Fishing Industry. There is just one other point: In the definition clause, "fishing boat" is defined as "any boat that is used for the purpose of capturing fish for gain." That is a very wide definition indeed. It includes boats which do deep sea fishing as well as the moses which is used for dropping a few fishpots or for catching sprats. It means that even the little moses will have to be certified to be in a seaworthy condition before it could be used for the purposes for which such a boat is used. I suggest that that definition is much too wide, when one bears in mind the conditions that obtain in the Fishing Industry in this country, and the fact that many persons are engaged in capturing fish near to shore in boats which to fishermen accustomed to them are perfectly safe. I believe that the boat which is commonly called a "moses" is peculiar to Barbados. As a matter of fact, some of them are only floating rafts. But under this Bill they are classified as sea going fishing boats. Although I agree that some form of registration of boats may be necessary, and as the honourable senior member for St. Peter has pointed out there is no question of a fee in regard to registration, still there are provisions such as the registration of fishermen and the power of the magistrate to suspend licences for as long a period as he may think fit, that I do not feel are applicable to the conditions which obtain in this island.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker,—I too feel that some of the clauses in this Bill to encourage the Fishing Industry are somewhat restrictive. If the Bill were to be passed in its present form it would retard rather than encourage the industry. I feel that if you want to encourage the Fishing Industry you can do so without putting in clauses which call for licences, registration and penalties etc. and which would reduce the profits of those engaged in the industry. It is an industry that is not always lucrative. There are many days when a fisherman goes to sea and catches nothing. It is a rather arduous job, and I doubt you will find one in a thousand of the population who will be willing to face the dangers of the sea in search of food for the island. When you get courageous souls willing to face those dangers you should make sure that instead of trying to prevent people from joining the ranks, you encourage more people to do so. Going to sea in search of fish does not impose any burden in the true sense on anyone else but the fisherman. For ages fishermen in this country have been going to sea unhampered by any other force than the natural forces. Today, while you are talking about promoting and encouraging the industry, does one see it in this Bill? Firstly, a fisherman has got to obtain a licence. and that means that if this Bill were agreed to tonight, many a young man whom we often see at the waterside catching fish when he is hungry, will be carried before the Courts and fined, and if he cannot pay the fine he will have to go to prison. It means that all those innocent young boys whom we see on the wharfside, and those other persons who on days when they do not have any employment use their only recourse which is to sink their lines in order to get something to eat will either have to get a licence or pay the penalty. It does not mean that either of those persons intends to become a fisherman by trade. They are either not employed otherwise, or they catch a few fish in order to supplement their spasmodic earnings. The Bill also provides for notification of the change of a skipper within a period of three days. We know that as far as St. Lucy, St. Peter, St. Philip and St. John are concerned it will not be always possible for that notification to be given in such a short period, and this provision must impose a hardship. Besides that, an owner of a boat has to register it, and he is called on to pay a dollar. I noticed about two years ago that some of what I would call pleasure yachts used to take up much of the tackling which was needed for the Fishing Industry and which was in short supply, while they (the yachts) lay off the Barbados Yacht Club and the Aquatic Club, non-productive as far as aiding with the food supply of the island is concerned. I asked some question about making the owners pay taxes for such luxury craft because after all the Treasury has to pay for their upkeep in the harbour. Up to now Government has not answered these questions. Honourable members know that some of these boats are worth around £500. A fishing boat costs around $400 or $600. The people who own these yachts can afford to pay licence fees, while a fisherman can hardly pay for the proper repair of their boats. We spend thousands of pounds to subsidise cod fish. The only assistance we give to fishermen is to lend them a couple dollars when necessary. We are telling them now that they cannot go to sea unless they get a licence and pay a dollar, but we spend thousands of pounds to subsidise the trade of the Canadian fishermen. This Bill has some fines which must be imposed on those engaged in the Fishing Industry if the provisions of the Bill are not carried out. That money will go into the Treasury. Those are the things that we have to consider. I hope that the Government will take the subsidy off the cod fish and put it on the local industry. Fishermen sometimes lose money. Government should not cause them to have their already small profits reduced, but should try to encourage more people to join the industry and bring in more fish. When you consider it carefully you realise that a pound of fresh fish contains more nutritive value than ten pounds of cod fish. If you were to spend on the local industry some of the money that you are spending on cod fish it would mean that you would reduce unemployment by causing a promotion of the Fishing Industry. But to pass an Act saying that a man cannot be a fisherman unless he gets a licence, and that if he goes to sea without getting that licence he will be fined, is limiting the scope of the Fishing Industry. What do we consider as tangible assistance? A man will not be satisfied to face the dangers of the sea when you tell him that he cannot fish for gain unless he gets a licence, and that he has to get a guarantee of the seaworthiness of his boat from the Fishery Officer. Especially now that the Government is making loans for the repair of fishing boats I can hardly see an owner that would be so cruel to himself or so blind

to his own interests as not to draw from the fund to put his boat in a proper state of repair. You do not have to tell him to safeguard himself. Self preservation is the first law of nature. I do not believe in taking provisions from Acts which may have been passed in other countries where the fishing Industry is on a much bigger footing and trying to apply those provisions to this country with its few small boats. I do not see that we need this type of legislation. For ages our fishermen have been taking good care of themselves and they will continue to do so. These are the things which I feel should be done. Some honourable members talk about price controlling fish. But industry depends on supply and demand and a fisherman cannot afford to keep his fish too long. If you extend the industry it will mean that you will need no control. Supply and demand will take care of the price. Honourable members do not realise how difficult it is for a man to get up at 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning and go out to sea in an open boat, and realising that they may not get back until several days later, or that when they come back they may not have enough fish to pay for having faced the dangers of the sea. I feel that it would be a good thing for the Government to allocate a tangible sum of money to the Fishing Industry; not only should the Government help them with a small amount to repair their small boats; but the Government should also consider building deep sea schooners and employing some fishermen to go further afield and bring in a regular weekly supply of fish. We would then be able to reduce the amount of cod fish which we import from Canada and elsewhere at exorbitant prices. Those are the things which should be done. The crew of half a dozen fishing boats could be put on one of these schooners. The schooner could be equipped with refrigeration facilities, and they could stay out to sea for a week. At the clubs are a lot of people who fish for sport. I do not see why they should not be taxed. Why apply the Act only to those who do it for gain? Why, I ask, when those who do it for gain are thereby helping to provide the population with food. I am hoping, Sir, that opportunity will be given for this Bill to be carefully gone through, because I do not think that some of the clauses really assist the Fishing Industry.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,— I do not intend to deal much with the speech made by the last honourable member. We realise that it is difficult for some people to change, and when we hear pleas for the boys fishing on the wharf we know that if you have been associated with that way of making a living it becomes difficult for you to change from that way of looking at things. This Bill is not for the purpose of promoting fishing by wharf boys, but those who want to fish in a decent manner. Why should any honourable member in dealing with this Bill want to drag in the boys who fish on the wharf? Are we going to call the whole wharf a boat? I will now deal with some of the intelligent views expressed by other honourable members. I believe that the honourable junior member for Christ Church was sincere when he said that there are certain clauses that need reviewing. Obviously. But not when we are dealing with the motion for the second reading. When we are dealing with the motion that a Bill be read a second time we are dealing with the principle of the Bill. What we see in the objects and reasons about the payment of a dollar is a mistake, and the Government will be prepared now with your permisison, Sir, to withdraw those words which make reference to the payment of a fee. Nowhere in the Bill is there any provision which calls for the payment of a fee for registration or licence. You are only called upon to pay a 1/- if you apply for a duplicate licence or certificate. I have already made that point. When an honourable member after you have explained that the words in the Objects and Reasons are wrong still gets up and tries to impress the House that the Government are imposing all these restrictions on the people who go to sea for fish, what can you say? The honourable junior member for Christ Church was led to believe that there is a fee attached to it; but there is no fee attached. It is the intention of the Government to withdraw these words from the Objects and Reasons. Honourable members know that now, before a man can carry a small row boat into Carlisle Bay he must register it and pay a fee. The boats that go further afield we now say should be registered in the interest of the fishermen who go out in them. Not long ago a man from a fishing boat who could not swim had to be rescued from drowning in the careenage. It is not the intention of the Government or the Director of Agriculture to prevent a man from going to sea to fish because he cannot swim. Where are the restrictions? Can you believe that a magistrate will withdraw any man's licence unless he feels satisfied that it should be? Do you think that a magistrate will suspend a man's licence unless he feels that the man is a danger to other working people? Put yourself now in the position of the families of fishermen; a poor woman's husband goes out to sea to fish and does not come back, and no account is given of him. We know human nature. We know that there can be rows on board fishing boats. If a man's life is lost suddenly on land there is an inquiry. Why should not there be an inquiry when a life is lost suddenly at sea? When the honourable member talks about restrictive practices does he know that the Trinidad Government sent people here to make a study of our industry? We have provisions that none of the other West Indian islands have. About two years ago the House passed a Bill to amend the Trade Act thereby giving fishermen an opportunity to get tackle free from duty. Can anyone truthfully say that this Government is not looking after the Fishing Industry? Government has provided a tractor for fishermen at Bathsheba. A man has to pay only 6d for using it. Can anyone say that the Government is using restrictive measures? Before that tractor was provided a fisherman had to get two or three others to help him haul up his boat. There is no island in the West Indies that has done more for fishermen than Barbados. We are not seeking to pass any restrictive measures. This Bill seeks to help the industry. Honourable members have criticised the clauses which speak about penalties. When we come to those clauses the committee can consider them. When honourable members talk about restrictive measures, why not ask why a man cannot put a motor car on the road as he likes. Even now under the old Harbour and Shipping Master Act you have to register the names of the members of a boat before you go to sea. Honcurable members ask why should crews of fishing boats have to register with the Director of Agriculture and the Fishery Officer. The answer is so that we will know that there are so many people going to sea to fish etc. If that is a restrictive practice, it is one which we use in our private lives in our own interests. I have been told by the honourable mover of the motion that the Bill go to a Select Committee and by the seconder also, that they are willing to support the motion for the second reading. I know that some honourable members have not had the time to read the Bill and the Government is therefore willing to postpone going into Committee until

next Tuesday. Next Tuesday will be a field day. The cost of living Resolution will be coming up for discussion and honourable members will want to talk on that because the Elections are not far away. I am prepared however to proceed with this Bill next Tuesday if honourable members say that they want more time to consider it.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker,—I do not see the need for sending this Bill to a Select Committee now. The only point of controversy as far as I see was the question of the payment of a fee of one dollar, and the honourable senior member for St. Peter has explained that that is a mistake. But there was raised by the honourable senior member for St. John a point that I am inclined to agree with, and that is, that the period of three days within which the Bill says you must report the change of captaincy of a boat is too short a period. Sir, you are talking about a captain. The honourable member says to leave it to the fishermen to safeguard themselves. But there are men in this country who know that they are endangering their own life and that of their car if they drive it without having proper brakes; but they still do it. I have known a fisherman who put down his boat for weeks. He took it out one morning and it caught so much water that he had to turn back. If he had gone further, he and his boat would have been lost. You are trying to safeguard these men. You cannot leave it to them to do it. Sir, relative now to the question of the tractor at Bathsheba: That is a very nice thing that they have done for those fishermen. We know that the fee for drawing up these boats is only a sixpence. Perhaps it will be said that a sixpence is nothing. But if you are hungry tomorrow and you do not have a penny to buy a loaf of bread you still cannot eat the bread. What I have understood happens down there is that the tractor driver demands the sixpence before he hauls the boat up. Some of those fishermen credit fish out. In any case they cannot sell fish until the boat is hauled up. There is nothing wrong with the tractor driver using his discretion and pulling up the boat, and making sure that he is paid his sixpence out of the first sale of fish that the fisherman makes. I would like the honourable senior member for St. Peter to go into that question. There is another thing that the fishermen complain about. The boats go out at one time, but they do not all catch their fish the same time. But the tractor driver does not like them coming in as they like. If he has to stay a little overtime he quarrels and refuses to pull up these boats, and the men sometimes have to push them up themselves. He seems to forget that sometimes he does not have to bring out the tractor for a long time. I believe that that tractor driver is being paid a salary, and I do not see why the men should have to pull up the boats themselves. Fishermen do not make a big amount of money. It is not always fishing time. More latitude should be given to these fishermen at Bathsheba, and owing to the time that this tractor driver gets off he should give these fishermen some consideration. I am appealing to the honourable senior member for St. Peter to make inquiries into the situation and to see that the tractor driver is the servant of the fishermen.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker—As far as I can see this Bill arises out of the fact that the Government is making occasional loans to fishermen to assist them with building and repairing boats, and is prepared to establish by law a policy which will ensure that when these loans are made they are recoverable; because the fishermen are to be registered and the Government will have the record. At the same time, one cannot help expressing satisfaction that some of the things that appear in the Objects and Reasons do not appear in the Bill. I would like to refer to the observations made by the honourable junior member for St. Joseph relative to the tractor driver at Bathsheba. He says that sometimes a long period elapses during which the driver does not have to bring out the tractor. But the honourable member should know there are certain times of the year when the driver has to work exceedingly long hours, and during that time he certainly needs an assistant to relieve him. There are many nights when he has to work until 8.30 or even 9 o'clock, and they very often he puts in 12 or 14 hours a day. I now what I am talking about, because on more than one occasion I have brought him down at a very late hour of the night. There is apparently some slight misconception with regard to the whole tractor business. There is not a tractor at Bathsheba because someone from the House or so felt that there should be one. The fishermen at Bathsheba after suffering untold hardship for years, sent a delegation to Government House to ask the Governor to try and give them some sort of mechanical assistance. They sent more than one delegation, and eventually Sir Grattan Bushe, the Labour Officer Mr. Guy Perrin and Capt. L. Sealy went to Bathsheba one evening and were horrified when they saw the primitive methods by which these fishermen had to work. The Governor promised them that he would see that something was done and that some aid was provided. It was during the war, but remembering his promise, Sir Grattan Bushe put the machinery in motion which resulted in this tractor being put at Bathsheba.

Mr. SPEAKER: How does all that affect the principle of the Bill? The honourable member seems to be giving the House the history of what led up to the tractor being put at Bathsheba.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have no such intention. I will say now that no harm could be done if a little further consideration was given to the sections of the Bill, and therefore I am sure that honourable members will welcome the opportunity to postpone further consideration for a week. I will say too that while one welcomes the idea of having an expert like Dr. Hickling tell us what to do, one can be pardoned for expressing a view that some of the more important recommendations of some of these experts should not be so long ignored. Dr. Brown is also an expert, and some of the far-reaching recommendations that he made still remain unimplemented. I refer to such recommendations as establishment of refrigeration facilities and a recommendation relative to the canning and curing of fish. These are recommendations to which we should pay as much attention as we pay to the recommendations of Dr. Hickling. I do hope that the Fishery Department will pay some attention to some if not all of these far reaching recommendations.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker—I shall be very brief. There is no new principle involved in this registration. Every boatman has to pay 24 cents and every boat owner has to be registered. These are boats that are used for hire. I am only drawing that to the attention of the House in order that they may see by next Tuesday the fallacy in the statement that this registration of boats is something new. I think it is only fair to add that members of the Executive Committee wanted to know what the fishermen's reactions would be. The fishermen therefore know of these regulations.

Motion that the Bill be read a second time was put and carried *nem. con.*

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ADAMS moved seconded by Mr. Cox that the House do now adjourn for three quarters of an hour, and the motion being put and carried *nem. con.*

Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

## PACKAGE TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1951

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Michael:—To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Package Tax Act, 1941.

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker,—This Bill is a fairly simple one as honourable members will see. The Comptroller of Customs has drawn attention to the fact that the package tax at present on each asbestos cement pipe imported into this colony is at the rate of 12 cents per pipe, whereas for asbestos cement roofing sheets the tax is 12 cents per ten sheets and for other pipes which are usually packed ten in a bundle, the tax is 12 cents per bundle. Honourable members will see from the "Objects and Reasons" of this Bill that the Bill has been drafted to amend the Act so that asbestos cement pipes may be taxed at the same rate as asbestos sheets. It is felt that that is something reasonable and the Government has sent down this Bill as a result. It is proposed that this Bill should be made retrospective as from the 1st July, 1951. I do not think it is necessary for me to say anything more on this Bill because I think that honourable members are pretty well conversant with what has been set out in the "Objects and Reasons". With those remarks I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

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

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

The three Clauses of the Bill were read and passed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government Business for to-day's sitting.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business having been concluded, the House will now proceed with the consideration of Private Members' Business.

## ST. PHILIP (HIGHWAYS INSPECTORS) BILL, 1951

Mr. GARNER: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that Order No. 58 standing in my name under Private Members' Business be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Philip:—To move the second reading of the Bill to authorise the Commissioners of Highways of St. Philip to increase the rates of pay and travelling allowances to the Inspector and Assistant Inspector of Highways of the said parish.

Mr. GARNER: Mr. Speaker,—This is a routine Bill; it is not controversial. I should state that this Bill has been duly advertised, not a parishioner has objected to it and it is the concensus of opinion of the Commissioners of Highways of St. Philip that in keeping with the cost of living and what is required of the Inspector and the Assistant Inspector of Highways in respect of their offices, they should be given the increased salaries and amounts in respect of travelling allowance proposed in this Bill. As you know, the cost of living has risen tremendously and the Commissioners of Highways cannot do anything to raise the salaries of these officers unless they get permission from this House to do it. I have been instructed by the Vestry of St. Philip to present this Bill in accordance with the desire of the Board. We are not giving these two senior officers of the Board increased salaries and not attending to the needs of the people who do the spade work; quite recently there was a strike in St. Philip and we have managed to get over it by increasing the wages of the staff and casual labourers. Those people are fully contented now and there is satisfaction in the parish—it could not be otherwise with my presence there—so that whereas there was a little prejudice against this Bill in the first instance, that prejudice has now been removed because everybody is satisfied with the increased wages. The staff is willing to see that these two officers get their increases now.

This Bill seeks to grant these increases retrospectively as from the 1st October, 1951. The parish of St. Philip is a big parish and I do not think that anything which has been asked for in this Bill is unreasonable. I want it to be known that the moment in which the Chief Inspector gets his increase, the Assistant Inspector has to get his increase also. If any discrepancy should arise I will be on the job to see that the law is carried out both in the spirit and in the letter. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. BRANCKER: I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Before you put the question, Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few remarks in connection with this Bill. The honourable introducer has said that he has been instructed by the Vestry of St. Philip to present this Bill. I imagine it would be regarded as peculiar that, as one of the representatives of the parish in this House, I did not second the motion for the second reading of this Bill; but that is because I know that originally it was the intention of the Commissioners of Highways of the parish only to increase the salary of the Superintendent of Highways, but not to increase the salary of the Inspector at all. The idea was that since the Superintendent of Highways had failed to obtain the post of Parochial Treasurer, he should be given a sop by way of an increase in salary. Since representations were made on behalf of the Inspector, it has been decided to increase his emoluments.

The honourable introducer of the Bill was at pains to emphasize that in case there was any delay in granting the full increase to the Inspector, he is in favour of seeing that justice is carried out. Those remarks were not accidental; the honourable member knows that certain people had it in their minds that although pressure had been brought to bear to bring about the grant of an increase to the Inspector simultaneously with an increase to the Superintendent, it was the intention to give the Superintendent of Highways the full increase and to give the Inspector his increase by

way of travelling allowance and to make him wait for some time before giving him his entire amount. Those are facts within the knowledge of the honourable introducer of the Bill, and he has placed himself on record as having decided to see that the Inspector gets his full increase in salary as in the case of the Superintendent. I, personally, do not feel that the Superintendent is entited to any increase in salary at all, and I believe that there might be some doubt in the mind of the hon. introducer of the Bill himself as to the merits of the Bill itself. I noted that he has been very careful to say that he was instructed to present this Bill; while the honourable member does not want to let down his colleagues in the Vestry, I believe that there is a lurking doubt in his mind as to whether the Superintendent should be given this increase in salary. He knows that it was the intention to increase the salary of the Superintendent but not the Inspector or other employees. The honourable member finds himself in the position in which he has to introduce this Bill as things go, but I am sure that honourable members would not have failed to take note of the language which he used in introducing the Bill. The honourable member was particularly careful in choosing his words; acting on instructions he has presented this Bill to the House. I, personally, should like to see the Inspector given his increase now that the parochial authorities of the parish have been forced by reason of the strike to pay some attention to the unestablished staff, and I regret that the taxpayers are being saddled with this increase for the Superintendent when, in reality, no real case has been made out by the Board for it, but merely an attempt to satisfy what he regards as a grievance in another direction.

In any case, as far as this particular Bill is concerned, the point at issue now is to ensure that no monkey tricks are played with the increase for the Inspector. It is an open secret that while, theoretically, we agree to give an increase in this Bill before us, the Board are toying with the idea, giving the Superintendent the full increase now and doing as they like with the increase to be given to the Inspector. I am sure that the honourable member would not have dealt with this matter in the manner in which he did, unless he himself had some apprehension on the point, and he sought to clear away that apprehension. His remarks will be re-assuring to the Inspector and the subordinate employees of the Board and the people of the parish; it is sincerely to be hoped that the Highway Authorities and the Vestry of St. Philip will take due note of this matter.

Mr. GARNER: I thought that my colleague knew me, but by certain remarks he has made he does not know me, or at least he does not see me in action at the Vestry. I would never come to this House with anything which I was not justified was right; I do not think the Vestry would ask me to do that, because they know me very well. When the honourable member thinks that I have any apprehension in this matter, it is all settled, I just want to make the record straight because I want everybody to know where I stand in this matter. I had to adjudicate the matter in respect of the casual labourers before I would consent to take charge of this Bill; hence I brought forward this Bill with a justified conscience. When I speak at the Vestry I speak with power because I have everyone behind me. I do not tell one section one thing and another section something else; when I bring forward this Bill, I bring it forward with my conscience free, free from stain or guilt or collusion. (Cheers).

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

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

On a similar motion, the Preamble was postponed.

The four Clauses of the Bill were read and passed.

The Preamble was read and agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. GARNER, seconded by Mr. BRANCKER, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

## CHRIST CHURCH PARISH (CEMETERY) LOAN BILL, 1951

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to move that Order No. 55 standing in my name be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. ADAMS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for Christ Church:—To move the second reading of a Bill to authorise the Vestry of the parish of Christ Church to raise a loan not exceeding $7,200.

Mr. GODDARD: This Bill which seeks to authorise the Vestry of Christ Church to raise this loan not exceeding $7,200, has met with the approval of the entire Vestry. This loan is required for the purpose of repairing the road which has already been laid in the Christ Church Cemetery for laying out and making other roads and paths in the Cemetery, repairing the Mortuary Chapel and cleaning a drainage well in the said Cemetery. It is very necessary to have this work carried out and it is unfortunate that it was not done earlier this year, because, as a result of the excessive rains which we have had, the roads in the Cemetery are really impassable. The work will be done departmentally by the Highways Board; the interest on the loan will be at the rate of 4% per annum and the loan will be repaid over a period of 10 years. The Bill is quite in order; I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. GARNER: I beg to second that.

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

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

On a similar motion, the Preamble was postponed.

The thirteen Clauses of the Bill were read and passed.

The two Schedules were read and passed.

The Preamble was read and agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. GODDARD, seconded by Mr. GARNER, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

## REVERSION TO GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. ADAMS: I am asking honourable members to revert to Government Business and finish Order No. 16 on the Order Paper. I therefore beg to move that Order No. 16 under the Head "Government Business" be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was 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.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House was last in Committee on this Bill Clause 2 was being considered.

Mr. COX: Mr. Chairman,—On the last occasion when this Bill was before the Committee, honourable members expressed the view that although the British American Tobacco Company were given the opportunity of storing tobacco in their new building at Lodge Hill, they should still pay to the Government the equivalent amount of rent which they are now paying for the present bond. The matter was discussed by the Executive Committee and the Government has agreed to adopt the suggestion of the members who raised the question. The undertaking is now given by the Government that in the near future legislation will be brought before the House having for its object the implementation of the suggestion by honourable members. With that undertaking we can proceed to pass this Bill.

Mr. GODDARD: I am glad that the Government has adopted the suggestion of the members of the Opposition; we had raised the point that although the facilities should be granted to any company to store their goods in their own suitable bond, yet they should not be free from their responsibility of paying the proper tax. This particular Company was first granted the concession of storing tobacco in their newly-built bond and they came back and asked for these facilities free of rent. That is what we questioned.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It seems to me as if honourable members are making second reading speeches but we are now in Committee on this Bill.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am going to speak on Clause 2 of this Bill. Like the honourable senior member for Christ Church, I am glad that the suggestion of the Opposition has been appreciated, but the honourable member in charge of this Bill has actually said that legislation having for its object the implementation of our suggestion, will be introduced. Is it necessary to bring down legislation for that purpose? As I understand the position, these goods must be stored in the Government Spirit Bond, but it does not seem logical to say that you must enact legislation so as to have people paying this rent. Why should you have to enact legislation for this purpose?

Mr. COX: At the present time, according to the law, this manufactured tobacco must be stored in the Government Spirit Bond. Some time ago we allowed the British American Tobacco Company to store tobacco in their own building; we lost money as a result, but it was not in the best interest of the Company to store their tobacco with other substances. Since we allowed this Company to store tobacco in their own building, they have asked that the law be amended to store manufactured cigarettes in their own building, and this Bill seeks to give them permission to do so. The Comptroller of Customs felt that it was unreasonable to ask these people to pay rent to the Government after they had been given permission to store articles in their own bond. Honourable members of the Opposition criticised allowing these people to store articles in their own bond and the Government losing rent from the Government Spirit Bond. It has been agreed to go on with this Bill as it stands, giving this Company the right to store their tobacco in their own building, but we are soon coming down to the House with a comprehensive Bill covering this same Company, making them pay the equivalent amount as if they were renting the Government bond.

Mr. GODDARD: I think I can explain the position. The Government gave the British American Tobacco Company the right to store tobacco in their own bond without paying the equivalent as if they were renting the Government Spirit Bond. The Government will now have to bring down legislation to deal with this matter.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

## ORDER NOT PROCEEDED WITH

Mr ALLDER: I am asking leave to proceed with Order No. 1, standing in my name under Private Members' Business as the next Order of the Day—To move the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor relating to the purchasing and taking over of all Estates in this Island owned by absentee proprietors.

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable member should have paid me the compliment as other honourable members have done. However, this particular matter will require hours of controversy and I certainly am not going to keep back honourable members to deal with an Address of this sort, in which case there able to do that on another occasion.

Mr. ALLDER: I regret that the honourable Leader of the House does not see his way to deal with this Order which has been on the Order Paper for some time. I would like to draw to his attention that when it seemed that there was not a quorum of members present I scampered in here to help him in the formation of a quorum; I may not be able to do that on another occasion.

Mr. ADAMS: We, the Government members, are not remaining to pass an address to ourselves; if the four of us leave the House there will not be any quorum. Why does the honourable member think that we are against him?

Mr. ALLDER: In the circumstances I am withdrawing my request.

## THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Mr. ADAMS: I am asking honourable members to come prepared to deal with the Domestic Sugar Agreement as the first Order of the Day next Tues-

day. I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to this day week, the 9th October, 1951, at 3 p.m.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. SMITH: The House will soon be prorogued and there is still a lot of work to be done. I think that we should sit next Thursday.

Mr. ALLDER: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to Thursday next at 3 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not agree with that.

The question that this House do now adjourn to Thursday next at 3 p.m. was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:—

*Ayes*: Messrs. SMITH, ALLDER, COX and ADAMS—4.

*Noes*: Messrs. MOTTLEY, MILLER, MAPP, F. L. WALCOTT, Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. GARNER, BRANCKER and GODDARD—8.

The question that this House do now adjourn to this day week, the 9th October, 1951, at 3 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.