BACKGROUND TO THE INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION FOR THE COMPULSORY DETERMINATION OF LABOUR DISPUTES IN TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

By

Addison M. Khan, M.A., LL.M., of Gray's Inn, Barrister,
Attorney at Law, President of the Industrial Court of Trinidad and Tobago

Introduction

Under the previous voluntary system of industrial relations that existed immediately before the enactment of the Industrial Stabilisation Act, 1965 ("the ISA"), there was no restriction on industrial action. Employers and trade unions were free to embark on industrial action if they failed to settle their disputes amicably and trade unions frequently used this technique to extract settlements from employers. The new regime established by the ISA however, changed that system. The ISA established an Industrial Court and provided orderly procedures for the settlement of disputes between employers and trade unions. It also virtually prohibited strikes and lockouts and unresolved disputes were reported to the Minister of Labour who in turn referred them to the Industrial Court for determination.

The ISA was, without doubt, one of the most controversial pieces of legislation that has ever been enacted in Trinidad and Tobago. It was widely criticised and condemned, especially by trade unions, as repressive and an unnecessary intervention in the rights and liberties of workers and their trade union activities.

Both before and after the passage of the ISA, trade unions criticised the Government for its introduction. They accused the Government of "courting" the employers.

The ISA was passed during a period of public emergency that was occasioned by disorders in the sugar belt. Workers employed by the sugar companies walked off their jobs and caused a complete shut down of the sugar industry.

In the face of widespread disorders, demonstrations, and a threat of a general strike, the Government moved swiftly and proclaimed a State of Emergency in certain designated areas of the sugar belt. On March 12, 1965, during the currency of the state of emergency, a bill entitled "The Industrial Stabilisation Act, 1965" was tabled in the House of Representatives. It was a most significant and far-reaching enactment. The employers welcomed it, particularly for its almost total prohibition of the wildcat strike. The trade unions, however, denounced it as being repressive and destructive of free collective bargaining.

Attempts to establish Industrial Court

The idea of establishing an Industrial Court in Trinidad and Tobago was first seriously considered in the year 1920 when Trinidad and Tobago was still a British Crown colony. In that year, the legislature of the Colony enacted the Industrial Court Ordinance, 1920 ("the 1920 Ordinance"), which became effective on August 17, 1920. That Ordinance made provision for the establishment of a standing Industrial Court in Trinidad and Tobago for the purpose of settling industrial disputes and for advising the Governor on any industrial or economic question on which he required advice. The 1920 Ordinance required the Industrial Court to have a President and other members appointed from time to time by the Governor from among independent persons, selected from representatives of employers and representatives of workers. When the Legislative Council passed the 1920 Ordinance, however, there was no established system of collective bargaining in Trinidad and Tobago and no organised trade unions to represent workers existed. The Director of Works was appointed as President of the Industrial Court and the Government compiled a list of persons to serve on the Court in the event it became necessary for the Court to sit. However, the Industrial Court never convened or determined an industrial dispute.

Trade Unions Ordinance, 1932

A Trade Unions Ordinance was enacted for the first time in Trinidad and Tobago in 1932. This Ordinance enabled trade unions of workers to be formed and to exist lawfully.

The Forster Commission

In 1937, there was a prolonged general strike in the oil and sugar industries to protest inferior terms and conditions of labour in those industries. The strike resulted in serious violence and disorders and, consequent upon such disorders, a Royal Commission of Inquiry[1] was appointed to enquire into the cause of the disturbances. Sir John Forster chaired this Commission. The Forster Commission commented adversely on the absence of a recognised system of collective bargaining and, in particular, on the absence of any proper machinery for the ventilation of workers' grievances. In paragraph 275 of its Report[2], the Commission stated

> "275. Had there existed in the oilfields and elsewhere organised means of collective bargaining through which the claims or grievances of the workpeople could have found ample means of expression, there can be little doubt but that the disturbances which subsequently arose might have been avoided."

The Forster Commission recommended, among other matters, the formation of a Labour Department and the establishment of an Industrial Court. In paragraph 297 of its Report,[3] the Forster Commission elaborated on its recommendation for the establishment of an Industrial Court. It said,

> "It is not our intention that the Industrial Court should in general be called upon to determine individual grievances; such individual grievances as fail to find local adjustment should, we think, be left to be dealt with by the Secretary for Labour and his conciliation officers."

The Commission continued in paragraph 298[4] of its report:

> "Since the year 1920, the Ordinances of the Colony have provided for the establishment of an Industrial Court. No court has, however, been established nor do we think that a court now established in the terms of the 1920 Ordinance would serve present needs. Final decision left to a tribunal constituted entirely of local persons would, we are satisfied, be suspect both by employers and employees (It is, in our view, necessary, therefore, that a person of the required experience and standing should be appointed from outside the Colony to act as President.

We accordingly recommend the establishment of an Industrial Court composed as follows:

(a) a President appointed from outside the Colony; and

(b) two assessors, a representative of employers and employees respectively, to be selected from panels to be set up by the Labour Department.

The decision of the Court should be the decision of the President alone, and it should be left to him to settle the Court's Rules and Procedure.

It will no doubt be asked what sanctions will exist for the enforcement of the decision of the Court. As in the United Kingdom no express sanctions will exist, but enlightened public opinion will be against the party refusing to accept the decision of the Court, and it is to be expected that the good sense of the parties themselves will compel compliance with the Court's decision."

No Industrial Court was ever established along the lines suggested by the Forster Commission.

The Trade Disputes (Arbitration and Inquiry) Ordinance, 1938

Another attempt was made to introduce a proper system for the settlement of labour disputes by the enactment of the Trade Disputes (Arbitration and Inquiry) Ordinance, Chap. 22 No. 10[5]. This Ordinance was placed among the laws of Trinidad and Tobago in 1938. This Ordinance enabled the Governor to appoint Boards of Inquiry or Arbitration Tribunals to inquire into the causes and circumstances of trade disputes and to make recommendations to him for their settlement. There were several unsatisfactory features of the Ordinance, foremost among them being the absence of effective sanctions for the enforcement of the recommendations of the Boards of Inquiry

[1] Report of Forster Commission on Trinidad and Tobago disturbances, 1937
[2] ibid.
[3] ibid.
[4] idid. The Forester Commission was, therefore, fully aware of the 1920 Ordinance
[5] Now repealed

and Arbitration Tribunals. The parties were required to give their consent before an Arbitration Tribunal was appointed and the terms of reference of a Board of Inquiry was limited to a review of the circumstances of the dispute and a report thereon. Invariably, a Board of Inquiry made recommendations for the settlement of the dispute but neither party to the dispute was in any way compelled to accept or implement the Board's recommendations.

Other Commissions of Inquiry

Other Commissions of Inquiry also recommended the establishment of an Industrial Court. In 1954, the Dalley Commission[6] suggested

> "It is also a fact, unfortunately, that in so many of these differences and disputes, both sides ignore that a third party is involved, namely, the general community, of which, after all, particular employers and employees are only a part. It seems desirable to emphasise, therefore, that not only should there be a willing buyer and a willing seller, but that the bargain struck should not be detrimental to the economy of the Country; in other words, that the rights of the general community should not be ignored. These considerations lend support to the idea of collective bargaining being supplemented by agreed arbitration by an independent tribunal in the event of genuine deadlock. While the community has its responsibility towards each of its sections none of these should ignore its own obligations to the larger community."

The Commission of Inquiry into the strike at Trinidad Cement Limited[7] also recommended the establishment of an Industrial Court, saying,

> "We consider that urgent consideration should be given to the setting up of progressive steps leading industrial disputes, if necessary, to an appropriate tribunal; and that, having regard to the state of our development and the sharp expansion inherent in our needs, such a course should be rendered obligatory, for at least an effective initial period."

Indiscriminate industrial action

During the period, 1960 to 1964, Trinidad and Tobago suffered immensely from industrial action. In this five-year period, 230 strikes occurred, an average of 46 per year. In 1962 alone, 75 strikes took place. 74,574 workers, an average of 15,000 per year, participated in these strikes. Of these 74,574 workers, 10,480 were employed in the sugar industry, 23, 860 in the oil industry, 7,443 in construction, 8,461 in electricity, gas, water, and sanitary services, and 6,199 in transport, storage and communication. During the five years, 803,899 man-days, an annual average of over 100,000, were lost as a result of these strikes. 144,363 man-days were lost in the sugar industry, 28, 601 in the oil industry, 47,441 in construction, 20,114 in electricity, gas, water, and sanitary services, and 137,462 in transport, storage and communication. As a result of these strikes, workers lost wages amounting to approximately $41/2 million in the five years. Government also lost an estimated $4.2 million in revenues consequent upon the reduction in income and profit taxes and indirect taxes and royalties[8].

The strikes were instituted mainly over such issues like recognition of trade unions and grievances, the negotiation or revision of collective agreements and sympathy strikes.

The result was chaos and confusion in industrial relations. The process of collective bargaining was frustrated and the industrial relations system was seriously challenged. Trade unions did not hesitate to use the ultimate weapon of strike to settle even the simplest disputes. The Government of the day reacted to this unsatisfactory situation by introducing legislation for the compulsory adjudication and determination of unresolved labour disputes by judicial process.

---

[6] Paragraph 135 of the Dalley Commission Report, 1954

[7] Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Strike at Trinidad Cement Limited, 1961

[8] See speech of Prime Minister, Dr. Eric Williams on second reading of Industrial Stabilisation Bill, 1965, in House of Representatives in Trinidad and Tobago Hansard, March 18, 1965.

Aim of legislation

It was chiefly to curtail indiscriminate strike action that was threatening to ruin the Country's economy that the Government took positive action by placing the ISA on the statute books. The long title of the Industrial Stabilisation Act, 1965[9], briefly summarised its purpose and intent. It was

"An Act to provide for the compulsory recognition by employers of trade unions and organisations representative of a majority of workers, for the establishment of an expeditious system for the settlement of trade disputes, for the regulation of prices of commodities, for the constitution of a court to regulate matters relating to the foregoing and incidental thereto."

President's statements

In the Second Annual Report of the President of the Industrial Court, Justice Isaac Hyatali, the first President of the Industrial Court encapsulated the principal reason for the introduction of the ISA when he wrote,

> "The (Industrial Stabilisation) Act as everyone knows was designed to relieve the Country from the rash of strikes, by which it was besieged in the period immediately preceding March 20, 1965, without destroying the processes of collective bargaining."

Justice Hyatali made a similar statement in the Third Annual Report of the President of the Industrial Court. He wrote,

> "There was no doubt that industrial warfare in the country was doing irreparable damage to its economy and was threatening the foundations of its stability, integrity and viability. It was against this dismal background that (the Industrial Stabilisation) Act was conceived and promulgated. It sought through the establishment of an appropriate judicial structure to settle disputes which the parties thereto could not resolve between themselves, to substitute order for disorder and reason for passion on the industrial scene and to arrest and repair the damage which costly and disruptive strikes had been inflicting on the country."

Collymore and Abraham

In Collymore and Abraham and the Attorney General[10], the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council also noted

> "So far as industrial disputes are concerned the (Industrial Stabilisation) Act, 1965, virtually imposes upon employers and employees alike a system of compulsory arbitration for the settlement of such disputes instead of industrial action such as lockouts and strikes. The arbitration is to be by an Industrial Court which is established by the Act."

The Precedents for the ISA

The Government studied a number of precedents before finalising the Bill for the ISA. It considered precedents from Australia, Singapore, Jordan, New Zealand, Scandinavia and the United States of America. It did not slavishly follow any of the precedents studied but eventually drafted a Bill that contained many unique features. Dr. Eric Williams, the then Prime Minister, took a personal interest in the ISA and the Industrial Court since he fully understood their crucial importance in protecting the national economy from the ravages of indiscriminate industrial action. In his "Reflections on the Industrial Stabilisation Bill"[11], he specifically noted that the Industrial Court created by the ISA was a cross between the Australian Court and the Singapore Court and that it was headed by a High Court Judge.

---

[9] Act No. 8 of 1965. The Industrial Court was not originally a superior court of record. The Industrial Strabilisation (Amendment (No. 2) Act, 1967 however, elevated the Court to the status of a superior court of record. It continues to be a superior court of record under the IRA.

[10] [1969] 2 all ER 1207.

[11] A series of articles published in "The Nation" (April 1965). Dr. Williams wrote at page 7 of his first Article dated April 2, 1965, "The Precedents of the Bill", "Our Industrial Court is a cross between the Australian Court which consists of Judges and the Singapore Court which consists entirely of laymen, whilst we modified the New Zealand principle of a Court headed by a barrister or solicitor. Our Court is headed by a High Court Judge, we provide for a Deputy President who shall be a barrister or a solicitor of ten years standing and we make provision for three additional independent members experienced in the fields of industrial relations, economics and accountancy..."

Exclusion of vested interests

Another important feature of the ISA was that it excluded vested interests. Members of the Industrial Court were to be impartial and independent[12].

Government Notice

In order to clarify certain misconceptions about the purpose of the Act, the Government issued a statement for the information of the public[13] denying that the primary purpose of the ISA was to prohibit strikes.

The challenge to the constitutionality of the ISA

Messrs John Abraham and Learie Collymore, two officers of the Oilfields Workers' Trade Union, filed a motion in the High Court of Justice ("the constitutional motion") for a declaratory order that the Act was invalid, null and void and of no legal force and effect in terms of and by virtue of the Constitution of Trinidad and Tobago.

Mr. Justice Maurice Corbin heard the constitutional motion and dismissed it. The Union appealed to the Court of Appeal. On January 27, 1967, the Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal. The Court of Appeal held[14] *inter alia* that the right of free collective bargaining and the right to strike

---

[12] In the same Article, Dr. Williams continued, "In the second place we have, following the Singapore trend, excluded vested interests - that is to say, both employers and unions- and selected all impartial and independent members."

[13] Notice No 812 published in Trinidad and Tobago Gazette: 20 May, 1965 stated, "INDUSTRIAL STABILISATION ACT, No. 8 of 1965
During the Debate in Parliament on the Industrial Stabilisation Act, 1965, and subsequently through various media, Government has taken steps to explain the reasons and purpose for which the Act has been promulgated. Notwithstanding this, however, it appears that certain misconceptions still exist in the minds of some members of the public with regard to the operation of the Act. It has therefore been considered desirable that the correct position should again be made public.

The primary purpose of the Act is not to prohibit strikes. It makes provision for the settlement of disputes by conciliation, arbitration and judicial process. It is only where strike or lockout action takes place without following the conciliation procedure provided in the Act or while a dispute is before the Court that such action becomes unlawful.

Certain provisions in the Act require that the public interest in matters covered by the Act should be safeguarded, and in this connection it provides for representations to be made where necessary on behalf of the People of Trinidad and Tobago. The provisions of the Act empowering the Minister of Labour to forward a statement to the parties to a proposed Agreement or to forward a dispute to the Court and those which authorise the Attorney General to intervene on behalf of the People of Trinidad and Tobago when a dispute is before the Court, will be put into effect only when the public interest is involved. Neither the Attorney General nor the Minister of Labour intends to intervene in every case, since in very many cases the public interest will be little, if at all, affected.

Attention is also invited to the fact that the obligation in section 19 (1) of the Act to give to the Minister of Labour notice in writing of particulars of the matters and things on which agreement is to be sought is binding on both parties to any proposed agreement. The notice required must contain particulars in respect of each matter on which agreement is to be sought if it is to be accepted as effective notice under section 19 (1) of the Act. Failure to give notice to the Minister or to forward with the notice the necessary particulars will have the effect of preventing the Minister from giving adequate consideration to the proposed agreement and of delaying the conclusion of an agreement."

[14](1967) 12 W.I.R. 5 In delivering his Judgment in the Court of Appeal, Sir Hugh Wooding, Chief Justice (as he then was) stated," The appellants' main contention was that the Act abrogates or abridges what they termed to be the right of free collective bargaining and the right to strike, both of which they maintain to be inherent in the freedom of association which is a fundamental freedom under the Constitution... the Act does substantially abrogate the so-called right to strike, but for the purposes of this appeal it suffices that the so-called right is abridged. Thus I come to the nub of the issue. This, as I see it, is whether the freedom of collective bargaining and the so-called right to strike are, or either of them is inherent in (in the sense of being an integral feature of) the freedom of association guaranteed by the Constitution.

My first observation is that individual freedom in any community is never absolute ... freedom of association means no more than freedom to enter into consensual arrangements to promote the common-interest objects of the associating group ... But the freedom to associate confers neither right nor licence for a course of conduct or for the commission of acts which in the view of Parliament are inimical to the peace, order and good government of the country. In like manner, their constitutionally-guaranteed existence notwithstanding, freedom of movement is no licence for trespass, freedom of conscience no licence for sedition, freedom of expression no licence for obscenity, freedom of assembly no licence for riot and freedom of the press no licence for libel ... What is or is not inimical to the peace, order and good government of the country is not for the courts to decide ... the strike weapon was so extensively used that to many it began to appear that the imbalance had tilted the other way ... it is likewise easy to see that Parliament may have considered that the best means of holding the scales in equal poise was to refer to a tribunal for its impartial adjudication all disputes which the parties themselves should fail to resolve. That was within the prerogative of Parliament. Collective bargaining is one of the principal objects of a trade union ... section 3 of the Act preserves it fully, to the extent that it obliges every employer not only to recognise any trade union which is representative of 51 per cent or upwards of the workers employed by him, but also to treat and enter into such negotiations with it as may be necessary or expedient for preventing or settling trade disputes. What has been abridged is freedom of contract. But that is not a freedom recognised, declared or guaranteed by the Constitution ... So, because there is nothing in the Constitution which prohibits Parliament from restricting freedom of contract it was a policy decision for Parliament, and is not a question for the Courts, whether in the interest of the country the People (to use the language of the Act) should be permitted any say on the terms of industrial agreements so as to ensure as far as practicable that, as recited in paragraph (b) of the preamble to the Constitution and repeated in section 9 (2) of the Act, "the operation of the economic system should result in the material resources of the community being so distributed as to subserve the common good."

were not included in the fundamental freedom of association recognised and declared by section 1 (j) of the Constitution[15] and were consequently not protected as such under the provisions of sections 2 and 6 of the Constitution. The appellants' challenge to the constitutional validity of the ISA or its provisions on six subsidiary grounds also failed.

Following the Court of Appeal's dismissal of the appeal, the appellants appealed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council[16] agreed that the ISA abridged the freedom to bargain collectively since, under its provisions, industrial agreements[17] only become effective if the Industrial Court registered them. The Judicial Committee also accepted that the ISA abridged the freedom to strike, and, in the case of essential services, abrogated it altogether.

The Judicial Committee stated, however, that the real questions were whether the abridgement of the rights of free collective bargaining and of the freedom to strike were abridgments of the right of freedom of association.

Their Lordships agreed with the Court of Appeal which rejected the appellant's main contention. They also dismissed the other subsidiary grounds. With one exception, they said they could not improve on the reasons given for their rejection by the Court of Appeal.

Their Lordships advised Her Majesty that the appeal should be dismissed with costs to be paid by the appellants.

The first sitting of the Industrial Court

The first sitting of the Industrial Court was held on April 29, 1965 at the Sixth Supreme Court in the Red House in Port of Spain. At that sitting, Justice Isaac Hyatali, who was its first President, explained the role of the Court and its members[18]. He emphasised the new and important role of the Industrial Court in dealing with trade disputes between trade unions and employers.

The beneficial effects of the ISA

Despite the virtual banning of industrial action, the ISA brought many benefits to workers, trade unions and employers as well as to the community as a whole. These included provisions for the compulsory recognition of trade unions, registration of collective agreements, an orderly system for the resolution of trade disputes and the establishment of an Industrial Court. These were all measures to ensure peace and stability in industrial relations.

In the First Annual Report of the President of the Industrial Court[19], Justice Hyatali emphasised the advantages of judicial machinery to settle trade disputes. After referring to the number of trade disputes that had been referred to the Court

---

[15] i.e. the 1962 Independence Constitution of Trinidad and Tobago.

[16] Op. cit. Their Lordships noted that the ISA did not affect the rights of trade unions enumerated in Convention No. 87 of the International Labour Organisation dealing with "Freedom of Association" and that it was, therefore, inaccurate to contend that the abridgement of the right to free collective bargaining and of the freedom to strike leaves the assurance of "freedom of association" empty of worthy content."

[17] A collective agreement was called an industrial agreement under the ISA.

[18] See First Annual Report of the President of the Industrial Court, pps. 6-7. (29 April, 1965-28 April, 1966). Justice Hyatali said, "This is the first sitting of the Industrial Court established under the Industrial Stabilisation Act, 1965. On behalf of myself and my brethren who sit with me - indeed on behalf of all the members of this Court, I extend to the parties before us and their representatives a most cordial welcome.

The occasion is an historic and important one for several reasons. It is not for me to recount them here as they are well known to all of you. All that it is necessary for me to say in this connection is that if in this new and challenging field of industrial investigation and adjudication, our country finds itself in this geographical region in the forefront of change instead of decay, then this Court, being the instrument by which this change is going to express and assert itself, is entitled to expect and to receive the full and willing co-operation of all good citizens and more especially of those who appear before us to litigate their causes.

On our part, we are firmly resolved to do no more but certainly no less than what we undertook to do in a simple yet solemn ceremony yesterday morning when we took our respective oaths of office before the learned Chief Justice -

'to do right to all manner of people after the laws and usages of Trinidad and Tobago without fear or favour, affection or illwill.'

Misguided, inaccurate and ill-conceived statements have been made publicly about the possible role and integrity of this Court - but let me here and now disabuse the minds of everyone of any false notions, which these utterances may have created. Not only would I remind you of the words of the oath to which we have solemnly subscribed but I take this opportunity to declare publicly and emphatically that this Court is an independent Court - free from the control, directions or influences of the Executive, members of Parliament, political parties and personalities and all pressure groups and combines, guided or misguided that may appear on the scene now or hereafter."

[19] Op. cit.

between April 24, 1965 and April 18, 1966, Justice Hyatali wrote,

> "In the ordinary course this would probably have resulted in an almost equal number of stoppages of work in a variety of industries and undertakings throughout the nation. The extent to which our small country - a speck of dust - as one of the big nations would describe us - would have been paralysed by so many strikes in a single year and the extent to which the well-being of our citizens, the stability of the country and the public welfare would have been damaged or destroyed are better left to the imagination since they are incapable of precise calculation.

The compulsory, expeditious, and if I may venture to say, just settlement of trade disputes in a peaceful and orderly manner has rescued the country from the crippling catastrophes which so many stoppages of work would otherwise have inflicted upon it. It is a comforting thought that both the essential interests of the country and the vital principle of social justice for its workers have been served and advanced by the enactment of the legislation and the due administration of its provisions and this lends support to the observation that the wisdom which inspired the establishment of a judicial system to stabilise the industrial life of the nation cannot now be questioned."

Industrial Relations Act, 1972

The Industrial Relations Act ("the IRA")[20] repealed and replaced the ISA with effect from July 31, 1972 and continued the Industrial Court.

Complaint No. 8 of 1974 between Trinidad Footwear Limited and Transport and Industrial Workers' Union

His Honour Mr. J.A.M. Brathwaite, the Industrial Court's second President, made a very useful comparison between the previous voluntary system of industrial relations and the new system of compulsory adjudication of disputes introduced by the ISA in his judgment in Complaint No. 8 of 1974 between Trinidad Footwear Limited and Transport and Industrial Workers' Union2120. His Honour Mr. Brathwaithe said,

> "Until just short of ten years ago this system operated on what is known as the voluntary principle. The settlement of disputes between the parties could not be enforced by the compulsory adjudication of any court or statutory tribunal nor could agreements reached between them in settlement of their disputes be enforced in any court. A conciliation service was provided by the Ministry of Labour and it was widely used when there was a failure to reach agreement by direct negotiations. But it was purely voluntary and could do no more than assist the parties to reach agreement between themselves. In the long run the parties had to depend on their respective bargaining strengths and all negotiations were conducted under the threat of the ultimate resort to the weapons of strike or lockout."

Conclusion

The ISA was a new and revolutionary enactment and it was introduced into the statute books of the country with considerable caution and after much reflection. Parliament was unsure how long the system of compulsory arbitration was going to endure. There is no doubt now, however, that the system of determining industrial disputes by judicial process has found general acceptance by trade unions, employers, government, and the population as a whole. The IRA is no longer of an experimental nature. It has become an integral part of industrial relations law in Trinidad and Tobago. The Industrial Court continues to play a vital role in safeguarding the economy as a whole, since its judgments are not confined to the immediate disputants before it but also take into account the interest of the community as a whole. It cannot be denied that the Industrial Court has made a significant contribution to the maintenance of industrial peace and stability in Trinidad and Tobago and its establishment is a credit to the foresight and wisdom of those who were responsible for its establishment.

[20] Now Chap. 88:01 of the Laws of Trinidad and Tobago (1980 ed.)