THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT).

SESSION 1946—1948

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 1st April, 1947.

Pursuant to adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 o'clock noon to-day.

Present:

His Honour Mr. G. B. EVELYN (*Speaker*), Mr J. T. C. RAMSAY (*Chairman of Committees*), Messrs. M. E. COX, D. A. FOSTER, R. G. MAPP, H. W. SPRINGER, M.A., G. H. ADAMS, B.A., H. D. BLACKMAN, C. E. TALMA, H. A. DOWDING, V. C. GALE, and E. L. WARD.

PRAYERS AND MINUTES.

Prayers are read and the Minutes of meetings held on the 13th, 20th, and 25th March respectively having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT enters the House and takes his seat.

DOCUMENTS.

Mr. SPEAKER : I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Reports of the Inspectors of Trees for the parishes of St. John and St. Andrew for the year 1946.

Messrs. WILKINSON, LEWIS, and BRANCKER enter the House and take their seats.

PAPER LAID

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

Statement of Expenditure of the Housing Board furnished in accordance with the provisions of section 14 of the Bridgetown Housing Act, 1936 (1936—8) to the 31st December, 1946.

Mr. CRAWFORD enters the House and takes his seat.

NOTICES.

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Mr. SPRINGER : Resolution to place the sum of £170. 2. 7. at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to purchase an area of land containing 4,362 sq. ft. situated on the sea frontage off Fish Alley, Fontabelle, and to pay legal and other expenses in connection with the sale of the land.

Mr. ADAMS : Resolution to place the sum of £50,162 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to meet the cost of subsidising the commodities mentioned in the Schedule hereto to the 30th June, 1947, in order that the prices of these commodities may be stabilised at such prices as may be fixed by the Competent Authority.

Mr. CRAWFORD : Resolution to place the sum of £62 8. at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the amount granted by resolution No. 2/1947 dated the 15th January, 1947, to purchase from the War Office certain buildings at Seawell and Charles Fort.

Mr. BLACKMAN : Resolution to place the sum of £4,351 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to pay with effect from the 1st April, 1946, and until the 31st March, 1948, a cost of living allowance to officers employed under Colonial Development and Welfare Schemes, at the rates, and subject to the terms, conditions and exceptions, set out in the Schedule hereto.

Mr. SPRINGER : Resolution to place the sum of £9,550 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the purchase and installation of machinery for the Cotton Spinning Plant and to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of cotton lint.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Resolution to approve the Rules made by the General Nursing Council under section 9 of the Midwives and Nurses Registration Act, 1932 (1932—1).

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

Mr. SPEAKER : The first Order 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 Government.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. COX, Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee of Supply, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY VOTE FOR ORGANIZATION FOR BANKING SAVINGS OF WORKERS IN THE U.S.A.

Mr. ADAMS : The first Resolution, Sir, is for the sum of £1,500 to supplement Resolution No. 57 of the 27th September, 1946, to provide the necessary staff and stationery for, and to meet incidental expenses in connection with the carrying on of an organization for banking the compulsory savings of

Barbadian workers employed in the United States of America, for the payment to their nominees of the allotments authorised to be paid under the terms of the workers' contracts, for the payment of any Court order in respect of the maintenance of any persons dependent on the workers, for the reimbursement of any monies paid by the Government of Barbados in respect of duties incurred by the workers in the United States of America, and in respect of advances made to workers by way of cash or in order to effect insurance.

The addendum gives all the information that is required. £700 was provided to meet the running expenses of the organisation to the 31st March, 1946, and this further sum of £1,500 is required to run it to the end of June this year. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BLACKMAN : I beg to second that.

Mr. HAYNES enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. LEWIS : Mr. Chairman,—Before the question is put I would just like to hear from the senior member for St. Joseph exactly what is the reason for the increase in the amount; it is more than double the amount on this occasion.

Mr. ADAMS : I really do not know but I can get the information for the honourable member if he really wants it before he votes one way or the other. All the information I have is that this is the amount of money that it will take to carry on the organization to the end of June.

Mr. TALMA : The very fact that this further sum of money is asked for means that another quota has been granted for workers in the U.S.A. I would like to ask the senior member for St. Joseph how many men are required and how soon recruitment is likely to take place.

Mr. ADAMS : Mr. Chairman,—I feel fairly certain that as soon as the Governor returns to the island to-morrow, an announcement will be made. I cannot make any myself but the House will know that this Resolution was sent down a week ago at a time when it was not known—and could not be known—what, if any, quota we were likely to get.

Mr. WILKINSON: It is hardly fair to ask us to vote this money without giving us some information. As the junior member for the City has said, this amount is more than double the previous amount of £700 which was for a period of six months while this amount is for a period of three months. Surely there must be some explanation as to why this amount is so high. Perhaps the Government has information that certain emigrants are going away in the near future but it is not prepared to give it to us. It is hardly fair to ask us to vote this money without knowing that information.

The question that this Resolution do now pass is put and resolved in the affirmative, the division being as follows :—

Ayes: Messrs. CRAWFORD, BRANCKER, LEWIS. COX, FOSTER, SPRINGER, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, TALMA, and Mr. SPEAKER.—10.

Noes: Messrs. HAYNES, DOWDING, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON, and WARD—6.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, the Chairman reports the passing of this Resolution in Committee of Supply.

The House resumes and on the motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN in each case, the Resolution is read a first and a second time.

Mr. ADAMS: I would like to say that I do not want to withhold information from honourable members. As soon as the information is available I will give it to the House.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, the Resolution is agreed to.

FACTORIES BILL POSTPONED.

Mr. SPEAKER : The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, —Second reading of a Bill to make provision for the registration and supervision of factories and for the safety and well being of workers employed therein.

Mr. ADAMS : I regret that I have to ask again for the postponement of the consideration of this Bill. The Select Committee will be meeting soon and I hope to be able on the next occasion to continue with the Bill.

DAIRY REGULATIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER : The next Order is to resume Committee on the passing of a Resolution to approve Regulations made by the General Board of Health under Section 3 of the Dairies Act, 1941, and approved and sanctioned by the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House resumes Committee on the Regulations, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN : When the House was last in Committee on these Regulations, Regulation 40 was passed. We proceed now from Regulation 41.

Regulations 41 to 43 inclusive are read and agreed to.

Regulation 44 For giving any medical certificate required by these Regulations a medical practitioner shall be entitled to charge a fee of two shillings and sixpence which shall be payable to him by the person requiring such certificate.

Mr. DOWDING : Mr. Chairman,—A fee of 2/6 for a medical certificate seems very inadequate to me. I happen to know that it is useless any of these employees going to a doctor and offering a fee of 2/6 for medical inspection, so I would suggest that the amount be increased.

Mr. SPRINGER: I am sorry. Since this Regulation was passed by the Board of Health and approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee, two changes have been made by the Board and one of them is in connection with this Regulation. Apparently that amendment has not yet been sent to this House but I ask leave to delete the words "two shillings and sixpence" in order to substitute therefor the words "four shillings and two-pence."

There being no objection, leave is granted and the Regulation is amended accordingly.

Dr. CUMMINS enters the House and takes his seat—

The question that this Regulation, as amended, stand part of the Regulations is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Regulation 45. No fee shall be charged for

(a) the registration of any dairy; or

(b) the granting of any written permission; or

(c) the issue of any badge;

under these Regulations: provided always that if any Certificate of Registration or badge shall be lost the Commissioners shall be entitled to charge a fee of one shilling for the issue of a duplicate Certificate or badge, which sum shall be paid to the Commissioners for the uses of the Parish.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I would just like to ask if the Government is also selling milk and not paying taxes although it is in competition with other dairy owners.

Mr. SPIRNGER: I have no information on that point but in any case the Government also owns a number of buildings on which it does not pay occupancy tax. As I say, I have no information to that effect but you, Mr. Chairman, and other honourable

members tell me it is true. I do not know whether this is the occasion to go further into the matter—perhaps I had better say no more.

The question that Regulation 45 stand part of these Regulations is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Regulation 46 is read and agreed to.

Regulation 47. These Regulations shall come into operation on the fifth day of October, one thousand nine hundred and forty six.

Mr. TALMA: As far as this Regulation is concerned I just want to know that nobody will be victimized.

Mr. SPRINGER: These Regulations have been in force since the 5th October, 1946, and it was made clear, I thought, that the House has the right to amend them without prejudice to anything that happens under them in the intervening period. As a matter of fact, they were promulgated before that date and have been in operation since then, this House is merely giving its approval to them. I would like to add that they were not put into operation on the same day they were signed; notice was given of the date on which they were about to come into operation.

Mr. MOTTLEY enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. TALMA: Despite the fact that I appreciate the remarks of the honourable member who has just sat down, Sir, I do not see how it can be fair or right or justifiable to insert a penalty clause in Regulations that are only now being considered in this House. No one should be victimized because this is not the law of the land; it cannot be enforced.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like to hint to the honourable member that it is the law of the land unless the House revokes it.

Mr. SPRINGER: Section 3 of the Dairies Act, 1941, under which these Regulations are made, provides that the Board (meaning the Board of Health) shall from time to time as may be necessary make Regulations with respect to the control of milk for sale and that all such regulations have to be reported forthwith by the Board to the Governor-in-Executive Committee for approval and sanction and shall, as soon as possible thereafter, be submitted for the approval of both Houses of the Legislature and, if not approved, shall cease to be Regulations from the date of their disapproval but the non-approval shall not affect anything done or suffered under the Regulations between the time of their coming into force and the rejection. So that under section 3 of the Act, these Regulations have been in force since the 5th October, 1946, and there is, therefore, no point in our attempting to change that date; it will serve no useful purpose.

The question that Regulation 47 stand part of these Regulations is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The Schedule is read and agreed to.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Chairman,— There were several points, the consideration of which was postponed. The first is in connection with Regulation 5 which deals *inter alia* with the distance at which a cow-pen shall be kept from any dwelling-house. I referred this point to the Chief Medical Officer who replied stating that fifty feet is recognized in most countries as the minimum distance for animals such as cattle and pigs to be kept from a dwelling-house and he went on to state that if, however, conditions in Barbados are such that great hardship would be caused by insisting on fifty feet, he agreed that thirty feet would have to be substituted but that it must be realized that such a reduction will adversely affect the public health; that it should be noted also that certain parishes have by-laws which prescribe the distances for such animals to be kept from dwelling houses. That is more or less the position as I understood it, that is, the object of fixing the distance at fifty feet was to safeguard dwellers from the danger of these open stock pens. The difference between a pen on an agricultural holding and one within the limits of the City is that no requirement of an impervious pen floor is made for the former and, therefore, that increases the danger from flies and other similar organisms which cannot obtain in the case of the latter. The disposal of excreta in the City areas is provided for in special ways and at special times whereas in the case mentioned in Regulation 5, that is not so. It is a matter for honourable members to decide whether they prefer to take the risk of infection, whether they think that persons who keep dairies in agricultural districts are likely to be so grievously inconvenienced by having to have their cow-pens fifty feet from houses, that it is worth while taking the risk of endangering the health of the inhabitants. I would like to point out that this does not affect the person who keeps one or two cows; it refers only to dairies in which three or more cows are kept, so that if honourable members are thinking of the person who has a little piece of land and who may not be able to get a distance of fifty feet from any dwelling house, it does not really apply to him. I do not find myself able to accept the reduction and I shall have to leave the matter to the vote of honourable members.

Mr. WALCOTT: Well, Sir, the honourable member says that this distance of fifty feet does not affect the man who keeps one or two cows. I hope that is plainly understood because if we are not interfering with the small fellow with his small piece of land, I would have no objection to this Regulation. But I would like, at the same time, to point out that a pig which is a dirtier animal than a cow is allowed to be kept thirty feet from any dwelling house; the cleaner animal is being carried farther away from a house than the dirtier animal.

Mr. SPRINGER: I want to make my position clear because I do not want anybody to say that I misled the House. A dairy is defined, among other things, as "any farm, cow-shed, milk store, milk shop, other premises from which milk is supplied on or for sale, or in which milk is kept or used for purposes of sale.....'' That is what I meant by not affecting the small man; he is not keeping milk for purposes of sale. (A voice: But he sells). Well, if he sells he has to obtain permission for the purpose of selling milk. Regulation 26 says:— "No person who keeps a milch cow or milch cows for the purpose of supplying his household with milk may sell or otherwise dispose of for profit any surplus of such milk, except he shall have obtained the written permission of the Commissioners so to do." I take it that if a person has obtained permission to sell his surplus of milk, it can be argued by the Authorities that he comes under Regulation 5. I will not say that the point is not debatable because there is a difference between a person who keeps his cows for the purpose of selling milk and a person who keeps cows for his own purpose and who gets permission, in case he has a surplus of milk, to sell it. It can be argued both ways. I would like to say that before I introduced these Regulatinos in this House I was worried as regards this distance of fifty feet because I know that people who have small pieces of land will find it difficult to get fifty feet from cow-pen to house and I wanted to be sure that this Regulation is not in-

tended to affect a person who keeps one or two cows. However, that is the position. I am unable to add anything more. It is a matter entirely for the Committee whether they approve of the fifty feet or whether the distance should be reduced.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am more convinced than ever, from what the honourable member has just said, that this is going to create a hardship on persons living in small tenantries whether they keep one cow or many cows. In these tenantries where one man's quarter of an acre abuts on another man's quarter of an acre, a distance of 50 feet from any dwelling house cannot be obtained and I do not think that any harm, from the sanitary point of view, will be done by allowing persons to keep their cows a distance of thirty feet from houses. I beg to move that the word "fifty" occurring in sub-paragraph (b) of sub-regulation 1 of regulation 5 be deleted and the word "thirty" substituted therefor.

Mr. SPRINGER: It appears that that is the general feeling of the Committee and I accept the amendment. There was a second point which was raised by the junior member for St. Philip, who is not in his seat, in connection with sub-paragraph (c) of sub-regulation 2 of this same regulation which says: "No cow shall be milked while in the cow-pen." I do not think that there are many honourable members of this Committee who will agree to the objection of the junior member for St. Philip but I still referred it to the Chief Medical Officer who replied that he could not uphold the objection because it would defeat the whole purpose of the Regulations, which is to ensure cleanliness in the production of milk. I beg to move that Regulation 5, as amended, stand part of these Regulations.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

The question that Regulation 5, as amended, stand part of these Regulations is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPRINGER: We come next to Regulation 14 (b) (iv) which is a matter for some misunderstanding because when I went into the question I found that the wording is not clear. It says:—"There shall be provided for each cow in the cow-shed a stall floor space of not less than forty feet square," and I think that it was my colleague who raised the question that that appears to be too large a space. But it would seem as if that is intended to refer to the whole space, including manger, gangway, and drain, and the Chief Medical Officer has stated that when it is taken as it actually is, the actual stall or standing floor space in the area as set out in this regulation will amount to only 17½ square feet but that the minimum should be 40 square feet. That seems to be the point at issue. The words of this sub-regulation —stall floor space—are wrong because that would insist upon having each cow, so to speak, standing in 40 square feet of space which is not the intention of the regulation at all. In other words, the total area of the drain, floor space, manger, and gangway per cow in the stall is to be 40 square feet and the Chief Medical Officer thinks that if the word "stall" is deleted and the words "including manger, drain and gangway" are added after the word "space", the 40 square feet can be allowed to remain. The matter has been discussed by the Stock Breeders' Association, of which the junior member for St. George is a member, and we have been addressed by the Director of Agriculture, who is the Chairman of that Association, on the subject. He suggests that if "floor space" is defined as manger, standing space, and gutter, the minimum area would be 30 square feet; he also takes the view that the gangway is not really necessary. I am not an expert on cow-keeping and the Committee will have to be assisted by those who know about that. Those are the facts for us who are laymen. If the floor space is to include manger, drain and gangway then 40 square feet will be needed; if, on the other hand, honourable members feel that the gangway is not necessary, then on the advice which is given, only 30 square feet will be needed. I will leave it to honourable members to indicate what is the desire of the Committee and whatever is the desire I am prepared to accept.

Mr. DOWDING: I am not very clear on this point and I do not think this is a matter which can be decided by this House to-day. I understand Sir, that, through the Stock Breeders' Association, Dr. Saint put forward recommendations which are acknowledged facts throughout the world in dealing with cattle of various sizes according to their breed and those are what I expected would be included in these regulations. I would like to know what exactly are his recommendations.

Mr. SPRINGER: The Director of Agriculture suggests that the difficulty can be met by defining "floor space" as manger, standing place and gutter, the minimum area being 30 square feet.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I am suggesting to the honourable member to leave out the word "gangway;" do not bring that in because you may have the gangway 30 square feet and leave only 10 square feet for the cow to stand on.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Chairman,—I beg to move that the word "stall" be deleted and that the words "including manger, drain and gangway" be inserted after the word "space". That is the suggestion of the Chief Medical Officer who has to administer these Regulations and what is more his Board has to approve of any amendments we make. I think we will be doing well if we accept his suggestion.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. WARD: I think the amount of floor space for a cow should be defined because if you do not do that, you might get a dairyman bringing two cows close to each other in their stalls. The gangway can be left out because all stalls do not have a gangway.

Mr. SPRINGER: I see the point which the honourable member is making and I see some more too. You are going to have difficulties in any case. I see great danger in defining floor space. If there is a certain amount of elasticity, a gangway can be provided if there is a sufficient area. As soon as you leave out the gangway you are going to have trouble. I suggest that we accept the suggestion of the expert.

The question that Regulation 14, as amended, stand part of these Regulations is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPRINGER: The next objection that was taken was in respect of Regulation 20. Honourable members quite rightly asked why it was that no provision was made for milk vendors who were not employed at dairies being medically certificated. I understand that the Board of Health thought that such a provision had been made but apparently the Regulations do not contain it and it is for us to amend this Regulation accordingly. I beg to move that the words "a medical certificate as in Form C in the Schedule hereto" be inserted after the word "possess" occurring in line 4 of sub-regulation (1) of Regulation 20.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

The question that Regulation 20 be amended as proposed by the senior member for St. George is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The question that Regulation 20, as amended, stand part of these Regulations is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPRINGER: The next objection was in respect of Regulation 33 which relates to the inspection of dairies. The matter was referred to the Chief

Medical Officer who replied stating that the English Milk Dairies Order 1926 enacts that notice should be given of inspections; that giving notice of inspections has the effect of making the owner of a dairy comply with the Regulations and lessens the number of prosecutions; that even after convictions are obtained, in many instances it is difficult to get the Regulations complied with, whereas the giving of notice does produce what is required in most cases. Honourable members can put their own experience against the experience of the Chief Medical Officer, although this is not a question of experience but a question of knowledge of local conditions. For myself I much prefer not to give notice. It is generally accepted here in Barbados that no notice is given of inspections of any kind. I am quite sure that the deletion of this Regulation would not meet with any disapproval by the Board of Health.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—I raised the objection on the last occasion and I still feel that this Regulation should be deleted. I do not think we need waste any time over it because, as the senior member for St. George has admitted, one's experience of local conditions must necessarily tell one that a Regulation like this is really not necessary in Barbados although it may work well in England. I submit that it will do a great deal of harm. As far as these Regulations are concerned, the people who are to see that they are carried out are the sanitary inspectors in the various parishes and if you go through the Public Health Laws carefully, you will see that these inspectors do not have to give notice to anybody at all as to the time of their inspection. I beg to move that Regulation 33 be deleted.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: While I agree with the deletion of this Regulation I would like to point out the possibility of an inspecting officer going to one's place at 11 o'clock at night to make an inspection. There should be specified hours for this inspection because inspecting officers should not be allowed to go to a person's place at an unreasonable hour. It should be done as in the case of inspections by sanitary inspectors who, under the law, cannot visit a person's premises at any and every time.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am well acquainted with the sanitary regulation to which the honourable member is referring; it provides that inspections by sanitary inspectors are to be made at reasonable times. The judiciary will not hold that 12 o'clock at night is a reasonable time to visit a person's place. Imagine a shopkeeper who had bad meat for sale being notified that his shop will be inspected under the Food and Drugs Act! Do you think the Inspector would ever see that meat?

Mr. DOWDING: I think we are forgetting that in dairy keeping, the work is done at unreasonable hours and I quite agree with the senior member for the City that there should be no definite period in which these inspections should be made. Up to the present I have never seen or heard of sanitary inspectors visiting dairies at 1 o'clock in the morning, although I think that is just the time they should inspect.

Mr. LEWIS: As a layman I am going to draw the attention of honourable members to sub-clause 2 of this Regulation. It would seem that this subclause makes it an offence on the part of a cowkeeper if there is any overcrowding in his cow-shed and I agree that it should be an offence to keep more cows in a cow-shed than there are stalls to accommodate them. If a person is keeping 12 cows in a shed which has only 10 stalls, it should be an offence to remove two of them at a time when he is expecting an inspection to be made and it would seem that subregulation 2 of this regulation is put in for that purpose. I think it should appeal to honourable members that, after all, we want to get people to comply wth these regulations rather than that they should be prosecuted and fined and then put water in their milk for the next two or three months to make up for the fines. That information which is given as to the operation of a notice about inspection should really commend itself to honourable members. We are not here to make criminals of cow-keepers. We really want to get them to comply with the regulations that are made in their own interest and in the interest of the community.

The question that Regulation 33 be deleted is put and resolved in the affirmative, the division being as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. Cox, Foster, Mapp, Dr. Cummins, Messrs. Talma, Brancker, Mottley, Haynes, Dowding, Gale, S. A. Walcott, Wilkinson, Ward, and Mr. Speaker—14.

Noes: Messrs. Lewis, Springer, Adams, and Blackman—4.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to move that Regulation 26 be re-committed in order to make an amendment to it.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

The question that Regulation 26 be re-committed is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to move that the following words be added at the end of sub-regulation 2 (c) of Regulation 26:—

"or shall provide a properly ventilated and fly-proofed cupboard which shall, in the opinion of the Commissioners or the Board as the case may be, be adequate in the circumstances, to be used in place of a milk room."

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

The question that Regulation 26 be amended as proposed by the senior member for St. George is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The question that Regulation 26, as amended, stand part of these Regulations is put and resolved in the affirmative without divison.

On the motion of Mr. Springer, seconded by Mr. Blackman, the Chairman reports the passing of the Regulations with amendments.

The House resumes and on the motion of Mr. Springer, seconded by Mr. Blackman, the Regulations are approved.

ORDER IN RESPECT OF DAIRY REGULATIONS WITHDRAWN.

Mr. Springer asks for and is granted leave to withdraw Order No. 4,—To move the passing of a Resolution to approve Regulations made by the General Board of Health under Section 3 of the Dairies Act, 1941, and approved and sanctioned by the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

HOTELS AID BILL.

Mr. SPEAKER:—The next Order—Second reading of a Bill to encourage the Hotel Industry in this Island—stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Philip. The honourable member is not in his place.

CLERICAL SERVICE (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave, Mr. Speaker, to take Order No. 7 as the next Order.

There being no objection, the honourable member is granted leave to proceed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, — Second reading of a Bill to amend the Clerical Service Act, 1944 (1944-27).

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,— As honourable members will see from the "Objects and Reasons", sub-section 4 of section 5 of the Clerical Service Act of 1944 gives the Governor power to adjust the increments of members of the Clerical Service if during the first year after the coming into operation of that Act it shall appear that the provisions of the Act with regard to the earning of annual increments will cause any undue hardship to any officer. The Act does not provide for a similar situation which may arise in connection with the earning of salary especially now that those persons who are drawing money from emergency funds are likely to be drafted in the Clerical Service. Some persons who are now drawing £100 a year in the Emergency Service would, if they are drafted into the Clerical Service, have to fall to the bottom of the scale and be paid £60 a year; it is, therefore, considered that the Governor should also have power to adjust salaries as well, in order to avoid the possibility of this hardship arising in connection with the earning of salary. This Bill seeks to do that and I beg to move that it be now read a second time.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—I really feel that this is a rather dangerous Bill. I am not prepared to vote for it and I will state my reasons. It would seem to me as if this Bill strikes at the very root of the Constitution, so far as the right of the elected members of this House of Assembly to control the purse strings of this colony is concerned. I feel that it is an extremely dangerous thing for us to let a Bill like this pass and especially because of the reason given by the senior member for St. Joseph. People enter the Emergency Service knowing that it is impermanent and you employ them knowing that it is purely temporary employment you are offering at a commencement salary far in excess of what the jobs would be worth if it were permanent employment with a pension afterwards; to make an adjustment in a permanent Service based on salary offered for temporary employment is, to my mind, rather dangerous and will place those persons whom you have offered permanent employment at a grant disadvantage,— that is, so far as the instance given by the honourable member is concerned. I feel, Sir, that if there is to be any adjustment in the Civil List or any salary it should be done by this House, as we do from time to time when the necessity arises; to give some sort of wholesale authority to some person to adjust salaries in the whole Civil Service or to take money out of the Treasury without the sanction of this House is, to my mind, a very dangerous privilege indeed. That is the way this Bill strikes me and for that reason I am not prepared to vote for it. Let the Government collect all the adjustments that are to be made and bring them in a Bill and I will vote for them if they meet with my approval. I had hoped, Sir, to hear a more valid reason offered than that anybody who is employed in these Emergency Departments would be drafted into the Clerical Service. I would like to say that this strikes me as being a rather dangerous thing for me to approve of in this fashion. I do not like it at all, not as an elected representative of the people having the right—and I hope the sole right—to spend the people's taxes or to say how they should be spent. I do not know if I should suggest that this Bill be sent to a Select Committee, so that if it has any merits we could consider them but it is so fundamentally against my nature that I have no alternative but to move that it be rejected.

Mr. RAMSAY: Mr. Speaker,—I, very much like the honourable member on my immediate left, see a peculiar danger in this Bill. I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker. They say, speaking legally, that the law of assault is so easy that that is why you should emphasize it before the jurymen and it is for that same reason that I am going to say what I am about to say now. We have a Clerical Service established in this country. More than that, Mr. Speaker. We demand that those persons willing and desirous of entering the Service should have certain qualifications and they are taken in, with a School Certificate at least, at a salary of £60 per annum. Those persons who are brought into the Emergency Service are not required to have any qualifications; their qualifications are the friends or the relatives of people who can pull strings. In the former instance, the parents or guardians of those children have to send them to Harrison College or Queen's College or to some private school to qualify for the Clerical Service and then they are taken in at £60 per annum; in the latter instance, these people are taken on as job hands and I have heard it stated that some of them get from $120 to $240 a month, whereas persons with greater qualifications are working in the Clerical Service for £60 and £75 a year. I say here and now with a full sense of my responsibility that if this House pass this Bill, it is going to sow a seed of discord that will not be eradicated in the next 100 years. These people entered the Emergency Service at salaries three times as much as what persons in the Clerical Service are getting. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to hand over to anybody my privileges to which you laid claim on my behalf. We may have a first-class Governor to-day and a vagabond as Governor to-morrow, if that term is not unparliamenatry. This House has a resposibility and a duty to perform and we should not take these people in the Clerical Service and put them over the heads of other persons who have worked equally as hard. There is no man who can do more than a day's work. I am not against drafting them into the Clerical Service but take them in on equal grounds. If you consider that they are deserving of something because they work at a greater rate of speed than that at which persons in the Clerical Service work, give them some compensation by means of a grant but bring them into the Clerical Service on the same terms and conditions affecting persons who enter this Service. This is the most vicious principle that has ever been enunciated in a Chamber where statesmen ought to be. I shall vote against it. My responsibility or my duty is to the taxpayers not to any Governor and I say it would be vicious to take these people into the Clerical Service and put them over the heads of persons who work equally as hard. These Civil Servants before they are admitted into the Clerical Service, have to go before a Patronage Committee which looks at the very colour of their hair and toe nails whereas people who are employed in the Emergency Department enter through the back alley; they would never have got into the Clerical Service by that means. We are adding insult to injury by this Bill. We have already insulted the Civil Servants and we are insulting them further now. Give these emergency employees something and let them enter the Clerical Service on the same conditions as anybody else. I beg to second the motion of the junior member for the City.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I have brought all this on my head. I mentioned a most extreme case and may have quite unwittingly given cause to the two honourable members who have just spoken to thunder at something that may never have existed. What really caused this amendment to be put forward is a vote from the Civil Service Association showing this possibility of hardship in respect of two persons who are in temporary employment in the Civil Service as a result of Servants having gone on military service; it is really bound up with the question of increments and salaries to be paid after the period of probation for two years is over. The case I mentioned is an extreme one and it is not cases of that sort that this Bill is contemplated to meet at the present moment; it is possible that cases of that sort may occur but when the honourable junior member for St. Peter thunders about putting persons who are employed in Emergency Departments over the heads of people in the Clerical Service, he can rest assured that this present Government is not going to encourage a thing of that sort. When the junior member for the City and the junior member for St. Peter talk about coming to the House and not giving power to this or that person to make these adjustments, they forget that there is at present in the Act provision in respect of the adjustment of increments. Civil Servants do not automatically get increments; they receive them on the recommendations of the Heads of their respective Departments. Section 5(1) of the Act says this: "The annual increment payable to officers appointed under this Act shall become payable only with the sanction of the Governor who may withhold or defer payments in any case where, in his opinion, the conduct of the officer has not been such as to merit an increase of salary." These honourable members are straining at a gnat and swallowing a herd of elephants. The Governor has the power to-day in respect of the payment of increments.

Mr. LEWIS: On a point of explanation. I was speaking in regard to more than the normal due.

Mr. ADAMS: What is the normal due? The junior member for the City said that every specific case should come before this House but far from taking away any power, here is the law, staring them in the face, that the Governor has the right to make adjustments in respect of increments! The Act goes on to say in sub-section 3 of Section 5—and this is the point that caused the Civil Service Association to take action — "Subject to the proviso of Section 4 of this Act service for increments in respect of any office under this Act shall be reckoned from the date on which an officer begins to earn the salary of such office," and section 4 says:— "Appointments to any office under this Act, other than initial appointments made on the coming into operation thereof shall be made by the Governor at the minimum rate of the scale payable in respect of such office; provided that any officer transferred from any office in the service of the Crown in this island to an office under this Act shall be eligible on such transfer to receive salary at a rate not less than that which he was receiving immediately prior to such transfer." Subject to that proviso, any service under this Act shall be reckoned from the date on which an officer begins to earn the salary of his office and then the Act goes on to give the Governor power to make adjustments in respect of increments. It has been found, in some cases, that following closely the wording of the Act, even in respect of increments, there have been adjustments and it has become necessary for the Governor to adjust salaries so that nobody will suffer.

As regards this amendment I have brought all this criticism on my head by taking an extreme case which may never happen. A number of Civil Servants was released during the War for military duty and persons who were temporarily appointed as a result were paid from emergency funds. I did not make it clear that they were paid from emergency funds but were temporarily employed as clerical servants. It has been the practice, when persons who are temporarily employed have been subsequently appointed as clerks under the Clerical Service Act, for the Governor to direct that they shall remain at a salary of £60 a year, the initial salary, even though they may have given the two years' service which beginners should undergo as a period of probation. The Civil Service Association has pointed out that that is inequitable and inasmuch as the Governor's power is limited under the Act to the adjustment of increments, this Bill has been put forward to give him power to make adjustments in respect of salary as well, in case a hardship arises. I suggest to the two honourable members, in spite of their language which is justified after the way in which I put the matter originally, to see that this is no favouritism in respect of anybody at all. I apologize to honourable members because I did give the impression that this applies to people who have not done any work as clerical servants. Honourable members may have got the impression that I was referring to persons who were employed in the Censor's office, for example, and who are now about to enter the Civil Service. There is the possibility that some of these persons who were temporarily employed in the Clerical Service for more than two years and who have subsequently been appointed may, if the Governor does not have the power to make adjustments in respect of salaries, have to remain for two more years at £60 a year before they get their £75 per annum and it is primarily to cover those cases that this amending Bill has been sent to the House. It is a perfectly reasonable amendment and I hope honourable members will agree to the passing of it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—I am going to support the motion for the rejection of this Bill. Paragraph 3 of the "Objects and Reasons" states:— "Experience has shown that cases may well arise in which, although an officer may clearly be suffering an injustice, the Governor has no authority to make an adjustment." That is in respect of salary but what may appear to the Governor to be an injustice may well appear to this House to be favouritism and I feel that if it became necessary for the Governor to remedy what may appear to him to be an injustice in respect of the salaries of persons in the Civil Service, he should send to this House and get the necessary authority to remedy that injustice in respect of the particular clerk or clerks. As far as I am concerned I am not convinced that the Act should be amended, giving the Governor this power which is being sought and I am going to support the rejection of the Bill.

At this stage, 2 p.m., Mr. Speaker adjourns the House until 2.45 p.m. in accordance with Rule 40(a).

REPLIES LAID.

On re-assembling,

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to lay on the Table of the House the Replies to Questions Nos. 20 and 24, both standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to lay the Replies to Questions No. 29, standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Michael, and the Replies to Questions No. 32, standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy.

AN EXPLANATION

Mr. CRAWFORD: I ask leave to make an explanation with regard to the Replies given to Questions No. 4, asked by the honourable junior member for St. Lucy, on the subject of the formation of a Police Association.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: The explanation is as follows:

It was assumed from the wording of the question that the Honourable Member was referring to a recent request and no search was therefore made of the Government records before October, 1945, the date on which Superintendent Calver arrived to undertake his investigation into the administration, organisation, discipline and conditions of service of the Police Force.

As a result of a further search of the Government records I am now able to state that a request for permission to form a Police Association was made to Government on the 9th of October, 1944, in a letter from the Senior Non-Commissioned Officers of the Police Force. Permission for the formation of such an association on recognized lines was granted.

I hope that this explanation will satisfy the honourable member, and that he will not think, as has been alleged, that the Government was trying to deceive him.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (A)

Mr. RAMSAY: I ask leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (a) in order to proceed with Private Members' Business.

Mr. WILKINSON: I would like to make a motion that this House do now adjourn for five minutes for the purpose of pointing out what I think is a serious misprint on the part of the Government. I have seen it stated in a leading article in the Press discussing the Ten-Year Plan and Dr. Senn's Report that copies of Dr. Senn's Report can be obtained from the Colonial Secretary's Office on the payment of 7/6. I am not aware that this Report has been laid on the Table of this House, and I certainly think that honourable members have been treated with discourtesy.

Mr. SPEAKER: An application has been made for leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (a) and I think that that matter should be brought up under Private Members' Business.

Mr. LEWIS: I am not objecting to leave being granted the honourable member, but I think that he will also have to obtain leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (b) which says that Private Members' Business shall be taken at 3.30 p.m. of the clock.

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

Mr. RAMSAY: I beg to move that Rule 61 (a) be now suspended for the purpose of proceeding with Private Members' Business.

Mr. HAYNES seconded the motion which was agreed to.

ADDRESS *RE* NATIONALISATION OF THE BARBADOS ELECTRIC SUPPLY CORPORATION LIMITED.

Mr. SPEAKER: When Private Members' Business was last being considered, the House was debating a motion made by the honourable senior member for St. Andrew for the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor relative to the nationalisation of the Barbados Electric Supply Corporation Limited. A motion for the postponement of the further consideration of the Address was made by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, and that motion was seconded by the honourable senior member for St. Michael. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph can speak now, and after him, the honourable senior member for St. Michael.

Mr. ADAMS: It has fallen to my lot at this stage to make a few comments in connection with this Address, and, although I think that Government members should, in the majority of cases, abstain from taking part in Addresses to the Government, on the other hand, there may be exceptional cases where members of the Government wish to assure honourable members beforehand in matters of fundamental policy as to whether they are in agreement with them or not. Although the question of nationalisation, generally speaking, is one on which many of us, if not all of us, can speak at great length—probably the greater the length the less knowledge of the subject—I think that all of us can contribute something, according to the way in which we view the principle of nationalisation or non-nationalisation, to any debate concerning any aspect of the question. It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, for the best advocate on either side to convince anyone of a different point of view. If you believe in nationalisation, you are temperamentally built that way; if you are not built that way, equally temperamentally you are built against the principle of nationalization. If it were possible—I suppose it is possible where politics are not the almost second nature of individuals—to find persons with open minds willing to be persuaded, maybe some would agree with one side or the other, but it would be difficult in the British world to-day to find persons the least bit interested in politics who have not already made up their minds one way or the other. Just as every little boy or girl, we are told, is born a little Liberal or a little Conservative, so to-day, on the question of nationalization, we are either rightwingers or leftwingers. I do not suppose that anything that I can do or say about nationalization would persuade, for instance, the two hon. members for St. James, just as their combined eloquence will not persuade any of us who have Socialist views. I am not attempting to try to win them over; that is a hopeless task. The people of this colony, like those of Great Britain, have shown that they are overwhelmingly in favour of those candidates for election who made their particular platform on fundamental principles like nationalisation and specifically promised, as the members of the Labour Party and the Congress Party have done, to initiate the nationalisation of the Electric Company. Members of the Labour Party even went one step further and promised that that would take place within six months of our being returned to power and having a majority. Well, we have not got a Labour Party majority by itself, and therefore that six months may be post-postponed. (Laughter). However, we have the assurance that the Labour groups in the House are both wholeheartedly in favour of the nationalisation of the Electric Company. (Cheers). Mr. Speaker, although I have spoken in a way that has evoked smiles rather than frowns on this matter, it is much too fundamental a matter to the very essence of our beliefs for us not to make it emphatically strong that the principle of nationalising a public utility like electricity is, to our minds, just as much of paramount importance as the principle of nationalising the water supply. If sixteen Labour members have been returned to the House of Assembly after preaching in every parish of this island night after night

that they are in favour of the nationalisation of public utilities and do not do their utmost to get that done, that would be a wilful, culpable betrayal of the people of this colony who sent us here on such a ticket. If the hon. junior member for St. Michael, who, I regret to say, is in a half-way House, cannot go the whole length with the Labour Party and the Congress Party on the principle of nationalisation of the Electric Company, I, at any rate, appreciate the serious approach which he has made to the subject, though I rather fear that the hon. member has been too easily persuaded into believing that price control is sufficient for the Electric Company. There is not any Socialist, any normal British Socialist, or any Barbadian Socialist that I know of in a responsible position at any rate, who believes in the nationalisation of everything. There are certain services which should be nationalised and others with respect to which it is enough to have price control or other methods of control in respect of labour, wages,, conditions of service, and so on; there are those which it would be absurd for a Government to take over not being essential to the life of the community. But there are some which are the very life-blood of the people. There are people who, if they could do it, would bottle air and sell it as a private enterprise. Transport for public convenience, pure water supply and light are, to my mind, three public utilities which are definitely to be owned and operated by the State. I have too often listened to juvenile debates and then to adult debates on the question of the inefficiency of Government-run institutions. There used to be a standing joke about fifty, forty and even twenty-five years ago in English circles about the inefficiency of the General Post Office. I would like to see any private company running the Post Office service and delivering letters and mails and cables with the efficiency and the regularity of the General Post Office. I am not prepared now, because it would be a waste of time, to cite instances, but for anyone seriously to maintain that the system of private enterprise for profits is more efficient than Government-run institutions where those institutions are run by people who are properly paid, is just to ignore the facts. I am tempted to quote instances although I have said that I shall not do that. As regards the alleged inefficiency, or in some case, the real inefficiency of Government-run enterprises as against privately-run enterprises, one would probably quote certain enterprises in this island like the Waterworks Department: some of us would quote two or three instances. I am asking hon. members to think for a little of the whole system of private enterprise in this world, whether it does not entail gross inefficiency with the consequent fleecing of the public to make up for the waste which takes place. The amazing figures which have been obtained both in America and Great Britain in relation to big enterprises, and the amount of money which is spent on advertising and cost of production, which would be saved in Government-run institutions will stagger you when you see them. We all know that when there is any complaint in some aspects of commercial life that private people are not doing their best, the Government interferes. We know that every commission agent vies with every other to bring in potatoes and onions; he brings in too many; they rot; he dumps them and the consumer pays for the loss. That is an instance to illustrate the inefficency of private enterprise. The Telephone and other concerns run by the Government in Bermuda have shown considerable profit. Hon. members know that the much-derided Lancaster Factory has been run by the Government at a considerable profit in spite of the derision to-day, and in this connection let me remind hon. members that an enquiry took place as a result of our having to come back and ask for more money to be paid to the engineer; and that every one of us who went in for an examination of the figures was appalled at the way in which the engineer works. You charge the Government with three or four bits of machinery: you try them out: you discard three and use only one. One is absolutely appalled at the way in which private engineering firms have been, in these circumstances and with poetic justice, getting a lot of money out of privately-run factories. That is on account of the inefficient way in which unplanned, private businesses carry on their work. I ask the House to pardon me for doing what I said that I would not do. I am repeating the promise made to the electorate not only by individual members of the Labour Party but by the Labour Party generally, and I have no doubt that the Congress Party will agree in principle with us. Mr. Speaker, we have natural gas in this island, and no one knows its potentialities for certain; no one can know, although such experts as we have, have said that it would take some cataclysum of nature to destroy its present resources. That is another source which can be tapped. My view is that with natural gas in this island, we should count the cost of materials; we have to pay for imported fuel and the primary duty of the Government should be to buy out the Gas Company now as it would cost very little. That consists largely of a tank and the premises—

Mr. SPEAKER : This Address is only dealing with one Company.

Mr. ADAMS : I mentioned that in view of what I am suggesting now.

Mr. SPEAKER : In my view, you should speak generally, but not speak about buying out one Company.

Mr. ADAMS : Natural gas should be used to generate electricity as near to its source as possible, and at the same time it may be possible to distribute natural gas through the Gas Company. Of course, this is all a policy of nationalisation, and I agree that the present Electric Company should be taken over by the Government, and we shall have these two sources of supply of energy throughout the island. Just as we have higher levels and lower levels in respect of water, we can have an electric plant near Turner's Hall, using natural gas to distribute electricity from that end of the island as a complement to the electricity which will have been already distributed there. With these two sources of energy, there would be less likelihood of a general breakdown in the electric supply. I say that with all the solemnity of which I am capable, and with every ounce of energy that I have in me. As long as I have the opportunity, I will use it to bring about what I have just said. To my mind, it is fundamental to plan properly. When we are embarking on the improvement of the housing conditions of the people, giving them proper water supply, it is equally fundamental to give them power and light. (Cheers). I am not now facetious. One hon. member has said that water is more important than light; while no human being can live without water, for him to live without light would be really going back to the status of the mole and the bat. [Mr. GALE: That is a stupid argument.]. The hon. member has characterised that as a stupid argument, and I suppose he is right. However, those who agree with the general principle of nationalisation, should strengthen the hands of the Government as much as possible along the lines which I have suggested, because nothing is more lamentable than to see that you start a scheme of road reconstruction and then dig up the roads to lay gas pipes or to bury electric lines. In short, in our planning we should at the same time make preparation in the villages for water and electricity before

the roads are finished, so that when it comes to the question of the nationalisation of electricity we should not have to incur a great deal of expenditure in undoing something which had already been properly done. I hope that the House will forgive me for speaking at such great length, but I feel very strongly on this subject, and, as I said when I started, I feel that this is one of those occasions when members of the Government should, in their individual capacity as members of the House when Private Members' Business is being conducted and the matter before the House is fundamental from a political point of view, state their views in no uncertain terms. Before I sit down, I repeat that, speaking for myself, I shall leave no stone unturned whatever to see that before the initiation of any new building plans dealing with the community in general, this question of the nationalisation of electricity be made a paramount matter in order that people may get cheap electricity in every hamlet and village of this island. Need I remind hon. members that before the present huge building Scheme in Trinidad started, the Trinidad municipality introduced electric light, the water-borne toilet system and shower bath in their houses? People came out of the slums, slums which were far worse than those of Nelson Street and Golden Square, and went into those houses; and in spite of the taunt thrown at working-class people all over the world, the amount of breakages or abuse with respect to these sanitary conveniences was amazing; there was no greater amount of breakages than those occurring in corresponding sections of other communities in the corresponding social level. When the Government undertakes their huge building programme, and in that programme they extend the sanitary conveniences in the way of water and have proper facilities in the way of light and power, I have no fear whatever that the reaction of the Barbadian agricultural labourer will be on no lower a plane than the reaction of the farmer and the agricultural labourer of Great Britain who have received the benefits of electricity going through the length and breadth of England and Wales. I have much pleasure in supporting this Address the passing of which has been so well moved by the hon. senior member for St. Andrew. (Cheers).

Mr. COX: I have listened with great attention to the speeches made by honourable members who preceded me, and more especially to those made by the honourable junior member for St. Michael and the honourable senior member for the City. I must say now that neither of those honourable members has presented any arguments against nationalising this Company, even although they are against the principle of nationalisation. The honourable junior member for St. Michael, in his attempt to defend the Electric Company, merely gave us a historical resumè —

Mr. GALE: On a point of explanation. I never attempted to defend the Electric Company; I was speaking about the principle of nationalisation.

Mr. COX: The honourable member merely gave us a historical resumè of the life and activities of this Company. He told us that the Company started in 1911 and they never paid any dividend to the shareholders from 1911 to 1927; and that from 1928 to 1932 they paid a 5% dividend, and the honourable member ended up by contrasting the activities of the Company with those of the Waterworks Department, and said that of the two concerns, the Electric Company has done a much better job. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that we ought to be concerned with whether the Electric Company has done a good, bad or indifferent job or not, or whether they paid dividends to the shareholders or not. The honourable senior member for the City started by saying that first things must be first. I like that; we should have roads and water. Every member of this House from time to time has been making much noise about the disgraceful state of affairs so far as water and roads are concerned; but I cannot see that the nationalisation of the Electric Company can suspend the activities of the Department of Highways and Transport. I think that it is correct to say that the Electric Company, the Department of Highways and Transport and the Waterworks Department are three separate and distinct Departments; and therefore I cannot see how one Department can clash with the other in this matter of the nationalisation of the Electric Company. I rather see that there are advantages to be gained. I believe that a proper Department will be started, more people will be employed, and those who are employed will be put in a state of security in respect of receiving pensions when they reach the age-limit; because up to now, there is nothing which makes it binding on the Electric Company or on any other Company to pay a pension to anybody in their employ. Surely, if the Government take over this Company, the employees will be put in a state of security so that when they come to retire, so long as there has not been any breach of the Act, they will receive pensions. That, however, is beside the point. What I think is the real point at issue is this: should an item which is necessary for the common use—an item which has more or less been brought into existence by people collectively and collectively required for the general use of the community — be the sole property of an individual or group of individuals for them to commercialise and monopolise as they will? This is an item which took an individual from almost every phase of employment to bring it into existence; we had the carpenter, the engineer, the mason and even the lawyers had to draft the Act under which the Company could operate. Electricity is therefore something which has been brought into existence by the community, and it should be the property of the State in order that conditions can be approved. When the honourable junior member for St. Michael says that this Company came into being in 1911, he should consider that of the 171,983 people in the colony at the time, there were only about 1,042 voters, and that was not a fair indication of the will of the people at that time. As a matter of fact, the majority of the people had no say in these matters for years. I would go so far as to say that the people were not particularly interested one way or the other. To-day the electorate has been very substantially increased, there being about 5,000 electors in St. Michael alone and about 30,000 in the whole island. As the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said, we have pledged ourselves to initiate the nationalisation of the Electric Company, because we think it is necessary to do so in the interest of the community as a whole and I think that we should keep to our pledge. Section 26 of the Electric Light and Power (Orders Confirmation) Act says this:

"The price to be charged by the Undertakers and to be paid to them for all energy supplied to the public lamps, and the mode in which such charges shall be ascertained, shall be settled by agreement between the local authority and the Undertakers, but shall not in any case exceed seven pounds, sixteen shillings and ten pence per lamp per annum."

When the honourable senior member for the City was speaking, I was listening for him to give us some of his experience in relation to the supply of

electricity during the War. Honourable members will remember that in 1942 the taxpayers of this parish of St. Michael had to pay for lamps which were not used at all. A deputation waited on His Excellency the Governor in this connection, and asked him to intervene in the matter. Unfortunately, as far as I have been able to ascertain, nothing was done. The point is that there was an Emergency and the Electric Company was being paid by the Parochial Authorities to light the streets. A "black out" was imposed in the interest and protection of the Company, and what do we find? The Company says this: "Under the Act we have to charge you so much per lamp per year, and you will have to pay that or you will not have any light. We are not interested in whether you are "blacked out" or not. Whether you use a unit of current or not, you will have to pay for these lamps." Imagine the parish of St. Michael being in darkness for a night! Where is the safety of the people who pay taxes for the upkeep of this Company? That is in itself sufficient ground to enable the Government to come to the conclusion that it is necessary to take over this Company. There is at the Belle Pumping Station, an electric pump for which $40 per day is paid for pumping water. I think that Government should be controlling that because, the Electric Company may fail to supply the energy there. If we are not careful they are liable to prevent us from getting not only electricity but water as well. I challenge any honourable member to say, when he takes into consideration the facts as they are presented, that the time has not come for the nationalisation of this Company. If any honourable member has the audicity to say that this Company should not be nationalised, he is only basing his arguments on the laws of the jungle, that every man must be for himself. Is it right for any individual Company to be in a position to do whatever they like with an item which is so important to the community? Let us go a little further. Section 61 of the Act says this:

"All ironwork, machinery, motors, locomotives, tramway carriages or material or stores of any sort required in constructing and making, and all ironwork machinery, motors, locomotives and tramway carriages required in working any electric lighting or tramway system, or other works contemplated by this Order shall be free of any duty whatsoever imposed by any law of this island."

This Company is allowed to bring in whatever they like free and even things which are not necessary; I do not think that there is anybody who has to keep a proper check on this Company. They are allowed to bring in things free, and they are biting the very hand that is feeding them! They are allowed to bring in all their articles free of duty, and at the same time they are blackmailing the Government, making them pay for lamps which were never lit! I think that it is high time that something be done about this Company. I cannot see any argument against that. The honourable senior member for the City was a member of the deputation which waited on His Excellency the Governor; everybody knows that there was a big noise about this Company at the time and what they decided had to be accepted. Here it is that the carpenter's tools and even the agricultural labourer's 60-cent cap are taxed, but the Electric Company, which is operating in the interest of a few people, are allowed to bring in everything free of duty! In the hour of crisis and agony when it was necessary for the Company to come to the protection of the island, they extorted this Government by telling them "You must pay or you will not have any light." This Company should not be left in the hands of any few individuals, because, as I have already said, it took many people to bring this electricity into existence. As regards contrasting the administration of the Electric Company with that of the Waterworks Department, the latter concern came into existence in 1895, and the same mentality was in charge of the Waterworks Department as that which is in charge of the Electric Company. People were not thought of as cogs in a machine in relation to the industry; they were the victims of force. They could not choose, and so long as Mr. "A" had plenty of water in his premises and in his garden, no notice was taken of any small man; he has no right to find out how he is living! That was the feeling in years gone by. When you talk about the Electric Company, you are also talking about the Waterworks Department; one Department is no better than the other. But now that the personnel of this House has been changed, now that the people of this colony have been given the franchise whereby they can choose whom they want to represent them, it is the duty of this Government to bring about a change in conformity with the desire of the electorate. I hope that each and every individual who has been preaching and supporting the nationalisation of this industry and every other industry will stand up like men and vote in favour of it. I feel that whenever public and private interests clash, the members of this House, realising that they could not have been members of the House other than by popular vote, should, in duty bound, give way to nationalisation. It is the people's vote which has given us a seat in this House to see that these necessities become their property so that they can get them cheaply. I know that the Government can supply electricity to the people very much more cheaply than the rate at which the Company is supplying it. In the year 1946—47 the Vestry of St. Michael paid $10,175.58 for street lighting. I cannot say whether that is too much or too little, but I still feel that the job would have been done much better if electricity were in the hands of the Government. The honourable senior member for the City says that even if this Company is nationalised, the economic position of the people will not afford them to install electricity in their homes but I feel that it is the duty of the Government to see that electricity is so cheap that each and every individual can have it. Night after night the majority of the people have to use snuff-bottle lamps which are very injurious to the health of the people. The soot goes down into the people's throats, and why should it not be thought right and fair that these people should be supplied with electricity just as Mr. "A." or Mr. "B"? I am hoping that this Address will be passed. I am one of those who are prepared to speak in the interest of the people at all times. I know that you cannot always say the things which the people like. The speech made by the honourable senior member for the City with regard to water will appeal to a few clap-trap, gullible people, but not to the intelligent people because they know that while the Electric Company is operating, the Department of Highways and Transport can also be operating and at the same time. Therefore it is only an attempt to draw a red herring across the trail to talk about first things first. I cannot subscribe to anything which I consider to be too cheap; we must raise the standard of the masses; we must be honest and upright. I do not like this fooling of the people; we cannot last too long if we continue to fool the people. We must be the criterion by which the people must be judged. I am prepared to speak as

my conscience directs me to speak. I am hoping that each and every individual who knows how pleasant a thing it is to have electricity installed in his house, will also realise how pleasant a thing it will be for his poor unfortunate brother to have electricity installed in his house. I think that I have said enough in connection with this matter, and I hope that honourable members will see their way to support the passing of this Address. I have already said that the Government allows the Electric Company to bring in all their items free of duty, and that proves that the Company is some part of the Government. I believe that the people who passed the Act were interested in the Company either directly or indirectly, or we would not have had this sort of legislation on the Statute Book. With those remarks, I beg wholeheartedly to support the passing of this Address in the hope that honourable members will do likewise.

Mr. MAPP: Speaking at length on this question of the nationalisation of the Electric Company would be like flogging a dead horse. There is, however, one fundamental argument that applies to this question, an argument which I do not think that any honourable member of this House can get away from. This Company is a private Company, and as any other private Company, it is placed in the comfortable position as any monopoly is placed, to restrict and control its output. There is no competition, and therefore they can do that. That is a principle which the representatives of the people who are here to to see after the interest of the people should be entirely against. As long as this Company begin or attempt to pay a 3% or 5% dividend on their shares as they have done in the past, even if they pay a 1% dividend on their shares, they are going to restrict their output to a certain point. They will supply the farthest parts of the island, and they will go across the back country in order to give the service to the private individual who can afford to pay for it. I say that that is one reply that I can give to the arguments which I have heard against the passing of this Address. The honourable junior member for St. Michael has defended this Company from the point of view of their profits; I think the honourable member said that the profits were not high. That, however, is not the basis of the charge against the Electric Company, in fact, I think that that is an argument in favour of the passing of this Address. If the Company have restricted their output to such a great extent and have only been able to pay a 3% dividened to the shareholders on the average, I think that it is high time that the Government should take over the Company and run it in the interest of the people. The arguments of the honourable senior member for the City are not convincing; nationalisation must come, because the world is going around and Barbados cannot be excepted. All we are asking honourable members to do to-day is to pronounce themselves as being in favour of the nationalisation of the Electric Company. I do not think that we should say that the Government cannot take over the Company now because there are other things to be attended to; I think that it should be left to the Government to say that. I do not think that any private member of this House, least of all the honourable senior member for the City, should make the excuse which he has made in this matter. The Government should be allowed to do what they are doing. They are in favour of the principle of the nationalisation of this Company, and we must adduce sufficient reasons to show why it should not be nationalised. I was not born with any instinctive belief in nationalisation, but I am convinced that it will work for the good of the community as a whole. The Electric Company came into existence since 1911, and they have restricted their output to a great proportion; some honourable members have said that that was due to the War. However, the War only began in 1939, and although their output has been restricted, the honourable junior member for St. Michael says that they have failed and have only been able to pay a 3% dividend to their shareholders. I cannot see any argument as to why we should not pronounce ourselves in favour of the nationalisation of this Company. I say that it should be left to the Government to tell us whether they can nationalise this Company or not. The honourable senior mmber for the City seems to be shirking the issue. I would like to say that it is strange that the honourable senior member for the City and the honourable junior member for St. Michael, who have become accustomed to the use of white electric lights in the districts which they represent and who are now experimenting with yellow sodium lights—it is strange that those honourable members should offer the strongest opposition to the passing of this Address. We who represent the constituencies far out where the darkness envelopes the people, consider that a restrictive policy is being carried on by this Company. I feel that those honourable members who have the interest of the inhabitants of this colony at heart, can hardly fail to support this Address, and I hope that it will be passed.

Mr. BRANCKER: This Address which has been introduced by the honourable senior member for St. Andrew, has been engaging our attention for some considerable time, and one is almost inclined to the view that each honourable member who has spoken has tried to surpass his predecessor in the length of his oration. I do not propose to adopt a similar course. What has occurred to me is that this Address is not nearly as comprehensive at it might be Honourable members seem to think that, as far as the Electric Company is concerned, there are certain well-defined lines as to the activities of that organisation. Honourable members have spoken about public utilities and I do not see why other public utilities should not be included in this Address. I propose, therefore, to make an amendment to this Address so as to include another Company which has been just as inactive, inimical and dilatory in the progress of the community—the Barbados Telephone Company Limited. It is just as difficult, if not more so, to get electricity in St. Andrew as it is to make a call to Bridgetown, say from the St. Andrew's Almshouse. The principle is the same. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said that he anticipated that the members of the Congress Party would be as much in favour of the nationalisation of the Electric Company as the members of the Labour Party, and I need hardly refer to the honourable member who has manifested the great importance of, and the necessity for, the nationalisation of electricity. The honourable senior member for St. Andrew has advocated the nationalisation of the Electric Company at many meetings, and that had its repercussions, when he introduced this Address. Neither the Electric Company nor the Telephone Company has shown a greater degree of enterprise than the other or tried to benefit the great majority of the inhabitants of the colony; on the contrary, they have shown their interest in getting the maximum they can out of the public. Honourable members will remember when we dealt with the Colonial Estimates how some of us expressed our feelings in having to pay for the use of telephones which gave such unsatisfactory service. I beg to

move as an amendment that all the words of the proposed Address be deleted in order to substitute the following:

"The House of Assembly respectfully ask that His Excellency the Governor take immediate steps to nationalise the Barbados Electric Supply Corporation and the Barbados Telephone Company Limited".

Hon. members have wondered why I have not included the Barbados Gas Company in this amendment; well, I understand that that Company is almost on the verge of extinction, and I do not think that we would be justified in taking public money to purchase that almost defunct concern, unless of course, we could be sure of getting it for a nominal sum. With the Electric Company nationalised, there would not be any need for us to worry about the Gas Company, because I know that the Vestry of St. Michael gives every chance to the Gas Company so as to ensure that there is an alternative service whenever anything goes wrong with the Electric Company. Indeed people are amused when they see persons walk around in the twilight with a stick and adopt the old-fashioned method of turning on the gas lamps; that is another reason why I have not included the Gas Company in this amendment. I have my eyes on the Soap Factory; (Laughter) but I do not propose to include that just yet. I think that if we deal with these two Companies to-day we can be sure that we will run them better than we have succeeded in doing in the case of the Waterworks Department and the Mental Asylum. We will convince the public of the necessity for the nationalisation of these companies and that it is possible for the Government, when they do not put incompetent people in offices to run these concerns efficiently. With those few remarks, I commend my amendment to the favourable consideration of the House.

Mr. TALMA: I sat with rapt attention and listened to the remarks of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph relative to the principle of nationalisation. I must admit that this principle had been agreed upon by all the Labour groups at the last Election. We agreed to the principle of nationalisation not only in respect of the Electric Company, but in respect of all public utilities, and the Progressive League made that as one of the main planks in their platform. They even went as far as to promise the electorate to give them electricity in every home in this island, and within a period of six months! Well, that was going too far. We are indeed anxious to see the service extended to every home which can afford to have it, and we feel very unhappy with the Management of the Company in not extending the service in every direction. The headquarters of the Company are at the foot of the Garrison Hill and yet Seawell Airport still needs electricity! Seawell Airport is like the Harbour because it is a landing ground; it is the place where passengers land and take off. The Electric Company has definitely failed in performing that utility service in this island. Recently we were paid a visit by the late Foreign Minister and what would have happened if the plane had arrived late? He might have lost his life through the negligence of the Electric Company. This Company have not performed their service well; they have extended the service to St. John, St. Joseph and St. Peter, and yet places like Seawell Airport and Silver Sands where there is a health resort, still lack the service. That is deplorable, because the headquarters of the Electric Company are on the border of Christ Church and this parish is not serviced with electricity! I have not made capital of this question as the members of the Progressive League have done, but I have always agreed with the principle of nationalisation as a whole. However, I do not think that we should single out the Electric Company for nationalisation; I feel that this question of nationalisation should have been brought up by a Coalition Executive; I feel that the Government as at present constituted should present a properly worked out scheme, and have a proper enquiry made by a Commission as to the working of these utility services. I do not think that it is fair to single out one undertaking for nationalisation when none of the others has done any better than that undertaking. There is also Radio Distribution which does not always live up to expectation. I feel that things are being done in a very illegal way and I would offer some free advice. People are charged in advance for something which they have not had. I think that the Radio, Electric, Gas and Telephone services should be incorporated and worked by the Coalition Labour Government, and that such a proposal should not have come from a Liberal or Conservative member of the House. I would not include the Transport service as yet. I think that the hon. senior member for St. Andrew is more liberal than the Labour group because he has brought forward something which has been promised by the Labour group, and more especially by the Progressive League which promised that electricity would be put into every home. Although I cannot foresee the day when there will be electricity in every home, I think that it is very desirable to see that the service is extended. Provided that the Coalition Labour Government are able to carry through their plans in a matter of this sort, provided that it can be put on a proper basis, I think that it is very desirable to have nationalisation of these services. Although such a thing is very desirable, one has to remember the fate of the railway and the fact that although this island has a good water supply, yet many a home in the island is denied water. It does not seem therefore as if the Government can function as well as some of these private undertakings, and although I am willing to vote for the nationalisation of the Electric Company, I think that a Commission of Enquiry should be set up to enquire into the possible extension of the service with the ultimate view of the nationalisation not only of this service but of all public utility services. I do not feel that we can just rush into things like that this is an important matter. If we took over the Electric Company and the leading men there quit their jobs, what will happen? It will require some time to make the necessary adjustments. We have to consider all that. I am just as much in favour of nationalisation as any other Labour member of this House, but I feel, as I have already said, that if we are going in for nationalisation, let us make a full sweep of all utility services. Let us nationalise all public utilities. (Cheers). Do not let us single out the poor little Electric Company because one or two hon. members might have some extra grouse against it. (A MEMBER: Shame!) When I say the poor Electric Company, I mean that there is one as against four. I also had in mind Radio Distribution, the Gas Company and the Telephone Company. I beg to move that paragraph 2 of the Address be amended by inserting after the word "steps to" in line 2, the words "appoint a Commission to enquire into the working of this service with the ultimate view of nationalisation", and that the words from "nationalisation" to the end of the paragraph be deleted.

Mr. RAMSAY. Much has been said about the system and principle of nationalisation. Fortunately or unfortunately for me, I was not born with the inherent feeling of nationalisation or otherwise. To me it is a matter of commonsense and reason. I am in favour of nationalisation because I want to have nationalisation where it will bring benefit to

the community. I do not think that the nationalisation of the Electric Company, as has been set out by the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, will bring us any credit. I think that we ought to set up a Commission, as the hon. senior member for Christ Church has suggested, to go into the firm's affairs. I do not want to make any speech against the Electric Company; some people think that when you vote for the nationalisation of a concern, you are against the persons. I have quarrelled with the Electric Company, and if they had not come for their meter I would have thrown it out in the street. I think that it is their scale for weighing their weight and I did not see that I should pay for it. My grandmother died at the age of 107 years; she did not have any electricity and she did not die for light. I very much more prefer water than light. I can get moonlight and I can get water. I want to tell the hon. senior member for Christ Church that at no time did the Progressive League say that they would put electric light in everybody's house. That is not correct—

Mr. TALMA: On a point of explanation. The Progressive League's candidate, Mr. McKenzie, promised the people that electric light would be put in every home. (A MEMBER: That was not the Progressive League).

Mr. RAMSAY: We could not suggest that electricity could be put in everybody's home. The Progressive League have too much brain. We should be very careful in our attempt to do business of this sort. We are supposed to be statesmen and in spite of our desire to benefit the people, we must not allow our zeal to outrun our discretion. I think that a Department ought to be set up to go into the affairs not only of the Electric Company, but also of the other public utilities. I am going to move an amendment—I do not know whether the hon. senior member for St. Andrew will accept it or not—because I cannot see my way to vote for the Address as it is. To my mind, it is not as comprehensively and intelligently worded as it might be. Of course, I cannot word anything myself, but I beg to move that after the words "steps to" in line 2 of paragraph 2 of the Address, the following words be inserted: "set up the necessary equipment to go into the business of the Barbados Electric Supply Corporation with a view to finding its true values and at the earliest date." If we send an Address of this sort to the Governor, and we do not set out what we want, the legal, technical brains will throw it into the wastepaper basket. The Governor can say that there is no machinery to take over the Electric Company. We really want cheap electricity for the people; we do not mind who get electricity if it is cheaper. We feel that if electricity was cheaper, the people would be able to have it and that is what we want. The Electric Company has a peculiar system of working; they refuse to give people electricity unless they have meters! I understand that that is not the case in Trinidad; you have so many lights of so much candle power over a certain area and they will wire your house and put a fuse. If you put an extra light, that will burst your fuse. When you go and tell them that something went wrong they will tell you that you used too many lamps and burst your fuse. I do not think that the Electric Company are as modern as they should be. I am not against them making money; I am sorry that I am not a shareholder in the Company. (Laughter). If the hon. senior member for St. Andrew will listen carefully, I have only suggested the insertion of a few words in the Address. If I am getting married, I will want a house and a job before I can take on a wife. I have not been to Oxford or Lincoln's Inn; I cannot read what is not here. I suggest that we tell the Governor to set up the equipment to enquire into the business of the Electric Company and afterwards nationalise it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to move that further debate on this Address be adjourned.

Mr. GALE: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILKINSON: In supporting this motion I would like to thank the hon. senior member for St. Joseph for presenting us with copies of Dr. Senn's Report after the few remarks which I made. The hon. member has, however, failed to present us with copies of the Ten Year Development Plan, and I think that it is rather discourteous of the Government to advertise Reports for sale before hon. members have had copies in their possession. As far as I know, that has not been done before, and I sincerely hope that it will not happen again.

Mr. ADAMS: This is a pure accident. I did not know when the copies of this Report came in. I did lay a copy of Dr. Senn's Report on the Table of the House last Tuesday. I understand that a Clerk was not in his place when he should have sent out those copies. The members of the Other Place got their copies earlier to-day. The members of the House would have got their copies earlier if that Clerk had been at his post. I have discovered that, as far as the Ten Year Development Plan is concerned, the Printers have not yet been able to get a sufficient number of copies to circulate to hon. members. As soon as these copies are available, they will be presented to hon. members.

The question that further debate on this Address be adjourned was put and resolved in the negative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. CRAWFORD, MOTTLEY, DOWDING, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON and WARD—7.

Noes: Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. RAMSAY, LEWIS, BRANCKER, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, SPRINGER, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, TALMA and HAYNES—12.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been resolved in the negative, seven hon. members voting "Aye", and twelve honourable members voting "No."

Mr. LEWIS: I think that what this House has to decide is whether we agree to the nationalisation of the public utility services of this island or not, and not to be invidious and say that we agree now or at any other time to the nationalisation of any particular service. I think that the amendment which I will move, and I sincerely hope that some other hon. member will second it, will put to the test those hon. members who are asking for the nationalisation of a particular service as to whether they agree to the principle of nationalisation or not. The motion which I intend to make is that all words of the Address as proposed be deleted and the following substituted therefor:—

The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor.

The House of Assembly are of opinion that the Public utility services of the Island should be nationalised and respectfully request Your Excellency to take steps necessary to this end as soon as possible.

That Address, in my opinion, is the one which this House should pass at the present time. We are thereby not saying anything about any particular utility Company. If an Address of this nature is passed, His Excellency the Governor can be advised as to the steps which should be taken to regulate, control and then actually nationalise the services, and

the order or sequence to be followed will be decided upon by the persons who, we are led to believe, will advise His Excellency in the matter. There are just one or two other remarks which I have to make as to whether the present time is the particular time for the nationalisation of these services or not. In my opinion, so far as Barbados is concerned, if the present time is not the time for nationalisation, it is the time to decide upon it: because we have some money in the Treasury and we can use it for the purpose of nationalisation; we can use our present solvency without borrowing money. The speed at which we decide on nationalisation can depend on the condition of the machinery and so forth. I would like to say in agreeing with the principle of nationalisation, that the question of profit must not operate too pre-eminently in the Government's mind. My opinion is that a Government-owned utility service should be a service to the people and not necessarily a profit-making concern. As to whether hon. members regard a public utility service like the Barbados Electric Supply Corporation as a flourishing concern or not, they must remember that we have had an Act on the Statute Book for a long time, and we are still affected by the method by which Companies can put money to their reserve fund at their sweet will. Even during the Emergency there was no control of Companies by the Government as was exercised by other far-seeing Governments outside of Barbados. I am not taking into account the argument that we should have proper roads and proper houses: in my opinion, we have to decide on this question of nationalisation, and we have to decide on having roads and proper houses for the people. If we have bad roads and bad houses. there is a greater necessity for light so as to be able to see how to get into these bad roads and bad houses. That is how I view the matter with all respect to what has been said. I think that we should accept the principle of nationalisation and leave it to the Government to do the rest. I therefore have much pleasure in moving that all the words of the Address as proposed be deleted, and those which I have read out be substituted therefor.

Mr. SPRINGER: I must first congratulate the honourable junior member for the City on his speech, which, if I am allowed to say so, has been the most statesmanlike speech that I have heard on the subject. I say that with no offence to anybody. I think that the only assistance which this House can give at this stage is to declare our decision on the matter of principle. I do not think that we have gone into the question of nationalisation in sufficient detail, and we cannot decide either on priority or anything else except we are in favour of the principle. I do not think that we are in any doubt as to this question of principle. I had some misgiving when I heard amendments proposed involving one or the other of the public utilities. I thought that if we did not accept the actual motion made by the honourable senior member for St. Andrew picking out a particular utility and asking that it be nationalised because of the priority of its need, the only thing that we could reasonably do is to express ourselves in favour of the nationalisation of all public utilities, leaving the Government free to take advice. We can have advice as to the relative facts before the actual law is passed. I do not agree with the halfway measures suggested in relation to bad telephones and things like that; I certainly prefer the amendment as proposed by the honourable junior member for the City. We are not questioning the *bona fides* or the efficiency of any particular Company; there is no Company—either the Electric Company or any other Company—which we want to defend as far as profits being excessive or extending so far as it has been able to do. There is no guarantee that any Company which exists for the purpose of making profits will be able to place its services to the community in this generation before guaranteeing its shareholders profit. The two things may clash and the public will suffer as a result. We want to ensure that the public will be saved whether the profits are eaten into or not, and the only possible way of doing that is to relieve the shareholders of their liability and the directors of their responsibility of carrying on if the Government can run the Company for the people. Obviously, it cannot pay to run a service as a perpetual drain on the public funds; but if it came to the choice of making immediate profits or paying immediate expenses as against recovering them over a long period, it will be possible for the Government even to budget for the period of a generation rather than for a period of five years so that the shareholders will see immediate returns for their profits. I express myself wholeheartedly in favour of the principle of nationalisation as the members of my Party have already done, and I beg to second the motion made by the honourable junior member for the City on the general principle as has been expressed and read out by him.

Mr. CRAWFORD: My desire to second the motion of the honourable junior member for the City has been anticipated by the honourable senior member for St. George. (Mr. SPRINGER. Not your desire). So many previous speakers have utilised the opportunity presented by this debate to reaffirm their Socialist or anti-Socialist principles, that I think by now we have almost been tired of hearing them. I do not intend to go any further than to say that, after hearing some of the previous speakers, one thought was constantly occurring to my mind and it is this: Why did they stop at electricity in connection with this question of nationalisation? Why did they not include the other utility services in the colony? To my mind, the honourable junior member for the City has, so to speak, touched the core of the matter by incorporating all of the public utilities of the island. I feel that we can now conclude the debate at that point and I rise to express my complete accord with the suggestion which the honourable member has made.

Mr. WILKINSON: This debate seems to have turned largely from the original Address as proposed by the honourable senior member for St. Andrew. It seems that we are now dealing with general nationalisation, whereas the honourable member's Address dealt with the nationalisation of the Electric Company only.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am just wondering as to whether the honourable senior member for St. Andrew will accept the amendment moved by the honourable senior member for the City or not. It is a question now as to whether the debate can be proceeded with on the wider grounds of the nationalisation of public utilites. That would facilitate the putting of the question anyhow.

Mr. HAYNES: Would I lose my right of reply if I speak now?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that you cannot speak now in that case.

Mr. WILKINSON: This question seems to have drifted around to general nationalisation. There are many amendments before us, one of them being that of the honourable senior member for the City to the effect that His Excellency be asked to form what is known in Canada as a Utility Board to control

all utility services. As far as I can see, if that Board so created were to be a success, that would carry out the wishes of every member of this House. We all want the same thing; We want these utility services to be given to the public. The honourable senior member for St. Andrew even went so far as to say that he did not mind so much about the price of electricity as long as the people got electricity. I would like to press upon honourable members that I have no shares in the Barbados Electric Supply Corporation; I never had any, and I do not intend ever to have any. I mention that because that has been used as propaganda at the Elections; it has been thrown at my colleague and at me that we were very large shareholders, and one person said that I had £46,000 in the Corporation. I said that I never owned one share in the Corporation and do not intend to own any. The honourable senior member for St. Andrew has made the point that the Electric Company has done practically nothing since 1911. The honourable junior member for St. Michael was able to put forward what the Company has done, and it is hardly necessary for me to repeat what the honourable member has said. However, I would like to emphasize that since 1945 the Company has made 20 miles of extensions, and it is expected that during this year a further 33 miles will be laid. The honourable junior member for St. Philip who, unfortunately, is not present to-day, talked about the huge reserve which the Company will not use. Well, the balance sheet of the Corporation is laid on the Table of the House and if honourable members will look at it they will see that this huge reserve amounts to £18,500. I do not think that that is a large amount for a utility Company. The depreciation fund is more than that amount. Of course, you have to put aside money for depreciation because you may have to provide replacements. The Company would suffer if they did not do that. They have had to put down an engine which costs £22,000 and due to the fact that the switch-board did not arrive, it could not be put to work. It will however be working shortly. The honourable junior member for St. Philip has remarked that the Electric Company make you pay every time that you put the service in your house; but is it not the same in the case of the Waterworks Department? They make you pay for installation and in some cases you pay by instalments. There has been a great deal of talk about taking over the Electric Company, and I would like honourable members to go back to 1910—1911 when the Company started. I remember that many businessmen in this country invited people to come out from Canada and England to start an Electric Company. Several people came and said that the proposition was not good enough. At last the present Company was given a concession and their goods were allowed to come in free of charge as in the case of other Companies. We have made a Contract which was put into the law and you will see that the Government has the right to take over the Company at a certain time. You cannot break Contracts like that. It was not easy to raise money in 1910. I mentioned that the Electric Company was started at the instance of businessmen of this community and the Government had to make concessions. We have made a contract with the Electric Company and we must honour it. Under the terms of the Agreement we can take over the Company under certain terms and conditions. The question is whether it is advisable to take over the Company or not. We all want the same thing; we want everybody to get electricity. Some of us think that this matter is better left to free enterprise and I am one of those who think so. The honourable senior member for St. Andrew has brought this Address, but I do not think that he has gone into any figures as to how much the colony will lose if this Company is nationalised. This Company has been operating since 1911 and they have paid over £110,000 in taxation. If it is nationalised, there will be no taxation. You will have to raise money to pay debentures of at least 3%. I do not think—as a matter of fact I cannot see —that any Government can do better than the Electric Company has done in the past under very trying conditions. Since the restrictions have been lifted, over 400 more services have been connected and do you think that if this Company were nationalised we would have had the material to do that? I heard one honourable member criticize the Company for not going ahead; how could they go ahead when the Government refused to give them permission to get machinery during the War? That is the reason why they could not do anything more. The machinery has now been installed and will be working in a few days' time. I cannot visualise that if you nationalise the Electric Company or any other Company, you will get extensions more quickly or that you will get better service. I beg to second the amendment of the honourable senior member for the City.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I have heard a lot about nationalisation and I would like to say that any Government which wants to undertake this matter of nationalisation should first try and put right what they have nationalised. They had charge of the railway in days gone by, they ran it at a loss to the community year by year, and now you cannot find it. They have the Waterworks nationalised and I do not think that any industry in the world could come in for the abuse which has been aimed at the Waterworks. That is a Government-run concern! The electric pump at the Belle Pumping Station has a nine-inch delivery and nine-inch pipes were ordered. I do not know if the Government said that they could not get them; I hope that they will not say that the Waterworks Department could not get them. That electric pump was delivering through a five-inch main. Well, nine by nine is eighty-one and five by five is twenty-five. (Cheers). Everybody knows what strain that pump was under; it was under a terrible strain. Think of a nine-inch delivery pump delivering through a five-inch main! That was enough to destroy it. We did not have to wait for Dr. Senn's Report to know that there is an unlimited supply of water in this island. There is no unlimited supply of electricity. As regards the roads, a certain proportion of them has been nationalised. The roads of the parish which the honourable Mover of the passing of this Address represents, have been nationalised for the last five years and in those years I do not think that anybody could have abused the Highways Board more than the honourable member who has introduced this Address has done. I can assure you that you cannot get through one of the roads of the parish which the honourable member represents and that is a nationalised parish! I do not consider that this Government should think of any more nationalisation until they have put their house in order first. Let us show the public that we are capable of dealing with matters where nationalisation is concerned before we interfere with these utility services. The honourable senior member for the City has moved an amendment suggesting that a Public Utility Board be established to regulate and control the prices charged by the utility services in this island.

and I support that. That is the right thing to do or leave the services to free enterprise. Before the Labour Government in England came into being, each man produced 3 tons of coal; that coal has been nationalised and today they are producing 2¾ tons under the nationalisation scheme. (A MEMBER: What about the manpower?) The manpower does not make any difference. If nationalisation is coming under that heading, it will run the country into bankruptcy. America is a country which we all have to acknowledge as the only country which is not bankrupt today; she is lending money to all these nationalised bankrupt concerns who got no result from nationalisation. If she goes bankrupt, it will be on account of helping these nationalised nations. America's whole interest is in that enterprise. There is the argument that no country is really prosperous; none can be prosperous because they put politicians in charge of enterprise when they should have men capable of running it themselves. I do not think that we have politicians in this island who are capable of taking charge of enterprise. They are failing with water and roads as they have failed with the old railway. I cannot see that there will be any change if these other concerns are put in their hands. We may get electricity cheaper but there will be an increase in other directions so as to run the concern. I say let things remain as they are.

Mr. WARD : It is a well-known fact that, in many parts of the world, the Government controls certain public utilities. Well, at the present time, this Government of ours controls the Waterworks Department and from my experience of the past 30 or 40 years, I am of the opinion that this is not the opportune time for the Government to nationalise the Electric Company. I feel that the Government should try and put those utilities which they now have under their control on a proper footing before they bite off more than they can chew. I feel that the whole community will be pleased to see electricity in this island put on a more equitable basis so that everybody can have the opportunity of installing it in their homes. I do not think that the Government should take such a drastic step at this time when there are so many more things to be put in order first. I feel that they will be taking a step out of their road and it may be quite true that they may never be able to nationalise anything at all. I feel that this Labour Government should go slowly and build up a foundation so that they can say "We have taken over and we are doing better than you have been doing." I feel that the Government should not want to find themselves in such a position that the world will say: "You have taken over and you have made a mess of it:" I feel that hon. members should have the good of this island at heart, and I do not think that anyone would like to see any calamity overtake this island. Although I know that in other parts of the world public utilities are controlled by the Government, I feel that this House should consider carefully as to whether it is not wise to allow the present Company or Companies to carry on a little longer and control and tell them what should be done or not. Let us appoint a Board to regulate the prices charged by these utility companies and say what is a fair amount for the Companies to make. I do not think that the Government should buy out the Electric Company, without even knowing what it will cost furthermore to extend the lines, with the present condition of the Waterworks Department. The Government took over the Waterworks Department since 1895, and yet there are places where the people cannot get any water for their use; they cannot even put out a fire if one started. Before the Government considers taking over the Electric Company, I think that they should be asked to control this Company, let us see if we can have electricity on a cheaper basis than at present for the people of this colony and have extensions to the remotest part of the island. We know that the Government has not even tried to nationalise the roads; there are many roads in the various parishes which the people have to repair themselves, and it is impossible for them to repair them. I feel that while light is necessary, there are other things which are more necessary than light. If we are spending half a million pounds or £600,000 or £800,000, I think that we should do the more necessary things first, and later on when we are in a much better position we can talk about nationalising not only the Electric Company but all the public Utility Companies. It is not fair to single out one Company and nationalise it because it would seem that you have something against that Company. I do not think that we should nationalise in any piecemeal way. Let us nationalise in the right way, or do not let us nationalise at all. If we are going to nationalise, we must first have a Commission set up to go into the whole question; if the Government is taking over these utilities, they must see that they run them for the benefit of the people. They may be running them at a loss; the taxpayers may be paying once and a half more in *ad valorem* duties than before, when that could have been avoided. I agree that the Government should, for the time being, set up Public Utility Boards to control the prices charged by these Utility Companies. I think that we should first give the people of this island a better water system, better roads and light can come afterwards. I am supporting the amendment which has been moved by the hon. senior member for the City.

Mr. DOWDING : This question of nationalisation seems to be a vicious circle. We started with the nationalisation of one Company and now we are proposing to nationalise everything. (A MEMBER: We have not got to the factories yet). I am wondering if, after we get to the factories, we are going to nationalise human beings. (Laughter). That is where I think it will end; that is what I think Hitler was trying to do when he started to produce the master race, the race which he could nationalise, all being of one colour, mentality, etc. but that could not happen. I, personally, am not all in favour of nationalisation. We have had the bitter experience of slavery, and if we continue with nationalisation, it must of necessity be a vicious circle. The Government runs things at a loss, the Waterworks Department, roads, etc., they must be run at a loss. Everyone knows that all sorts of things disappear, no one takes any interest and things must therefore be run at a loss. It will all reflect on the community, and the Government will have to say "You must do more work in this Department", as it happens in England to-day. The Prime Minister is requesting them to do more work, but later will have to say that they will have to do more work. That is why I do not like nationalisation; it may eventually lead to a new type of slavery.

Mr. HAYNES: The debate on this Address has taken a long and weary course, but, in the circumstances, that could not have been avoided, there having been certain delays. As far as I can see, the feeling of the House, excluding those hon. members on my left, is that the principle of nationalisation should be accepted. Well, personally, I think that they are going too far. (Laughter). (A MEMBER: We are not nationalising the sugar industry). My idea is that we should tackle these things one by one, and we would be able to see whether we are success-

ful or not. That is my feeling in the matter and I brought this Address before the House with the intention of seeing if we could get the most important of these public utilities—electricity—made available throughout the island. The matter is so important to everybody in this island that I shall be forced to accept the amendment of the hon. junior member for the City (Cheers) but with this qualification, even if the hon. junior member for the City does not agree with it, that the Government will treat the Barbados Electric Supply Corporation as a priority in the Address. I am hoping that the Government will give me that assurance owing to the great need for electricity. I am not proposing this out of any spite against the Corporation; they have not done me anything. As soon as you speak against one Company it is thought that you have something against that Company. I am only making this proposal with the intention of getting electricity throughout Barbados. (Cheers). I hope that the members of the Government present will realise the absolute, essential need for treating the electric supply of this island as a priority in this Address. I ask leave to withdraw my Address.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member accepting the amendment of the hon. junior member for the City without reservation? Does the hon. member want to withdraw his Address and accept the amendment of the hon. junior member for the City?

Mr. HAYNES: I take it that way.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: There are two motions before the House. The position is this; the honourable senior member for St. Andrew moved the passing of an Address to which various amendments were moved. The hon. junior member for the City has moved an Address in general terms, and now the hon. senior member for St. Andrew has withdrawn his Address and accepted the amendment of the hon. junior member for the City. Therefore, I will put the motion made by the hon. junior member for the City.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Where does my amendment come in?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Andrew having withdrawn his Address in favour of the Address moved by the hon. junior member for the City, the original Address will now be that which has been moved by the honourable junior member for the City. The question which I will put is that the words proposed to be deleted stand part of the Address. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

The following division was taken:—

Ayes: Messrs. RAMSAY, LEWIS, BRANCKER, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, SPRINGER, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, CRAWFORD, TALMA, HAYNES and Dr. CUMMINS.—13.

Noes: Messrs. MOTTLEY, DOWDING, GALE, S.A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON and WARD.—6.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been resolved in the affirmative, thirteen hon. members voting "Aye", and six hon. members voting "No". The question now is that this Address do now pass. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye" those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it. I will ask the hon. senior member for St. Andrew and the hon. junior member for the City to present this Address.

Mr. HAYNES: As Your Honour pleases.

FURTHER REPLIES LAID

Mr. LEWIS: As Your Honour pleases.

Mr. SPRINGER: I ask leave to lay the Replies to Questions No. 14, standing in the name of the honourable senior member for Christ Church, and the Replies to Questions No. 34, standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy.

There being no objection, the honourable member was granted leave to lay the Replies to these Questions.

THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. ADAMS: Committee of Supply will be the first Order of the Day under Government Business at the next meeting of the House.

Mr. WILKINSON: I ask leave that Order No. 4 on to-day's Order Paper under Private Members' Business be made Order No. 1 under this Head at the next meeting.

Mr. COX: I object.

The question that Order No. 4 on to-day's Order Paper under Private Members' Business be made Order No. 1 under this Head at the next meeting was put and resolved in the negative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. CRAWFORD, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, DOWDING, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT and WILKINSON—7.

Noes: Messrs. LEWIS, BRANCKER, COX, MAPP, SPRINGER, ADAMS, BLACKMAN and TALMA.—8.

Mr. TALMA: I ask that Orders Nos. 67 and 76 under Private Members' Business be made Orders Nos. 4 and 5 at the next meeting.

Mr. WILKINSON: I object.

The question that Orders 67 and 76 under Private Members' Business be made Orders No. 4 and 5 at the next meeting was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. BRANCKER: I ask leave that Order No. 35 under Private Members' Business be made Order No. 6 at the next meeting.

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ADAMS: Before moving the adjournment of the House, I should like to make an explanation affecting the Resolution in connection with the carrying on of an organisation for banking the compulsory savings of Barbadian Workers employed in the United States of America. There is a mistake in the Addendum of the copy which I have filed. I do not have to ask that the Resolution be re-considered because the Addendum does not form any part of the Resolution. What I would like to point out is that the period for running the expenses of the organisation is six months and not three months. This Resolution is on the same basis as all the Resolutions which have been passed in this connection in previous years. I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to this day fortnight, the 15th day of April, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

The question that this House do now adjourn to this day fortnight, the 15th day of April, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The House was accordingly adjourned to meet on Tuesday, the 15th day of April, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon.