

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1950—51

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 22nd August, 1950.

Pursuant to adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 o'clock noon on the abovementioned date.

PRESENT:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*),
His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS (*Deputy Speaker*),
Mr. L. E. SMITH (*Chairman of Committees*), Dr.
H. G. CUMMINS, Messrs. D. A. FOSTER, F. E. MILLER,
M. E. COX, T. O. BRYAN, J. E. T. BRANCKER, F. C.
GODDARD, J. H. WILKINSON, O.B.E., W. W. REECE,
K.C., O. T. ALLDER, R. G. MAPP, and G. H. ADAMS,
B.A.

Prayers are read.

MINUTES.

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 1st. August, 1950, having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR.

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

MESSAGE No. 24/1950

His Excellency The Governor

To

The Honourable The House of Assembly

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that he is in communication with the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies with regard to the filling of the vacant post of Assistant Medical Superintendent, Mental Hospital. Extreme difficulty has been experienced, since the creation of a second post of Assistant Medical Superintendent in April, 1944, in securing the services of a substantive holder of the office and, in fact, the Government has been compelled so far to resort to a series of acting appointments. The Secretary of State advises that the services of a medical officer of excellent professional capability and character may be obtained on agreement for three years, provided return passages not exceeding \$960 are made available.

2. His Excellency will be glad to learn as early as is possible whether the Honourable House will agree to the Government accepting the condition referred to, in which case the sanction of the Legislature for the expenditure will be sought in the usual manner.

L. SAVAGE,
Governor.

Government House,
Barbados.
18th August, 1950.

PAPERS LAID

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

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 7 Order, 1950.

The Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) No. 2 Order, 1950.

The Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) No. 5 Order, 1950.

The Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations 1950, No. 2.

Statement of the sums of money paid over to the Colonial Treasurer by the Commissioner of Police during the quarter ended 30th June, 1950.

Annual Report of the Department of Labour for the year 1949.

PETITION

Mr. REECE: Mr. Speaker,—I have the honour to present a petition from the Vestry of the Parish of Christ Church praying the House to pass a Bill to amend the Christ Church Parish Loan Act, 1948. The petition is respectfully worded and I ask that it be taken as read.

The petition is taken as read.

MESSRS. GARNER, CRAWFORD, and MOTTLEY enter the House and take their seats.

NOTICES

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 7 Order, 1950," made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the 21st day of

August, 1950, under the provisions of section 3 of the Civil Establishment Act, 1949.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (Teachers) No 2 Order, 1950," made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the 21st day of August, 1950, under the provisions of section 3 of the Civil Establishment Act, 1949.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$6,360 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1950-51, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1950-51, No. 18, which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) No. 5 Order, 1950," made by the Governor on the 21st day of August, 1950, under the provisions of section 2 (1) (a) of the Pensions Act, 1947.

Mr. COX: (On behalf of Mr. F. L. WALCOTT). Resolution to approve the Regulations entitled "The Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations, 1950," No. 2, made by the Director of Highways and Transport on the 21st day of August, 1950, under section 7 of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937 (1937-16), as amended by sections 41 and 42 of the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945 (1945-12), and approved and sanctioned by His Excellency the Governor on the 22nd day of August, 1950.

Mr. ADAMS: Bill to amend the Colonial Treasurer's Act, 1891.

Mr. ADAMS: Bill intituled An Act to confer upon the consular officers of foreign states with which consular conventions are concluded by His Majesty certain powers relating to the administration of the estates and property of deceased persons; to restrict the powers of members of the Police Force and other persons to enter the consular offices of such States; to amend the Merchant Shipping Act 1898; to confer immunities and privileges on consular officers and employees of such foreign States and for purposes connected with the matters aforesaid.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Of my intention to ask the leave of the House to pass later in the day a Message to His Excellency the Governor relating to the Official Reporter of the Honourable the Legislative Council.

Other Notices are as follows:

Mr. REECE: Bill to amend the Christ Church Parish Loan Act, 1948.

Mr. SMITH: Of the following Address :—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor*

The House of Assembly beg to draw to the attention of His Excellency the Governor the fact that in certain instances labourers who are in receipt of assistance from the Labour Welfare Fund have built or are building houses which lack proper sanitary conveniences.

The House of Assembly are of the opinion that Government should also include proper latrine facilities in its housing programme carried out under the Labour Welfare Fund.

QUESTIONS

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

Whether attention of Government has been drawn to a statement published in the local Press to the effect that, as from 1st October, 1950, an increase of motor omnibus fares in the country districts of this island has been sanctioned by Department of Highways and Transport?

2. If the abovementioned statement is accurate, is Government aware of widespread dissatisfaction created in rural areas by such publication?

3. Has Government sanctioned an increase in such motor omnibus fares?

4. If the answer to question 3 (above), is in the affirmative, will Government give the matter very urgent and careful reconsideration, having regard to widespread penury and unemployment existing at the present time in country districts of this colony?

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

1. Is the Government in agreement with the terms of a letter No. 1315 Vol. 11/68 dated November 15th, 1944 and signed by Mr. P. F. Campbell, Acting Colonial Secretary, in reply to a petition dated October 9th, 1944 from the senior Non-Commissioned Officers of the local Police Force, in which it was stated that the Governor had no objection to the formation of a Police Association?

2. Will the Government state what stage if any has been reached in the formation of such an Association?

Mr. SMITH: To enquire of the senior member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House of Assembly :—

1. Whether Government is aware of the unsatisfactory condition of rice arriving in this Island from British Guiana and styled "No. 1 Rice?"

2. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, will Government take immediate steps to inform the appropriate authorities in British Guiana of the existence of dissatisfaction in Barbados at the poor quality of such rice with a view to effecting an improvement?

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the senior member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House of Assembly :—

Whether Government will give favourable consideration to communicating with other British Caribbean Governments with a view to the determination of a date for a National Holiday throughout the Area in honour of the return to the B.W.I. of the 1950 members of the West Indies Cricket Team?

2. In the event of such a Holiday being decided upon, will the local Government see to it that all government employees (including labourers of the Departments of Highways and Transport, and Public Works) be paid their full pay for that date?

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

1. Whether Government is aware of the great popularity of the Public Library service in Pie Corner, St. Lucy?

2. Will Government take steps to establish a branch of the Public Library in this area as soon as possible in order to cope with the demand in that District for library facilities?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. REECE, seconded by Mr. GODDARD, a Bill to amend the Christ Church Parish Loan Act, 1948, is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, a Bill to amend the Colonial Treasurer's Act, 1891, is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, a Bill intituled an Act to confer upon consular officers of foreign States with which consular conventions are concluded by His Majesty, certain powers relating to the administration of the estates and property of deceased persons; to restrict the powers of members of the Police Force and other persons to enter the consular offices of such States; to amend the Merchant Shipping Act 1893; to confer immunities and privileges on consular officers and employees of such foreign States and for purposes connected with the matters aforesaid is read a first time.

MR. SPEAKER'S RULING *RE* VESTRY QUALIFICATION BILL AND JURORS (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: I have been asked by the Leader of the House to give a ruling on my opinion as to whether he can proceed with the present Vestries Bill and the Jurors Bill now on the Order Paper.

After some consideration I wish to state that there is precedence in this House which justifies the honourable member to proceed with these Bills at once if he so desires.

ADDRESS *RE* FURTHER LEAVE TO THE OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, — In accordance with the notice which I gave earlier to-day I am asking leave to move the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor relating to the granting of further leave to the Official Reporter of the Legislative Council.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Sir,—The Debates Committee has decided that Mr. C. B. Rock should be granted a further month's leave and considers that it would be extremely difficult and embarrassing for the Other Place to hold its meetings without an Official Reporter. The Committee, therefore, recommends that a further month's leave be granted to Mr. Rock and it has engaged the services of a Reporter to help Mr. Rock who, I am told, is still doing a certain amount of the work but is unable to do all of it in his present state of health. This Address is asking His Excellency the Governor to send down a Resolution to pay the Reporter who is assisting Mr. Rock. The Address read as follows:—

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency the Governor

The House of Assembly respectfully beg to draw to Your Excellency's attention that the Debates Committee has found it advisable to grant Mr. C. B. Rock, Official Reporter of the Legislative Council, one further month's leave from the 15th August, 1950. The Committee has engaged the services of

a suitable Reporter to assist Mr. Rock for this period and suggests that a salary of \$80 be paid him.

The House of Assembly respectfully request Your Excellency to send down the necessary legislation to give effect to the proposals of the Debates Committee.

I beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the senior member for St. Joseph to present the Address to His Excellency the Governor.

Mr. ADAMS: As Your Honour pleases.

MR. LEWIS CORRECTS A STATEMENT OF MR. ADAMS

Mr. LEWIS: Before Your Honour proceeds to call the Orders of the Day I ask your permission to correct a statement made by the senior member for St. Joseph some weeks ago in this House and made use of in the editorial of the *Barbados Recorder* of last Saturday's date. I would like to state that the General Board of Health has nothing whatever to do with the fixing of the price of land that is divided into lots for sale.

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. SMITH being in the Chair.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—The first Resolution is for the sum of \$25,816 to supplement Part I, of the Estimates, Head XX, Education by \$6,666 and Head XXV, Public Works Department by \$19,150. The sum of \$6,666 is being asked for for Repairs to Providence Boys' School, \$2,400 for Repairs to Christ Church Boys' Foundation School and \$16,750 for Repairs to the breakwater at "Princess Alice" Playing Field. The most important of these items is new expenditure—the necessary repairs to the "Princess Alice" Playing Field. The "Princess Alice" Playing Field is only a geographical expression. The breakwater happens unfortunately to be associated with this now notorious spot, and inasmuch as I have made that statement I will deal with the repairs to the breakwater first. As honourable members will see, the addendum to the Resolution states:—"The breakwater at the 'Princess Alice' Playing Field has collapsed in two places and is in urgent need of repairs. There is a section behind the recently erected pavilion which has lost a quantity of the bedlocks thereby causing erosion. In time this may affect the foundation of the building. As it is likely that heavy seas during the hurricane months will cause further damage to the breakwater, it is proposed to effect the necessary repairs immediately. These will entail the building of an outer protection for the wall and filling in the eroded portions with old stone blocks and scrap metal to form a binder for material which will be used as a filler; this filling material will be supplied by the Vestry of St. Michael as soon as the outer wall has been rebuilt. The Colonial Engineer estimates that the work will cost

approximately \$16,750." If honourable members want the figures I will give them.

This is the Colonial Engineer's estimate:—

Clearing and rebuilding two breaches in retaining wall—
223 ft. plus 172 ft. long by
6ft high by 4 ft thick .. \$ 9480.00

Placing concrete in bags—
9,480 c.ft. at \$1.00, moving
old C. I. from reef grounds,
providing for care of refil \$ 480.00

Providing and packing stone for
half back fill—226 loads
boulders @ \$10 .. 2,260.00

Reclaiming stone from sea and
providing and placing outer
protection to wall .. 3,000.00

\$15,220.00

10% contingencies.. 1,520.00

\$16,740.00

say, \$ 16,750.

So much for the breakwater. As regards the Christ Church Foundation Boys' School, honourable members will see that the addendum states:—"Pending a review of the general school building programme and a decision on the proposal to build a combined school to replace the Christ Church Foundation Boys' and Girls' Schools, for which token provision has been included in the Capital Estimates of 1950-51, there are urgent repairs which must be done to the Boys' School before the next term begins towards the end of September. No major repairs are contemplated and it is estimated that the provision of \$2,400 will be sufficient to make the school watertight until a decision has been reached on the proposal to build a new school. The work will be undertaken by the Colonial Engineer." If honourable members need any further details I will give them. I must say, however, this: The Governing Body has written the Government mentioning a much larger sum which apparently was thought necessary by private enterprise to do these repairs. The Governing Body, however, after the Colonial Engineer made his estimate was in absolute agreement that the Colonial Engineer should see after affecting these repairs at the sum he mentioned. The Government's attitude was that this money would be wasted if we are going to build a combined school later on but owing to the present weather conditions it is essential that the school should be made at least watertight and it is thought that the sum of \$2,400 will be enough for the purpose. The \$6,666, the two honourable members for Christ Church will be pleased to hear, is for repairs to Providence Boys' School. The Governor-in-Executive was informed two months ago about the required repairs and the proposed extension of this school and I will give honourable members the details. They are as follows:—

Repairs, including taking down
and rebuilding east wall, removing
and replacing roof and ceiling,
renewing worm-eaten timber,
copper gutters, down pipes, and
repairing and replacing all old
walls \$ 3,060.00

Extension—Providing annex of 600
square feet floor space at west
end of building \$ 3,000.00

\$ 6,060.00

10 per cent. contingencies .. 606.00

\$ 6,666.00

This building is the property of the Methodist Church, so the Director of Education and the Colonial Engineer got together and discussed this matter with the Methodist School Board of Managers. A much larger sum was thought Education and the Colonial Engineer got together and discussed this matter with the Methodist School Board of Managers. A much larger sum was thought of at first but after the discussion, it was agreed between them what should be done and the Colonial Engineer has now submitted a revised estimate for the repairs. The repairs are not part of the Education Board's ordinary programme for 1950-51 and it for that reason that we have to come with a supplementary Resolution. I am sure that the junior member for Christ Church with his usual graciousness will compliment the Government on being so ready to come to the aid of a school in the parish of Christ Church. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. DOWDING entered the House while Mr. ADAMS was speaking and took his seat.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman,— I am not a member of the Governing Body of the Christ Church Boys' Foundation School but on their behalf I extend an invitation to every member of this House and of the Government in particular to visit the school and see the conditions for themselves. Last year we voted a sum of money for the building of a combined school and I certainly thought that by now operations would have been commenced. Members of the Governing Body are wondering whether the scheme has been abandoned or not. I understand that such a mess has been made in the building of other schools that the whole building programme in respect of schools has been shut down and that the Government has to start all over again. I regret that that has happened because it only throws the Foundation Schools away back and both of these schools are working under horrible conditions; they are both overcrowded. The Governing Body has to rent a building nearby to accommodate the overflow from the Girls' School. The wonder is how the staff and the children manage to work in the Boys' School. I would like to know that some progress is made in the very near future with respect to this new school which is to be erected in Christ Church. As I have said on a previous occasion, Christ Church is the second largest parish of this island and is thickly populated. Time and again it has been said in this House that there should be secondary schools in other parts of the island, particularly in the parish of St. Philip, but let us put those which we have at present in proper shape and extend their accommodation and then we can see whether we need the other secondary schools in the other parishes which are often mentioned. The Christ Church Foundation Boys' School has done good work in this island and I am sure that with proper buildings and staff it would continue to progress and probably one of these days produce a Barbados Scholar. As regards the Providence Boys' School I am glad that this Resolution has been sent down because the condition of that

school is very dangerous. I visited the school recently and that wall of which the senior member for St. Joseph spoke is bulging very dangerously and I hate to think that the children would have to go back to that school next term in its present condition. I should like the honourable member to tell us if there is any likelihood of the building of the new combined school being started in the very near future because information as to the Government's intention and as to how soon building operations will be started, will certainly ease the minds of the people in Christ Church and the adjoining parishes.

Mr. REECE: Mr. Chairman,—I, like the senior member for Christ Church, am pleased to know that something is about to be done to the Providence Boys' School and the Christ Church Foundation Boys' School in Christ Church. Sometime ago I attended divine service (Laughter) in the company of the senior member for Christ Church at Providence Church. After the Service I was taken over to the school by the Minister and really, Sir, it was in a deplorable condition. It was at that time in a dangerous condition and not fit to be used as a school where people's children had to go daily and receive tuition. It was really deplorable to think that children had to attend that school and that while they were there, they were in constant danger of the wall collapsing and perhaps causing some of them to lose their lives. Another thing that was brought to my attention was that the school is expanding; the pupils are increasing in number. The headmaster who is a most enthusiastic person and a great friend of the senior member for St. Joseph is certainly doing an excellent job with the result that the attendance is going up and up. Not only is it absolutely necessary to make the building safe but further accommodation is needed and I am glad to see that in this Resolution it is proposed to provide an annex of 600 sq. ft. of floor space to give the necessary additional accommodation. But I am wondering whether that is enough. This school is expanding; the children who are accommodated in the school are crammed into a limited space, and I, for one, feel that this additional 600 sq. ft. of floor space would just accommodate the number of children who to-day are attending the school. I think that the Government, when bringing this Resolution to the House, should have had the figures, should have borne in mind the fact that the school is expanding and should have brought in a Resolution for a much larger sum of money to provide more than 600 sq. ft. of additional floor space at this school. However, Sir, it is gratifying to know that something is being done and I hope that the work will be completed during the long vacation, so that when the school is re-opened it would be in a safe condition and the children would be better accommodated. With regard to the Foundation Boys' School, I am pleased that the amount is only \$2,400 because I am entirely in agreement with the idea that the building has to be pulled down and scrapped. It is not a fit and proper building in which children should be taught. It is a building which has been extended from time to time with the result that it is a patchwork building and not at all suited for a school. That school serves such an important purpose in the educational system of this Country that the day cannot be longer delayed when the scheme of which the senior member for St. Joseph spoke is brought forward for consideration. Whether the two schools should be combined into one school for girls and boys or whether there should be two separate schools on separate sites is a matter for decision by the Government,

but the fact remains that something has got to be done because no matter how you extend that school it is impossible to get the best results from the children who go there. It must be most disheartening to the Headmaster and his staff to have to teach children under the conditions that obtain at the Foundation Boys' School. We have extended Harrison College and Queen's College and have built a new Combermere School. In my opinion we have been concentrating on the First and Second Grade Schools in the parish of St. Michael and the time has come when proper secondary schools should be built in the other parishes which the children in the country could attend without having to take the long journey to the schools in Bridgetown. Now, the Christ Church Foundation Schools have established for themselves a good reputation in the educational system of Barbados. We find children attending those schools who do not come merely from the parish of Christ Church but from the adjoining parishes. I have known children from Black Rock in the parish of St. Michael to attend those schools; so that, I repeat, that these schools have established themselves as good sources of education. It is my humble view that it would be better to develop, enlarge and improve these two schools—having regard to the fact that they have established themselves in the minds of the public as good institutions—it is better to have these two schools properly staffed to serve the needs of the adjoining parishes than to erect schools of a similar type in the parish of St. Michael (Mr. Crawford: Shame). I know that the honourable member is thinking of the parish of St. Philip. He is an ambitious representative of that parish; but St. Philip will always remain mere St. Philip whereas Christ Church has already established itself as an educational centre. The Christ Church Foundation Schools, I repeat, have created for themselves good reputations as seats of learning in spite of the numerous handicaps—bad buildings and inadequate staffs—with the result that bus services are run regularly to those schools from the outlying parishes and I repeat that it is my view that the Government would be wise if it would enlarge those two schools and give them proper staffs, and so relieve the pressure which is to-day being felt at Combermere School, Harrison College, and other schools situated in the parish of St. Michael. I am supporting this Resolution. I know that my remarks have not fallen on deaf ears, so far as the senior member for St. Joseph is concerned because I know that if there is anything upon which he is keen it is Education. I know that he sees the force of the argument which I have put forward. I do hope that when we come here next February to consider the Estimates the Government will have made its decision in the matter. These matters, I know, involve the question of finance. I realize that no Government can go ahead and get on with a scheme until it has considered the financial implication involved. It has to raise the money to spend and do all sorts of things, not only in connection with schools but in respect of other matters that come before it and which call for the expenditure of money. All of those things have to be considered but this is a most important phase of the educational system of this island. The money has to be spent at some time or other. Whether it should be raised by loan or taken out of Current Revenue is a matter for the decision of the Government but the money has got to be spent on these schools because they are schools to which children from the other parishes go; they are well established in the minds of the people and

the people are sending their children to them. If that is so, the matter has got to be faced. But as I have said it is a question of £. s. d. I have no doubt at all that if the money had been forthcoming something would have been already done to the schools because I know that it is some considerable time since plans and specifications have been made and submitted to the Government. But it is a question of money. The importance of these schools is very great. These are really schools which cater to the people with a little money; they take the children from the elementary schools; they are the schools to which the artisans and the peasantry of Christ Church and neighbouring parishes can hardly afford to send their children. Big schools properly staffed are going to cost money and I know that the people who send their children to these schools are not in a position to pay big fees; the people whom these schools serve are people of the non-moneyed class. In my opinion education at the second grade schools should be cheap, so that the people in the lower brackets could be ensured of a proper education for their children. It all comes back to the question of money but the money has to be found because this is a matter which has to be faced. Some day the Christ Church Foundation Schools for boys and girls must be extended, so as to be able to perform and discharge a duty to the community, — the duty of educating the children of the small-moneyed inhabitants of this colony.

MESSRS WARD and BETHELL entered the House while Mr. REECE was speaking and took their seats.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,—I am glad to see the Government taking the step to put these school buildings in proper repair but I am deeply disappointed at not seeing any provision made in this Resolution for repairing St. Margaret's School. I asked some questions relative to the condition of that school long enough for the Government to have taken notice of it. Its condition is definitely bad and I feel that it would be very embarrassing if some of the children and the staff fell through the floor or fractured their legs while going up the stairway which is definitely moth eaten and weak. I do not think that the cost of the repairs is above that which the Government could really afford at the moment. I am wondering, Sir, if it is forgetfulness on its part or whether it is lethargy consequent upon the failure of anybody responsible to the Government to see the school in its present condition which is definitely deplorable. There is another question and it is in connection with the erection of these new school buildings. If you went to the Westbury Girls' School you will easily observe that it is more like a sugar bond than a place for accommodating hundreds of children in a hot climate such as we have in Barbados. The windows are too narrow and the school definitely does not cater to the better health of those who have to occupy it. Those who construct these buildings should be instructed to provide better ventilation in them. It has been recommended by the Health Authorities that children should even be taught in the open air under trees and shades at certain times of the day, and in spite of such recommendations you still see school buildings going up in this island with small windows, narrow doors and inadequate ventilation. I am hoping, Mr. Chairman, that if it was a mistake in forgetting the needs of St. Margaret's School, in a short while the Government will send down a Resolution to have it repaired and thereby bring about that safe feeling which a properly constructed

building would effect on the part of those who have to occupy it for many hours of the day.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman,—I should like to make a few remarks on this Resolution. I am in favour of it as far as the schools are concerned. I am always in favour of the Government spending money on schools because I have always felt that Education should be given priority when it comes to the spending of public funds. I am very much in favour of the spending of this \$6,666 for this item, Repairs of Elementary Schools, only that the amount is a bit too small when you think of the number of elementary schools in the island. But with regard to the breakwater at "Princess Alice" Playing Field I think it rather inopportune for the Government to time this expenditure at this particular date. We have a controversy going on now about the playing field and I think it might be regarded as reckless on the part of the Government to spend this \$16,750 in that direction; it is equal to throwing good money after bad money. I am to some extent impressed that something like \$16,000 has been squandered at this particular playing field and it is lamentable to think that the Government could decide to throw sixteen thousand good dollars at sixteen thousand bad dollars already spent. With regard to the breakwater at the back of the playing field I do not think that it is necessary and I do not know that it should be recommended. I do not think that the Government should embark on this expenditure at all. I am asking the senior member for St. Joseph to be sympathetic with my feeling in the matter. I think it is reckless to spend this \$16,000 in the hope of preserving this wooden building at the "Princess Alice" playing field. Another point is this: The Government has already committed itself to a Deep Water Harbour and I think the Government could very well enter into a small contract for the repair of this breakwater. This is a throwing away of money and I do hope that the senior member for St. Joseph would appreciate my feeling, not in the light of embarrassing the Government. The Government would not like to lose this Measure but I do think that the government has badly timed the spending of \$16,000. It is a misuse of the money which could be used to better advantage. I do not think it is worth while to spend \$16,000 to preserve a wooden building that costs less than that amount. The Government could fill in the cracks in the existing breakwater and then hold on for a year or two to see whether the breakwater itself would fall into the Deep Water Harbour Scheme. I do not think that it is the best thing to spend this \$16,750 in connection with the "Princess Alice" Playing Field—the members of the Government do not seem to be paying any attention to my remarks about this \$16,750 so I will resume my seat.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Chairman,—I am going to confine my remarks to "Repairs of the breakwater at "Princess Alice Playing Field". Well, Sir, I would not go as far as the last speaker and say that to spend this \$16,750 in connection with this playing field would be a waste of money, yet I entirely agree with him that the proposal has come at a bad time. In fact, it could hardly be a worse time than the present because, to use the words of the Leader of the House when speaking about this playing field, it is becoming very notorious. Already this playing field has had expended upon it by the Vestry of St. Michael \$16,168.35. There is at present an investigation—if you call it that—going on by the said Vestry as to how that money was spent. It may be said—I think the Leader of the House did say

so—that “Princess Alice” Playing Field is only a geographical expression and that this \$16,750 has nothing to do with the playing field but if the pavilion was not there, I challenge the honourable member to say that the Government would be spending this amount because the addendum states: “There is a section behind the recently erected pavilion which has lost a quantity of the bedlocks thereby causing erosion. In time this may affect the foundation of the building.” I am not saying that the Government may not have good reason to prevent this building from being lost entirely and to prevent money that has already been spent from being wasted; but I am saying that we have every right to discuss the proposal because it concerns the “Princess Alice” Playing Field. The addendum says so and I do not see that we are out of order at all. As I have said, the Government may have good reason for considering that this money should be spent and the building saved and that the money already spent on it should not be lost entirely or thrown on the Reef—I would like to put it the latter way—but I repeat that this proposal is badly timed. The Government might have waited until the investigation which the Vestry is conducting is completed and the Vestry made its report or if the Government feels like so doing, it could make its own investigation into the whole affair rather than the haphazard one that is being conducted at present, and then come to the House for an amount such as this to repair the breakwater. I do not intend to touch on any matters that are being investigated; it would not be proper to do so in this House; but what I am saying is that already we have spent \$16,168 on this playing field and it does seem that this \$16,750 is a preposterous amount to again spend on it. For all we know, it would have been better if the building was washed away by the sea; we would be saving the taxpayers a lot of money. The addendum further states: “As it is likely that heavy seas during the hurricane months will cause further damage to the breakwater, it is proposed to effect the necessary repairs immediately.” The hurricane months are August and September; the heavy seas come along and wash away what you have done and you may have to come back to the House for more money. I say that the timing of this proposal is wrong. The Leader of the House may probably try to convince the House it is right but I am at liberty to put my view of the matter. The addendum says that the filling material will be supplied by the Vestry of St. Michael but I would have nothing at all to do with the Vestry of St. Michael. Every member of the Government should wash his hands off the Vestry of St. Michael; they are not worthy to be considered until they have cleared up the mess in connection with the playing field. The people in the parish of St. Thomas cannot get a playing field yet while we have spent \$16,000 on that playing field and it is now proposed that we should spend \$16,000 on the breakwater down there. If I did not feel strongly about the matter I would not get up here and speak as I have but I realize that the Government is trying to save the money that has been already spent. After all, it might be worth while to spend that \$16,000 rather than let the building go to ruin but I would not spend it at this time. I would wait until the investigation is finished and in the meantime have nothing at all to do with the present administrators. I hope that the investigation will reveal to the public that there has been no misappropriation of funds, or anything that would call for public protest in the matter.

Mr. WARD : I am going to support this Resolution but there are one or two observations I would like to make. I am wholeheartedly in favour of the Government's programme for the erection of new schools as well as the repairing of the present schools that are in need of repairs but still I would like to remind the Government that it has embarked upon the building of some new schools and up to the present moment we have not got any immediate relief because those schools have not been completed, and as far as I know, nothing is being done to effect the completion of them. I feel that it is a waste of money to start building these schools and then lay off while we are in great need of school buildings in which the children can be taught. That is one observation I would like to make. I feel that the Government should get behind the Authority whoever it may be to complete the school buildings which have been started and which are in a state of incompleteness at the present moment. I also feel that this House is entitled to a Progress Report on the construction of these schools. We had an Authority known as the Architect and Planning Officer but I do not know if we will ever get a Progress Report from the Architect and Planning Officer's Department. A Commission of Enquiry has been appointed in connection with that Department but I still feel that this House should be given a Progress Report, so that we would know how the funds have been expended. As far as the breakwater at the “Princess Alice” playing field is concerned I do not feel about it as the last honourable member has expressed himself because we have been accustomed to spend money on that breakwater in past years. In my opinion it would be unwise on the part of the Government to leave the breakwater in its present condition and allow the seas to come in and wash away all the money we have spent before. No one knows when a hurricane will take place; we may have heavy seas later in the year and if we spend this money immediately and protect the breakwater we may be able to save the spending of much more money later on. I am going to support the Resolution but I would like the Government to take more interest in the completion of the new school buildings which have been started.

Mr. LEWIS : I am going, Mr. Chairman, to offer a few comments on each of these three items in this Resolution. Now, the first item is “Repairs to Elementary Schools” and we are told that it is the Providence Boys' School in the parish of Christ Church which is to be repaired and extended. The two honourable members for Christ Church are pleased to see this going on but I would like to know whether the Government does not ask for estimates in connection with the schools at a particular time of the year. Are the owners of the schools responsible for the repairs or is the Government responsible for them? Because if the repairs to the Providence Boys' School were such as the repairs to the Boys' Foundation School are, one could understand the Government coming to the House 5 or 6 months after the Estimates have been passed with a supplementary vote for the repairs of that school. But this \$6,666 is for the purpose of erecting an east wall and providing additional floor space. Was the additional space not required during the last five or six months? I do not know whether there has been some contention between the owners of the School and the Government or whether there was some legal point to be settled but I feel that some explanation should be given as to why you should come 5 months after the Estimates have been passed with a supplementary vote for such repairs as the building of a wall and

the provision of additional floor space; these are things that must have been known to the people responsible for sending estimates to the Government and the Government should have got the information in time for the consideration of the Financial Estimates. The next item is the "Repairs to the Christ Church Boys' Foundation School". Well, I can only hope that only the \$2,400 will be spent, although in a few months' time the school will be in such a dilapidated condition that a decision will have to be made as to whether you are going to erect a combined school up there or whether you are going to abandon the idea. The members for Christ Church would like to see some more money but it is unwise to spend too much money on repairs because the condition of the building may force a decision about the building of a combined school or two separate schools. My criticism of the first item is based on the fact that in line 3 of paragraph 1 of the addendum it is stated that the repairs are urgently needed. What repairs? Building the wall and providing additional floor space—repairs that could not be urgently needed in the space of a few months. Now, Sir, before I pass on to the third item, I would like to say that I am willing to vote for the supplementary estimates of repairing the schools, because, after all, the Government has taken notice of its building programme and has set up a Commission of Enquiry to satisfy public opinion in respect of charges which have been made and that is highly commendable. I do not think you should sit and let the children get wet in the schools. But when it comes to the third item, Repairs to breakwater at "Princess Alice" Playing Field, it is badly timed in many respects and it would have been worse timed if this Resolution had been considered last Tuesday because while an investigation is going on into the expenditure of funds supplied by the Government to the Vestry of St. Michael, it would have been a bad thing to come in with a Resolution, not for the protection of the Reef Grounds but for the protection of a building known as the pavilion on the "Princess Alice" Playing Field. Now, Sir, on this very morning you took up your daily newspaper and saw a lecture by the Director of Agriculture on Hurricanes. You took up your newspaper to read the report of a meeting at which you expected some enlightenment would be given as to the criticism—

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

REPLIES LAID

On re-assembling,

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker.— On behalf of the honourable senior member for St. Peter, I beg to lay the Replies of Questions No. 3, standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. John; and the Replies to Questions No. 1, standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Philip.

SUSPENSION OF RULES 61 (a), 61 (b) AND 61 (c)

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to move for the suspension of Rules 61 (a), 61 (b) and 61 (c) in order to continue Government Business.

Mr. ALLDER: I beg to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes in order to discuss a matter relative to an accident which took place early this morning. Due to the heavy rainfall which took place—

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member asking leave to move the adjournment of the House? There is a request for leave to make a motion before the House and I must put that to the House.

Mr. ALLDER: I am moving the adjournment of the House in order to discuss a matter of public importance.

Mr. ADAMS: May I ask who is the person to judge whether the matter which is to be dealt with is a matter of urgent public importance?

Mr. ALLDER: I feel that I am quite in order in making this motion. This is not the first time that such a motion has been made. Honourable members would have known that we had a heavy rainfall during the last week-end and as a result a large stone came down from a hill in the parish of St. John, entered the home of a worker and partly demolished it. This is a matter which I feel should be dealt with in the very near future either by the Hurricane Relief Committee of the parish or by the Government. It was fortunate that the children of the owner of the house were not at home.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member explaining why he is making the motion?

Mr. ALLDER: I am trying to explain why I am making the motion. If the children were at home they would have been killed as a result of that accident. All these overhanging cliffs—

Mr. ADAMS: Under what Rule is the honourable member acting when he speaks about a matter of public importance? I respectfully suggest that it is for Your Honour alone to say whether the subject to be discussed is a matter of urgent public importance. As Your Honour knows, it is laid down in May's Parliamentary Practice what the procedure is in respect of these matters.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, if I may interpose, I think the urgency of the matter lies in the fact that the Hurricane Relief Committee of St. John has refused to give any assistance to the victim of the incident referred to by the honourable senior member for St. John.

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable member is entirely out of order; there is no motion before the House. If the honourable member had risen on a point of order and Your Honour ruled that it was a point of order, then he could be heard; but what are we coming to if every Rule is to be flouted?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I rose on the question of the suspension of the Rules.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. John was allowed to make an explanation as to why the matter was so urgent and I was bearing with the honourable member. That is the position.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Am I permitted to object to leave being granted to move for the suspension of the Rules on the ground that a motion for the adjournment of the House has been made?

Mr. SPEAKER: At this stage I am paying attention to the request for leave to move for the suspension of the Rules.

The question that leave be granted the honourable member to move for the suspension of Rules 61 (a), 61 (b) and 61 (c) was put and resolved in the affirmative, the following division being taken.

Ayes: Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. SMITH, FOSTER, MAPP, LEWIS, BRYAN, COX, ADAMS, GODDARD, E. K. WALCOTT, WILKINSON, and WARD—12.

Noes: Messrs. ALLDER, GARNER, BRANCKER, CRAWFORD, DOWDING and GILL—6.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Rules 61 (a), 61 (b) and 61 (c) be now suspended.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker.— I beg to call your attention to Rule 40 (b).

Mr. SPEAKER: Rule 40 (b) says: "No motion for the adjournment of the House shall be made before a quarter to three p.m. of the clock except the

consent of Mr. Speaker has been previously obtained." I do not know what the honourable member wants to infer from that.

Mr. ALLDER: According to that Rule I have already intimated to Your Honour that I intended to move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: My consent was not given.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I called for a division on the declaration relative to the suspension of the Rules.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Clerk has no intimation or recollection of the honourable member having called for a division.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment, the House was in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

COST OF REPAIRS TO SCHOOLS AND BREAKWATER AT "PRINCESS ALICE" PLAYING FIELD.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House was in Committee of Supply before the adjournment, we were considering a Resolution for \$25,816 to supplement the Estimates 1950—51, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1950—51, No. 15, which form the Schedule to this Resolution. The honourable junior member for the City was speaking.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,— I had just got to item 8 in this Resolution and I was saying that I, too, share the view that it is unfortunate that this vote should be asked for at this time when the hurricane season is on us. We read in today's newspaper that repairs had been started to Lakes Bridge and that bridge has been again washed away. Unless you get repairs to guard walls, bridges and things of that sort done at the right time, you are literally throwing away money. In paragraph 2 of the Addendum to this Resolution it is stated that "As it is likely that heavy seas during the hurricane months will cause further damage to the breakwater, it is proposed to effect the necessary repairs immediately." As a layman I question the wisdom of effecting these repairs now because what you do today may be washed away tonight. Perhaps the hurricane season is a good time for effecting these repairs, but to the ordinary layman it would appear that it is not. On that ground I support the contention that it would be better not to vote this money now, because you may need a little more money after the hurricane season and the money would be better spent then than if it was spent now. The next point is this: if the Government has money under the Labour Welfare Fund for the erection of playing fields and it has come to their notice — and the St. Michael's Vestry themselves have been told through their Auditor—that the vouchers are not in order, I think that the Government is in honour bound to have an independent investigation into this matter. The honourable senior member for St. George was told at our last meeting that if you are setting up an investigating Committee, you do not have to ask any particular Board anything. When Pay Ward "A" was being built, the Government got information that lumber was stolen and they had an investigation made; of course they went feeling that the lumber was not there, and the Board had to give assistance. I am wondering if the Government could not get the same investigator to investigate this matter relative to the playing field. I see from the newspaper that people are not satisfied with the spending of the money in respect of this playing field and they want an investigation

made about money being misspent or not properly spent by the Vestry. In the face of funds not being accounted for on a signed statement to the Vestry, how can the Government ask me to vote this money? I think that the Government should wait until the public is satisfied that that money has been properly spent before they ask for other money. I do not see how they can ask for \$16,000 of the taxpayers' money in such quick succession. If people are not satisfied about the expenditure of the money in respect of the playing field I feel it is time that somebody should investigate that matter. In view of the present position I cannot imagine the Government asking that this money be voted; a big meeting has been held, it has ended in smoke and now we are asked to protect a building about which we are in doubt. I repeat that this is not the correct time to do this work. I do not know how long the Resolution has been considered by the Government but it was introduced on 8th August. It is stated that the hurricane season is approaching and I know that in August you are in the middle of the hurricane season. I am going to wait and hear what the Government has to say about this matter; I know I will be told that it is nothing to do with the playing field, but if you are spending this money on the reef it is because the playing field is there and the building has been erected. I think that this is a matter which the Government should have taken time to investigate, and the mention that the Vestry of St. Michael is putting scrap metal and other material there—that is asking for trouble because the only scrap metal that should be put there is the Vestry itself. This is not an attempt to give people playing fields; it is an attempt to keep the reef grounds from going into the sea but at the most unfortunate time. The Government must answer these questions before I vote for item 3 of the Resolution. The first couple of speakers on the other side could not get any further than item 2 because this playing field is theirs and they are perfectly willing to vote this money. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph is bound to get a majority vote for this Resolution; one honourable member on the other side could speak at great length on this Resolution, but unfortunately he could only see two items in it. We represent the interest of the island, not only the interest of Christ Church which is in the first two items in the Resolution; the interest of the island is a little lower down in the Resolution. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph should realise that this is a most unfortunate time to do this work; this work should have been done before the hurricane season and the honourable member should postpone this item and ask for the money later on.

Mr. ADAMS: I do not know if there is anything of importance about Providence Boys' School which was not answered. Some years ago it was agreed between the different denominations and the Government that the Government would be responsible for the maintenance of schools no matter to whom they belong. In this case the connection between the Church and the School is such that it was felt that the Wesleyans should be asked to contribute part of this money where the parapet wall was concerned because the Church would also benefit from it. It is a fact that the Government has to spend money in repairing Church property and sometimes it has happened that the Church Authorities object to a schoolmaster or schoolmistress of a different denomination or of no denomination at all being appointed to a particular school. Those occurrences are few and far between and the Government has not thought fit

to withhold a maintenance grant from schools of denominations other than Anglican. As regards the Christ Church Foundation Schools, we had the information both from the Governing Body and the Colonial Engineer that the Girls' School is in good order, but the Boys' School is not in a good state of repair. It was said that a private firm estimated the cost of repairs at \$72,000 whereas the Colonial Engineer said that money would be wasted and he could effect repairs for \$24,000 making the building watertight. There is token provision in the Capital Estimates for a combined school and the work had to be postponed; after the state of affairs with regard to the St. Leonard's Girls' School we had to see where we were before we could embark on other buildings. In respect of the Christ Church Foundation School we had a token vote of \$1 in the Estimates and I think the original amount was \$175,000. Of course if we are advised that instead of having a Combined School we should have two separate schools we will give further consideration to that. The Government is much aware of the state of the Christ Church Foundation Schools and if the honourable junior member for Christ Church were now present he would say that they are the centre of education. The Government is not forgetting Christ Church at all.

As regards the last item of the Resolution, I believe we were taught once the story of Job how he finally lost patience. Any challenge, which the two honourable members on my right—the honourable junior member for the City and the honourable junior member for St. Thomas—choose to make I will reply to it far beyond their dreams. Those two honourable members got in this House on the Labour Party's money and they owe a moral duty if no other, if they say that they are supporters of the Government, to let the four members of the Government in this House know what objection they have to this or that scheme. The rule about Executive secrets is no longer what it used to be; I have a perfect right to tell members of the Party what is going to be discussed and see if the Government has a majority. But those honourable members possess the mentality of 50 years ago and people of that mentality see the possibility of getting into the promised land and wander in the wilderness. The honourable junior member for St. Thomas spoke about the Government saying nothing about ministerial status and I promised him that I would say what the constitutional position is. He and the honourable junior member for the City are the people who have caused us not to make constitutional progress within the last few months. How can you run responsible government if there is not the least element of loyalty to your Party? Everybody is free to say what he likes and those honourable members can become Conservatives if they like. Every honest man does that; Mr. Churchill did it. This Government is quite confident of its position in this community and if those two honourable members keep on getting the support of their constituents through the prestige of the Labour Party they will find that the Labour Party can find some strength in its position in the Government in so far as individual members are concerned. We are either getting on with the business of the country or we are not. If members of the Opposition point out errors to show that their views are better than those of the Government, they owe a duty to their constituents; it is open to them to go outside and try and convince the whole island that they can do better than this Party can do. When honourable members use the Labour Party's money and climb on the back of the Party in order to be here and then they do not show loyalty to the Party,

let them have the decency to go over to the other side. It is because of those two honourable members that there has not been a change in the constitution of Barbados; they are the only real obstacle to it. If this Government had a Party majority behind it, a majority which would really support it, we would have had ministerial status already. Saying these things in private makes no difference and I want the public of Barbados to know them as I have promised. I am quite confident that the public will support the Labour Party in whatever decision it makes. The honourable junior member for the City is always willing and anxious and ready to attack everything he sees; let him attack opposite policies. He is free to say what he likes but if a man is a member of a Party and he is cutting the throat of the Party from inside, then let him go outside.

I have told honourable members that the accident of the playing field being there has nothing to do with this vote; if the Everton Club was there it would be said that this work was being done to please the honourable senior member for St. Peter, but every child should know that the maintenance of breakwaters is the responsibility of the Government, Princess Alice Playing Field being there or not. As soon as anybody reports that such and such a breakwater has given way we have to see about repairing it; it is the Government's duty to prevent the sea from encroaching. The honourable junior member for the City could have found out when this matter first started so that he would see that the apparent coincidence of some paltry Vestry investigation, which I have not read although I am a taxpayer of St. Michael, has nothing to do with it. If the honourable member felt that the Government was doing anything wrong, was it not his duty to come to us and ask us about it? On 6th June, long before the Vestry matter, our attention was called to the condition of the breakwater, but the first official notice came from the Churchwarden of St. Michael who drew the attention of the Government that there were two breaks. Before he did that, there was a meeting between the Head of the Waterworks Department and the Colonial Engineer and the latter made an estimate as to the cost of these repairs having in view that the Vestry would supply half of the filling in. It is easy to forget the facts when you want to throw mud; for years the Vestry have been dumping stuff down there. What is the Reef but the dumping of stuff by the Vestry? The honourable junior member for St. Thomas makes the Heavens ring with his cry: "Have nothing to do with this Vestry"; all the information could have been obtained from me. But there comes a time when you must be courageous enough to tell your best friend what an idiot he is if you think he is an idiot. Suppose the Vestry feel that if they throw stuff there they will save this pavilion; is there anything wrong about that? If those two honourable members cannot take my word for it as members of the Party, they can let me know. I repeat that it is the Government's duty to repair breakwaters and the Colonial Engineer who is no novice, says: "Do it now and do it for \$16,750". We have to take the risk of doing this work, being guided by our technical experts. Before the Churchwarden wrote to the Government, the Colonial Engineer and the Head of the Waterworks Department went on the spot, they put their heads together and came to the conclusion that these repairs could be speedily effected by the use of blocks of stone and scrap metal to form a binder for material which will be used as a filler. The scrap metal is the property of the

Waterworks Department; but the honourable junior member for the City cannot let things pass without making some of the feeblest attacks in Christendom. The Sanitary Commissioners will continue to dump their stuff as they have been doing. The honourable member attacks the Government when it is doing its duty; the breakwater must be repaired lest you have to spend more money later on. Imagine that we do nothing about repairing the breakwater and then more of it falls down and then we have to come for \$30,000 or \$40,000? Would the honourable member not ask: "Were you not told in June or July that you should repair this wall? Why have you waited all this time and now you have to saddle the taxpayers with the expenditure of money which you could have saved? But we know the honourable junior member for the City and I suggest that in future he should be more like what he looks, that is, a man, and remember that there is nothing whatever to stop any human being from having any views—religious, political or otherwise—but there are certain conventions of ordinary decency which decent people in our midst like to observe and which they like to see observed by others and one of them is that you are loyal. If there is any point which I have not made clear I would be glad to make it clear before I sit down; I ask honourable members to believe that this Resolution has nothing to do with the Vestry matter. The Government has been advised that this work can be done now if the Committee votes the money.

Mr. LEWIS: Any challenge that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph cares to throw out to me I am willing to take it up. I may look like a man and he may not know that he does not look like one. We are members of this House, and Mr. Chairman, you have granted the honourable member some latitude. He has not yet answered the question as to whether these repairs will be done during the hurricane season.

Mr. ADAMS: Did the honourable member not hear my last sentence? We have consulted our adviser and we are going to do it now if the Committee votes the money.

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable member said that the attention of the Government was called to the condition of the breakwater in June. The "Princess Alice" Playing Field has a breakwater which has collapsed in two places, and it is the Churchwarden who has drawn that to the attention of the Government because he has the Playing Field down there; the breakwater had collapsed long before they put the Playing Field there. The Addendum to this Resolution says: "There is a section behind the recently erected pavilion which has lost a quantity of the bedlocks thereby causing erosion. In time this may affect the foundation of the building." This work is being done because in time the erosion may affect the foundation of this building. The only person that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph can convince about this matter is himself; he cannot convince anybody else. There are those who will vote for this item anyhow, and there are others who will vote for it for reasons, so that today the honourable senior member for St. Joseph is in a happy position. If somebody tells you that you should do work in May or June before the hurricane season comes in, should you now say that you will do the work immediately? Are you not literally throwing money into the sea? This Resolution was introduced on the 8th August and paragraph 2 of the Addendum says: "As it is likely that heavy seas during the hurricane months will cause further damage to the breakwater, it is proposed to effect the necessary repairs immediately." The inform-

ation as to the condition of the breakwater was given long before the hurricane season.

I believe that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph wanted to say something and he has taken the opportunity of saying it: I am glad that he took the opportunity of saying it when he alone did not have the right of reply. Has the honourable member secured the information from the Colonial Engineer that this money is needed to effect these repairs immediately? This Resolution was brought in here because of the building of the Playing Field; the repairs which were necessary to the Reef wall last year were not done, nothing was put in the Estimates for the repairs and this Resolution has been brought down because the Playing Field is there. Cannot the honourable member see that that is written plainly in the Addendum to this Resolution? Is he asking us to believe that they are repairing the wall merely because the Reef is there? The honourable member is not asking for loyalty to principle or loyalty in an emergency or loyalty to something which is in the interest of the community; he is asking for loyalty to profound ignorance. That is not the type of loyalty which he should expect from the members of the Party; he will not get it from me. I drew attention to Lakes Bridge; why did the honourable member not defend that? Is he going to put back that Bridge during the hurricane season? I have given a concrete example of doing work at the wrong time, and I ask the honourable member if he has got the opinion of the experts that this money should be used now, or if we should not wait until the hurricane months have passed. The process of erosion has been going on for years and it would be something abnormal for this building to go into the sea before the end of the hurricane season. Why should we vote this \$16,000 of the taxpayers' money to be thrown away?

Mr. Chairman, you allowed the honourable member to talk about ministerial status. I saw something reported in the newspaper about it and it was my intention to take the matter up, because I feel that such a statement has no right being made. If there is one man in this island who is keeping back the constitutional progress of the island, it is the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. He is either getting behind the backs of members of the Party and telling people that he cannot rely on the Party because they are not University graduates or something of that kind and therefore he has no confidence in them. Let us take a simple concrete example; this colony had representative government for centuries and it has now a constitutional Experiment. Trinidad had no constitutional Experiment and in their forthcoming elections each one of the members of the Legislature can be an Independent, but the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Home Office have already said: "Irrespective of what the conditions might be, I know that you can carry on ministerial status;" and why can't they have that confidence in the honourable senior member for St. Joseph? The honourable member is performing a miracle in the Barbados House of Assembly; he has no working majority in it; he has to supply a Speaker and a Chairman of Committees and he is still getting Government Business done. Is he not performing a miracle? Mr. Attlee's Government could not do that; he is finding the greatest difficulty in carrying on with a small majority. But the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is working with a minority; he is still carrying on the Government and in spite of that he refuses being given ministerial status. It is either that he has no confidence in

members of the Party or they have no confidence in him. From the Budget and the various things which I see introduced here, the hon. member is afraid of ministerial responsibility in this island; he refuses to carry out the Experiment in the way in which it should be carried out. It is the considered opinion that the hon. member has responsibility already and he has refused to practice it and carry out the Experiment. How can you call a man like that, majority or no majority, and give him more responsibility when he refuses to practise the Experiment and see whether he can carry it out or not? When I hear that Jamaica and Trinidad have been given ministerial status before we have been given it, and the little Leeward Islands are getting adult suffrage before we get it, and we have a Labour majority in this House, I say that we have been in the backwash now through the people whom we regard as our leaders, and not through the back benchers. The back benchers are the people who can run this country and the honourable senior member for St. Joseph would be surprised to know how they can do it. The honourable member is afraid of ministerial responsibility; his colleagues cannot take it and that is what is keeping him back. They have a smart man at Government House watching them. They know how to shelve and run from responsibility: that is why we have not got it, not because I criticise them. If I criticise you that is a sign of strength; it is a sign of strength in your Party when it can disagree with you and still vote for what you want, but it wants a reasonable explanation. It is not because I criticise them that they have not got ministerial responsibility; it is because they do not know what to do. I must highly compliment the honourable senior member for St. Joseph; he has carried out his threat and I am glad that he saw fit to do it while we are in Committee and we could reply to him and tell him what we think. Ministerial responsibility in this island is being retarded by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and by nobody else.

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

GRANT TO THE CHILDREN'S GOODWILL LEAGUE

Mr. ADAMS: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution for \$502 to supplement the Estimates 1950-51, Part I, Current, as shown in the supplementary Estimates 1950-51, No. 16, which form the Schedule to this Resolution. Hon. members will see that this money is needed for effecting repairs to the Children's Goodwill League Creche, and the expenditure comes under the Head "Subsidies and Grants" in the Estimates. As in other cases, the Colonial Engineer was asked to make an estimate as to the cost of these repairs, but as the hands of the Public Works Department are rather full at the present moment it has been thought that it would be enough to make a grant to the Children's Goodwill League of this amount of money and have the Colonial Engineer to inspect and report on the work from time to time. This amount of money is small, personally speaking; I think I should state that when this old railway workshop was rented by the Government to the Children's Goodwill League at a nominal rent, one of the conditions was that no responsibility for maintenance should be attached to the Government. But the League is doing good work, its funds are limited and it would be hard lines if the Government did not prevent further deterioration of the building because originally there was a condition

that the Government would not be responsible for its maintenance. After all, it is the Government's building and we are not spending money on the building of anybody else in this particular case. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS in each case, the Resolutions passed in Committee were read a first and second time and agreed to.

DAMAGE TO WORKER'S HOUSE BY DETACHED STONE

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes in order to discuss a matter of public importance. Due to the heavy rainfall during the last week-end a large stone weighing several tons fell from a cliff at College, St. John, and entered the home of a worker. The owner of the house was fortunate that his children were not in the house at the time. We approached the Hurricane Relief Committee for assistance in having this stone removed from the house; this stone has to be blasted. The members of the Hurricane Relief Committee told me that they cannot offer this worker any assistance unless it is declared by the Authorities that there has been a hurricane, and further that they did not have any funds at their disposal so that they could give this worker any assistance. Members of the Hurricane Relief Committee have asked me to bring the matter to the notice of the Government and other people in the area who are living in fear of losing their lives have also asked me to do so. Some of these people are actually afraid of sleeping in their houses tonight. I have raised this question with the hope that the Government will make it possible to come to the assistance of this worker, and also do what I suggested in this House some time ago, that is, to purchase the tenantry which is for sale in the parish. Owing to the fact that people cannot get land in a better area on which to place their houses, they are forced to take whatever spots they can possibly get and they place their houses under these cliffs. These people's lives are in danger and this is not the first time that such an occurrence has taken place in this colony; a few years ago a similar accident took place in the parish of St. Thomas and somebody was killed. I think that this is the proper time for the Government to acquire land in the parish of St. John since the opportunity has offered itself to them to do so, and have these houses removed from these dangerous places. It is not only in St. Thomas and St. John that many people are forced to live in these dangerous places, but also in St. Andrew and St. Joseph. It does not mean that an occurrence of this sort is going to take place now and not again; every time there is the threat of heavy weather you must expect some release of these large stones which make their way down to people's houses and they end up in the sea in some cases. It is either a question of saving lives or allowing death to have its full course. I hope that the Government will take into consideration the facts which I have brought to their attention and make it possible for assistance to be given

to this worker and his family immediately. Mr. Speaker, you can imagine the plight of the owner of this house, his very existence having been threatened. I am hoping that this evil will be remedied now; the time is opportune because there is a tenantry in the parish to be sold and that tenantry could be acquired so that houses could be removed from these dangerous places and put on it. I daresay that if the Government had taken the precaution as I suggested some time ago, all of these boulders which are to be found in the country would have been removed as a result of the Government sending out orders to the various authorities in the island. This morning I telephoned the owner of this tenantry which is for sale and he told me that priority must be given to the tenants who are labourers at the particular plantation; he says that if they have money to pay down on account of their spots they can do so and pay the remainder gradually. But that is not exactly what should take place, because there are many people who cannot find a deposit to pay on the land and they will be placed at a disadvantage in so far as getting their spots is concerned. If the Government were to purchase this tenantry all these people who live in places such as Society Hill, Coach Hill and others where the stones are ready to roll down whenever the time arrives, could be removed to this tenantry. Mr. Emtage has told me that even when his tenantry is assessed and, in his opinion, the price is too high, he is not going to sell it; he is selling it at a reasonable price if the Government or anybody else saw fit to buy it. This stone has nearly destroyed people's lives and if it had fallen during the night an undertaker would have been in the business. I am asking the sympathy of this House in this matter; this is a clear case in which action should be taken. I cannot see any reasonable excuse for failing to take action in this matter. The Government should make a survey of the boulders which are a source of danger in the parishes and have them demolished; they can also assist by removing people immediately from these dangerous areas to places where land is available. I hope that the Government will take action in this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member's motion not having been seconded—

Mr. CRAWFORD: I rise to second the motion. The facts of this case have been made pretty clear by the hon. senior member for St. John, and I sincerely hope that action will be immediately taken to improve the unfortunate position in which the owner of this house now finds himself. I think that since an occurrence of this sort has taken place on more than one occasion, it is hardly necessary for us to ask that the hon. member's suggestion about the removal of all overhanging boulders throughout the island be implemented.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member want the question to be put?

Mr. ALLDER: I ask leave to withdraw my motion.

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

FURTHER REPLIES LAID

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to lay the Replies to two sets of Questions which I had before me but which I overlooked.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to lay the Replies to Questions No. 4 standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas; and the Reply to

Question No. 14 standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Andrew.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 60

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move the suspension of Rule 60 so as to proceed with Order No. 5 as the next Order of the Day, and in order that Orders Nos. 2, 3 and 4 which I am asking leave to postpone may not be removed to the bottom of the Order Paper.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

PUBLIC UTILITIES BILL, 1950

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph:—Second reading of a Bill to provide for the regulation of Public Utilities.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—It was somewhat of a surprise to me when I noted that the *Advocate* newspaper, the organ of big business in this colony, I believe, has given its blessing to this proposed Bill. Although of course, from a Government's point of view, it has made a few mistakes, it has nevertheless approved of the principle of a Bill of this sort. I take it that that is an indication that my friends on the left of this House approve of the principle that the good of the community is of paramount interest in matters affecting public utilities, and that the interest of the consumer must come first, although a Bill of this sort could not by any means actually provide for any compulsory bankruptcy of big business. I do not think that there is any member of this House who is in disagreement with the principle of this Bill, although some honourable members may be completely mistaken as to the attitude of the Government towards public utilities in this colony. In order that there might not be any misconception whatever, I propose to say right at the beginning of my introduction of this Bill that the Government has not changed one whit its policy of nationalisation and its determination to make nationalisation a reality as soon as, largely from a financial point of view, it thinks fit. Let no honourable member get away with it that the Labour Party is going away from the policy which it has preached all its life for some alternative which the members of the Electors' Association have put up during their election campaign. I have already drawn to the attention of the honourable senior member for the City that a Public Utilities Bill is not in opposition to the principle of nationalisation; sometimes it is the best method of approach to nationalisation and it may be half way to nationalisation. It is not that you are abandoning your intention of entering the house of nationalisation, but at a particular time it may be better, instead of waiting for the whole loaf, to see that you get half a loaf now. If oil were already gushing in Barbados, we would have come to the House with proposals to buy out these three companies. I do not want anybody connected with these three companies to have any idea that the Government is abandoning its policy of nationalisation and it has come with something less than nationalisation because it has no policy of nationalisation; the Government has to bear in mind the question of capital expenditure, it has to look for 3½ million pounds for the construction of a Deep Water Harbour and it has to provide for the extension of the Hospital and for a housing programme. The Government therefore says: "We will do some more house building before we nationalise and meanwhile we will control the activities of these three

companies." It is only fair and right that these companies should not be under any misapprehension as to the policy of the Government. Why has electric current broken down so often? All of us may suspect that with nationalisation in the air, the Electric and Gas Companies are not as keen on spending money on improvements as they would be otherwise. That is human nature with big business; they are not going to spend money on a concern if a Government is going to take it away from them compulsorily. It is significant that electric current has been breaking down with new machinery and the current has been off and on for some years now. I have been looking at some of the old debates in this House and I am surprised at comments which have been made by honourable members as far back as 1947 about the inefficiency of the electric service.

I believe it is the feeling of this House that if and when the second reading is given to this Bill, the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee. I could not, as a member of a democratic Government, object to the principle of a Select Committee considering the Bill and if that is the wish of the House I would be glad to see the Select Committee function efficiently and quickly and report its findings to the House as soon as possible. I say without offence that none of us in this House has had any practical experience of the working of a Public Utilities Board, but it is nothing extraordinary; a child could follow it carefully in 20 minutes' time. Companies run riot with prices which you do not control. In respect of public utilities a consumer might say: "My pressure is too low, my bus does not come in time, or my milk is adulterated" and so on. Public utilities exist all over the world, not merely in respect of gas and electricity but also in respect of items which I have mentioned—things which are consumed by the public generally, things to which every member of the community is entitled.

I have said what I have just said because I think it is right for the Government to give people an opportunity to know what the Government contemplates, and correspondence has been taking place for some time between the Government and the Head Office as to the effect of this Bill on nationalisation. While it would not be true to say that these companies are being ignored or they have not had a chance of passing their comments as regards this Bill, I should hasten to make a comment on that before I sit down. It is true to say that two of these companies have for some time been in communication with the Colonial Office directly on the policy of the Government and the likelihood of legislation being enacted which would affect the operation of their companies.

This Bill is modelled on similar legislation obtaining in British Columbia, and in that country more than three industries are covered by this legislation. We have been advised that for our purposes, the British Columbia legislation is an excellent model and it has been proved in practice to have worked well. The consumer does not always get away: sometimes complaints are turned down and sometimes an application may be made by a company to be allowed to charge an increased rate by saying that by extending their service it was necessary to charge more than they have been charging. It would be interesting to hear a report from British Columbia as to the sort of complaints which are made. Sometimes people complain that the pressure of electricity is not great enough and the company puts it right: they complain about the type of tap with which the Waterworks Department provides them, about the

rates and so on. Sometimes things are granted and sometimes they are not. The honourable junior member for St. Joseph will be glad to hear this; in 1948 there was a complaint made against the Harrison Investment Company Ltd., for their refusal to connect their electric power lines unless the customer paid the cost of such connection. I believe that people have to pay hundreds of dollars for erecting poles for a telephone service and they do not get back the money. In this case the complaint was turned down because the service was required seasonally.

I take it for granted that honourable members have read the "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill through carefully and they have gathered what the different Clauses refer to. Honourable members will pardon me if I read through the different parts of the Bill. First of all, "the object of the Bill is to set up a Public Utilities Board. The Board will consist of three members appointed by the Governor and its principal function will be to supervise public utilities exercising monopolistic powers so as to ensure that the rates which they charge are fair and reasonable and that the service which they provide is adequate. In brief, it will act as a quasi-judicial body, inquiring into and determining impartially any matters of difference which may arise from time to time between the electricity, gas and telephone companies and the public as regards rates and service." We are confining the provisions of the Bill only to three companies at present, but the British Columbia Bill goes further than this and it covers railway, tramway, ferry, operation of a toll bridge, conveyance of messages or communications by telephone or telegraph, production of generation for storage, furnishing of gas, electricity, steam or any other agency for the production of light, heat and so on. Our water is already nationalised; I am reminded that water is not nationalised in that a private person can sink a well wherever he likes, but the general distribution and sale of water to the public is nationalised. I also have before me the Alberta Bill which is more voluminous than that of British Columbia and I am instructed that the British Columbia Bill works extremely well. Customers feel if they make any complaint about the service which is supplied to them, that makes for good relationship between the company and the customer; the customer feels that the company cannot always be wrong. Honourable members may say that the number of members comprising the Board is a small number, but practical experience has shown that it is better to have a small number of members comprising the Board. In a small community it would not be difficult to get three persons to administer impartially the duties of a Public Utilities Board. Part I "deals with the appointment and constitution of the Board. It will consist of a Chairman and two members appointed by the Governor for a term of five years at salaries fixed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. If a member of the Board is interested in any matter coming before the Board, a deputy will be appointed to act in his stead for that occasion. The Board may engage experts having technical knowledge to assist it in carrying out its duties and may, with the consent of the Governor, utilise the services of any employee in a Government Department. The expenses of the Board will be borne by the public utilities themselves who will be assessed in proportion to their gross earnings." I am told that some people have objected to Clause eleven of the Bill which deals with the expenses of the Board. In short, no money is coming out of the Treasury in the operation of this Board, and I imagine that that should appeal to honourable members.

The Governor-in-Executive Committee will not pay such salaries to these gentlemen as to cause an increase in the rate of electricity. Part II, deals with rates and rate-making: "Every public utility will be required to file with the Board a tariff showing the rates which it charges and if it desires to change the rates, it must give notice to the Board of the proposed changes. Upon receipt of proposals for a new rate, the Board may, on its own motion or upon complaint, enter upon a hearing and determine whether such rate is just and reasonable and if the Board finds that it is not, it may determine what is just and reasonable and fix the same by order." I am told that somebody is critical about that provision; I am sure that the honourable senior member for St. Andrew and other honourable members can assure the House that there is no danger that a thing will be just and reasonable to-day and it will not be just and reasonable tomorrow. "Similarly the Board may inquire into existing rates and if it finds that they are unfair or unreasonable, may determine the fair and reasonable rates to be observed in future. Temporary rates may be fixed by the Board pending the final determination of a rate inquiry and if the rates as finally determined are in excess of the temporary rates, then the public utility will be permitted to recover the difference by a temporary increase over and above the rates as finally determined." That is a sort of back pay for a company. Part III, deals with service and facilities. "Every public utility is under obligation to provide adequate and efficient service and if the Board, after a hearing on its own motion or upon complaint, finds that the service or facilities of any public utility are inadequate, it shall determine and prescribe the service and facilities to be provided and fix the same by its order. If the Board finds that an extension of an existing service would in its opinion, provide sufficient business to justify the construction and maintenance of such extension, it may order the public utility to make such extension to its service as the Board considers reasonable and expedient." This Bill does not call upon a company to run itself into bankruptcy in order, for instance, to provide Pie Corner with a bus service; a company will be at liberty to go before the Board and say: "We cannot run a bus service down there, we can show you that it will not pay to do so." Speaking personally, I regret that it is necessary for us to take this step instead of being in a position ourselves to put water and electricity in every house and a bus service along every route. The Government does not look for profit and you cannot ask the Electric Company to put light in every house in Barbados. This is a reasonable Bill based on similar legislation which has been found to work well in other countries. It may be the duty of the Government to make extensions of its own to places which are not served by bus or electricity, but it will be the duty of the Board to examine carefully the position of a company which says: "We cannot afford to do it." It will be the duty of the Board to call for and have before it the financial position of these three companies so as to have some proper estimate of their business before telling any one of them that it must extend its service. I presume that there will be some argument about Part IV. "This Part provides that no public utility may issue stocks or shares or debentures without the approval of the Board." That is a very useful provision to make in the operation of a public utility because it can so manipulate itself as to lose capital or to show that it cannot afford to extend its service. In the British Columbia legislation no fewer than six sections deal in detail with what a public utility may or may not do on the question of securities. Part V deals with

procedural matters. All hearings will be in public so that people will not be able to get behind closed doors and help their friends. A customer will have the chance of listening to complaints which are made by any other customer, and "power is given to the Board to subpoena witnesses, and to compel the production of such books, records and documents as it may deem necessary." Part VI deals with the enforcement of the Board's orders; if a public utility does not carry out the Board's orders, the Board may take over the business and run it. Certainly as far as the lower ranks of the staff are concerned, the Public Utilities Board will find itself cheerfully supported by workmen of the Electric Company, the Telephone Company or the Gas Company if the Board had to take over any of these utilities. The public will still have the service if the Board has to take it over and run it. Part VII deals with offences and penalties. "Every public utility which fails to obey an order of the Board shall be liable to a fine not exceeding \$1,000 and every director and manager of the public utility to a fine not exceeding \$100 unless he proves that according to his position or authority, he took all means in his power to carry out the order. Every public utility furnishing false information to the Board shall be liable to a fine not exceeding \$1,000 and any officer of a public utility failing to furnish information required by the Board shall be liable to a fine not exceeding \$100." We have thought that these fines are reasonable but I do not suppose that the Government will object to any honourable member suggesting that the fine of \$1,000 is too small. Part VIII deals with the question of appeal and review and it provides that "the Board may review, vary or rescind any decision made by it, and an appeal shall lie to the Court of Error on a question of law." There must be some finality in these matters and certainly the Board should be the final arbiter. Just before coming to the House this morning I read an article in the *Law Quarterly Review* in which reference was made to a case in which the honourable senior member for St. James is concerned—a case which is going to the Privy Council. The writer of the article stated that Barbados is particularly generous with its appeals; there is an appeal from the Court of Error which heard the appeal from the Assistant Court of Appeal which heard the appeal from the Police Magistrate. In some cases it is a question of appealing from Caesar to less than Caesar. I suggest to honourable members who feel like the "Advocate" on the question of appeal in this Bill, to review the case. If it is proved that the pressure supplied by a public utility is too low or the meter leaks and you are made to pay more than what you consume, surely those facts need not go to a Court; it is only on a question of law that there should be any talk of an appeal. As regards Part IX, I have been told that there has been some vague criticism about giving the Board power to interfere with legislation. The provision under this part of the Bill only means that although there is an Act dealing with the Electric Company and this Company operates under a franchise, that does not prevent the Board from dealing with the electric or telephone service. The Government has come to the conclusion that the British Columbia legislation is the best legislation for us to adopt here; its provisions will work well and they will be for the benefit of the consumer. The provision which directs that two companies must use the same poles should cut down the cost to the consumer. "If the Board, after enquiry, finds that public convenience requires the use by one public utility of poles, or other equipment belonging to another public utility, it may make such order as it deems reasonable directing the joint use of such poles or other equipment." If, for instance, the Electric Company has poles going

down to St. Andrew from Bissex Hill and somebody, in St. Andrew wants a telephone installed, you may have to stretch the wires from Bissex Hill Police Station, because the Telephone Company will say: "We have to put down our own poles and charge you \$1,000 for installing the telephone." I repeat that this is a provision which will help the consumer where price is concerned. The public utilities are paying the expenses of the Board as I have already said, and we have done that because it is also being done in Canada and the fear of the consumer paying for a public utility services than he should pay will be borne in mind by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. The salaries of members of the Board will not be at such a rate that they will absorb so much of the profits of any company as to compel it to pass on any increase to the consumer; the salaries are paid in proportion to the income. Newfoundland created such a Board only this year using Canadian legislation and having similar powers; the legislation affects light, power, telephone and so on, and provides for the payment of the members of the Board by the companies concerned. This Government has only included these three companies in this Bill because at the present moment water is a Government concern and the Department of Highways and Transport exists with an Advisory Board, and as long as that is in existence it will need some tightening up; it was not necessary to provide for transport in this Bill, that being already provided for by what is the equivalent of a Public Utility Board. Relative to the milk supply, that is a very knotty problem and it may be, that at the present moment it is a matter to be dealt with by Police Magistrates rather than by a Public Utility Board. We have drafted a Bill in respect of a co-operative milk-canning company and we are awaiting the financial blessing of the Colonial Development and Welfare Organization before we bring it down to the House. If we find that the distribution of milk is to be included in this Bill, we will include it; but at present it does not seem necessary to put more in the Bill than these three public utilities. I have much pleasure in moving that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I rise to second the motion for the second reading of this Bill because I am very pleased indeed to see that the Government, after nearly four years, having changed its mind, has awakened from its slumber. The Government has realised the impracticability if not the impossibility from the financial point of view of what it has been preaching, that is, the nationalisation of all public utilities. The Government has not abandoned the policy of nationalisation, as the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said; it has decided to bring about the better working of public utilities which is a point taken from the programme of the Opposition. The Leader of the House said that he was surprised at the "Advocate" newspaper supporting the Government in this Bill and I say that I was surprised at the Labour Organ supporting the passing of this Bill at all. I know that there are a lot of honourable members who are in favour of nationalisation; they feel that the nationalisation of all public utilities is the best way of ensuring the best service to the community. We of the Opposition made it clear during our election campaign in this colony that we would support any Public Utilities Bill which had for its aim and object the proper control of public utilities in this island; but we were definitely opposed to nationalisation and we will oppose nationalisation today. Nationalisation was a plank in the platform of the present Government, but we of the Opposition opposed nationalisation and we still

oppose it because we feel that in practice in Barbados it is not possible to effect nationalisation at this stage of the development of this colony. We feel that there are too many other pressing problems to be dealt with in this colony; we feel that there are too many other things to be done immediately and therefore we do not feel that money can be found to nationalise public utilities when private enterprise can carry them on with Government control. To show our good faith in that respect, today we wholeheartedly support this Bill. I know that there are a lot of people who will preach nationalisation until it comes to them personally.

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Speaker—I am interrupting the honourable member on a motion that this House do now adjourn for half an hour. We will come back after tea and continue the consideration of this Bill. I have interrupted the honourable member for the purpose of moving the adjournment of the House for half an hour after which the honourable member can continue his speech.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that motion because I have a good number of points to make and the tea will help honourable members to understand them better.

The question that this House do now adjourn for half an hour was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES BILL

On resumption,

Mr. SPEAKER.— On the adjournment, the House was debating the Bill to provide for the regulation of Public Utilities and the honourable senior member for the City was speaking on the motion for the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I was saying that I had much pleasure in seconding the motion for the second reading of this Bill because it was one of the main planks in the political platform of the members on this side of the House; that I was very glad to see that the Government has abandoned the idea of nationalization and that it is to be hoped that the establishment of a Public Utilities Board would become a reality shortly. This is the only fundamental difference which exists between us on this side of the table and the members who form and support the Government—Nationalization. We on this side of the table still oppose Nationalization but there comes a time when one is bound to see things in their true perspective. We say that public utilities could not be allowed to go on as they have been going on for years and as a compromise we are in favour of the establishment of a Public Utilities Board. The senior member for St. Joseph was very exhaustive in pointing out the aims and objects of this Bill and in telling us how it works in the Dominion of Canada and in parts of the United States of America. We are going to support this Bill but we do not support it in every iota. We feel that this Bill will take a great deal of studying and when I suggest that it should go to a Select Committee I do so with no idea of holding up the passage of the Bill, but it is ushering into Barbados a new outlook and therefore, all Parties should be given an opportunity to go into every section of the Bill, especially when we realize that there is existing legislation dealing with public utilities which will have to be brought up-to-date. Apparently the Government in its wisdom has decided that for the present this Bill

should deal only with the Telephone Co., the Electric Co., and the Gas Co. Going through the Bill you will find that the Board is to consist of three members who will be appointed by the Governor. We expect that you are going to have on this Board a man of legal ability, a man of engineering ability and a man of economic ability. The redeeming feature about this Bill, as I see it, is that no one connected with the local companies—directly or indirectly, politically or otherwise—will be given a seat on the Board and that, I think, is a step in the right direction. But, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering, after reading the Bill, whether you will have a Department to deal with a matter of this sort. It is stated that there is going to be a Secretary and it looks to me as if there will be a Department to deal with public utilities. In my opinion, the provisions of the Bill are not wide enough and in many respects it needs to be amended. Without any other legislation as a guide other than that which obtains in Canada the draughtsman of this Bill is likely to have included provisions which are not suitable to, and exclude provisions which are suitable to, local conditions. For some reason the Government has suggested that only the Telephone, Electricity, and Gas Companies should be dealt with under this Bill but I feel that in this—shall I say?—modern day when it is so necessary to educate people, Radio Distribution should be included. I feel that Radio Distribution is as much a public utility as the Gas Company is, and that this Bill should apply to it, more especially when you read the Bill and see that there is a section which says that the Commissioners will have the right to control and act in the same way with a company which does not manufacture the commodity it sells but actually buys it from another Company as they would act towards the Gas, Electric, and Telephone Companies. That is one of the reasons why I am suggesting that this Bill should be referred to a Select Committee. If Radio Distribution was included and we were to pass legislation to the effect that one Company could use the poles of another Company I can quite see that one of the immediate benefits from this Bill would be the extension of Radio Distribution to other parts of the island. Not only that; it would result in the reduction of the now mounting cost of the Radio Distribution Service. After all, the principal thing in which we are interested is that when we enact this legislation to control public utilities, the consumers should benefit not merely from an extension of the particular service but that they should get the particular commodity as cheaply as possible. Although the Bill is not as voluminous as some Bills we have had to deal with yet it is a Bill which will take a great deal of study and if honourable members have read it, they will realize that there are some sections of it which must be amended. It is true that the Waterworks, as a public utility, is already under the control of the Government but it is a known fact that the Government has set up a Special Committee for the purpose of assisting in the running of the Waterworks and I am wondering, if you have a Public Utility Board and have enacted legislation to deal with public utilities, whether that legislation should not include the Waterworks. I am sure that honourable members will give very careful consideration as to whether or not all public utilities should not come within the provisions of this Act. Now, Sir, there is a section of this Bill which I hope will allay any fears in the minds of honourable members who are

in opposition to the establishment of a Public Utilities Board, who would like to see Nationalization but who cannot really see that it is impossible, if you want to give relief in the immediate future to the inhabitants of this colony, to have Nationalization. In this Bill one of the powers of the Commissioners will be to say whether or not a Company can extend its shares. Take a Public Utility Company today with assets amounting to £100,000. When we have enacted this legislation before that Company could decide to extend its shares or to have any appreciation of its Capital, that must be decided by the Board. Some honourable members ask *sotto voce* "Who says so? The only body who says so is this Bill. In Part IV of this Bill there is a section which actually borders on Nationalization. In other words, the Board has to say to a Public Utility Company what dividends it should pay; this Board—some honourable members would be opposed to it purely because it was a plank in the political platform of the Opposition—would be able to say to a Public Utility Company "your service should be run first where the majority of the people could benefit from it." That was always the contention of those of us who would like to see Barbados a better place for all of us to live in. There are some further powers which I would like to see given to the Board. I am going to mention them and honourable members should weigh them carefully and give very serious consideration to them. Nobody in this Country—at least none of us who have a sense of responsibility—would like to say to people who 50 or 60 years ago came into the colony with capital and invested it "We confiscate all your property and you can go." Even if you nationalize in a democratic country like this you will have to find money to pay the particular Company whose commodity you have nationalized; that is what it comes to. You are not merely going to say to the Company "Well you have been here for 50 years; we thank you for what you have done" and kick them out. That cannot be done in a democratic country.

Now, Clause 27—Part IV—says this:—

(1) No public utility shall issue any stocks or shares or any debentures or other evidence of indebtedness, payable in more than one year from the date thereof, unless it has first obtained the approval of the Board to the proposed issue.

(2) The Board may grant its approval of the proposed issue in the amount applied for or in any lesser amount, and subject to such conditions as it may deem reasonable and necessary to impose.

The whole crux of this is that the Board will say whether a Company is over-capitalized, whether the dividends it is paying are honest and fair. There are no two ways about that. At one time the senior member for St. Joseph told me that a Public Utilities Bill could not work in this island but I am yet glad to see that he is such a big man as to be able to see that it can work and has brought it down to this House. The Public Utilities Board should, I repeat, be in a position to say to a Company "If you are going to extend your shares or increase your Capital, those Shares must be offered first to local people," and if they are offered to local people no one person should be able to buy more than a certain amount. I appeal to the senior member for St. Joseph to see that if this important legislation is enacted, all the shares in the Electric Company, for instance, should not be held by a few people in London and Barbados. The Board must be able to control the Directors' salaries and the

fees that they draw. An honourable member remarked that the Vestries control those but that honourable member does not know much about that phase of the matter. Any reasonable man, even if he is a Tory, must agree with me that in this twentieth century we in Barbados could not give a public utility company facilities to expand locally and allow all its Shares or the greater part of them to be offered abroad. I am thinking of giving working people in this country the opportunity of acquiring shares in a Public Utility Company. Anybody who has read similar legislation in Canada will know that such exists there today. To expand any Public Utility Company in Barbados is going to call for Capital and if we allow all the Shares to be offered abroad, it amounts to this: you have no control over that public utility Company. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that with such powers given to the Board we will be able to say, sooner or later, that we own the public utilities in Barbados. There are some sections of this Bill which will, no doubt, be controversial; for instance, the section which provides that the Governor may actually on his warrant to the Colonial Treasurer pay out money without the knowledge or consent of the Legislature. I do not know who is responsible for that but I can say that I am almost sure that with the meticulous care of my colleague that provision would hardly pass muster in this Chamber. I draw to the attention of the honourable Leader that that would have to be amended, and is a further reason why the Bill should be sent to a Select Committee. I am making these points because we of the Opposition are proud of this Bill which gives a certain amount of protection to both sides. Some honourable members may ask "But what kind of Board are you going to get?" and I am wondering whether a provision should not be inserted in the Bill to the effect that the appointment of the members of the Board shall be submitted for the approval of the Legislature. Some honourable members will say that this is a palliative. That may be so on the part of those honourable members who are wedded to Nationalization; but if you insert a provision which says what the Return should be and that a Statement of Accounts must be laid before the Legislature year after year, then there would be no cause for fear. I say that there comes a time in the lives of individuals when they must compromise. Unless people want to talk in the air and really do not mean what they say, this, to my mind, is the real Bill for this Country. Some honourable member will say "Nationalize everything". This is my second turn in here and when I first sat in this House I sat next to the late senior member for St. Andrew, Mr. Haynes, who introduced the question of Nationalization into the House. I remember well that I offered then to resign my seat if in two years my opponents who had promised so recklessly that they would nationalise, would effect nationalisation. I repeat now that if they could nationalize before the end of this session I would resign my seat. The would-be nationalizers remind me of the little boy who dreamt that he had a motor car to drive all over the moon: they build castles in the air. I appeal to honourable members to see the wisdom of supporting this Bill because it is the one Bill to give some relief to the community in this direction. As regards appeals in matters of this sort, they should be heard by judges because it is difficult in a small community with people so closely connected with one another to get a fair and unbiased decision from a jury in respect of a public utility. I do not

know much about the law but I would say that in matters of this sort appeals should be allowed on not only questions of law but also on questions of fact because in the first working of this Bill you will find questions of fact arising and we should be at pains to allow persons who may be complainants to appeal on questions of fact, inasmuch as there may be great dissatisfaction at the commencement of the operation of this Act. Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the sending of this Bill to a Select Committee because every member of this House should be fully acquainted with the provisions of the Bill. I do not think that an honourable member should find himself in the position of not being able to answer any question that might be put to him in a matter of such vital importance. I repeat that it gives me pleasure to second the motion for the second reading of this Bill and although I feel that it will have a stormy passage I hope that the passage will, nevertheless, be safe.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker,—I must confess that it is with some amazement that I heard the introducer of this Bill express surprise that it should be supported by the Daily Press and more even so to hear him express some wonder at whether it would be supported by the honourable members on my left, for the simple reason, Sir, that the Bill seeks to give legislative sanction to a proposal which has been pushed with vigour throughout the length and breadth of the country by the Conservative Opposition in this Chamber. My position was somewhat sustained by the fact that the senior member for the City jumped up with alacrity to second the motion for the passing of the second reading of the Bill. I want to say here and now that in my opinion the inclusion of this Bill among the statutes of the colony will not make the position to any appreciable extent better, in so far as the control of public utilities in this colony is concerned. It is all well and good to say, as has been said by the honourable member on my left, that there is similar legislation in Canada and Newfoundland but Canada is a country of unrestricted free enterprise. Furthermore, in some respects the Canadian Constitution itself offers less liberty to the individual than our own Colonial Constitution does. However, we are not now discussing constitutional matters. Because a Public Utilities Board works well in Canada, it does not follow that it is going to achieve the results which are necessary here in consequence of the peculiar conditions which exist in a colony like this. Now, I am going to say that this Bill is bound to be a very great disappointment to a large number of people in this country. I am not one of those persons,—persons to whom the honourable member on my left referred,—who believe that you can indiscriminately socialize and nationalize industries and public services in this colony. I am realistic enough to realize that a certain amount of free enterprise is absolutely essential in a country with a colonial economic status such as ours. As a matter of fact, I am willing to go so far as to say that in order to extend our economy beyond its present colonial status we may need, in some respects, a strong dose of free enterprise but I certainly will also at the same time submit that when it comes to public utilities there can be no justification for failure to assume complete control, even in a colony like this.

The honourable member on my left who seconded the motion for the second reading of the Bill, emphasized the definite impracticability at the moment of acquisition by Government of the public utility services in the colony. Now, let us assume that that is so. Certainly, Sir, what certain mem-

bers of this House and the community are entitled to hear from the introducer of the Bill is that at least some elaborate investigation has been made. Give us some sort of proof,—present facts and figures to prove that you have gone thoroughly into the possibility of acquiring these public utility Companies and that having found it to be practically impossible at the moment you have to fall back on this Bill. But do not come here and merely say that because we are spending money on housing—and I do not know what money we are spending on housing, except the Labour Welfare funds—or because we expect to start a deep water harbour scheme sometime in the future, you have had to abandon, even for the time being, the proposals for the nationalization of public utilities. Or do not merely tell us that because the British Labour Party has had to stop its nationalization programme you should stop with yours too. At least, the British Labour Party have made a beginning with the nationalization of coal and transport and we have not heard it pronounced officially that they have stopped their programme for further nationalization. But we are being told by the local Government that we are going to stop before we have started. I want to make my position perfectly clear. I am not suggesting for a moment that we can get up in this country and nationalize indiscriminately industries and public services. As a matter of fact, the only industry of any importance in this island is the sugar industry. To talk about nationalizing the sugar industry you have to be quite clear in your mind whether you intend to nationalize the manufacture of sugar. If you want to nationalize the manufacture of sugar, that is quite possible but to nationalize the growing of the sugar would mean the acquisition by the Government of almost every square inch of arable land in this country, which would be impractical at the moment. But apart from the nationalization of industries, most decidedly there was easy access for the reaching out by the Government into the acquisition and control of public utilities. I repeat, Sir, that either we should be told by the Government that it has exhausted every single opportunity for discharging what is in reality its obligation to the country or the Government should admit its incapacity to reduce its pet political platform propositions from the level of academic theories to concrete legislative measures. This Bill must be a very poor sop to people who were told, as has been already quoted by the honourable member on my left, four years ago “if you return us to power, within six months we will nationalize the Electricity Service.” This Bill, I repeat, must be a poor sop to them; it must be a source of acute disappointment. After all, apart from the financial encumbrances which any State imposes upon itself when it takes over a public utility service, it must be also borne in mind that an undertaking of this sort is an investment and that apart from incurring the liability involved, there is the prospect of the State earning the invariably handsome profits which are made by the public utility and with which it is hoped eventually to amortize the financial obligation that it has assumed. It is not merely a question, Sir, of taking over a public utility and hoping that one of these days you may be able to pay back the money you borrowed to acquire it. No private utility operates for the health of the Company Directors; they operate because they make money. The honourable member on my left talks about controlling dividends. Those dividends admittedly are there. We want to be told that it is beyond the financial capacity of the Government, bearing in mind the

dividends returned by the public utilities to take the step to nationalize them. I repeat that by its pretensions, by its professions, by its very nomenclature, the Party in power has obligated itself to a step of that sort. I, Sir, share the disappointment which must be felt by a large number of people in this colony, if we are going to be told that it is impossible even to acquire the Gas Company, when the Government already owns the supply of natural gas and it is merely a question of paying a proper price for the machinery in Bay Street I repeat that, in my opinion, it is not so much a question of impracticability but merely either a decision not to implement your own proposals or to confess your inability to implement them. It cannot by any stretch of the imagination involve any extra administrative ability to acquire what is known as the Gas Company in this country.

Even in the field of Insurance, the Government has been urged to undertake the insurance under the Workmen's Compensation Act and if you cannot make Insurance pay you cannot make anything pay because Insurance is only a matter of mathematics on the one hand and efficient and economic management on the other. I repeat that the community is entitled to expect more in this direction from the Government and could hardly be expected to accept with pleasure what little it has been offered. Now, with regard to the Bill itself Clause 2 defines the public utilities which will come within the scope of the Bill. The honourable introducer said that Transport could have been included but that we already have an Advisory Board and a Department of Highways and Transport and, therefore it was not thought advisable to include Transport in this Bill. The Advisory Board is—well the Advisory Board. As a matter of fact, an announcement has been made that bus fares will be increased from the 1st of October and I would like to know if the Advisory Board knew anything about it.

As a matter of fact I am wondering if the Executive Committee knew that bus fares are going to be increased and I should not at all be surprised to hear that the Advisory Board did not know. There has been tremendous opposition in this House to the establishment of these Advisory Boards and to the creation of these various government departments, the Directors of which are given complete power, until such time as we have Responsible Government. That has always been my position and to hear it advanced to-day that the actual existence of one of these Boards and one of these omnipotent Directors of a Department is reason enough for not including an essential service such as Transport in this Bill is positively astonishing. The seconder of the motion has suggested the inclusion of Radio Distribution. With that I expect we all agree but I am wondering how the senior member for St. George is going to accept the suggestion, in view of the fact that he has always proclaimed himself to be of the considered opinion that the Government itself should acquire and operate the service known as Radio Distribution.

It is all well and good to put whatever you like in this Bill. Everything will depend, Sir, in the final analysis, on the personnel of the Board. The appointment of its members will be in the hands of the Head of the Administration. From our experience of the past and of what has happened we know fully well who will be appointed to this Board. I can think of at least one person who will be a member of this Board—Mr. Michael Greaves—because he is said to have had experience in Canada on similar Boards and I am telling you that in my opinion, when this Board shall have been appointed, the second state of the consumers in this colony will be worse than the first. We have in the Commission of Enquiry Act

at least some source of redress but with this Bill we shall see what we shall see. Furthermore, Sir, with regard to the Services for which the Bill should operate—Transport definitely should be included, Radio Distribution has been suggested, (A voice : Ice Companies (Laughter) I feel, Sir, that this is far too important a matter to be approached with such levity—I want to suggest this :

Sugar is the main source of wealth in this country; it is the mainspring of our economy and welfare and it means more to the entire population than any other industry. I am, therefore, suggesting very seriously, Sir, that in Clause 2 there should be added the manufacture of sugar in the colony. (Laughter). I really expected to hear a little laughter from people who do not know any better but I am amazed at the Senior Member for St. Joseph. I am suggesting, Sir, that in Clause 2 of this Bill the manufacture of sugar should be declared a public utility service or that there should be inserted a sub-clause 3 to the effect that the manufacture or the processing of sugar in the colony shall be a public utility service. If the Senior Member for St. Joseph, as he has intimated, sends this Bill to a Select Committee with the approval of the House I am prepared to furnish the Select Committee with a copy of an Act in which a Public Utilities Board is empowered to control the manufacture of sugar in a West Indian colony. I go further and say this : Even if I could furnish no precedent for the suggestion, the peculiar conditions which obtain in this colony are enough to give some sort of validity to the proposal I have made.

It is high time that there should be some control of the manufacture of sugar in the colony. If we are setting up a Public Utilities Board, all we need do for the purposes of the Act, is to declare the manufacture of sugar a public utility service, and bring the operation of sugar factories within the scope of the Act. If I am a member of the Select Committee I am prepared to put forward such a suggestion and to furnish the Committee with a copy of similar legislation to that which I propose. I am going to add, for the information of the senior member for St. Joseph, that the same Public Utilities Board which controls the manufacture of sugar to which I referred, is also responsible for the Telephone, Gas, Transport and other public utility services in the particular colony. I think that what I have further to say now can be deferred until the Bill comes back from the Select Committee but I want the members of the House and of the Select Committee to consider very seriously, if we are going to have this Act—the majority of opinion in the House is in favour of it and they will get it—the possibility of extending its provisions as far as possible so as to include the manufacture of sugar.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker,—As far as this Bill is concerned I am expecting, when it is passed by this House, to see all the flags flying in Broad Street, and the members of the Opposition can say “We, the reactionaries, lay down the policies and the Socialists carry them out.” I am definitely disappointed over this Bill and the debate, so far, is sufficient to cause me to be in favour of throwing the Bill through one of the windows of this Chamber. There are some persons, Mr. Speaker, who feel that a Public Utilities Board is a good substitute for Nationalization. Nationalization, the fundamental policy of all Socialists, is not only a guarantee of service to the public at an economical rate but it is also a guarantee that the profits accruing from public utilities will provide the social amenities that are needed. In an over populated colony like Barbados, there is the tendency to concentrate all the wealth in the hands of the few and at the same time

pauperise the many. The only alternative to that would be Nationalization or what is termed “common ownership.” Things that suit large countries do not necessarily suit small communities such as ours is. As regards the personnel of the proposed Public Utilities Board, do you think you could find a man who would have the capability to sit on that Board and not be thinking as the capitalists think? And would you expect such a man not to sympathise with should like to know how the Barbados Museum and his kind? What you are doing in a Bill of this sort is to regularize extortion to a greater extent than we have now, inasmuch as you are giving the members of the Public Utilities Board arbitrary power to decide whether the public should pay one cent or one pound for a commodity. A public utility Company would have the right of appeal but as far as I can see, the public would not have that right and even if you give the public that right you would scarcely get any section of it to take the lead, other than grumble at the decision of the Board. We have recently had an example of a Bill to give the Gas Company permission to increase its rates and it is only through the fortunate power which rested in the hands of members of the House that representatives of the people were able to sit around a table with representatives of the Company and other advisers who know and save the public from being robbed of a certain amount that was recommended by the Company and supported by figures which they gave; the result is that that Bill has not been passed into law yet but with a Public Utilities Board the Company would have had its way and the public would have been fleeced. That is only one example but we have had other examples in this colony of actions such as this: A lady in Brighton sold land to one individual at 6d. per square foot. The Government gave permission for the setting up of an Assessment Board in respect of land. Two weeks after, another person went to buy some of that same land and the lady stated that the Government says that land should be sold at 36 cents a square foot but that she would sell hers at 30 cents a square foot. Nothing but extortion, corruption and all the evil things you can think about! The people of this colony have got to groan and bear it. I have heard the majority of the members of this House say that they would not support any increase in bus fares because every concessionaire makes good profits and they do not deserve any consideration at the expense of the people. But although that expression has been made by several members of this House, including the honourable member who seconded the motion for the second reading of this Bill, you have read in the newspapers that the proposal to increase the bus fares is going to be carried out. Why? Because you have put too much power in the hands of certain Directors.

Certain officials in this colony think that they can ride the people rough shod and you know that the normal tendency is to give the strong the favours from every source in preference to the weak and most deserving. I would prefer Mr. Speaker, to wait, if I had to do so for fifty years, until I could see my way to bring in some measure of nationalization instead of this Bill. This is a sop which—I am going to say so now because I feel so—is going to be poisonous,—poisonous because few of us will live to see the real principles of Nationalization introduced in this colony. Some honourable members and people outside this House seem to magnify the argument about public ownership of certain productions. The same way a few persons can come together and pool their resources and establish big Utility Companies, how comes it that thousands or millions of people in a

community cannot pool their resources or give permission for their resources to be pooled in order that they could own whatever utilities there are and on which their existence depends? It is a joke. I have often heard the opposers of Nationalization and Progress say "You know that the Government cannot run anything successfully." Do you know why they say that? Because if the Government cannot show harmony in carrying out its policy, these anti-nationalisers would continue to do the stupid things that are done in other countries. Mr. Speaker, I have seen where in small countries in the West Indies the Governments own all the Utility Services. (A Voice Name one). St. Lucia, Trinidad, Grenada, St. Vincent—and honourable members know it too. If they don't own one Utility Service they own the other and I am sure that this Government can own one Utility Service or the other. There is an Act which permits you to demand that they present their books and to go into those books to see if the public is getting its fair share. But you are going to say now that that Act is no good and that you are going to appoint a special Utilities Board which in the end might do more harm by acquiescing to the demands of private enterprise. It is all right for the senior member for the City to spread before our eyes the nice things which the public could get through this Bill. Certainly I agree with him if human nature was different but as things are, how do you expect to get those things when everybody is cutting and slashing each other? How can you put this power into the hands of people who are not sufficiently in sympathy with the people? In the first place you are going to say that the supposed members of the Utilities Board are to be persons who have high qualifications, who know about the various industries, how they are run and so on. As I said, I prefer the present conditions to go on until you can really control things and make sure that you are losing nothing. There is another thing, Sir. I notice that in case a Company fails to carry out an order given to it, it would be fined \$1,000. I have not seen any provision for a continuity of that fine until the Company carried out such an order. In a day like this with the strength of Corporations, a Company can flout an order given to it and be satisfied to pay the \$1,000 in the expectation that it will recoup itself by increasing the rates by some other means. That is a point which I do hope if you reach that stage you will clarify. There are some Companies in America which would prefer to throw away \$1,000,000 than to conform with certain regulations; it pays them to do so. There is no provision, as far as I see, for that. As regards the argument of the senior member for the City about shares being sold to local people, that is not sufficient. The entire Bill should be thrown away. I am not satisfied with it. No person who has studied the principles which are adopted by Socialists could accept this Bill and be satisfied with it. This is what I call a setback because it prevents you from fixing your attention on Nationalization. You are going to swap Nationalization for this Bill and if this becomes operative I do not see any of us being able to enjoy in our lifetime the benefits of Nationalization which should be. I can sympathise with the Opposition; this is in their interests and that is why I should expect them to raise flags to-morrow if this Bill is passed; they should close their stores and give their employees a holiday. I am beginning to wonder who is who. Again, Mr. Speaker, rather than limit Nationalization to the few public utilities I agree with the junior member for St. Philip that there should also be nationalization of the Sugar Industry in this island. We are reaching the point where it may be necessary even to nationalize Banks, and Insurance Companies. Some people seem to feel that the argument about the nationalization of

the Sugar Industry is fatuous; it is not; it is only so to those who are weak minded and who are not sure where they are. If we say that we are duplicating the policy of the British Labour Party I can say that they have not backed down from their policy whatsoever and I agree with the honourable member who said that they only resorted to a temporary recess but that they intend to carry out the nationalization of steel. I feel that rather than our backing down on such a policy we should be making the pace so hot that even the Socialists in England would say "You are a little too fast; you are going ahead of us; stop and wait for us." But we have not started anything at all. These public utilities make huge profits annually and large premiums go into the pockets of their shareholders in Australia, England, Canada, and elsewhere. If, through Nationalization, the Government was able to get those profits owned by the people, it would be in a position to meet the demands which are daily increasing through an increasing population. We certainly would get far ahead in solving those problems which we have now. Regardless of what happens, as the result of the consideration of this Bill, I want it to be placed on record that I am not in favour of it, despite whatever amendments may be made.

Mr. MAPP: This Bill does represent a compromise between one side and the other; it is a compromise between the extreme measure of nationalisation and unfettered private enterprise. To all Socialists who believe in the policy of nationalisation it would be a disappointment that the Government has not yet seen fit to nationalise one or two of these public utilities. But, Mr. Speaker, although it is a disappointment to me, yet at times I preach the gospel of moderation and I believe in half a loaf being better than no loaf at all. In this case I believe that having a body that can regulate the rates charged by these public utilities is better than having no such Body at all, and allowing these public utilities to charge the public whatever they feel like charging, whether the rates are exorbitant or otherwise. I agree that this Bill is a temporary compromise and in saying that I am well aware of the difficulties with which we are faced. I am aware of the fact that if the Government waits too long before they nationalise the Gas Company, that Company will not be nationalised at all, because if it is allowed to recover and stand on its feet we will be told that there is no money with which to nationalise it, and the same thing applies to the Electric Company. The longer we wait, the more it will cost. Some time ago when the Directors of the Gas Company were very apprehensive about the Government nationalising it, they said that it was not worth anything; and before much time elapses and before this Company becomes financially heavier than it is to-day, the Government should take steps to nationalise it. Hon. members have lost sight of the fact that the stepping up of this Company does not prevent the Government from nationalising it in the near future. If the Government wants to nationalise this Company it can do so; therefore I agree with this Bill in that it is better to have half a loaf than no loaf at all. It is better to have some Authority to whom the public can appeal rather than have no Authority at all. I agree that a Company such as Radio Distribution could be included in this Bill and it is rather unique to hear that we should include the manufacture of sugar in the Bill. But to get back to these public utilities, hon. members will find that the City of London Corporation has Boards to run services,—

Boards on which members of the public are directly represented to look after their interests. If the members of a Public Utilities Board such as this, are wisely and properly chosen it can operate very much to the benefit of the public. I therefore agree with the remarks of the hon. junior member for St. Philip, but in the last resort it will boil down to the kind of representation you have on this Board. Certainly if it is of the nature which I have seen in this colony in recent years, I consider that this half loaf will be a little better than no loaf at all; and if you get personnel in certain areas appointed to this Board, it will be of no use at all.

I am fearful about having the expenses of this Board being paid for by the public utilities themselves. I realise that if the Government bears these expenses it may be said that the members of the Board are simply agents for the Government; but on the other hand, if the public has to bear these expenses, it will be said that the members of the Board are the agents of the public. What you want is impartiality in the Board. I do not agree with certain proposals in this Bill; you want an impartial Board—a Board comprised of impartial people not dependent upon the public utilities for their salaries. If the public utilities are paying the expenses of the Board and an appeal is made by the consumers of electricity that the rates charged are too high and the appeal is turned down, would not the public say that this is probably because the Board is paid out of the gross earnings of the Electric Company and it would not like to see the rates reduced too far? I should like the expenses to be paid in proportion to the gross earnings of these public utility companies. I am in favour of having a very thorough examination made of this Bill because I do not like certain of its proposals, I hope therefore that this Bill will be referred to a Select Committee so that all suggestions will be carefully considered.

As regards the question of transportation, while it is true that that is controlled to a certain extent by the Government, the public know very well my views about that control and I do not withdraw one iota about those views. Some hon. member mentioned about the rates which the Director of Highways and Transport warned would come into effect in October. I do not know if those rates should come into effect before they are approved: or if they are not to be approved: but how can you set up a Board like this to regulate the rates of certain private companies before rates can be raised, and at the same time you allow this Department to raise the rates of private companies before the books are presented? You are saying that you cannot raise the rates before you look at the books and yet the Director of Highways and Transport says that there is to be a levelling up of certain rates. The lowest rates are to be raised to the highest, but the highest rates cannot be brought down: I say that the raising of the rates should not be allowed unless the books are inspected. If I stand alone I will oppose the policy of the Government in this matter because it is wrong. Some time ago I wrote a letter to the Department and I asked a question in this House relative to the rates along the St. Thomas route; it was a question of having an equitable rate for the same mileage. When I asked the Director to level the rates the reply was that it was not done so: but the low rates are being raised and the Government is getting the blame—not the Head of the Department. This is a matter of saving people from themselves. I do my duty to my Party in spite of the fact that people do not

think so, and I also do my duty to the people themselves. I am in favour of this Bill although, I repeat, it is half a loaf, but you have to see that it is worked properly or you will not have any loaf at all. I should like to have that part of the Bill altered, which makes it appear that the members of this Public Utilities Board will be the agents of private companies: you cannot prevent people from saying that the Board is carrying out what a company wants. If that provision is in the Canadian legislation, there is no reason why it should be in the Barbados legislation: There is nothing wrong in the Government paying the expenses of this Board; we are saying that you cannot charge whatever rates you like and we therefore come between you and the consumer. I do not think that it should be allowed to be said that the Board is acting in the interest of private enterprise. I think it would be pennywise and pound foolish to say that you do not agree with this Bill and do not see that it can be made workable so long as you are not ready for nationalisation. This Bill, I repeat, does not prevent the Government from nationalising these companies; it is not until the Secretary of State says you can have nationalisation that you can nationalise these companies.

Mr. LEWIS: I should like to make a contribution to this debate. This Bill is of special interest to me; when the question of the nationalisation of the Electric Company was discussed in this House on an Address brought forward by the then hon. senior member for St. Andrew, I moved an amendment which was eventually agreed to by the House. The idea of the amendment was to prevent the House from being charged with making an invidious distinction and a personal attack, so to speak, on the Electric Company, and I gave the House the opportunity of expressing itself as being in favour of the nationalisation of the public utilities in this island. That Address was duly presented to the Head of the Administration; I do not know if any reply was ever sent to the House, but I do know that it has been frequently said in this House by members of the Executive that the Secretary of State for the Colonies was being consulted as to our taking over public utilities in this island. I have not seen or heard what the Secretary of State for the Colonies has said in connection with the matter, but we find that this Bill has come before us, and as hon. members have said quite rightly, it is a backing down or a back peddling from the Socialist policy of nationalisation. As to whether you still retain your desire to nationalise public utilities—it is doubtful whether you will want to do that with a Bill of this sort on the Statute Book. The amendment to the Address to which I have referred was moved particularly to remove the stigma of a personal attack on the Electric Company; it was moved particularly to give the Executive Committee the opportunity of deciding whether the public utilities would be nationalised one after the other or what would be the policy of nationalisation, and they had the assurance that the House would vote the money for nationalising these public utilities. Since then there have been more members in favour of nationalisation in this House and therefore I see no reason why we should back down from that policy. In the meantime we had the Gas Company mentioned as being in an almost derelict condition and I understand that it was hinted to a member of the Government that it was possible to buy that Company at that time. It was said that the Gas Company was not importing any coal for the purpose of manufacturing gas, and the Government failed

to take the opportunity to nationalise the derelict concern. From the time I heard about natural gas I heard the honourable senior member for St. Joseph say that it should be nationalised. I have come to the conclusion that the Government has abandoned its policy of nationalising this Company and getting cheap gas for the people of this colony. I asked the honourable member for St. Joseph about buying out the Gas Co. and he told me they had a franchise by law and nothing could be done. I have been told that the Electric Company had a franchise when the hon. senior member for St. Joseph made the statement about nationalising it in six months and what am I led to believe? We have referred matters to the Secretary of State and we have been playing into the hands of people who will put off these matters; we find that while the United Kingdom would be willing to aid us in the matter of the nationalisation of public utilities in this colony, the Colonial Development Corporation is coming out and nationalising some of our industries for the benefit of the people in England. These are things which we have to watch.

It is certainly a compliment to the members of the Opposition for the Government to adopt the method which they have profounded and we cannot say that they did not bring forward a proposal such as that which we have before us. At one time there was on the Order Paper standing in the name of the honourable senior member for the City an Address asking for the appointment of such Boards as the one which is provided for in this Bill, and undoubtedly the honourable member put that forward as an alternative to nationalisation. Therefore we can pat ourselves on the back that we have adopted something from the Opposition—something which they have proposed as an alternative to a Socialist policy. We have imported into this colony a Financial Secretary and I would like to ask: What information has he ever given to this Government? What information or advice of a financial nature has the Financial Secretary ever given to this Government? It is, that you cannot nationalise. I have not heard about any reply from the Secretary of State on this question of nationalisation, but I warn the Government not to take his advice because it is obvious that Socialism in England is not for export; and while nationalisation is in the air, the Colonial Development Corporation is taking over some of our existing industries.

I think it is regrettable that the "Objects and Reasons" of this Bill did not state whence the Bill was taken; if it had been stated that this Bill had been taken from legislation in British Columbia or Alberta some honourable members might have been able to get advice as to the working of such a Bill. It is obvious that this Bill was copied from somewhere and it is a pity that honourable members were not given the opportunity of getting some information about it. Other Bills have been introduced in this House and it was stated they have been taken from legislation operating in Trinidad or the United Kingdom or elsewhere. The public debt of this colony is low, the Head of the Administration and others will tell you that our public debt is low; if your public debt is the lowest in the area and money is cheap, when are you going to nationalise? Are you going to wait until the Gas Company puts itself in a position as the A-1 distributing Company in the world and then take it over? We have lost an opportunity because we have no foresight. These Companies have engineered this Bill so that respon-

sibility to the public will be put on the shoulders of this Board; before long you will discover that a Bill of this nature has got the Board involved. You cannot say what rates a company must charge if you do not say what it must pay out in wages: the two things are inextricably bound up and you cannot tell me that that is not so. The moment the Union asks for any increase in wages, a company will say: "I must put up my rates." That is where this Board is going to run into difficulties: It will be blamed for all the things that go wrong. I defy anybody to tell me otherwise; the Board must regulate wages as it regulates the rates. In the present law there is a provision that these companies can charge up to the maximum rates and that is where they have been getting away with murder.

I think that the members of this House should see that it is in the hands of the Head of Administration to choose the members of this Board. We have given up many of the privileges which we had particularly in the appointment of Boards because we were promised ministerial status; but our privilege has gone, our power has gone and ministerial status has not yet come. It behoves us to see that we retain some authority in matters of this sort. The transport system should be under the control of this Board; we are going to have an increase in fares and I am glad to say that the City is not included in that. If owned in St. Michael you may not have to raise the fares because what you lose in the roundabouts a case has been made out for nationalisation, it is in respect of the bus service. If the buses were you will get in the swings. If you have a public transport system owned by the Government that is the only way in which you can have cheap transport. As regards the water supply. I am afraid that although it is controlled by the Government, it has not been extended as it should have been. There has not been any foresight in connection with the extension of the water supply and that is why we find ourselves in the position in which we are today. I do not see that any harm can be done if you give this Board power to extend this service; it could review the whole system and advise the Government.

I am voting against the second reading of this Bill because I feel that I am in honour bound to do so. I can only say that this Bill will definitely put back nationalisation; it will take away the headaches which the companies have and they will say; "The Government Board says I must charge you so much and you can go and see the Board." And the Board might be satisfied with the books that are presented to it. Another point is this: if you are going to have federation and you are going to finance a federal scheme, I think it is time that we make haste and keep the profits in respect of privately-owned public utilities within the island. If we want federation we will have to pay an admission fee, therefore let us prevent money from going out of the colony. If it will pay people outside to operate a telephone or an electric service, it will pay people in Barbados to do it, and as soon as the rates are pushed up you say that the service should be run by the Government. The Government has been given an assurance of the House on this question of nationalisation and they have not told us what they were told by the Secretary of State for the Colonies. We have not had any economic survey because the members of the House will not let somebody come and make it. One honourable member of this House said that £1,000 would be too much money to pay for somebody coming here and making an eco-

conomic survey of this colony. We have a small public debt, a guaranteed preference and we are told that we can borrow money at 4% interest; I want to know what better conditions are we waiting for before we **nationalise**. The British Government started a nationalisation scheme and they had to back down when they lost the majority after an election; but the position in this colony is different. Even with the loss of a large majority the British Government will persist in nationalisation but they will not encourage Barbados in it. I am not going to make any motion; I must say that I am surprised to hear how honourable members speak against this Bill and do not make any motion for its rejection. I am not making any motion because I may be placed in an awkward position; but this Bill is merely shifting responsibility to a Board appointed by the Head of the Administration. In his Speech from the Throne the Head of the Administration endorsed the appointment of a Public Utilities Board and it looks to me as if we are not men enough to stand up to the responsibility of Socialism. It seems to me that we are faltering now that the time has come for us to put into practice what we have been preaching.

Mr. MILLER : Like some of the previous speakers I believe that this Bill will answer a crying need, but I accept it as a pale imitation of what Socialism is. This Bill is utterly an instrument of capitalism; it is a hindrance to the march of progress. The inventors of electricity had in mind that electricity was a prime necessity for the people but after 100 years electricity still remains the preserve of the few. I feel that this Bill is a sad mistake and a pale, cheap imitation of what Socialism means. I am thinking of 1937 when people were shot down in the streets and some of them were left to die like dogs. We climbed on the backs of people, we promised them nationalisation of these public utilities if we were given a majority in this House and here we have a mistake—an agricultural Bill, an instrument of the rich. This Bill is intended to destroy the socialist view and not even the Prime Minister of England could satisfy me that that is not so. This Bill will have no effect on nationalisation; it will bring peace of mind to those who oppose nationalisation. It is a farce and it is not in accordance with Socialist views. The writing happens to be on the wall; this Bill is something like the vampire which takes to night to take advantage of its victims, and I say it is wrong. It is a solace and peace of mind to those who want to continue to exploit the people; it is in sharp contrast to the march of progress. Think of the many people who should benefit from electricity; to-day you have to go to the Manager of the Electric Company, take off your hat, form fours and salute so as to ask for an installation. He will tell you that it will cost you \$40 to get that installation when it should only cost you a few dollars. Look at the honourable senior member for the City; he is smiling because he knows that this Bill is mockery. The suffering people are wondering if nationalisation will ever come about. After hearing the Speech from the Throne, I am surprised to see that this Bill has been brought down by a Socialist Government; I believe that the honourable Leader of the House intends to do something for the people; but it is wrong to bring down a Bill of this sort. There is no excuse about not having any money; immediately after the War England nationalised the coal mines with dollars and cents. I repeat that this Bill is a mistake; it will grieve this Party which deserves to suffer. The people want to go forward; we promised to do something for them and this Bill is a means of destroying that promise. This Bill will go down in history as a mistake; nationalisation is our only hope. There is nothing wrong about nationalisation; when there was a Tory Government which

knew of nothing but exploitation, they decided that water should be placed in the hands of the people. To-day we have advanced and we have a Socialist Government; we have asked the people to give us a majority and to-day nationalisation happens to be a dream. Look at the quiet composure of the members of the Opposition; they are lauding the Government and praising it to the skies. It suits them to do that now that this Bill has been brought down—a Bill which we of the Labour Party came to fight against. I am saying all this with a deep feeling. You could pay down some money on a public utility and pay the remainder in 50 years; you do not want to have all the money at once. You have the Gas Company; I have spent quite a lot of time to show that people could get gas at a cheap rate and now we have this Bill before us. When we talked about nationalisation in this House, much fear went into the hearts of the rich, but now we have a turning of the tables. I know what will happen after what I have said to-night; I am not altogether foolish. I have nothing to lose but my life. (Cheers). I am concerned about the people's benefit. I want it to go on record that it is a real mistake for a Labour Government to bring down a Bill which is a cheap imitation of Socialism.

Mr. GARNER : I am not going to say very much about this Bill; much has been said against this Bill and I will begin by saying that I, too, am disappointed about it. I am a Socialist by birth; I came into this House as a Socialist and up to this day I retain my views. The day on which I am not so inclined, I will leave the House. I must say I feel that this Bill is only a palliative. This Bill is a compromise which true Socialists will never swallow. I know that my good friend on my immediate left took great pride in seconding the motion for the second reading of this Bill; it was exactly what he clamoured for during the last election campaign. On the other hand the members of the Labour Party and those of the Congress Party were almost unanimous in their programme for the nationalisation of the public utilities. I am of a revolutionary nature; however I feel that it would be unfair to the honourable Leader of the House to put more weight on him at this hour.

Mr. ADAMS : The lateness of the hour would have prevented me from saying anything at all but it is my duty to stick to the Rules of the House and not reply when the House goes into Committee in the consideration of this Bill. It is my duty to reply now. I am going to reply in the only way suitable to the members of this Party who have seen fit, without the slightest preliminary warning, to attack the Government as if it was most vicious, dishonest and treacherous; and to have done that after I made it clear that if the money was in the Treasury—if we did not have to provide for housing, a Deep Water Harbour and an extension of the General Hospital—a Resolution would have been coming down to this House for nationalisation and this Bill would not have seen the light of day. I do not think that the honourable senior member for St. George was doing more than repeating something which he would have to get off his chest whatever the Bill before the House was. I cannot conceive of people belonging to a Party and purporting to support the Government, making the type of speeches which they have made after hearing the Leader of the Government say that the Government has not altered its views on the question of nationalisation but that it is purely a matter of £. s. d. and if the oil gushes in good quantities we will buy out these Companies. Honourable members have referred to what I said in Queen's Park that if we are given power within six months we will nationalise the Electric Company; it is my duty to forget their infantile speeches which will come back to them.

to their regret—not mine. The honourable junior member for the City says that it should have been stated in the Bill that the legislation had been taken from British Columbia and he would have known; he knows that the members of this Party meet every Monday night, he refuses to come and ask questions but he gets up in the House and attacks the Government instead of coming around to me even to-day and asking for information. Unfortunately the honourable senior member for St. George has followed him down that track which is longer than they think. When they come to the end they will find that that track is only a cul-de-sac; it will not lead up any steps. I have served the people of this country for many years, using my judgment to the best of my ability; I will be infinitely more careful in future in expending my energy in asking people to put this or that candidate in the House of Assembly. (Mr. CRAWFORD: A man reaps what he sows, you know) The honourable member may be right; I have put a great deal of confidence in people and I am getting a hard kick from my friends. A Bill of this sort has paved the way to nationalisation in other countries of the world. This is no compromise; imagine the honourable senior member for St. John preferring to wait for 50 years for nationalisation rather than control public utilities by this Bill to-day. Could you want more absurdity than that? I repeat that a Public Utilities Bill has been proved to be the half way house to nationalisation in other parts of the world. I have promised and I said it for the benefit of the companies that we are not compromising; as soon as the money is forthcoming we are buying out these companies. It is the duty of the Government to let the companies' shareholders in London know that. If honourable members had the slightest political decency and sense of loyalty to their Party would they not have come and ask; "Why have you not brought down a Bill for nationalisation?" I can understand the honourable junior member for St. Philip; until the day of his death—I hope that it will be long—he will be attacking me. I would feel that there is something wrong if I did not hear an attack from him, and he has been far milder than the members of this Party who only had to stick to what they have promised to do—to discuss every Bill before coming to the House and ask questions about it before coming here. The honourable junior member for the City cannot help doing these things, but there is some hope for the honourable senior member for St. George; that is why I said I regret that he is following the honourable junior member for the City. The honourable member has referred to the Speech from the Throne; I told him I knew what that Speech would have been. I discussed it as the Speech affecting this island even although the views expressed in it were those of the Governor himself. I spent some hours and made it quite clear that the policy of the Government to set up a Public Utilities Board does not conflict with nationalisation. The honourable junior member for the City has a habit of speaking as if he knows all and dares the Government to contradict him; he does not know that in nine cases out of ten I do not give myself the trouble to contradict him, but I will do it on this occasion. The honourable member cannot agree with anybody on earth; he has by innuendo at one time and directly at another time, said that the Secretary of State for the Colonies has put up something to us the honourable member ought to know that in 1947 the then honourable senior member for St. Andrew (Mr. Haynes) introduced an Address which was passed with an amendment made by the honourable junior member for the City, and the two of them went to Government House with it. For the benefit of any doubting Thomas I could give the dates in this file of communications and the substance of the com-

munications between this Government and the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Never have we asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether we should nationalise or not. The honourable member says that Socialism is not for export; the Secretary of State for the Colonies has never been asked about nationalisation; he has been told that we intend to nationalise. The constitutional position in Barbados is such now that they do not dream to hint to us what our policy should be.

There are some things which entail the approval of the United Kingdom Treasury: none of the colonies can borrow money without the approval of the United Kingdom Treasury and we have to say for what reason we are borrowing money because if we become bankrupt they have to repay the money. That information could have been obtained from the Opposition or anybody else. We have asked: Can we float a loan for the Deep Water Harbour, for the Ten Year Development Plan and also for the purpose of buying out these Companies? and the answer is: "We do not think that the United Kingdom Treasury will give you permission to raise a loan for all these purposes. You have to consider the financial position of Barbados." We have said that we will not come down for any fresh capital expenditure unless we have made our fiscal survey. We want to unlock the hard hearts of the United Kingdom Treasury for they are hard. All that information I am giving to the honourable junior member for St. Philip; I repeat that money would have to be raised with the permission of the United Kingdom Treasury. I am supposed to have said that the Gas Company has a franchise and that is why we could do nothing about it, but that is not true; document after document will show that as far as that Company is concerned I have been pressing since 1947 for something to be done about it. I have told the House that the sum to be paid to the person for going into the matter plus the cost of his passage would probably be what the Gas Company would cost. Then came the question of nationalising oil and it was decided that we should go into the whole question. The question of the Electric Company increasing their rates after the Barbados Workers' Union got an increase for the workers, made us realise that if we have not got the money to buy out this Company, we must at least control the Company and when they say that they cannot afford to do anything we must know whether that is true or not. When we have a Public Utilities Board, the Board can compel these companies to produce documents in their possession and we will know everything possible about these companies, if today we came with a Resolution to buy the Electric Company we would be buying a pig in a poke; but with a Public Utilities Board we would know everything that we have a right to know about these companies. Today these companies can say: "We cannot reduce the rates because our expenses are so much; but as soon as this Bill is passed, there is nothing under the sun connected with these Companies that we will not know. Suppose we even had the money today to buy these Companies; would it not be infinitely better to know the innermost workings of these Companies before buying them? Cannot honourable members see that this Bill should be the preliminary step to nationalisation? Even if we had the money to buy out these Companies we should discover how they are working first. We might find that we should not even buy out the Gas Company; we might find that as a going concern it is worth a certain amount, but if on the other hand we are con-

vinced that it is not worth anything we will want to establish our own concern which will force out the present Company. Natural gas is nationalised and the wells are ours as much as the oil.

I am sorry that I have spoken at such length, but it is my duty as Leader of the Government to refute the allegation that we are traitors to the country and that the Secretary of State for the Colonies has put something to us. We say that if we do not have the money to buy out these companies, we should stop them from increasing their rates. We had a few Canadian gentlemen in this colony besides Mr. Tanner and we saw at once that it was this Canadian legislation that we needed and we have come down to the House with this Bill. I want to say in conclusion that if those honourable members who were elected to support this Government choose to stand on their feet today and accuse the Government of being traitors to the country, we now know who our friends are. We are not afraid of a trial of strength; and in future this Government is going to be very careful with whom we associate.

The question that this Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative, the following division being taken:—

Ayes: DR. CUMMINS, MESSRS. SMITH, MILLER, MAPP, BRYAN, COX, ADAMS, MOTTLEY, GARNER, GILL, GODDARD, WARD and WILKINSON—13.

Noes: MESSRS. ALLDER, LEWIS and CRAWFORD—3.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—The suggestion has been made that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee and I must agree with that suggestion. I therefore beg to move that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye," those against will please say "No." I think the "Ayes" have it. Subject to the approval of the House, I appoint the following honourable members to serve on that Select Committee—The honourable senior member for St. Joseph (Mr. ADAMS), the honourable senior member for St. Thomas (Dr. CUMMINS), the honourable junior member for St. James (Mr. WILKINSON), the honourable junior member for St. Philip (Mr. CRAWFORD), the honourable senior member for the City (Mr. MOTTLEY) and the honourable junior member for St. Michael (Mr. BRYAN).

THE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ADAMS: The Order Paper will remain as it is at present. I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to this day week, the 29th day of August, 1950, at 3 p.m.

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