

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1954—55

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 9th August, 1955.

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

Present

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*); Hon. G. H. ADAMS, C.M.G., Q.C., B.A., (*Premier*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*); His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS, (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); Mr. F. C. GODDARD, (*Leader of the Opposition*); Mr. F. E. MILLER; Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mrs. E. E. BOURNE and Mr. J. C. TUDOR, M.A.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meetings of the 7th, 14th and 21st June, 1955 respectively, having been printed and circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded by His Excellency the Acting Governor to lay the following:—

Message No. 21/1955 from His Excellency the Acting Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly regarding the Combined Police Training School.

The Message reads as follows:—

MESSAGE NO. 21/1955

His Excellency the Acting Governor

To

The Honourable The House of Assembly

His Excellency the Acting Governor has the honour to refer to paragraph 4 of Sir Robert Arundell's Message No. 19/1954 regarding the savings which

would be effected when the present Police Training School is replaced by a Combined Police Training School designed to serve the Leeward and Windward Islands and Barbados.

2. After considering recent recommendations submitted by the Commissioner of Police for an increase in the establishment of the Force, the Government is satisfied that it is necessary to retain the posts of Inspector and Corporal which it was originally intended to abolish on the inauguration of the Combined Training School.

3. The estimated savings resulting from the closing of the present Police Training School would consequently be reduced from \$10,125 to \$3,959.

R. N. TURNER,
Acting Governor.

Government House,
Barbados.

August 6, 1955.

(M.P.—6196 Vol. IV)

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Seawell Airport Regulations, 1955.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. M. E. COX: Resolution to place the sum of \$4,950 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955-56, Part I, Current, as shown in Supplementary Estimate 1955-56, No. 17, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$23,732 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955-56, Part II, Capital, as shown in Supplementary Estimate 1955-56, No. 18, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Resolution to place the sum of \$9,250 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955-56, Part I, Current, as shown in Supplementary Estimate 1955-56, No. 19, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S NOTICE

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to give notice of the following Address:—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Acting Governor*

1. The House desire to draw to Your Excellency's attention that favourable conditions now exist for partial convertibility in the Trade Relations of the British West Indies and the Dollar Area.

2. The House further desire to inform Your Excellency of the persistent efforts of the Government of Jamaica to get that island's special position in the Sterling Bloc as a dollar-earner reviewed.

3. The House are of the opinion both that the Government of Jamaica needs support in its action, and that opportunities should be sought for freer trade between the British Caribbean and the Hard Currency areas of the United States and Canada.

4. Accordingly the House respectfully request Your Excellency to take such immediate steps as would bring about the concerted action of all the British Caribbean territories in a policy designed to produce a more favourable trade balance between these territories and the Dollar area.

3.25 p.m.

**COMMITTEE'S REPORT RE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE**

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Report of the Select Committee appointed by this House to consider the terms and conditions of the Clerk of the House. This Report has been circulated and I am going to ask leave to proceed with it later today.

**TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES
APPOINTED**

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, before you proceed with the Orders of the day, I beg to state that the Chairman of Committees telephoned me stating that he would be unable to attend this meeting of the House early. I beg to move that the Hon. junior member for St. John be appointed Chairman of Committees until such time as the Chairman of Committees should be present.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

The question that the hon. junior member for St. John (Mr. VAUGHAN) be appointed Chairman of Committees in the absence of the Chairman of Committees was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

The question that His Honour do now leave the Chair and the House do now go into Committee of Supply was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. VAUGHAN being in the Chair.

**Supplementary Estimates No. 13
Lord Mayor's Show**

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, the notes on this Item (No. 61) Head XXIX Miscellaneous Services, Lord Mayor's Show, 1954 set out the position quite clearly.

Hon. members will recall that in the Supplementary Estimates No. 29 of 1954-55 the House voted an amount of \$310 to cover what was then estimated as the cost to this Government for participating in the 1954 Lord Mayor's show. The cost of participation of each island was estimated by the Trade Commissioner in London; and it was a general effort on the part of all West Indian Governments to participate in this show. Unfortunately, the figure was underestimated, and subsequent to the passing of that Resolution we had to come back to the House for \$47. Owing to an oversight the first amount of \$310 was allowed to lapse and we have now come back to revote that \$310.

As I said before, the note is fairly explanatory and it is unfortunate that the vote of \$310 should have lapsed; but these things will happen.

I beg to move that Head XXIX — stand part.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I should like to enquire whether the Hon. Minister of Labour can tell me exactly what is the method of making a payment of this kind. I have in mind that if you receive a Bill from the Crown Agents in England, after the vote is passed by the Legislature that there should be some method of remitting the money; not waiting for the Crown Agents to send for it. Did they wait for them to submit a voucher? What is the method? If the Minister does not know he can say so; but after the Legislature have passed money there should be no lapsing.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I agree with the honourable member. What he said is quite true; there should have been no lapsing. But as I said just now, it is due to an oversight. This amount will be debited and paid through the Crown Agents as usual. I assure the honourable member that steps will be taken to see that this does not occur again.

The question that Head XXIX stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XXX—Income Tax Department

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, this is just a matter of the purchase of 225 parts of Reports on Tax Cases, under Head XXX — Income Tax and Death Duties. These reports were not available during the last financial year, and this is simply a matter of a revote. I now beg to move that Head XXX stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to a small matter under Head XXX, in connection with these reports on taxation. I think this amounts to an irregularity which I have not seen before. When you talk of "Reports" are they Law Reports? [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Yes] Are they decisions in cases? [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Yes.] Now that I have noticed it, I would like to ask that the wording be changed, because one cannot tell whether it means Law Reports or reports by some Income Tax Commissioner in cases or whether it relates to decisions in cases.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: These are ordinary reports dealing with income tax cases.

The question that Head XXX stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
3.35 p.m.

Head XXXIII—Civil Aviation

Head XXXIII — Civil Aviation — was called.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: This is the final item of the Schedule. The Director of Civil Aviation has stated that the position with regard to the medical stores at Seawell is not so happy, in view of the fact that B.O.A.C. is now operating a Service to Barbados with Strato-cruiser aircraft, and it is expected that B.W.I.A. will be introducing Viscount aircraft later in the year. He has consulted the Director of Medical Services in this matter and in view of the inadequacy of the supplies of these medical stores, it has been agreed that we should take steps as quickly as possible to increase the stocks at Seawell. We are asking the Committee to vote the sum of \$400 in order to supplement these stores.

I think the Committee will agree that this is an urgent matter, especially with regard to the increase in air services which will be instituted in the very near future. With that in view, I think the Committee will agree that we should vote this money as quickly as possible. I beg to move that this Head stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: This is not anything which is around the corner; we have dealt with this matter already. It has been distinctly stated that these aircraft will be carrying more passengers and you will therefore have to have more medical stores. While I feel that a case can be made out for this vote, I would not like Government to put a lot of things at Seawell which might go bad. Some of these stores might deteriorate if you store too much of them; eventually they may not be as serviceable as they should be.

I am throwing out a suggestion to the Ministers as regards procedure in future, which I hope they will accept. I myself feel that in a Resolution of this kind, all of these items should be in the name of the Premier; and when he moves that the particular item stand part, the appropriate Minister concerned should second the motion and explain the Head. In relation to this particular Resolution the first item would concern the Minister of Trade; the second would concern the Premier and the third would be moved by the Minister of Communications, seconded by the Minister of Social Services when the explanation could be made. Here the only explanation the Minister of Trade can give to this Head is what is written down here already.

That is the way how I would like to see it done; the Estimates are introduced by one Minister and the explanations are given by the particular Minister concerned.

The next thing is that we have not got Medical Officers at Seawell to assist if a big crash takes place up there. While I feel that it is a very necessary thing to have these stores up there, you will still certainly have to get medical attention by telephone; therefore I would not like Government to think that they have now settled this question.

You may have 64 passengers coming in by plane, none of them might get killed, but you will still see the need of the St. John Ambulance Brigade, the Red Cross and so on. I would like to let them know that they have not taken all the precautions which are necessary. I would like them to have the St. John's Ambulance Brigade, or people who can give first Aid in residence.

Merely to say that you want medicine, and then to have nobody around able to tell you how much of it is to be taken and how to bandage people, is merely

touching the fringe of the matter. I would not like them to have too much in the way of medical stores at Seawell, and when you come to use them you find that they are ineffective because there have not been any crashes for two or three years. It is a very good thing to have a bandage; but if you have somebody who bandages wrongly that can produce more harm than good.

The question that Head XXXIII — Civil Aviation stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to move that this Resolution for \$980 do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to.

Purchase of Motor-Cycle for Police

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The next Resolution, sir, is a perfectly straightforward one. The Addendum to it is very clear. There was an accident with a Police motor-cycle and the Insurance Company paid up what the Commissioner of Police considered to be the fair valuation of the cycle at the time of the accident. It is necessary to have this \$700 in order to purchase a new motor-cycle. The Resolution is as simple as that. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. GODDARD: I quite agree that the motor cycles for the use of the Police Force are most useful. I would like to enquire from the Premier how many motor cycles there are in the Force.

While I am on my feet on this subject I would like to say that during or before the consideration of the Estimates the Commissioner of Police had requested a vehicle for the transportation of the Police Band. I understand that the present method of moving around the Band results in the instruments being knocked about and damaged thus costing the Government money. Besides that the Band is called upon to travel to entertainments at night. I know that this has met with the favour of Government's members; but for some reason or other the amount requested was taken out of the Estimates. The Commissioner of Police has put up a good case for it; and if it is possible for the Hon. Premier to give us some light as to why the request was not accepted, I would appreciate it.

The Commissioner recommended a van for the removal of instruments and I know that it met with the favour of many members of the Executive Committee; but for some unknown reason the matter did not reach the Estimates. Whether they have it in mind for the next occasion, or whether there was an oversight on somebody's part I do not know; but the matter did not reach this House.

3.45 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The Commissioner of Police felt that the number of motor vehicles was totally inadequate and therefore it was impossible to maintain proper control even with these replacements. As regards the other thing which was mentioned, I am under the impression that it is Government who prevented them from getting that van. Normally every time the Police come for these things, we say: "Can't you not wait until next year." It is only when a case like the one in this Resolution is put up that we then come to the House with it; we do not come until we are told that it is impossible to carry on without a particular thing. I think that is the only explanation I can give: and

it is my recollection of what has happened when we were preparing the Estimates.

I recollect that the Commissioner of Police wanted us to replace the Station wagon. It was also a question of having more motor cycles; as a matter of fact, during the discussion with him the whole question as regards equipping the Police Force with motor transport came up. Such a thing as having a bus to carry around the Band also came up then; and as I have said, my recollection is that we told the Police Commissioner to try to do with what he had until next year.

I have certain figures before me and if the hon. junior member for Christ Church will be content to await until I refresh my memory by reading the page which I have before me, I will be able to tell him something about what he asked later.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I myself would not be willing to press my own arguments too far, but I would like to say that the Police Band is a revenue-producing unit and I think that perhaps consideration along those lines should be given to them. In case of an emergency and any special conveyance is needed, the Band's wagon could be used for taking the Police around; so I think it would not be a bad thing if the item mentioned by the hon. junior member for Christ Church was reconsidered; but, as I have said, I am not pushing it too far. It is a fact that the Police Band is extremely popular and it is a credit to the island and what it wants, it gets. However the instruments should not be left to get damaged for the sake of proper conveyance.

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

Supplementary Estimate 1955-56 No. 15

Head XXIX—Conferences and Payment for Compensation

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is for the sum of \$10,300 to supplement the Estimates 1955-56, Part I — Current. Hon. members can see from the notes before them what the amounts are for. [A VOICE: Note No. 2 does not make sense at all.] I must confess that I am looking at it for the first time since it was printed.

As regards the first item, I would just say that the number of conferences which have taken place during this year is considerable. Already the expenditure on Conferences is over \$15,000; I have the actual figures which I will give to hon. members. They are as follows:—

Conferences	Officers Attending	Amount
Financial Officers (In Jamaica)	E. S. S. Burrowes ..	\$ 559.64
Head Teachers of Secondary Schools	E. C. M. Theobalds	439.64
Administrative Officers (In Jamaica)	.. L. N. Chenery ..	408.88
Commonwealth Communications Board 2nd Techni- cal and Traffic Meeting .. (In London)	.. W. P. Cooper ..	2,141.82

I am sure the hon. junior member for Christ Church will be pleased to know about this:

Caribbean Tourist Association ..	L. A. Secchi ..	\$ 514.63
G. A. T. T. ..	Professor Beasley ..	3.00

(That seems to represent Extra-Mural activities.)

Commonwealth Labour Organisa- tion	Hon. R. G. Mapp .. Mr. F. L. Walcott Mr. R. G. Mandeville	5,693.14
--	---	----------

R. E. C. Jan. 1955 (In Jamaica)	Hon. R. G. Mapp ..	45.00
------------------------------------	--------------------	-------

West Indian Con- ference	Hon. C. E. Talma Mr. E. C. M. Theo- balds Mr. W. C. Rose	3,107.16
-----------------------------------	---	----------

Freedom of Move- ment Conference	Hon. G. H. Adams	6.00
-------------------------------------	------------------	------

(I have not seen six cents. I would like to know what it is for.)

R. E. C. May, 1955 (British Guiana)	Hon. G. H. Adams Hon. K. R. Hunte Mr. E. S. S. Bur- rowes Mr. L. A. Secchi	1,391.21
--	--	----------

Review Committee Of U.C.W.I. ..	H. S. Jervois ..	560.62
------------------------------------	------------------	--------

Police Conference (In Jamaica)	Major R. A. Stoute	465.40
-----------------------------------	--------------------	--------

Meeting of Stand- ing Technical Committee of B.A.T.A.C. ..	P. D. Lopez ..	120.00
---	----------------	--------

TOTAL .. \$15,506.14

As hon. members will see, all these items were necessary. When it is sometimes suggested that the Minister goes on a joy-ride, I do not know how much joy-ride you can go on with an expenditure of \$6. At any rate it is a good thing that I have read out these figures. That is the explanation as far as the first item is concerned.
2.55 p.m.

As regards the Ex gratia payments for compensation, the supplementary provision required is not \$30,000 as stated in Note 2 of the Notes to the Supplementary Estimates, (which is an error on the part of the printers), but \$300, as stated in the Supplementary Estimate which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. TUDOR: I am particularly relieved by seeing that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph could be so easy and laughable at what are the effects of this rapidly increasing expenditure of public money in connection with these Conferences. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have always maintained (as I think most hon. members have) that there must be a certain amount of travelling to a greater or lesser degree according

to the particular problems on which all Governments have been engaged. I have equally maintained that too much money is spent on the Conferences which, according to the actual results, do not seem to bring us any benefit. Of course, we can count ourselves fortunate if an hon. member went to Trinidad at a cost of only \$300. I am not being ironical when I say that, because I know that he has been on other journeys of equal importance.

How the figures are arrived at in computing his expenses I do not know; but the fact which remains is this: that we have voted in March \$18,000 to cover the cost of these things. This is now early August; scarcely five months have elapsed and of this \$18,000 we have spent according to what I see before me, more than \$16,000 in Conferences of one sort or another. It means that at that rate by the first week in the next month it is quite possible that the vote will be exhausted. We are now asked therefore to make a further provision of \$10,000.

You will forgive me, Mr. Chairman, for recalling what I am going to say now. Some months ago I had occasion to draw to the attention of my constituents in St. Lucy the huge amount which this Government spends on gadding about. I said from what I can see and from my own reckoning of the figures, the average seems to be about \$25,000 a year; some years it would be rather less than that. In a year like the year 1953 it would probably have been more because we had all the extra expense in connection with the Coronation Celebrations. However, Mr. Chairman, the point which I wish to make is this: it is quite easy for the Hon. Premier to argue that all these journeys are necessary. It is easy to argue that because they are the Government they are the best judges of what is or what is not necessary. But where the taxpayers feel uneasy, is that the results which seem to come from this coming and going just do not appear to justify the expenditure.

While we are on this question of the results which seem to come from these journeys, I put it to hon. members Mr. Chairman, that this House has done itself a grievous disservice since it could not retain a tighter grip on the Executive in these matters; and lessening this grip is probably one of the reasons why we do not see the results of these Ministerial and other journeys. What I mean is this: in all parliamentary Assemblies of this nature where a Ministerial System is in practice, it is a matter of practice as well as theory that whenever Ministers of the Crown (we cannot control the other people) go away on official business, as soon as they come back to the Legislative Assembly of which they are members, opportunity is taken to explain to the House the purpose of their journeys, its nature, and what has been achieved if anything has been achieved. I do not know by what means this House as a House will be able to insist on more respect being paid to this Chamber; but I do think that if a Minister, having been away, as soon as he comes back, should not print his statement and circulate it, but should make a personal report to the Assembly of which he is a member, on the journey, and what relates to his particular journey. With that, I think the control which the House naturally exercises over these things would go on much better so to speak.

Obviously, when we vote the money in a way like this, we have no control of how it is spent; but if Ministers knew that they had a certain accountability to the House (not so much because they might lose their posts as Ministers, but because they might have to face a storm of criticism) we would see the results of the journeying in a carefully prepared

statement which they would render to this House on their feet and not in pen and ink. This is very important; and it is so because this Legislature and the people of this island have no control over, indeed no knowledge in many cases, of what is done in their name.

It would have been so nice, for instance, when the Hon. Premier returned from the Conference on Federation held in Trinidad earlier this year, (I mean the Conference on Freedom of Movement of persons within a British Caribbean Federation) if he had treated the House to the courtesy of a personal statement and also given an explanation of what went on. Had he done so, he would merely have been paying due respect to the House of which he is a member, (the most senior member in fact) and such action on his part would not have prejudiced any future debate which the House might like to hold on the merits or demerits of the Federation Report.

4.05 p.m.

The House as a Legislature should have received first hand whatever he found was valuable to communicate to it, without leaving hon. members to rely either on what they read in the Press or in private correspondence from their friends in Trinidad or in the columns of the *Trinidad Guardian*. I think that the House has to re-assert its right and privilege. It may be argued that nowhere among its ancient privileges would you find the privilege of a Minister having to report on his duty; but the Legislature is not a static thing; it is a living thing and the privileges of a Legislative Assembly increase as its experience increases.

I cannot speak too strongly on this whole matter with respect to the check which we have to keep on expenditure, since we vote money twice or three times a year to supplement votes which are expensive enough, and we do not know how the money is being spent until it is time for a supplementary amount to be voted. It is only then that a particular Minister can let us know that we should feel good that we have not been asked for more because he only spent so much. We are glad when Ministers can keep down their expenditure. The more cantankerous of us would like to send them to some places where the expenditure would not be anything at all. Even some of us who are not so cantankerous but equally as determined would like to get them as far as the ballot box and at the end of that journey prove that there is a point of no return; but it will still cost money.

We are interested, so long as the people of this island have not got to bear the expense; but since they have the right of expenditure we want to impress upon the Ministers that they cannot ask for money without giving some indication of what they propose to do with it, and not leave us until they want some more money to tell us that they did not spend as much as we imagined they have spent.

In the next place we want to insist that this House must find some means of re-asserting its privileges or to claim what in these circumstances, would be a new privilege of hearing first hand from Ministers a report from their own mouths on what has gone on at the Conferences which they have attended; and in cases where the Conferences have not been attended by Ministers but by subordinates, the Ministers should say to the House in any manner they like, the substance of decisions reached at the particular Conferences in which the subordinates participated. I do not think that these criticisms have been in any way unreasonable; they are criticisms which should not have been made and which would not have to be made in a Legislature in which their Ministerial

idea was being taken seriously by the Ministers themselves.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: We are all aware that the hon. member is so comparatively busy with his particular vocation that he has not got any time to think of what he is going to say in this House before he says it. Could there be more tripe or nonsense spoken than what the hon. member has said? I came back from the Conference on Freedom of Movement of persons within a Caribbean Federation and I did exactly what the hon. member said I should do. I told the House that we had decided on the following Tuesday to let the world know that Barbados had not been let down, and that as far as Freedom of Movement is concerned we had won our point. I made a personal explanation.

Opposition has sometimes come from the honourable junior member for the City, that you have no right to make any personal explanation since members cannot debate statements made in the House; and what is the use of this practice of allowing Ministers to make personal statements on the floor of the House when members cannot debate them? We know the particular facetious objections which the honourable junior member for St. Peter makes; I will say no more because the honourable member is not in his seat.

When the honourable junior member for St. Lucy tries to teach us, of course he was once a pedagogue and he has made the excuse for that. When he attempts to tell the Ministers what we should do when we are doing it, I repeat that he has not got the time to think of what he is going to say when he comes into this House on Tuesdays. I came here after the Trinidad Conference and said that I would like to make a personal statement because the newspapers would give the impression that Barbados went down there and lost on the question of Freedom and Movement when the reverse was true. We had a debate when Government asked the House to approve the report of the conference in Trinidad and I told the House not to mind what was stated in the *Trinidad Press*; therefore what the honourable member said tonight has already been done.

The Minister of Communications Works and Housing has made a similar personal statement; what is wrong with the honourable member's memory? Has he forgotten all of that? A personal statement has been made by the Minister of Labour on emigration from this side of the House. I apologise for wasting the time of the Committee in replying to the honourable member.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, sometimes one wonders whether the Hon. Premier really understands what he says on any subject especially in this Assembly, and especially when he is trying to make people look ridiculous. However on this particular matter I am not willing to bandy words with him. I daresay that later on this afternoon or on some subsequent occasion we should have a more worthwhile subject for such heat and warmth.

When the honourable member returned from the Freedom of Movement Conference, of course he said something in the House; but he said it after it had been drawn to his attention that misrepresentation has been made in the Press.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: On a point of correction. How could that be true? How could any human being with the exception of Sir Archibald Cuke and myself know what was said. The very morning we left Trinidad the newspapers carried an article purporting to be what had taken place. I was approached by Reporters as to whether it was true that no

Barbadian could go to Trinidad for five years. I said it was not true; but I could not disclose exactly what happened. We were not to say any thing until the next Tuesday when the British Newspapers would publish what took place. How could anybody know anything barring Sir Archibald Cuke, the Attorney General and myself?

4.15 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: The Hon. Premier has just said that it was only after it was asked him "is so-and-so true?" that he made a statement; that is tantamount to what he is saying. It is just as if a question is asked of you relating to a matter which you cannot discuss at a particular time, but which hints to you that the facts are not as you know them, and you make a brief explanation when the matter is brought to your attention. That is exactly what has happened. But that is just a diversion.

When Ministers make what they call statements, it is usually after some controversial matter has been discussed in the House and some public agitation exists upon it, and the criticism of it is so strong that the Minister is forced to say something about it. It occurred when we were dealing with the expenditure on the Spa Road. It occurred with the Minister of Agriculture with respect to allegations made some weeks ago by the hon. senior member for the City on that Department. Those are the two personal statements which I remember off hand.

What I am saying is this [and the Hon. Premier has not answered my point] when they go away on Conferences, they are going in execution of a policy therefore when they come back they have a right to tell the House not those things which are secret, but they should give to the House a statement of the particular policy, the execution of which took them on their journey.

What I remember of the statement made by the Hon. Premier with respect to the Trinidad Conference I do not call a personal statement. That is just letting out a bit of information to stop journalists from misleading the public through their not having all the facts.

What I should like to say to this House is that the Ministers should come back and say: "In accordance with our policy, we have been there and have done this; we have got thus far, and we intend to get so far; meanwhile this our policy." That is a statement of policy which they should make.

We are not insisting on gossip as to how Mr. Gomes behaved on a particular Conference or how many times Mr. Manley stroked the back of his hair or how many times the Hon. Premier held his eyes under his hands making as though he is sleeping when he is listening intently; we want a statement of policy and that is what Ministers owe as a duty to this House. Not only does it inform hon. members but it helps them to take stock of the opinions before the House.

If when they come back they say that from the Government's point of view the opinions which they had put before the House have borne fruit, (and you can expect that such and such a thing would have been done) then the House would know that the policy which Government favours will continue. That is what does not take place, because the statements which we get arise out of controversy; it is just something on a piece of paper that is read by the Minister and circulated among hon. members in vindication of a particular policy.

Sir, I am not asking them to defend themselves, but to take a lead in moulding and influencing public opinion by keeping the people abreast of what is

happening. The Hon. Premier has so completely misunderstood me that he used words without understanding actually what he was saying. I forgive him and so far as the sneering reference to me is concerned, he knows very well I can deal with that.

Mr. LEWIS: I hope that some of the noughts in the explanatory note have been left out in this small figure. I would like to say that it is very gratifying to note that we are getting through with a Conference with only an expenditure of \$6 and for another with only \$120; but what I am surprised about and would like a little explanation about is, whether the amount is a big or small one, with respect to a meeting of Regional Economic Committee where a sum was paid out of the Conference vote to that Committee. I thought some estimate was made of the likely expenditure of R.E.C. for the year and the money paid when the R.E.C. wanted its delegate from Barbados and his advisers to go somewhere.

Do you mean to say that that money comes out of the vote for Conferences instead of out of the vote for R.E.C.? How would we know what R.E.C. is costing us when you do that and when there were the Oils and Fats Conferences and an hon. member had to go and take two or three advisers? With the coming into being of the R.E.C., I really thought there would have been some plan.

I am glad to get this information about these Conferences because it is revealing to me that the R.E.C. is costing us more than the vote which we have put down in the Estimates for that purpose. It might cost \$45 for this Conference and \$1,391 for another, but I think if the R.E.C. is calling on the Governments of the region to give something extra pertaining to its work, it should pay for it first and then send a Bill to the Governments concerned on a sort of pro ratio manner. I had been hoping that this kind of thing was going to be kept separate; we are already getting the loan for the Deep Water Harbour mixed up with other loans.

Another matter concerning this vote is that I never had the impression that this Government was paying for two of the three delegates who attended the I.L.O. Conference; I thought it was a matter for the Workers' Union to pay for their representation and the Sugar Producers' Association to pay for the employers' representation. I am still of the opinion that the amount which the Premier read out is what was being paid for the Hon. Minister of Trade alone.

As I have said, I do hope that the Hon. Premier only read out all the people who attended that Conference but that their expenses were not included in the \$5,000 odd that he said it cost us. It is not the general impression that Mr. Mandeville and the hon. junior member for St. Peter were included in this expense; if it is, it seems to me that it would have cost us a great deal more money.

4.25 p.m.

However, although I do not totally agree the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, (I may be satisfied with an oral report at certain times) I would counsel the hon. member to press for a written report of these matters with some account of the expenses in connection with these Conferences included in that report. Sometimes reports are written and small statements made concerning these things; but I do not hear anything as to what they cost. I repeat that I would press for a written report whenever the Government spends money on anything of the sort; in that way we could debate the matter in general, so that every hon. member might get some information out of it, and the Minister could then augment his report. I want when I am discussing the report, to be

in a position to pin the Hon. Minister concerned down to what he himself has written, reminding him that he has written it.

I know that oral reports and Messages have often come from the Governor on particular matters. There is a lot that may be said in support of what the hon. junior member for St. Lucy has said; but my firm opinion is that there should be a set policy in which somebody should be held responsible for all moneys spent out of the public purse. If we have a number of such reports, we might be able to debate them individually; but when we get Supplementary Estimates like this, we are only able to say: "If that materialises, well, our money would be well spent; but we are in the dark about many things."

However, those are my principal views; and in addition to what I have said, I should also like to know definitely, why the expenditure which passes through the office of the Regional Economic Committee should not form a matter for the participating governments. In cases where you have say, about 16 advisers from several Colonies assembling together on a particular subject, I should like to see a pooling of the expenditure involved for the simple reason that we should have a sense of responsibility for others. I repeat that I am of the opinion that we should keep expenditure undertaken by the Regional Economic Committee separate, so that we may be able to know readily what some of these things are costing us.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the practice with the Regional Economic Committee is this: when the Regional Economic Committee sends a delegation abroad the expenditure so involved is met by them; but when a Government has to send a number of delegates to a conference of the Regional Economic Committee, the Government concerned meets the costs involved. In this respect we have paid less expenses than any other Colony for the simple reason that many conferences are held here in this island.

I do not want to say anything that might appear to be a reflection on any of my colleagues; but if certain hon. members have mentioned the question of how much money is being spent, we may say that from our angle much money certainly has been spent on certain occasions; but Government have endeavoured to arrive at uniformity in respect of the amounts which they advance to delegates for the purpose of covering such expenditure.

Hon. members might not believe it; but we as delegates get so little money that I have never attended a conference outside Barbados without having to use my own money or borrow some in order to supplement the amount allowed us. On one occasion I was the only West Indian delegate at a conference in London who had to travel otherwise while all the other delegates were travelling by taxi, because my allowance could not afford it. I have often been asked by the Heads of the organisations which sponsor some of these conferences why we do not send people to their conferences more often. I have also been asked by the Head of the United Nations Organisation why we do not take advantage of their offers to send delegates to conferences convened by them.

So far as expenditure on conferences is concerned, Barbados is to the reverse of the alleged overspending by hon. members. In view of this, I have been recently drawing the question to the attention of the Executive Committee as to whether we should not attend these conferences more frequently. Far from overspending, we have turned down several conferences recently. Up to last week we declined an in-

itation to send delegates to a conference by Pan American Airways.

After what I have said, I hope that hon. members will not continue to feel that we are extravagant in this matter of conference expenditure. I repeat that we are to the reverse of that; in fact we often get criticised for our infrequent attendance. I had to remark to myself recently, that I never thought I would like to be such an Aberdonian. I look with care upon conference expenditure; that is bound to be the attitude of the Minister with the portfolio of Finance.

4.45 p.m.

Who knew a month ago that we would have been faced with the fantastic, (I withdraw that adjective) but who knew that we would have been faced with the present howl of the bus Concessionaires? Who knew that Combermere School would have collapsed? We have got to be careful in spending money therefore far from being extravagant it is Aberdonian; therefore, I suggest that we should agree to send people to Conferences which we feel we really cannot get out of. We have gone to conferences once or twice when we were the only people who were likely to stand out.

As regards the point made by the hon. member as to the I.L.O., we have reached a stage where the British Government in international affairs is still representing Dependencies and we have got the British Government to help us. We are sometimes amused when somebody asks: "What is the good of sending anybody to these Conferences when they are not allowed to sit down and talk?" At one of these Conferences I sat on the left and the Hon. Albert Gomes on the right and we both spoke; so that by degrees this question of appearing as observers and actually participating in the Conferences, is growing up. I say that lest it be thought that we only had a chat with the Secretary of State for the Colonies and he talks on behalf of the Colony. In Colonies like the Gold Coast, Nigeria and ourselves, you go in not as members of a British delegation but you go along with the British delegation and speak.

I really did not have the time to read all that the Minister of Labour said in Geneva, but he did speak in Geneva. He might not have spoken like the hon. junior member for St. Lucy would have done if he had been a Trade Unionist. The British Government has said that you can stay in the Conference and speak but you have to pay for it. I raised the question as to why we should pay for the Sugar Producers' Association who are rich people? The British Government's attitude is this: "If you are paying for Trade Union representatives you are paying for them to be there." They have told the colonies that their Governments pay for their representation and I feel pretty sure that the Hon. Minister got less money for his maintenance than either of those two Government representatives, because unfortunately we are perhaps too sensitive to criticism on financial matters and we are content with \$15 for maintenance when some other Governments give their people \$25 or in some cases \$50.

I do not say that we will always be contented with the disparity; but there is no foundation for any suggestion that a lot of money is spent on delegations. Except for the I.L.O. Conference when I attend at these Conferences I unfortunately have to put my hands in my pocket. I find myself owing people money in England because I did not have sufficient money paid by the Barbados Government. There is no extravagance in expenditure whatever.

I have read out 14 Conferences 9 of which were official. The outstanding amount except for the I.L.O. Conference which included the Trade Union Secre-

tary and the Sugar Producers' Association, that is the biggest amount; but the rest was for officials. I ask the House to believe that we have tried to be as careful in our expenditure as possible; we believe and realise that a Government of this sort will live or die on how it handles the finances of this colony. [VOICES: Hear! Hear!]

Mr. ALLDER: All that the Hon. Premier has said is beyond the point. One is not particularly interested in how much a particular delegate is allowed for his maintenance or whether the Premier tips the waiter at one of these exclusive joints in Europe out of his pocket. Sometime ago whenever the Government was sending out someone on a delegation, the Legislature had to have a say in whether the Government should spend money on the particular Conference or not and what amount was to be spent. For the four years since I have happened to be here that practice was carried on; but recently a few years back the Hon. Premier has seen fit to change that procedure; and in its place he has forced the decision on the Legislature to give a lump sum to the Executive Committee to be spent on such Conferences. I think I was one of those members who expressed certain apprehensions over giving the Government that lump sum; and today it has been proved that we were right in expressing fear that the privilege might be misused.

Now Sir in 1953-54 the total cost of Conferences was \$11,842; in 1954-55 it reached \$12,000; in 1955-56 (just four months since we have passed the Estimates) we voted therein \$18,000 and the Government is now asking for an additional \$10,000. In the explanatory note it is stated that the \$16,000 has already been spent.

4.45 p.m.

Now if this is the fifth month in the financial year and the Government has seen fit to come back for \$10,000 on the \$18,000 which has already been voted, there remain seven months more to go; and I am wondering what would be the total expenditure for Conferences at the end of this financial year. Those are the difficulties which confront hon. members on this side of the Table; and I hope they also confront members on the Government's Bench. These are things to which we should not blurdly agree.

What is more, Sir, of the Conferences which one hears of today, the various organisations and individuals who are represented definitely show that it is unnecessary for this Committee to give Government a blank cheque in respect of this particular item for Conferences. It appears to me that all an organisation has to do is to get in the graces of the Hon. Ministers and its representatives' passages would be paid for. I am saying that if the Government had to come to the Legislature every time for sums of money when a Conference was to be held, I am sure the Legislature would turn down several of these Conferences; because it would feel that owing to the persons who would be attending those Conferences, it would not be necessary to spend such a sum of money on sending that person to the Conference. I am sure that if Supplementary Estimates for these conferences were forthcoming, many of them would be turned down [A VOICE: By whom? The minority?] The hon. member asked if it would be turned down by the minority; that question shows you that it is a dangerous thing when absolute power is held by an individual or a group of individuals who do not have a sense of responsibility to the community. Of course the hon. member can say; "So long as I want it, I can get it."

Sir, I am going to move that the amount be reduced by 50%. I know that the motion is not go-

ing to meet with agreement by the majority of this Committee; therefore, the Hon. Premier can sit down with confidence and with the knowledge that the motion will only be heard about. But that does not mean that there are any good morals attached to that behaviour; it does not mean that because you have the power that everything you do is right.

What I am saying, Sir, is that if in the fifth month of the financial year, we are spending \$28,000 on Conferences how much are we going to spend in the 12 months?

Sir, my prime interest in this conference vote is purely an economic one; I am not interested in the attendances at these conferences overseas unless they result in the economic improvement of the colony. I may say that most of them adhere to tradition. In certain countries whose resources are greater than ours, you will see Ministers, officials and politicians running about and attending the conferences held and that is because they deal in power politics; but it does not mean that a small colony like Barbados should do the same thing.

On top of that, the Legislature is being taken for a ride inasmuch as it has been forced to give the Executive Committee a blank cheque which permits members of private organisations to go overseas at the expense of the Public Purse. It is a fact that the Secretary of the Sugar Producers' Association which is a big concern, with millions of pounds at its disposal was sent to the I.L.O. Conference and the taxpayers of this colony had to foot the bill. Although all of us, regardless of our political affiliation, are sympathetic to the cause of Trade Unionism and would do as much as possible to assist the Union and its officers in gaining ideas and putting over the point of view of the workers, yet, legislatively speaking, it might not always be expedient to ask the Legislature to vote sums of money to send delegates from that organisation overseas. I think that the Workers' Organisation should be made to know that some of its burdens should be borne by its members. A sentimental approach to trade unionism can cause something to be done which can be taken as wrong.

I presume that this vote has been asked for because it might be felt that no member would have the guts to oppose the passing of sums to be spent on a trade unionist going abroad. That may be taken that you are against trade unionism; but one must bear in mind that one wants to be honest to all and sundry and to those who have to pay taxation. It is not because we do not sympathise with the Trade union and its officials or because we do not want its officials to be present at these conferences; but I do want to stress that attending these conferences does not particularly assist the island economically. It does really help the officers of such organisations to get better ideas when they attend these conferences; but when they come back you cannot say that the colony has improved financially as a result, not even when the Ministers go; and they have been going for sometime and very numerous times at that.

Sir, we cannot say that we have improved economically from their going and we should curtail some of the movement of these officials who every time they want to go up to London to explore their private business and the business of their friends, they come and say that there is some conference to which we must allow them to go and for which we must foot the bill.

4.55 p.m.

It is a known fact that some of the decisions to go overseas are not always solely motivated by an

interest in the advancement, economically and otherwise, of the colony. There is a semblance of truth in every rumour; and I say that the taxpayers of the colony should not be saddled with such a thing on so many occasions.

I hope that hon. members will notice that a very great deal of privilege and authority has been taken away from us recently; and that we are rapidly becoming a "Pondside" debating society. Of course, it seems to me that some honourable members do not care about regaining the lost privileges of this Chamber; but there are some of us who are not merely interested in being in here for the sake of being in here, but are also interested in sharing in the dignity which our predecessors have bequeathed to us. Although our voices may now be few, it is still our duty to continue to demand that such privileges and dignities be restored to this Chamber. If it is too much to ask that all be restored to us, we can at least, ask that they help us to preserve the little that remains.

As I said before, I should like to see a majority of this House take steps to change the Regulation whereby expenditure on conferences given every year to the Governor-in-Executive Committee in lump sum be cancelled; and instead, make it imperative for the Government to come to this Chamber with a Resolution to cover the costs of delegates every time they have to go overseas.

Now, if I had my own way I would not increase the amount of \$18,000 which has already been voted in the Estimates of 1955-56. Even if somebody did go overseas on a delegation, inasmuch as nobody dies if nobody goes, or inasmuch as none would die if they did not go overseas on an emigration delegation, I feel that not one cent of this Resolution should be agreed to, and I really mean that.

I would like to know if in the not too distant future, Government would review its policy on conferences and immediately release a few officials to move around the Midlands of England seeking up potential employers who may be willing to absorb the surplus population of Barbados. [VOICES: Hear! hear]. In that case, I would agree to part of the amount.

I am going to move formally that the amount be reduced by the small sum of \$1,000, as preferred by other honourable members.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Before the honourable member concludes his speech, I should like to hear his reaction to this: that at every conference a member of the Opposition be sent to keep Government's members in order!

5.05 p.m.
Mr. ALLDER: I do not know why the Hon. Premier has decided to descend to seek my opinion on such an important matter; [Laughter] because I am so unnoticed by the hon. member as a politician, and my ideas are so extremely limited in his opinion, that I must take it either that he has started to see virtue where he failed to see it in the past! [Laughter] Or is it that he is somewhat repeating his snobbery in respect of humble human beings like myself.

However, I will still offer my opinion; and I certainly would feel that the Government by the actions of some of its Ministers, still does things which many of us who are not in the Government's Party would have cause to criticise. Inasmuch as two brains are greater than one I would agree that this side of the House should be represented at such Conferences and Committees. [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The Leader of the Opposition]. The hon. member will always refer to the hon. junior member for Christ Church because of his influence; not even so much because of his position as Leader of the Opposition and as a politician, because the hon. member

knows that there is no monopoly of political ability to be found where he is looking for it. I agree if the Government decides to do that; but I would also hope to hear the Hon. Premier make another suggestion that the Government would only spend money on delegates going to such Conferences which only help the colony to advance economically.

That is where bargaining power for Barbados and what it produces come in. Wherever such decisions take place send as many people as you like and spend as much money as you like; but certainly not on some second-hand organisation which might be a little loyal to the Government members, feeling that if it wants its members to go overseas the Government will readily agree that the cost of such passages be paid. We do not want that.

I am saying that \$28,000 is a lot of money to be spent by Barbados merely on trips. I would like to conclude my remarks by repeating that with this \$28,000 I know that in a month's time quite a few Barbadians would be filling those vacant posts in the Midlands of England. I should like to make it clear that the motion for the reduction of this amount be applied to item 35 "Conferences" in respect of this Resolution.

Mr. TUDOR: I beg to second the motion made by the hon. senior member for St. John.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Sir, it is with great reluctance that I rise to my feet. I am afraid that before I can actually and intelligently assess whether this \$10,000 asked for is too much or not enough, I think this House should be apprised of what Conferences have cost the Government within the last 25 years; then we would be able to analyse the position and see if we are going forward too quickly or not.

I want to ask this question: for the last quarter of a century or even the last ten years, by members of this Chamber going to the outside world to attend conferences, has this Government suffered materially, socially or educationally? If we have not suffered through sending Government members of this Chamber to these Conferences none of us can say that this money is too much to be spent on Conferences. In searching over the Budget of this island about six years ago I find that the amount was in the vicinity of \$9½ million; today it is \$14 million; and if, Sir, we are going forward in all phases we must expect Conferences to cost more.

I cannot agree with many of the statements which have been made; I consider some of them irrelevant and irregular. It has been said that the majority rule of any Government is dangerous [laughter] I have also heard that the minority rule is dangerous!

Mr. ALLDER: On a point of explanation; the hon. member is referring to a statement which I made. If he takes it that because the present Government in power claims to represent the bulk of the people of this island then it does not necessarily mean that this Government truly does things which the majority of the population will appreciate.

The hon. member must also realise that sometimes authority is taken and used against those who have taken it; it is not necessarily always correct that because you are ruling the majority should rule.
5.15 p.m.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Sir, the electors of this island less than four years ago gave the present Government a mandate. If the present leaders of the Government misuse that power then they will be called to question at the right time; it is up to the electors to take relevant action if the Government misuses its power.

If Sir, this honourable Chamber feel that this money is too much to spend on Conferences, I think it is our business to set a ceiling price.

I want to state that I am supporting this Resolution as it stands. If the present Government is abusing its power and position to such an extent as to radically mis-spend the hard-earned taxes of the taxpayers, the time will come when they will have to answer for it. It is my feeling, however, that since we have been developing so rapidly, we must take part in receiving and giving views and ideas with the outside world. How can you accurately dictate the spending of this money when air travel and everything else is going up? There is even a clamour now to increase bus fares.

I think that there is a 5 per cent increase on what it cost to get to Europe twelve months ago. Whatever it may be, I am sure it is an increase instead of a reduction. In promoting the diverse and vast amount of business that accrues to Government we have to go to the outside world so as to bring back ideas to help our people to expand. If you want to know that this island is expanding, ask those people who have been away for even five years and have just come back. Even in my small way, I have seen a development. I can say that we have derived benefits from the Sugar Conference. Since the Hon. Mr. Manley took over in Jamaica, he has scarcely spent a whole month in the island. Mr. Chairman, with those few remarks, I support the passing of this resolution.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I do not want to prolong the debate, Mr. Chairman, but I do want to say that we too often make the mistake of ignoring the misleading and inaccurate remarks that have been thrown at us from the other side of the House.

The honourable senior member for St. John said that when he was first in this House there was no conference vote; and sometime afterwards, there was a conference vote and he credited me with the power of forcing the Legislature to give Government what he called a blank cheque. He could not be more wrong. His guide, philosopher and mentor, the honourable junior member for St. James introduced in 1942 the Conference Vote.

Mr. ALLDER: I rise on a point of Order, Mr. Chairman. The Hon. Premier mentioned something about my having some mentor, guide and philosopher. It is unkind to charge me with having a guide, philosopher and friend. I had one once in the person of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph and I have removed myself from under his hands; therefore, I am asking you to ask the honourable member to withdraw those remarks.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But it is not unparliamentary.

Mr. ALLDER: It is offensive in that the honourable member is stating an untruth. I do not know of any person in that area who is my mentor or guide, therefore I object to that statement.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I can only ask to withdraw things which are unparliamentary.

Mr. ALLDER: There is an insinuation in the remarks of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. You know too well that the honourable member is implying that I, who have come in here as a Labour candidate, am becoming a turncoat because I have as my political adviser and mentor a man living in Spooners Hill.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to interrupt the honourable member. If he wants me to withdraw the remarks, I would withdraw the remarks. I would have thought he would have liked the honourable junior member for St. James to be his mentor. Maybe, he would be able to stop wandering in the darkness and drifting from one political party to another.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, those remarks are also offensive.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I also withdraw them if he thinks they are offensive.

Mr. ALLDER: The honourable member had all those persons as his political mentors.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I take it that we can get back to the Resolution. I would just like to say that people returning to this island after living in a big country for some time have preconceived ideas of what they expect to see; and when they come and see the progress made, it is really out of keeping with what they expected to see and that is why they express surprise. That can be so, therefore, I am not going to think that this island has progressed so much, according to the view expressed by the honourable junior member for St. Philip; because people who have been living for 25 to 40 years in the United States of America have come back and said so. I like to see progress made all the time, so I do not think we should judge ourselves by that statement of the honourable member.

Sir, there is no getting away from it that with the creating of responsible Government, you must give block votes to the Government for its members to carry out their policy; but in return for that, the Government should feel itself obligated to give the Legislature every and full opportunity to criticise its policy. I think what should be done is that at the end of a conference, some form of a report should be sent to the Legislature to give an estimate of what it costs and such things; and that is how this House could help Government in these matters.

I am surprised to hear what the honourable junior member for St. Philip said. What he said amounted to this: since the Government elected has the majority, it must do as it likes until it goes.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: If I intimated that in my speech, I did not mean such a thing.

Mr. LEWIS: He may not have said it in the same words, but he implied that those who form the Government must do as they like to do, and it must be corrected at the Polls. I would just like to say in answer to that that we have a system of paying the Leader of the Opposition to oppose what the Government is doing; and the reason for that is that the people at the Polls have to judge as to what they hear for and against any measure if there is any criticism of the Government. It is not only for the people to criticise the Government but also the Opposition. If the honourable junior member for St. Philip is too timid to oppose the Government and just leaves it to the voters, do not let him say that is the system of Parliament, because that is not so.

I would like to say that the motion for the reduction of the vote by \$1,000 would not be any criticism of the Government. It is just because some members feel that the vote of \$18,000 plus the \$9,000 to make a total of \$27,000 for this year is sufficient for Conferences. Honourable members are not saying that things have not gone up; I know that travelling by bus is very expensive.

5.25 p.m.

Travelling abroad is an expensive game to play. While the Government should participate in Conferences because it is a modern idea and they stand to lose a great deal if they do not, it must also be remembered that gold can be bought too dear. I too have heard the criticism that many important Conferences have been held to which Government has not sent a delegate when they should have done so; and I am inclined to agree that the criticism is in some measure just. Sometimes a Minister is

absent, to say nothing of other hon. members. However, while it is the spirit of the age we must be still careful that it be not too frequent. If this Government is seeking to share the interests of the Caribbean peoples I know that they will find themselves in a position where they will have to spend too much. I know that these things will happen, but you have got to keep a strict eye on the expenditure involved.

I have also heard something about a Deep Water Harbour. But I am also asking that all expenses in connection with its construction be kept separate and charged to the Deep Water Harbour Scheme at a later date.

I must say that as regards the remarks of the hon. senior member for St. John to the effect that hon. members of this House do not seem to care about losing their prestige or power in this House, I do not think he can charge me with that. I should like to ask the Ministers of the Government to evolve a system whereby, whether through the instrumentality of White Papers or Statements, they can put a position before this Assembly in such a way that we can have an intelligent debate on what is going on. Matters that would be more critical to the Government they have not seen fit to bring into this House, and we are only now seeing after the revision of the Rules of the House.

My criticism, I repeat is, that I want to see a Government-instituted policy that will enable other hon. members and myself to question what is going on; and I am going to allow this Government, as a responsible Government, to formulate that policy. In pursuance of that policy you should supply the evidence by which you can be criticised and judged. That is something that the Government should be anxious to do. Let us get some form of report on every occasion that money is spent from the Treasury, together with the expenditure when that can be obtained. In this way members can become *au fait* on the subjects dealt with at those conferences.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard that because you have a Trade Union you must pay the cost for the employees to travel to conferences. That may be quite right; but you should counsel both sides, and particularly the Trade Union side.

Another factor is that the funds of the Regional Economic Committee are misused in the formation of certain associations. I would have told the Citrus Growers' Associations for instance, that they should go ahead and form their association and then the Regional Economic Committee would assist them.

Who formed the Sugar Producers' Association? The sugar producers must have formed it themselves. When the citrus growers formed that Association they did not call other people into it. It concerned the growers. Is it reasonable to expect that because there is a Regional Economic Committee, none of the islands having a common interest, could not take the initiative by sending someone to Dominica and such other places and saying: "Let us form an association between ourselves?" No; on the contrary the feeling is: let the Regional Economic Committee form it. If the feeling is that they will take more notice of a Government-sponsored association well that is different. I think that to the people who say that the labourers always want everything done for them it should be pointed out that that is just what they are doing.

I am voting for the reduction by the sum of \$1,000 in the hope that the Government will in future, give me every opportunity of knowing the details of what takes place at these conferences. You cannot come here every time there is a conference and ask the House to form a policy which is now practised by the Government. There may be a reason for withholding yourself from attending cer-

tain conferences; but they should adopt a method that would allow the voters to know what is correct.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I do want to make one or two other criticisms but happily they have already been touched upon by the hon. member who has just spoken. Nevertheless, that gives me an opportunity to go to something else which arises out of one of the speeches of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph in the course of this debate. I heard him say (he may correct me if I am wrong) in an interjection made to the hon. senior member for St. John that Government I think, was considering the suggestions of taking along a member of the Opposition on such Conferences.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not recollect the hon. member having said that. I think he asked the hon. senior member for St. John if he did not consider that it would be appropriate that the Leader of the Opposition should go on every delegation to these Conferences.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I said that the suggestion has been made to me more than once to be passed on to the Government. It is that the Leader of the Opposition should go on every delegation taking part in such conferences.

5.35 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: The suggestion has been made to me more than once to put it up to the Government that the Leader of the Opposition should accompany members of the Government to Conferences. However I would like to say first of all that I cannot defend the attitude of my own Party toward it; but I think I could make a few general observations which may not be out of step with regard to our attitude when that matter comes about.

In a matter in which the policy of the Government is different from that of the Opposition Party, I cannot see that any useful purpose would be served by having the Leader of the Opposition no matter what Party he represents, on a Conference delegation; because in the eyes of the supporters and of his Party members outside the House, the impression might be given that unanimity exists where in fact it might not exist. In all matters which require national unity, it might be a helpful thing.

You will remember that ten years ago just when the British General Election had been completed but the results were not known in those three weeks' interregnum so to speak, the Potsdam Conference came up and Mr. Churchill who had to remain in office until the election results were known, took along Mr. Attlee with him to the Conference, taking the view that the results of the election might put the Labour Party as the winners in which case Mr. Attlee would have to start afresh and outside of what has been going on. It so happened that the Labour Party was returned and Mr. Attlee carried on. That is a circumstance in which the Leader of the Opposition might accompany the Premier or any Minister to a Conference.

Consequently in circumstances which call for national unity, (for instance when later this year the Plenipotentiary Conference meets to put the official touches to the Federation of the West Indies) it might be desirable that an all-Party delegation or a by-partisan delegation be sent from each House of the Legislature. In a case like that, when the motive of the Conference is a national one and not necessarily a political party one, of course a useful purpose could be served by including the Leader of the Opposition on the Government delegation. But in all other matters where there might possibly be a divergence of policy between the governing party and any Opposition or the Official Opposition, it would not be in the interest either of the Government or the Op-

position or of the country as a whole to pretend that there is a unity of outlook and policy existing when in fact no such thing exists.

The question that Item 35 "Conferences" be reduced by \$1,000 was put and resolved in the negative on the following division:

Ayes: Messrs LEWIS, TUDOR, HAYNES, ALLDER and E. D. MOTTLEY—5.

Noes: Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mrs. E. E. BOURNE, Messrs. MILLER and J. C. MOTTLEY—8.

The question that this Resolution for \$10,300 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: At this stage, Mr. Acting Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. Speaker who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

On reassembling.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY CTD

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

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. VAUGHAN the Acting Chairman being in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1955-56 NO. 16

Airport: Remote Receiver Buildings

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of \$1,500 to construct a building to house what is called a remote receiver. As you will see from the Addendum to the Resolution under the terms of the Agreement between the Government and International Aeradio (Caribbean) Ltd. who are responsible for all aeronautical telecommunications at the airport with the exception of air traffic control, the Company is allowed free use of existing buildings and offices at the Airport. International Aeradio (Caribbean) Limited have asked that a small building estimated to cost \$1,500 be constructed at the Airport to house electrical equipment. The Government has agreed to the request on the understanding that the Company will pay a rental of \$12.50 per month for the use of the building.

I think, Sir, that is pretty straightforward. At present the building which is now occupied is rent free. This amount is for the purpose of constructing a building to house that equipment. The rent charged has been explained. I hardly think there is anything more to say, and I now formally beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. TUDOR: I note when listening to the Hon. Minister of Communications that he said that this matter was pretty straightforward, and in a certain sense it is; but there is still something on which I would like a little information. I noticed in

the first part of the Addendum that the company is allowed free use of a building and offices at the Airport. The Company is now asking the Government to build this small building to house electrical equipment and we are told that Government agrees to that request. Does it mean therefore, that this particular small building which is to be erected falls outside of the general agreement under which they are to have the use of a building and offices free of cost?

It says quite clearly that they are going to rent this new building and I would like the Hon. Minister to say (1) what is the existing agreement to permit these people to have free use of a building and offices and which is being modified in some way in view of the fact that they are now going to pay rent for this additional building; and (2) while he is answering that question, perhaps he might agree to tell us how many buildings that company now occupies free of cost, and whether in the foreseeable future Government would be asked to erect more buildings for that company, and whether all future buildings erected for that company would be rented or whether this particular building alone is to have rent charged for it.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Acting Chairman, so far as the answer relating to the question whether this new building is separate or outside of the agreement, I say, "yes, it is." The Company will occupy those buildings which they now occupy and as I have already pointed out, this building to be erected is for the purpose of housing a remote receiver. As regards the question as to whether Government will be asked to erect future buildings and rent will be charged for them, I will say that would be also outside of our previous agreement; therefore, if you have to erect any buildings in the future, it is obvious that you will charge rent for them.

6.30 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: This Government is trying to hold down this country as a pawn to the United Kingdom.

Mr. Acting Chairman, I notice that in the Resolution for \$1,500 this firm will be paying 10% a year on the cost of this building. I do not know whether the Government felt that 10% was the correct percentage for their investment. I rose principally to suggest to the Government this point: why do they bite and bite at the Airport?

What I think is this: (and I hope the Minister of Communications will note it) I think there is a great opportunity for the Government to augment their income by providing a verandah to the Airport building as is done in other countries where persons who are desirous of doing so, may pay a small fee to go and view the passengers landing and other activities of the Airport. It can be done; and you can also provide a restaurant service where people can go and have lunch. It would be a means of collecting a tidy sum of money to add to your revenue. In other parts of the world wherever you have an Airport (and we are expecting ours to grow) facilities of this sort are provided. Some day the hearts of the Government will turn and they will see the advisability of going into that.

It is by drawing attention to these things that I am endeavouring to show how badly the people of this country are treated. When we realise that we give \$10,000 as a subsidy to British West Indian Airways, and that in spite of that you are still being charged more for the journey say from Puerto Rico to Barbados than you are being charged to go from New York to Puerto Rico by another air service, then I say that is more than I can comprehend. There are times when we must speak out; and I

will always say in reference to this that you are taking advantage of the people of Barbados.

How can you deery colonialism and at the same time perpetuate the worse form of imperialism as soon as you tax people to support British West Indian Airways. Just to keep a few pennies in the pockets of a few people you are strangling the majority of people as a whole. Any time you invite me so to do I am going to say this if I sing a solo: "You are robbing the people when you allow a British Company like B.O.A.C. to come in here."

Whenever I talk tourism it is apt to be said that I am talking for the hon. junior member for Christ Church; but I talk tourism for the thousands of unemployed in this country. It burns me to hear or think of it. Within the past week not less than 32 people came to me willing even to sell their souls and bodies in order to get out of this country. I could hardly reject imperialism and then perpetuate a thing like this. I am not anti-British, but whenever you come to some matter in connection with the Airport, I must say that what is done is a downright disadvantage. If you could offer me the greatest British honour that you could think of I could not think of selling the people. What I say is this: how can you account for a company which charges you twice as much for a journey of some 600 miles as compared with a company which does a journey of some 1,600 miles for comparatively less?

I do not think there is much in this Resolution to criticise. If anybody else had done these things some of the members of the Government would have called them some of the most hard-hearted people in the world. It is scandalous to think that in this 20th century when colonialism should be a thing of the past, Barbados forward as it is politically and otherwise, can still see its way to go on subsidising and giving every facility it can to British West Indian Airways. In so doing you are saying: "Down with everybody and everything else."

Even the common man in the streets knows what we owe to the United States of America; we owe more to that country than you can think of. When I talk in this way, what I notice has already been said of me is apt to be reiterated; that is, one of these Ministers has said in this House something about not selling your birthright for a few hundred American dollars. Whatever it is you are going to sell, you are selling it to feed your family; all that kind of talk is sheer ignorance. All that it amounts to is fooling people and is dishonest.

Just to have it go down in the records of the Colonial Office that a Minister got up and said something about selling your birthright for a few American dollars is what has given rise to such remarks. I hold that you will sell it for Russian dollars if you had to do it for the sake of feeding your family. Political ideologies will have to come together sooner or later; I hope to be in here long enough to see the hearts of the Government turn. It is said that I am supposed to belong to a Conservative Party in this island; they seem to think that I am glad to be able to say that you are keeping down the people by supporting British West Indian Airways. You pay them a subsidy and then you say that you cannot get planes.

Now, getting back to those remarks about selling your birth right, I must say that some of the Hon. Ministers have no birthright anyhow. [Laughter].

6.40 p.m.
Mr. ALLDER: I do not understand the Government's policy with respect to rentals at Seawell. If as he says the Government does not charge any of the Airways Companies—

Hon. M. E. COX: I never said that. What is the Airways Companies to do with this matter? I never mentioned Airways Companies.

Mr. ALLDER: The Hon. Minister claims that they do not charge International Aeradio Caribbean Limited any rent for the building which they are at present occupying. In my opinion, Sir, the policy in that respect is being confused. You either charge rent or you do not charge any rent: but the buildings which this company occupies are large ones and their maintenance is more costly than the building which it is proposed to erect. Inasmuch as the greater quarters are being occupied freely by this company, I do not see how you can start to charge rent for the small one.

I am not arguing for the free housing of any company at Seawell because personally, I feel that if there are any companies up there who are enjoying the use of Government's property free and they have been doing so in the past, the Government should look around to receive income by compelling such companies to pay rent commensurate with the trade which they are doing at Seawell. Taking into consideration the amount of money which has been spent up there in order to facilitate the operation of these companies and the annual recurrent expenditure of \$122,517 per year with the possibilities of an increase in this expenditure, I can see no other way than to suggest that we should get greater revenue from this source.

These companies are rich companies; and you can see today that they are competing with each other to get entrance at our Airport, therefore we have reached the stage where we do not have to bend over too far backward in attracting them to use our Airport. As I have said the annual recurrent cost is mounting from year to year, and it is time that we get them to pay what rental the business of these companies can reasonably afford to pay.

Hon. M. E. COX: In answer to the point raised by the hon. senior member for the City relative to the improvement of the Terminal Building at Seawell, I should like to say that we were prepared to add another floor to the Terminal Building this year. We were prepared to extend it, but the Director of Public Works said that it would be difficult for him to handle it during this financial year; and consequently we decided to leave it over until the next financial year.

There is only one further point to which I would like to reply and it is the point made by the honourable senior member for the City, who also stated that this Government was a pawn of the British Government in connection with bringing the Pan American Airways to Barbados. I would like to say here and now that this Government is neither a pawn of the British Government nor any foreign Airways Company.

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

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the Acting Chairman reported the passing of four Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX in each case, the Resolutions passed in Committee were read a first and second time and passed.

APPOINTMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE RE WEST INDIAN REGIMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to move for the appointment of a Select Committee to prepare a draft reply to His Excellency the Acting Governor's Message in connection with the

re-establishment of a West Indian Regiment. I think that we should have a Select Committee appointed to reply to that Message since it is a very important one. [A MEMBER: You can make a motion.] Very well, Sir, I beg to move that a Select Committee be appointed to consider and prepare a draft reply to the Message from His Excellency the Acting Governor relative to the re-establishment of a British West Indian Regiment.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

The question that a Select Committee be appointed to consider and prepare a draft Reply to His Excellency the Acting Governor's Message in connection with the re-establishment of a British West Indian Regiment was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: Subject to the approval of the House I have the honour to appoint the following members to serve on such a Select Committee:—The hon. junior member for Christ Church (Mr. GODDARD), the hon. senior member for St. George (Mr. BARROW), the hon. senior member for St. Philip (Mr. CRAWFORD), the hon. junior member for St. John (Mr. VAUGHAN), the hon. junior member for St. Michael (Mr. BRYAN), the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries (Hon. C. E. TALMA) and the Hon. Premier (Hon. G. H. ADAMS).

CLERK OF THE HOUSE

Select Committee's Report

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, as you will remember, earlier in the day I intimated that I was going to ask leave to deal with the report of the Select Committee appointed to review and report on the terms and conditions of the service of the Clerk of the House. I intimated that I was going to ask leave to proceed with this report because I want a decision as quickly as possible owing to the fact that our Acting Clerk is only desirous of acting in that position for a month. I think the report was circulated amongst honourable members and is now in their possession. I am now asking leave to deal with the report.

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

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: The main point about this report is the conditions of service under which the new Clerk should be appointed. During the life time of the late Clerk, Mr. Sergeant, the terms and conditions were that the Clerk and Deputy Clerk should be qualified Barristers or Solicitors. Well, the Committee which reviewed this matter after careful consideration are of the opinion that the terms and conditions of service of the Clerk of the House of Assembly should be as follows:—

- (1) That the Clerk and the Deputy Clerk should each be a duly qualified Barrister or Solicitor.
- (2) That the Clerk be in attendance at his office in the Public Buildings from Monday to Friday (inclusive) every week from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. and throughout every meeting of the House of Assembly and on such other occasions as Mr. Speaker shall require his attendance, except on such occasions as Mr. Speaker may grant him leave.
- (3) That the Clerk should discharge the duties of that office in accordance with precedence and in addition he should perform any duties required of him by Mr. Speaker.

- (4) That the salary of the Clerk should be (\$4,128 x 192 — 5,280) per annum payable in equal monthly instalments."

As regards the salary, that is a departure from the previous salary paid and for two good reasons. First of all, it has always been said that the remuneration should be that of a Police Magistrate and that is the salary agreed to. The other reason is that the late Mr. Sarjeant was Clerk of the House for 19 years and as in all business practices a new Clerk would not be remunerated at the same rate.

According to the report, the Committee were of the opinion that the post should be filled as soon as possible and that an advertisement calling for applicants for the post should be inserted in the Official Gazette and in a local newspaper. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this report be adopted.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Committee for the expeditious way in which they have considered this report; I hope it is born on example which will be emulated by other Committees. I take it that when we conceived the idea of setting up a Committee to review and report on the terms and conditions of service of the Clerk of the House, the idea aback of it was really to aim at some improvement if that were possible. I see that the terms and conditions of service are much the same as what they were before; and in that spirit which I have just mentioned, I would like to move two amendments to this report.

Mr. SPEAKER: An amendment cannot be actually made to a report. The hon. member can make a suggestion or make a motion as to what he wants adopted.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, I am going to move the motion that after the word "Solicitor" in the first clause that the words "of not less than five years' experience" be added. In moving that motion, I would like to say that there should be some stipulated time as to the experience of the person to be appointed as a qualified Barrister or Solicitor. I think the House would stand to benefit by the practical experience which a qualified Barrister or Solicitor would bring to us and for that reason I have made that motion.

Now, the Hon. Minister has informed us that it has always been felt that the salary of the Clerk of the House should be in line with that of a Magistrate. If you will remember, the maximum salary enjoyed by our late Clerk was \$5,760 per annum. If the motion which I make for the qualifying period is inserted, I would like to see that the maximum salary of the Clerk should be put back to \$5,760 per annum. You have to bear in mind that the Clerk of this House is a whole-time job; and along with that it entails very long hours of work on Tuesdays when this House is sitting. As a whole-time job and with the experience which I am asking, I feel that the maximum of \$5,760 would be the desirable figure. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the incremental scale would have to be increased also, so that the incoming Clerk would still have a six year period to reach the maximum; that should therefore be increased proportionately to \$240 per annum. I am therefore making the motion that the salary scale be fixed at (4,128 x 240—5,760) per annum payable in equal monthly instalments.

7 p.m.
Mr. SPEAKER: What does the honourable member mean by "proportionately."

Mr. BRYAN: By that I mean rising by increments in proportion to the basic salary.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member seconding the motion?

Mr. BRANCKER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Speaking in support of the honourable member on my right, up to the present time as has been pointed out, you are now paying a Magistrate what the original motion proposes to pay our Clerk. Let us compare the post of Clerk with that of a Police Magistrate in Barbados; a Police Magistrate in Barbados as we all know starts in that capacity and he can rise as far as his ability will allow him. We have a former magistrate who is now Chief Justice in British Honduras; we have one who is a Puisne Judge of Barbados and several others; but we have nothing more to offer in this Chamber than the Clerkship.

If we provide the salary which a Police Magistrate should receive, we can only hope that somebody who feels he has not enough merit or personality to obtain a post as Police Magistrate will be satisfied to be appointed to the Clerkship of this House. We should also bear in mind that whereas the office of a Police Magistrate carries pensionable emoluments the Clerkship of this House carries no pension. In the event of retirement for one reason or another the question of awarding a pension is left at the discretion of this House. In other words there is no certainty about it.

We will be offering for our Clerkship the same salary as that of a Police Magistrate; but there will be no bright prospects, no pension and the hours of work are certainly longer. The hours of work of a Police Magistrate are from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m.; and there is hardly any Police Magistrate who sits every day from Monday to Friday. While one of the Police Magistrates in Bridgetown sits sometimes on Saturdays, the Police Magistrates in the rural areas do not sit on Saturdays at all; yet it is suggested that we should pay the same salary as that of a Police Magistrate.

As I said before, apart from the fact that the Magistrates of Barbados do not sit more than five days and between the hours of 10 o'clock and 4 o'clock, we have been sitting here late and we often sit until after 4 a.m. on the following day. As a matter of fact, it is doubtful whether it is lawful for a Police Magistrate to sit longer than between 10 a.m. and 4 p.m.

We are giving longer hours of work, we guarantee no pension and we can offer no promotion. I take it that we should feel that we want a man as good as we can get to perform the duties of the Clerk of this Chamber. In seconding the motion of the honourable junior member for St. Michael, it is largely owing to the terms of the arrangement I think, that everyone will agree that we want the best type of man whom we can afford to pay; and that we do not want this office for a Barrister or a Solicitor who finds that he has got neither the qualifications nor the personality for the post of a Police Magistrate. With those remarks I support the motion of the honourable junior member for St. Michael.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, three or four years ago I felt that it was not necessary to have a Barrister or Solicitor to fill the post of the Clerk of this House. It is not necessary today. For that reason I should like to suggest that in any agreement which we may reach tonight in advertising for a person to fill this post, the words "Barrister or Solicitor" be not inserted in that advertisement. That is—

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the honourable member's motion?

Hon. M. E. COX: I will make that. There will be no reason for saying that if a Barrister or Solicitor should apply preference should not be given to either of those individuals; but I do not think that it is necessary to have a Barrister to fill this post. I think I am correct in saying that the former Clerk of the House of Commons, Sir Frederick Metcalfe, was not a Barrister or Solicitor and he held that post for many years. I do not know who has succeeded him, but I am of the opinion that he is not a Barrister; the holder of post of Clerk or Deputy Clerk of the House of Commons is not a Solicitor either as far as I know.

I feel, Sir, that there are a number of persons with good qualifications in this island outside of Barristers or Solicitors, who could come into this House of Assembly and do the work required to be done; and who could remain in the office and do everything which is required to be done by this House.

7.10 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member referring to the post of the Clerk or the post of the Deputy Clerk?

Hon. M. E. COX: I am dealing with the post of the Clerk because the post of the Clerk is vacant. On the whole I am saying that it is not absolutely necessary to have a legal man to occupy that position. I am convinced that there are qualified people in this island who are capable of doing the work of this House, and doing it as capable as a Barrister or Solicitor. For that reason I feel that the words "Barrister or Solicitor" only should not appear in the advertisement; we should also allow applications from other suitably qualified persons. And if in interviewing the applicants it is felt that a Barrister or Solicitor who might apply for the post is better than the others who have applied, obviously he should be given the job.

My colleague has suggested an amendment to the effect that you should not consider a Barrister or Solicitor who has not had five years' experience. I do not know what is behind that amendment, but there again I do not think that that is necessary; if you are prepared to accept a solicitor, any man who passes the examinations can do the work.

I do not agree with setting out any period of five years' experience in the advertisement; that might prevent this House from getting the benefit of the services of an individual who will come in here and do the work even better than a Solicitor who has ten years' experience. Because a man has five years' experience as a Solicitor that is no guarantee that he is any better than a man who has the experience of a year or two. If we are asking for a Solicitor, this stipulation of five years' experience should not be included in the advertisement; thus it will be open to all Barristers and Solicitors to apply for the post.

I am not in favour of the amendment made by my colleague; and I would suggest to let us drop any reference to the experience which a Barrister or Solicitor should have to qualify him for this particular post.

Mr. Speaker, if I am in order, I would like to move an amendment to the motion made by the Hon. Minister of Social Services. He has moved that the Report of the Select Committee be adopted; I should like to add to paragraph 1 of the Report, after the word "Solicitor" the words "or a person with experience in parliamentary procedure."

7.20 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Sir, I must say that some peculiar things can happen in one's political

lifetime. This is the first occasion that I can see eye to eye with the Hon. Minister of Communications and I therefore rise to second his amendment.

I am among those who are convinced that the amendment which the Hon. Minister has put up is really the right thing to do. I have actually noted and discussed it with the hon. junior member for St. John and the amendment which the Hon. Minister moved was actually my phraseology. I do believe myself that with the presence of the Deputy Clerk (whom I am absolutely sure has no interest in this vacancy at all as a wholetime job, but whose position as Deputy Clerk is for almost a period of 19 years and as a trained Solicitor of 26 years' standing,) it strikes me that it would be a good idea if rather than pin the appointment of the office down to a Barrister or Solicitor of any years' standing, that the person to fill that office could be a person possessed with a knowledge of Parliamentary procedure.

I have seen even in my time that some lawyers whenever it came to their making a draft for parliamentary purposes, have caused a tremendous lot of confusion; and you will be creating no precedent, if the person appointed is only possessed with a knowledge of parliamentary procedure, because the actual Clerk of the Commons in Northern Ireland is not a Barrister or Solicitor at all, but is a person experienced in parliamentary procedure.

It is a fact that a lot of students of history do a tremendous lot of research work, and are very meticulous and although they may not be lucky in passing examinations, they might be suitable persons for such a position. Therefore, in this Chamber where it is not necessary for both Clerks to be specialists, we should be the last persons to subscribe to anything to prevent persons other than Solicitors and Barristers from applying for this post.

I do not know if it were a question of both the Hon. Minister of Communications and myself thinking alike, but immediately as I got this report it struck me that such an amendment as was moved by the Hon. Minister was the one which I should make. The honourable junior member for St. Michael made a motion that we should have a Solicitor or Barrister of not less than five years' standing to fill the post, but I do not agree with that suggestion, because a Solicitor of even ten years' standing might not be suitable for the job. I again do not agree with him that the salary should be increased.

I am one of those who agree with the other terms and conditions of the report that the Clerk should be a wholetime officer and he should be called upon to perform duties as the Speaker may direct and I think that such a job with a salary rising to £1,100 per annum is quite sufficient. I do not think with the economy of Barbados that this job is worth anything more than that; and I am not even putting it in relation to the post of Police Magistrate; I am thinking of the terms and conditions of the post in relation to the economy of this island. A salary rising to £1,100 per annum is a very reasonable salary.

This is where I disagree with the Committee when it comes to the salary fixture. I think that immediately an officer comes in here and starts to work he comes right into the job. The least salary which you should start at is £900 per year. At one time I thought that the bottom figure should be £1,000.

I am seconding the motion made by the Hon. Minister of Communications, but I am adding my views on the question of salary. I do not agree with his colleague when he says that the maximum should be £1,200, per annum. I think the maximum of

£1,100 as has been decided by the Committee is the correct figure, but I do think that the starting point is too low.

I do not know if the Hon. Minister of Communications has a similar view. I feel that when an officer comes in here he comes right into the work. The starting point should be around £900 per annum. However, I am not making any amendment for that. Again, I wish to say that the motion as moved by the Hon. Minister of Communications is a very correct one and I would suggest to the House that they should vote for it.

Mr. MILLER: In view of the fact that there are occasions when this House meets twice a week, I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, if this Chamber would accept a simple and small amendment. I propose to make a motion so that the daily hours of service should be less.

It is my view that the hours should be 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. instead of from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. As a matter of fact, I do know that if we make it from 6 o'clock in the morning to 4 o'clock in the evening you will still get people applying for the job. Why make a rule that the Clerk should come in at 10 a.m. when he may have little to do on certain days. On the other hand, he can arrive at ten and at 12 o'clock he can go off and take two hours for lunch. I therefore, make a motion that the hours of attendance of the Clerk should be from 11 a.m. until 4 p.m. and I hope that some hon. member would be willing to second that motion.

7.30 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am in agreement with the last honourable member who has just sat down, in saying that the hours should be fixed in quantity rather than from period to period. We in the tropics start to work too late. I do not see why if a Clerk went to work from 8 a.m. to 2 p.m. he should not do more than if he went to work from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. We are considering it with the Civil Service.

I would prefer to start to work just as I get out of bed; then you are fresh; and as you get out of bed you can go straight to work and you work well. A Magistrate functioning after 2 o'clock in the afternoon is acting by rule of thumb. [A VOICE: You don't practice at the Bar now]

I should like to make this suggestion in the spirit of what the honourable member said: I suggest that Clause 2 be amended by the insertion of the words "at such appropriate hours" occurring after the word "occasions" in line five. The word "appropriate" will indicate that you are not allowing the Clerk to come in at 8 a.m. every day; that is a discretion which should be reserved for the Speaker.

After 2 o'clock the standard of work is apt to be lowered. We in the tropics could do far better work if we stopped at 2 o'clock in the afternoon. The amended clause should then read as follows:—

"That the Clerk be in attendance at his office in the Public Buildings from Monday to Friday (inclusive) every week from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. and throughout every meeting of the House of Assembly and on such other occasions at such appropriate hours as Mr. Speaker shall require, his attendance, except on such occasions as Mr. Speaker may grant him leave."

I am not being facetious, but I should like to know if we could put in the word "unqualified" Barrister! [Laughter.] The days when we wanted a Barrister or Solicitor are over. Some of the ablest lawyers in the world are not good at drafting

A lawyer may be a good advocate and a poor draftsman; draftsmanship is an art in itself. No longer does a Clerk of the House have to help honourable members with the drafting of Bills. It does not take a Barrister to read a proof; it takes an energetic man, that is all. I would suggest to hon. members that we might agree to further amend the motion by adding the words "a person versed in Parliamentary procedure".

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, —

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member seconding the motion of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I never heard it, Mr. Speaker. There is much that mystifies me from time to time so to speak. It has been the tradition through the years to employ a trained Barrister or Solicitor in the positions of Clerk and Deputy Clerk of this House and I imagine that there have been good reasons for it in the past. The hon. senior member for St. Lucy has been so convinced in his mind that legal training in these positions is important, that he has even gone so far as to suggest that there should be a legally-trained adviser to the Speaker.

Well now, if in addition to legally-trained men in the positions of Clerk and Deputy Clerk you also need a legal adviser to Mr. Speaker, it is infinitely more important to have legal men in the positions of Clerk and Deputy Clerk; except that the hon. senior member for St. Lucy feels that the best way to get a legally-trained adviser to the Speaker is by eliminating trained men from the positions of Clerk and Deputy Clerk.

I personally feel that if the posts of Clerk and Deputy Clerk need legally trained men, then a legal adviser to Mr. Speaker is superfluous and completely unnecessary; but rather than burden the Treasury with this high-falutin official as legal adviser to the Speaker, it would be more convenient and economic to have the Clerk and Deputy Clerk as legally-trained men. If on the other hand the House feels that the position of Clerk and Deputy Clerk are no longer required to function to the extent to which they used to, and have concluded that all that is necessary is a certain amount of acquaintanceship with parliamentary procedure, then I should not at all be surprised to see that they support the amendment that for the future the Clerk of the House should no longer be a legally-trained man. In so far as that particular principle is concerned, I am not quite satisfied in my mind as to what the Hon. Premier proposes to do.

7.40 p.m.

Is he suggesting that the Clerk himself need not be a legally-trained man but that the Deputy Clerk must be a legally-trained man? [MEMBERS: Yes.] Your Honour yourself appeared to be somewhat intrigued by the new suggestion and queried whether the Mover of the amendment meant the Clerk alone or the Clerk and the Deputy Clerk.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was not intrigued; I was curious to know. [Laughter.]

Mr. CRAWFORD: The position is this: are you suggesting or are you accepting the suggestion that the man in the junior position must have better qualifications than the man who is in the senior post? The present salary of the Deputy Clerk is £600 a year and the salary of the Clerk himself is £1,200 a year; are you suggesting then that your junior man drawing one half of the salary of the senior man must be a legally-trained man and the senior man be a layman?

Hon. M. E. COX: I do not know where the hon. member got that idea from. I said that I

did not believe it was necessary to have a Barrister or Solicitor for either post; but when Your Honour queried me I made it clear that I was dealing with the post which was vacant. If the post of Deputy Clerk was vacant I would have dealt with that too. There is no point in arguing on that now.

Mr. CRAWFORD: While it is true that the post of the Clerk is vacant there should be some regularity in our procedure. If they are insisting that you should bring in a Clerk who is not legally trained then the position with regard to the Deputy Clerk should be clarified.

I am not for a moment suggesting that it is impossible to find in Barbados non-legal people with the aptitude and capacity efficiently to execute the duties attached to the post of the Clerk; but at the same time it seems to me that we are unnecessarily lowering our traditional standards. There is no paucity of legally-trained men to apply for this post, and the only reason there can be for any fundamental alteration in the qualification for this post is that we have a special desire to serve our friends who may not be legally qualified.

There was a time in the history of this country when non-legally trained men were employed in magisterial positions and there has been a ruling from the Secretary of State for the Colonies on the point. The Administration is not expected to appoint non-legally trained men are available; and similarly long as legally trained men are available; and similarly in Parliament the positions of Clerk and Deputy Clerk which require a certain amount of legally-trained knowledge, in my opinion I see no reason at all for any deterioration in the standard. I should hate it to go on record that in 1955 I am suggesting that it is impossible to find men capable of doing these jobs who are not Barristers or Solicitors. The people who want this change should advance some logical reasons for it. They should tell us that the Clerk and the Deputy Clerk do not require any legal qualification at all to do these jobs or that Mr. Speaker does not require any legal assistance.

Mr. Speaker is not a Barrister and in the course of his parliamentary duties occasions will and must arise when he will require legal assistance. Where is he to get that legal assistance from? Time may be when there may not be a Barrister elected to this Chamber because they are certainly fewer now than they were before. Even if you have a Barrister elected to this Chamber his legal ability and training are not at the services of Mr. Speaker; and in any case he may not belong to the same Party as Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Speaker may not be inclined to call upon him for assistance. Therefore we are entitled to have in the position of Clerk or Deputy Clerk a legally-trained man. If in this country we are reverting to the American system and we are using our position to reward our friends with jobs, let us say so and be done; but do not let us unnecessarily and wantonly lower our standard in any direction without full justification for so doing. I am yet to hear that legal training in these positions is superfluous; until I hear that I am entitled to the conviction that the change in the status of the Clerk and Deputy Clerk is not necessary.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I rise to give my blessing unhesitatingly to the amendment as proposed by the Hon. Minister of Communications. [MEMBERS. Shame!] I want a lot of us to get away from the idea that only certain men with certain official qualifications can do certain jobs. That is not true and it will never be true. There was a time when the world was run before Academic degrees were insti-

tuted; the world was run and run well for those times. You have the English tradition of lay magistrates who have been valuable in running affairs in England and whose findings and submissions have, as far as I know, been accepted by the highest legal traditions, and they themselves had no official legal training. 7.50 p.m.

I am one of those who believe that except for certain specific professions like medicine or certain technical branches of engineering, when a man of general intelligence has been associated and interested in certain institutions and the procedure of running those institutions, that, at times, is a greater qualification for the job than any academic qualifications. That has been seen from time to time. Of course, I hope it will be taken for granted that I am speaking of an intelligent man with a certain background of education; and I will go as far as to say that sometimes that type of man is intelligent enough to give himself that background of education.

I have seen many an injustice done to members of the Civil Service who have served admirably for a great part of their lives in certain departments and whose efficiency in the job was unmatched and subsequently proved unmatchable, by turning them aside and appointing over their heads persons with academic qualifications. As a matter of fact, we give worship to or make a fetish of academic qualifications to the point that we are in danger of lowering the spirit of education itself; that is what is happening to-day. We are in danger of making people want education just to qualify themselves for a job, and after they get the job they have no more interest in it than anybody you pick up out of the street [Cheers]. They are abusing the real value of qualifications.

Give me an intelligent man with interest in certain institutional issues every time before you give me the man with the mere academic qualifications. If he has academic qualifications plus an interest and integrity as a citizen, I will say: "Yes, you can give him the preference"; but only to give him the job on the mere acquisition of academic qualifications, I think is doing the whole nation a disservice. We must be satisfied that a man is educationally qualified to fill certain positions. We all know and acknowledge that in certain positions it is not the highest type of qualifications, it is not the person who possesses the highest academic qualifications that will fill the post with distinction. How many present-day Civil Servants can qualify with the distinction in positions in certain institutions as were held by some old-timers without those certain qualifications?

There are many devoted servants who are literally wedded to the positions and they perform their duties in a way that no person with academic qualifications can better.

Let us take as an instance something like road engineering; academic qualifications can be a distinction to a man holding a post of road engineering, but a man who loves road engineering (and as we know there are many persons who because of their length of time in the execution of the practical work are much better than any young Civil Engineer coming out from the Academy) puts into the shade some persons who hold academic qualifications.

I have been told that when the railway was being laid here that certain people were brought out to do the job, but a native born Barbadian who had a flourish for doing such a job (and we know that there are certain people who are born to do certain jobs) was the actual person who put down the railway. So, Sir, I want us to get away from the idea

that in certain positions only the man with academic qualifications can fill them. It is not true. Intelligence plus experience is as great a college as any.
8.00 p.m.

I believe that in the position we seek to fill this is not impossible. I have been so carried away by my own convictions that I have not even remembered to cite a case of which we all know; I am referring to the case of Mr. Arthur Hinds, M.B.E. the late lamented Clerk of the Legislative Council. He was not a solicitor or a barrister; yet, as far as we all know, he executed his duties with an efficiency that earned him the respect of every legislator for all the time that he was Clerk of the Other Place. I repeat, that he was not a solicitor or a barrister; but when it came to his work there was not any fault to be found. That is a very notable case in point, and as such, it helps to substantiate my conviction that we do not necessarily have to go out of our way to fill the post of Clerk of the House of Assembly by a solicitor or a barrister.

Trusting to leave that impression on honourable members of this House, the impression that academic qualifications are not in every instance essential to the fulfilling of a position adequately, I heartily endorse the sentiments expressed by the honourable member who first put forward this alternative motion.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is out of Order.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the oral tirade of the honourable junior member for St. John and I am wondering what this is all about. I reflect that this is one of the few occasions when this honourable House is conducting its business as a House free from the restrictions of Party discipline. We have seen in this House tonight the very indecent spectacle of five honourable members of the Government's Party expressing one view and two others expressing other views. It only goes to show what could happen when the crack of the whip is not heard.

We are discussing the Report of the Select Committee which was asked to meet and recommend to us how soon, among other things, we should fill the vacant post of Clerk of this House; we are, therefore about to employ a servant. Before we do that, it should only be necessary as I have thought, to expect us to accept or reject the Select Committee's Report. On the contrary, we have seen, at least, that there has been an unprecedented amount of log-rolling in which everybody, so far, has participated. I am not participating in it because I have nobody to recommend; a fact, Mr. Speaker, to which you are a witness.

Every one who has spoken, so far, and particularly the Minister of Communications, has given the impression that, by the terms and special circumstances of the amendments which they have moved, they have in mind the kind of servant that they should employ. I have listened to all of their different amendments; and having followed the arguments of those amendments, there emerges in my mind the type of persons those Movers of the amendments wish to have sponsored. [A VOICE: What is the motion?]

Mr. Speaker, so far back, and up to now, honourable members of this House have been able to have trained guidance, so to speak; and today we have had the astonishing spectacle of the honourable junior member for St. John arguing in such a way that would deny the value of academic qualifications.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker, I entirely object to that statement alleging that I denied the value of academic qualifications.

Mr. SPEAKER: No, no; I agree with the honourable member that that is not what he said.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I did not deny the value of academic qualifications. I said in effect, that it should not be termed a fetish.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, there is a difference between a principle and a fetish. He can make it a fetish if he likes; but I wish to ask whether, in arguing as he did, he did not make his own fetish of the question of the lack of qualifications. After all, Mr. Speaker, the Clerk of this House has been for sometime (I cannot say has always been, because my memory does not serve me on that point) but I can say that the Clerk has been for some time a solicitor, and in some cases, we could almost term him a barrister. If it has become necessary that there is no longer to be a barrister or solicitor sitting in the post of Clerk of this House it should be told to us more clearly that, either the nature of the work is changed to the extent that work formerly done by a legally trained Clerk is no longer done by him, or that the intellectual level of the House has risen to such an extent that it is not appreciated by hon. members.

Something occurs to my mind just at this point, and it is this: the Clerk of the House does or should do for hon. members not in the Government, what precisely the Crown Law Officers do for the Ministers. It is true, that if I were asked to draft a Bill I would undertake to do so; but I would not undertake to do it without a certain amount of misgiving. I would therefore be able to rely upon the Clerk of the House (if he is a barrister or solicitor) to assist me in the drafting of such a Bill.
8.10 p.m.

The Hon. Premier in spite of his being a lawyer or rather I should say in addition to his being a lawyer, would still find it necessary to consult the Crown Law Officers; and in view of the fact that he is a Minister, he has the right to have the advice and support of the Crown Law Officers. What is the ordinary member of this Assembly to do if he wants assistance which cannot be given to him by a layman? As to the argument about suitably qualified persons, the term "suitably qualified" can be interpreted in any way you wish to interpret it, but in so far as we have known it, the term "suitably qualified" has meant that a person is a barrister or solicitor.

I notice that the Select Committee for reasons best known to itself, has taken it upon itself to recommend that the salary of the Clerk should be rather less than what we have been paying for this office. I do not know the *argumentum ad hominem* but it does seem to suggest that the principle has not been adhered to, and merely because we have to choose a new servant we believe that we must alter the scale of salary because the next person may not be so distinguished or so old. I think we should adhere to principle; if it is felt that the job, no matter how long it takes or how many man hours are spent on it on a particular day, if it is important enough to carry a certain salary, then that salary should be maintained.

This is not a Government matter or a political matter; this is a matter concerning the House; it is a matter of filling a vacancy created by the death of one of its servants. We need not look left or right for guidance in these matters; if we feel that somebody be employed having his own ability to do our business he should be offered a salary commensurate with the work which he has to do and bearing some relation to what the former officer enjoyed. I do not think it is fair for this House to employ its Servants

at cut-rates; if you are doing that it will be said that whereas you kept certain standards in the past you are now employing an inferior type of Servant. I do not take that view.

Mr. Speaker, with reference to the amendment moved by the hon. junior member for St. Michael, I say we are so pleased when we hear his voice in this House no matter what he is saying, it sounds delightful. Although he says it quietly and we can scarcely hear him on this side, we attach due weight and importance to what he has said. I gather that he said that not only should the proper standards be maintained but that a certain amount of experience be taken into account and shown for the job. I am not so much out of sympathy with him because a fully-qualified person should be considered and it would not matter whether a man has five years' or ten years' experience. I am not quarrelling with him in that matter because he is on my side in the argument; but I wish to lay stress on this point before I sit down.

The argument that it would be essential to have a fully-qualified person can be carried too far and we are investigating at present the effects of such a policy. Standards are being lowered everywhere and soon the very lack of standard will be the standard; I do not subscribe to that. I would like hon. members to take whatever view they have in this matter without making it so transparent that horses are being prepared, and that odds and bets are being taken on the favourites.

Mr. ALLDER: I only rise to say that the more I sit in this Honourable Chamber the more I am convinced that there is no right and there is no wrong because both are the same. They only differ in meaning according to the individual or group who try to manipulate things. We seem to be breaking away from tradition tonight. I am happy to see that certain honourable members are capable of going away from what they have always tried to emphasise.

With respect to the Report of the Select Committee appointed to go into the duties of the Clerk of this House I would say that certain members have done the least expected, and I hope that when other considerations come up they will be as willing to disregard certain traditions in the same way as they are disregarding them tonight.
8.20 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: There have been three motions put before the House. The Hon. Minister of Social Services moved that the Report be adopted. The hon. junior member for St. Michael moved an amendment to the motion which was that the Clerk and the Deputy Clerk should each be a duly-qualified Barrister or Solicitor of not less than five years standing, and that the salary should be placed in the following category (4,128 x \$240 — \$5,760) that is the salary which the late Clerk enjoyed. The next amendment was moved by Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing. He moved that the Clerk and the Deputy Clerk should each be a duly-qualified Barrister or Solicitor or a person with experience in parliamentary procedure.

I am going to put first the amendment as moved by the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of Order. I note that the amendment by the hon. junior member for St. Michael is in two parts. I think you should put them separately.

Mr. SPEAKER: If that is the feeling of the House, I will do so. At any rate I will put the second amendment as was moved by the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing first.

The question that the addition of the words "or a person with experience in parliamentary procedure" be added to the end of Clause 1, of the report was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows—

Ayes: Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. O. T. ALLDER, Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN, Mr. F. C. GODDARD and Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY—8.

Noes: Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Hon. R. G. MAPPE, Mrs. E. E. BOURNE, Mr. T. O. BRYAN, Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER and Mr. J. C. TUDOR—7.

8.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now, the question to which hon. members will now address themselves is the amendment as moved by the hon. junior member for St. Michael. The first part of that amendment has been eliminated and therefore, is out of the question. The question is now that the salary of Clerk of the House be [VOICES: Whose motion?] Now, no interruptions from hon. members. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: But is this a division?] The first part of the hon. member's motion is ruled out as a matter of necessity. I am ruling now. I repeat that the first part of that motion by the hon. junior member for St. Michael has been eliminated.

The question now is that the salary of the Clerk of this House be \$4,128 by \$240 to \$5,760 per annum [Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Where are you quoting those figures from?] I am dealing with the amendment as moved by the hon. junior member for St. Michael.

Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye" those against will please say "No"; I think the "Noes" have it. There is now no question of a division. That Select Committee's Report remains in effect.

The question is that the Report as amended, be now adopted. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye," those against will please say "No," I think the "Ayes" have it.

ADJOURNMENT

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, The House was adjourned for three quarters of an hour.
8.35 p.m.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE MOTOR VEHICLES AND ROAD TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS

On re-assembling,

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to take Order No. 14 as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing: To move the passing of the following Resolution:— Resolution to approve the "Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations, 1955."

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, in moving the passing of this Resolution to approve the Regulations controlling the activities of improvised passenger-carrying vehicles, I should like first of all, to appeal to hon. members to view this question with an open mind and not to regard it in the light of what any electors in a particular constituency might say,

but rather in the interest of the community as a whole.

I would also like to ask hon. member to forget that the Minister of Communications is dealing with the matter against whom guns are more often than not fired; (incidentally guns with wet powder).

I would just like to give a brief history of the introduction of the system of the allocating of routes to Concessionaires. Honourable members will remember that some years ago, in the 1930's between 1937 and 1939 there was an organised system of passenger transportation in this island; consequently competition was very keen, and I should like to say that was not to the benefit of the passengers or of the community, because it had reached a stage when buses would leave Trafalgar Square where they were then parked and run sometimes half way and turn back into Trafalgar Square and then leave again. Sometimes passengers used to be in buses for half an hour before they got to their destination which might not be more than say three or four miles away.

In addition to that there were many accidents taking place. I well remember that bus-drivers at that time would start off at a terrific speed and seeing that there were passengers for another bus following, would stop suddenly in the middle of the road with the result that the radiator and bonnet of the rear bus would crash into the rear of the bus in front. Transportation was in a very disorderly state of affairs at that time; in other words there was chaos. The Legislature in its wisdom, (I may say that it was one of the only things which the Conservative Government did that could be regarded as wise) decided to pass legislation for the orderly development and running of the transport system in this island.

As I have said before, routes were allotted to Concessionaires and for many years that system worked, (with the exception of the insufficiency of the number of units) satisfactory for some years, but within the last five years, and more particularly in the last two years, vehicles which are not at all constructed for the conveyance of passengers have been purchased and run as if they were passenger vehicles. They are operating on some routes and they are keenly competing against buses which sole right it is to ply for fare on the particular routes.

At this stage I should like to say that no member of this House would deny the fact that these improvised passenger-carrying vehicles have been of considerable assistance to the travelling public; I think the Committee which sat recently to consider the question of bus fares made that point. The Committee realised that the improvised vehicles were carrying off quite a lot of business, but they also stated that that was due to the fact that the Concessionaires, instead of increasing their units in proportion with the demands of the travelling public, would seem to have ignored the public to a large extent, made money, (there can be no mistakes about that) and did not care what became of the passengers. As we have heard and we have no reason to disbelieve it, we who keep in touch with the activities of the people know that the concessionaires have invested in real estate properties and so on.

Nobody is annoyed because they invest in real estate; nobody grudges them for that; but in carrying on business you cannot on the one hand say: "I am not making any money out of my business" and on the other hand buying properties out of it. Judging from what the Concessionaires have said as against what they do, it would appear that they

are buying properties and investing money out of losses. I had to say that recently. They would like us to believe that they have been losing money since 1948 and more particularly in 1953 and still they are continuing to invest in real estate property; if they want us to believe that, we have to come to the conclusion that they are using money out of the losses.

Mr. Speaker, if the Concessionaires had to put back a reasonable amount of that money into their business this situation would not have arisen. I think it was in 1953 when the Concessionaires made a concerted appeal to the Government for increased fares.

9.40 p.m.

In November 1953, they made this appeal for increased fares. The matter was considered and no decision was reached at the time, but they did strongly suggest that what you call "pirate" buses should be removed from off their routes in as much as that those vehicles were depriving them of a large number of passengers. As regards the question of removing those vehicles, Government felt and still feels that under the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, ample provision was made to prevent vehicles which are registered for one service from being engaged in another service; but it has been reported to the Government that the Police have found it difficult in some cases to get a conviction against an individual who uses a goods vehicle for carrying passengers for reward. They claim that there is no evidence to prove that the people who are carried by those goods vehicles pay fares.

If you look at Section 2 of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937, you will see that a "goods vehicle" means a motor vehicle which is so constructed as to show that its primary purpose is the carriage or haulage of goods, merchandise or other loads. We always felt that that interpretation was clear, and that it was a matter for the Police Magistrate or Judge to exercise the law.

Surely, if you look at some of those improvised vehicles you will see that their primary construction is certainly not for the carrying or haulage of goods even although they are licensed for that purpose. One would have felt that it would have been an easy thing for a conviction to be established against anyone who carried large numbers of passengers in a goods vehicle.

However, this question was again discussed last year. Perhaps, I should say that before Ministerial Government started, I, holding the portfolio for Highways and Transport, attended a meeting of the Concessionaires and I made it clear to them that there was a lack of sufficient number of units by them to accommodate the travelling public. They admitted they were lacking in these units, but they said that they could not increase them at the time because of the "pirate" buses. That was in 1953. Since then on two occasions I had talks with them and I told them that in order to establish a case for an increase in bus fares or a rebate, whatever the case may be, they would have to keep properly audited accounts. That was in 1954.

Unfortunately, we are no better off today than we were in 1953 because, as you will see, when the Committee which sat on this question made its report, although making recommendations for an increase in bus fares the Committee stated (and this is what it says on page 8 of the report)

Statistics and Accounts:—

"In the course of this enquiry we found ourselves at some disadvantage in that adequate statis-

tical information was not available from many concessionaires to enable us to make proper comparisons and reliable estimates. For example, important information such as numbers of passengers carried, mileage covered, etc., was lacking in many cases. We recommend that Concessionaires should be required in their own interests to keep full records of such details in the future."

As I have said, ever since in 1953, on two occasions, I made it clear to them that they would have to satisfy the Government if they say they are losing money. No Government wants them to lose anything. In our second last letter to them we said that Government would be willing to give them a rebate (provided of course that the House of Assembly agrees) to recover any loss, and to give them any increase that may be recommended by the Labour Commissioner and also to make a reasonable profit on their capital so as to improve the service to the island.

I may say that quite a lot of misrepresentations about this matter have been carried in the Daily Press and the *Recorder*. It is a fact that the Press has a habit of twisting what Ministers tell them from time to time.

9.50 p.m.

It is reaching a stage where one finds it very difficult nowadays to say anything to Pressmen. The *Advocate* as you have seen, has been championing the cause of the Concessionaires; and that is expected of the *Advocate*. While making it appear as though they represent public opinion, in truth and in fact, the *Advocate* represents the opinions of a few rich people in this island and a few others whose identity is difficult to describe.

They do not know public opinion; they do not care for public opinion; and hence when a few wealthy or influential people get together and say or desire to have something done, the *Advocate* publishes articles editorially and otherwise purporting to be the sentiments of the people. The *Advocate* define 'people' as meaning a few wealthy people, we of the Government and of the Labour Party define 'people' as the masses. As our good Bishop Hughes who left us some time ago once said: "It is people that matter; not a few people, but the people as a whole."

The argument has been used that since 1939 bus fares have not been increased. At that time gasoline was thirty cents a gallon, today it is 63 cents a gallon; tyres were \$40.00, today the price has been considerably increased. That argument is of not much value. What has happened is that during the years gone by, the country folk if they did get to town once a week, they had to do so either by walking the whole journey, or by driving for half way and walking the remainder. Today, however, as a result of the activities of the Barbados Labour Party, the whole position and the conditions of the working classes of this island have been changed if not completely transformed. There is now a much higher standard of living. Thousands of children from all over the island day in and day out are able to travel to Bridgetown to be schooled. As I told someone a few days ago, if the position was that people came to town only once a week, I would say: "Yes; increase the bus fares."

Every government is a political government for the simple reason that it is elected by a majority of the people. What the Concessionaires are saying amounts to this: we are nothing to do with the case of the school children who have to come in to town to be schooled. Increase the bus fares and let us wax fat.

The Government is of the opinion that we must first consider the case of the thousands of school children who have to come from the country districts to the metropolitan area from day to day to be schooled. Let us consider for argument's sake the case of the man who has about four children going to school; fares have been increased to five shillings per week and his salary has not been increased; he has got to find three more shillings per week in order that his children might continue to reach school. The Concessionaire is not thinking of that.

I lay the emphasis on the facilitation of transportation for school children because I believe in doing everything possible to facilitate the education of the children of this island, being confident that when you educate a people you set them free. The Committee recommends that bus fares should be increased in spite of the fact that they did not get possession of essential statistics from the bus Concessionaires.

The Government does not accept the Committee's recommendation for an increase in fares on the ground that if the Concessionaires failed to produce the basic statistics, how then could they make out a case for an increase in fares. How can you know whether a company has made money or not if you are not in possession of facts and figures? You cannot estimate the amount of money they receive. You cannot estimate the mileage either; and that is a factor which would enable you to say that you have made so many trips, you have burnt so much gas, and things like that. The Government emphasised that you must keep proper accounts if you wish to convince us that an increase in fares is necessary.

I remember talking to a Concessionaire some years ago who asked for an increase. This is what, in effect, he said: I will not say that I am not making some money; but there is another company running on a particular route doing less miles than me and he is getting a larger fare than I am getting for a longer mileage. Either put me up to him, or bring him to me. Those were his remarks to me. It did not appear to me as though he was concerned with an increase in fares as much as he was about what he considered to be an anomaly or unfair arrangement.

I am going to quote from paragraph 14 of the Report at this stage because honourable members will recall that as soon as the Committee had submitted their Report, someone connected with the buses or the Association wrote in the local Press saying: we have as many buses as could cope with the demands of the community. We have some 28 spare buses for which there is nothing to do.

Now paragraph 3 of the Report reads as follows:

"From our examination of the bus services in general, we have formed the opinion, and in this we are in agreement with the view expressed by the Director, that there is considerable room for improvement. The buses are too few and services not frequent enough. Better types of buses are required providing greater comfort and accommodation for passengers. It seems obvious that the 'pirates' could not obtain the support they do were it not for that fact that they are in some degree making good certain inadequacies in the present services."

10.00 p.m.

In 1953 I pointed out that sufficient bus transportation was not provided for people who were travelling with their baskets of breadfruits, yams and things of that sort, and in the absence of the provision of that type of transportation these people were forced to seek other means to be transported. The days of walking for a distance of 20 miles to

and from Bridgetown are over; and the people must have transportation if they are to carry on their business. The Committee said this."

"At our request the Director has submitted a memorandum giving his recommendations on the improvements which should be made in the bus services and this memorandum is attached as Appendix II to this Report. Concessionaires have acknowledged the inadequacy of certain services, but have claimed, with some justification, that they have been unable to carry out improvements owing to the inadequacy of the fares. We recommend that it should be made clear that improvements on the lines indicated in Appendix II will be expected to follow an increase in fares."

In Appendix II are set out certain improvements having regard to bus fares being increased.

If you read the *Advocate* you will see that none of that is mentioned; all they emphasise and feature day in and day out is that part of the Committee's recommendation for an increase in fares; their view is that the Government should swallow the Report as the Committee puts it up, and do not differ from anything. Well, that does not happen even among children. You will see that there has been much correspondence between the Government and the Concessionaires; we have done our best in trying to reach reasonable settlement and it is not to be felt that we were backing down from our stand. It has been said that the Government has begged the Concessionaires to carry on, but we did not beg them to do anything.

The Concessionaires are imbued with the idea; "This is my bus, I need not run it; I can put it in the garage." But that is not so; this is a matter of Government transportation and the Government has given it to the Concessionaires as agents to carry it out. They are not to be in the position of holding up the public at random in case they fail to agree to any particular thing. That should be clearly known to one and all.

We have received many letters some of which we read. I do not want to read them now at this late hour because, before morning some of these Concessionaires might see the wisdom of accepting the Government's offer. What culminated in this further period of ten days is that the Concessionaires who wrote us saying that they would be ceasing to operate after the 31st August but that they would be willing to co-operate with the Government. Nobody knew what is their meaning of co-operation. You co-operate in discussing something while the buses are in the garages and the public is suffering.

The Government asked the bus owners whether their co-operation meant that they would be willing to continue operating for a period of thirty days during which time negotiations with a view to reaching some agreement would be carried out. They then replied stating that they would not agree to thirty days but would carry on for ten days.

10.10 p.m.

Some of them have gone as far as saying that we from a political point of view, are afraid of bringing in legislation to control the operation of all those improvised vehicles. I can say for myself, and I think I can say it for other members, of the Government that I have adopted the policy of doing what I can consider is right and in the interest of the community and leave it to their judgment. Even although they might not be quite pleased with you at the time, in the course of time, they will see the wisdom in what you did.

Many people were annoyed in 1937 over what happened when the bus service was regulated and

concessions given to certain people, but after that everything went on smoothly. Sir, we are not afraid of anybody because we work conscientiously day and night for the people.

We are convinced that it is right and in the interest of the community that some control should be exercised over the operation of these improvised vehicles, therefore, we have brought down regulations to provide the necessary control.

Sir, emphasis was laid on the question of increasing bus fares and that Government should control the operation of these improvised vehicles. Government made it clear that it would control them when it was satisfied that Concessionaires had sufficient units to operate on their concession. Now this is the point: even although this Resolution to approve of these Regulations has been introduced, the Concessionaires are still saying and pressing for an increase in bus fares.

As can be seen, while the Government was trying to keep the negotiations on a high level, everything that was discussed behind closed doors appeared from time to time in the *Advocate* newspaper. The Government suggested giving them a 15% rebate on petrol which works out to around \$60,000 annually. Can you imagine a reasonable people saying: "Well, no, we are not accepting 15% rebate, we want 50%." That would work out to approximately \$210,000. In addition to that, they are saying, if higher wages are recommended by the Labour Commissioner for their employees, "we also expect you to provide for those higher wages." They are the people who want the public to believe they are reasonable.

When it reached that stage, I think it is time that the public should know something of what is going on. One Concessionaire said that he was losing \$40.00 a day as a result of "pirate" buses. At a meeting held at the office of the Director of Highways and Transport, there were present Messrs. T. O. Dowding, A. P. Jordan, P. Stewart, K. Jones, Bus Concessionaires, and K. Sandiford Secretary of the Bus Owners' Association. Mr. Dowding led off the debate and among other things, he said that when there was need for chartered buses in excess of those held by Concessionaires, "pirate" buses should be allowed to operate under the control of Concessionaires.

He is one of the Concessionaires who suggested that with the exception of the transportation or workers to a particular place, "pirate" buses should not be allowed to operate. I just quoted that to show you how you have to follow and appreciate what they say from time to time. They change in what they say as often as chameleon lizards which change in their colour to match the shade of the tree on which they are climbing.

Mr. Dowding at that meeting went on to state emphatically that the question of "pirate" buses was even more important than that of increased fares. That meeting took place on the 7th January, 1954. In other words, he was saying at the time that if you only removed these "pirate" buses from the various routes on which they operate, you need not worry about the increase in bus fares.

I go further, Mr. Speaker. When we were putting through the Five-Year Plan, we increased the price of gasoline by one cent per gallon. At that time, the point was raised on the floor of the House that the Concessionaires had a case for an increase in bus fares. We said that we were not increasing bus fares. The increase then caused gasoline to rise to 65 cents per gallon; it is now 63 cents per gallon. I understand that something like 4,000,000

gallons of gasoline are consumed annually by the people in the bus industry. It can be seen that with a decrease in the price by two cents per gallon that that is a fairly substantial amount going back into the pockets of the Concessionaires.

10.20 p.m.

At a later stage I may have to deal more fully with this matter; but perhaps, I should leave them off for the present.

Now, to get back to the Resolution. The Committee were convinced that some measure of control should be exercised over the vehicles marked "luggage vans." Some hon. members would be surprised to know that persons who own these passenger-carrying vehicles have approached me stating that competition has got too keen among themselves today, and I can see it. You have only to look at the Leeward group and you will see the truth of that statement. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Every man still gets a little pick for himself.] A man came to me and told me that he wanted to register a waggon; but when he went to the Director of Highways and Transport, the Director refused to register the wagon for carrying more than six passengers. I showed him the law relating to the registration of vehicles for public transportation. I showed him that under the Taxicabs Act, he was not allowed to carry more than six people. Well, he was very annoyed, but I told him that at that stage I could do nothing to help him; he would have to be satisfied with the provisions of the Act.

Honourable members will appreciate that if you do not provide some check, the situation which existed in the 1930's will be on us very soon again.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Regulation 3 of these regulations states: "These Regulations shall come into operation on such date as the Director may appoint by notice published in the Official Gazette." And it is stated very clearly in the Explanatory Note that in no case are we prepared to remove or rather prohibit these vehicles from carrying passengers and their wares. This fact is stated in the Explanatory Note as follows: "It is not intended to restrict the transportation of hawkers carrying goods of a perishable or fragile nature." With that safeguard honourable members can willingly agree to the passing of this Resolution which in effect gives legal status to operation of these vehicles.

It is also proposed that each route will be dealt with individually. In other words, when the Regulations are proclaimed, the Director of Highways and Transport will endeavour to issue permits to all those persons who are now operating these vehicles for carrying passengers. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: No can do! Don't you believe it.] I should like to assure the honourable senior member for the City that the Director of Highways and Transport or the Director of any department under a Ministerial system has got to carry out the policy of the Government which, in the last analysis, is the policy of the House. I want to assure him, that it can only be done when we say it is to be done. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: O.K. Sir!]

What is the use of a Ministry then? [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: That is the question] If you have a Ministry for running the affairs of the country and anybody can go behind a responsible Minister and do as he likes, that Ministry is a farce. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: So it is.]

Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that the permit has got to be submitted to the Minister concerned. The terms of the permit will be approved by the Minister concerned, and the actual date of the concession, or the withdrawal or revocation of the

permit will have to be decided by the Minister. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Power Power!] Of course, all this will happen when the Minister is assured that the Director is satisfied that the route is efficiently and adequately served by the Concessionaires. [VOICES: Hear! Hear!] I lay it down; and if you do not believe it, that is a matter for you.

I want to go further and say that we have the interest of the community at heart at least as much as you do. We are not interested in the Concessionaires primarily as the Concessionaires; neither are we interested in the owners of those other passenger vehicles; our prime consideration is for the travelling public. We want to see the travelling public provided with an up-to-date and first class transport service.

[VOICES: Hear! Hear!]

As I said just now, before these Regulations come into force, we have got to be satisfied that the Concessionaires have provided a sufficient number of units to accommodate and facilitate the travelling public. Mr. Speaker, in so far as the vehicles for carrying hawkers are concerned, they will continue to operate indefinitely. If the Concessionaires have a million buses, this hawker service as carried out by these small "luggage vans" will continue. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: What service?] I am referring to the people who carry breadfruits etc. for sale. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: And where will they sit? Down on the floor?] If the honourable member would read the Regulations he would see this: Regulations 52A (1) "No person shall use or keep for use a motor vehicle having seating accommodation for any number of persons unless he shall first obtain a permit in writing from the Director in such form as the Director may decide."

What I am saying is that you will not be able to fix up these seats in these vehicles without having a permit; and the people who are using these improvised vehicles for passenger transport etc., will have to get permits when these regulations come into force. That is what, in effect, we have said here in these Regulations.

10.30 p.m.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that Regulations such as these are absolutely necessary. From my own experience I agree that on some routes at some periods the Concessionaires are at a disadvantage; I have seen that for myself. I have seen improvised lorries and passenger-carrying-vehicles with four sticks nailed to the sides parked along the bus stand and I have heard people from these vehicles shouting: "Come here, he cannot leave before six o'clock!" and things like that, and the people leave the buses and get into these lorries. That is not good enough. These motor buses have got to conform to some standard laid down by the Director of Highways and Transport; you cannot carry a greater number of people than the number specified, the buses must be inspected, your roof, your everything must be in order.

As I have said, although you are properly fitted for carrying passengers you still cannot carry a larger number than that which is specified. It does not make sense to impose such restrictions on a bus and then any improvised vehicle can come along and carry any number of passengers one may like to carry. Therefore there should be some legislation limiting the number of passengers which any of these vehicles can carry. These Regulations are for the purpose of controlling the operation of these vehicles. We are all glad to have these improvised vehicles to assist in carrying passengers and goods for people, because I must emphasize

that the bus Concessionaires have failed to keep abreast of the times.

Only last Saturday week a man from St. Philip told me that a bus had taken up a load of passengers and had left two loads. I know how passengers have to suffer. If somebody is going to the head of Roebuck Street he has to go back to Trafalgar Square from Lower Roebuck Street and pay three cents for that, and then pay another three cents to go up Roebuck Street. We are fully conscious of that and we know that removing these vehicles which are so useful at the present time would be doing a disservice to the community; therefore we say that we are passing legislation to control their activities.

If for example you have "pick-ups" running on the Bush Hall route and the Concessionaire can supply in six months or nine months time a sufficient number of buses to accommodate the passengers, we would withdraw permits from these improvised vehicles for carrying passengers. In 1953 we passed the Bill to provide for third party insurance which includes compensation to person who might receive injuries while driving in buses. On the other hand if you get injured in any of these improvised vehicles you cannot get anything by way of compensation because these vehicles are licensed as goods vehicles and are not covered to include passengers.

I have spoken at length on this matter and I could go on to speak for four hours because we are faced with a situation where the public is not certain if it will have a transport system on Thursday morning; and if it gets one, we are not certain what type of service it will get. I want to assure this House and the public that we have done everything we possibly could in trying to reach a settlement with the Concessionaires to continue the service. The hon. senior member for the City raised this question last Tuesday and he has given us quite a lot of food for thought. He has revealed things which I did not know concerning the bus owners. 10.40 p.m.

We have not acted on what the hon senior member for the City has said. We have allowed our offer to remain. The hon. member should know a lot about it because the question of rates of these companies goes before the Vestry; and as he has also said, he is a personal friend of some of the people in the industry. Along with that, the bus owners are the people who deal in real estate; therefore, when he says anything about those people, you must pay attention to what he says. As I have said, we have not acted on what he said. In view of the fact that we made an offer to them we are still willing to carry out our offer.

Perhaps I should say before I sit down that I have been criticised by some people over what I had to say on the matter over the radio. Some people said that I said very little; but that was in view of the letter which we received on that Sunday about 2.30 o'clock from the Concessionaires. As I was made to understand, they were from 9 o'clock on that day at a certain gentleman's home bartering about the matter. Let me say that I never said one single word of what I intended to say over the radio as a result of that letter coming at that late hour. I had intended to speak for about 20 to 25 minutes but I refrained from doing so because I did not want to break off any negotiations that could be made. So, Sir, even for that I would like to apologise to the public. I had quite a lot to say on that occasion, even something in reply to the nonsense which Mr. Sandiford caused to be published in the *Advocate* of that date. I therefore will make an appeal to the public here and

now that if in case there is a complete breakdown and your transport facilities are not as good as they are today, I want you, if you suffer any inconvenience—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not addressing the Chair.

Hon. M. E. COX: I said, sir, that if there is any breakdown in the negotiations and the public has to suffer a little inconvenience, I am appealing to the public to bear it, always bearing in mind that the Government is acting in what it considers to be in the best interest of the community.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mrs. BOURNE: I beg to second that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: There seems to be some doubt as to whether this Resolution approving these Regulations should be seconded. Before going further, I wish to say that I have a severe criticism to offer and it is this: there is nothing at the minute of greater importance to the populace of Barbados than any matter dealing with buses and the transport service. We came in here today at 3 o'clock and I am wondering why the Hon. Leader of this House has waited until after dinner it being now almost 11 o'clock, a time when members are already exhausted, to let the Hon. Minister for Communications deal with Regulations like these. You came in here at 3 o'clock and you go on until this time. Members of the House are tired and the Reporters cannot do justice.

Any remarks or criticisms made cannot be properly published because the Government persists time and time again in dealing with matters of paramount importance at this time of the night. It is not fair to anybody other than to members of the Government and to say the least it is not fair to the Reporters. However, I suppose because you are in it you will have to stick it. If you sit until 3 o'clock in the morning I will stay and deal with this matter. I note that the Hon. Minister of Social Services is absent from the Chamber, but I do not think he has left out of discourtesy.

Sir, when I spoke last week on the question of the general transportation the matter was postponed. On the last occasion when similar regulations such as these came before this Legislature, if I recall correctly, I think I was at the spearhead in seeking to get them thrown through the window; we were successful then. I want to ask: What is the Government's attitude tonight on this matter? Why have they taken the opportunity at this time to deal with this matter?

First of all, let me say that there is no chance of any hon. member being able to amend any of these regulations; we must either pass them as they are or we must reject them. No law gives us the right to amend regulations. On policy it is my duty to throw out regulations because since this Government came into power, there was an occasion when we criticised them on bringing in regulations when we could not amend them and the Hon. Premier said that he would bring down a Bill to give us the right to amend regulations; but up to now, that has not been done, therefore, I am not voting for any regulations until that is done.

We have listened very intently to the Hon. Minister of Communications and I would like to say that I am quite aware that he has a big job. I am quite aware that this is the first crisis to face his Ministry and the Government and it is no easy task to deal with, especially with so virile and vigilant an opposition. He himself has got to be on the alert; and

with the public so interested in the matter, I am sure he must have had some sleepless nights trying to think out what he should do in the matter.

Now, the Hon. Minister has given a review of the entire situation leading up to the regulations. He has also given a resume of some of the communications and discussions that lead up to the appointment of the Bus Fares Enquiry Committee and the bringing in of these regulations. In short what he has been telling us is that a Conservative Government some years ago regularised the transport system of this colony and it served well from some time in the thirties up to within recent years where it is serving the purpose but not as well as it should be. The Hon. Minister repeated what I said last week; and that is, that the public is not getting a proper service. He has also told us that the Concessionaires have been asking for increased bus fares and the Government has taken a stand, and rightly so, and told them that it is not giving any increase in bus fares.

Well, the Government appointed a Committee to enquire into the matter and the Committee made certain recommendations. As I have said earlier this afternoon, some peculiar things happen in one's political life time and I am going to say that the article which appeared in the *Sunday Advocate* of 31st July, 1955 was one of the most dishonest statements I have ever read. Let me say that at no time the Chief Justice ever said, when he was deliberating on cases between the Vestry and the bus Concessionaires, that they were not making money. I am sure if he were here somebody could be charged for contempt of Court. That is just in passing.

10.50 p.m.

The Hon. Minister of Communications has given us his review of the entire situation. The Concessionaires want some more money, but we have pointed out that we are not satisfied with the service as it is. I agree with him in that although he has not made the following quite clear that is that although the Committee actually made recommendations for an increase in fares, the recommendations say that you have not increased bus fares since 1939. I think he should see that there is some justification for this.

In 1939 when you had to run a bus you got three cents or four cents per passenger; today you are carrying 36 passengers. The distribution of wealth has turned itself around into the hands of the populace not only in Barbados but all over the world [laughter] Don't laugh at that because you may be laughing at your own folly. Consider the standard of living of America or even of England. People leaving here and going to England get £15 a week. This proves the truth of what I have said just now that this is not confined to Barbados.

Let us come back now to Barbados. In 1939, 60 school children took the school certificate; today 600 are taking it. So that when a man transported so many passengers in that day the numbers were unstable or uncertain. He went up for instance with 30 passengers and he might come down with none.

As I said before, you cannot prove that the luggage vans have not been carrying passengers. I want honourable members to know where I stand in this matter. I have not abandoned my faith in free enterprise; if there is one thing I hate it is that the Government should run this transport system. There is one thing I believe the public will know upon awakening tomorrow: if the Concessionaires should say "we are going to stop we cannot make enough money," then the public will see that the people who would apply for the concessions will say that they

can do it. Do you think this public will be satisfied? They will say that each company has been doing business and making money. They are not going to go into this blindly. I am sorry for the small fish. Some of these people do not realise what is happening. After you have consigned the people who apply and you still give a 15% rebate, that is dishonest; I regard it as collusion with the Concessionaires.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to interrupt the honourable member; but I want to object to those remarks. The forms are drawn up; and included in the forms is the 15% which it is said will be subjected to the approval of the Legislature. The big proprietor and the little proprietor have applied.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I still hold that it is political dishonesty and I prepare to prove it. All the honourable member has to do is to prove to me that it is honest. What I am saying is this: lest anybody should think that I have any grudge against anybody making money, I say that people should use their brains to make money rather than let the Government stand by and take more than their one-third share of the profits in taxation.

Somebody said here today in the course of this debate, that the Clerk may come in at 10 o'clock, take off his jacket, eat his breakfast and go back at 11 o'clock; that is some people's idea of what a man's work day should be. In Government's opinion it does not take brains to buy say something at 3 cents a pound and sell it at 4 cents a pound; but I think it takes a lot of brain to do that and then pay Government tax.

11.00 p.m.

I read in an article recently "we like competition"; but as soon as competition comes at your door you do not like it. I say this: any man who expects to run a business in these days and pull all the money out of it and allow the business to remain as it was 20 years ago, he deserves to face competition which will throw him out of business. You could not do that in any part of the world; if the Hon. Leader of the Opposition had kept his business as it was in 1920 the people next door would carry away the business. You have to improve your business; the bus Concessionaires have not improved their business and they have assisted the "pirate" buses to come in.

The Hon. Premier would say that I am talking nonsense; but you cannot get anybody convicted under these regulations. You must not do this sort of thing today; let us get away from Nazism. I say bring down something when the time comes saying that if people are running these buses they must run them in such a way that the safety of the public will be ensured; but do not come down with these Regulations. Does the Hon. Minister realise that these Regulations destroy his arguments? You can give a permit to fix seats; you can give a permit to do a lot of things, you can give a permit to go to "Jenkins"! [laughter].

This is only a sop; you say that you cannot give the bus Concessionaires increased fares but you are only giving them a rebate on the gasoline they use. Well, as soon as you do that you admit that there is an insufficient service. If a person is running buses and he wants to improve his business, do you take the taxpayers' money and give him? Why are you taking the taxpayers' money and giving it to these bus Concessionaires? That is not the right thing to do; if the books have shown a loss well then you can increase bus fares; but you have not got the courage to do that.

It is said that the books show a loss but they do not believe it; and obviously they will not in

crease the bus fares; but they say: "I will give you a rebate on the gasoline, because you have to improve your services and bring in new buses." I repeat it is nonsense to offer any rebate of 15%; that is my view. If a man is making money and he is buying properties why do you want to give him increased bus fares?

This is the strongest point against the Government in these Regulations. The first Regulation says:

"No person shall use or keep for use a motor vehicle having seating accommodation for any number of persons unless she shall first obtain a permit in writing from the Director in such form as the Director may decide."

I say that there is no haste. This is only a sop to the Concessionaires. Paragraph 3 of these Regulations says:—

"A permit shall be carried on the motor vehicle in respect of which it is issued and shall be produced to any member of the Police Force on request or to any person authorised by the Director."

I say when the time comes and it is necessary to bring down legislation saying that you must run these vehicles for the safety of the public, then do so. I see that Mr. Tudor has put new buses on the road; there is no interference with the established routes.

11.10 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: I particularly said that these regulations were brought in now so as to act as a deterrent to those people who would be inclined to invest money in the buying of more of these vehicles.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Let me say that all the regulations you may pass cannot be any deterrent to a man who wants to do something to feed his wife and children. You cannot get away from the fact that they are serving a useful purpose. The Hon. Minister has said that these regulations are brought in to act as a deterrent. Let me say that the only thing that prevented bus Concessionaires from forcing the hands of Government is these pick-ups. It is a fact that if bus Concessionaires had stopped their services these pick-ups would have turned around so quickly that Concessionaires would not know what they were doing. [A VOICE: It is not that; it is the Emergency Powers.] What Emergency Powers are you talking about? Do you think that stopped them?

I believe in being practical. What, Sir, is the use of bringing in these regulations now when the Hon. Minister has admitted that they are doing a good job. The Hon. Minister also said that the Concessionaires said: "we are losing money, as much as \$40 a day by these pickups." Is that not an indication of what Concessionaires were making when there were no pickups? I pointed out to you last week that whenever there was a collision between a bus and some other motor vehicle, and the matter was taken before the Court, the bus Concessionaire would go into Court and swear: "I am a bus Concessionaire; I make \$40 a day on that bus." Go and read the evidence and you will see that.

You come in here today and you are asking us to agree to this Resolution. It looks to me as indecent haste. Do not be a laughing-stock for the people. I have taken the stand that you are right in your action. I think you are right; and if you are right, you are right, and I am with you. I have said before that I represent the City, but I think we who represent the City should act as ambassadors although the only time when people in the City want to use a bus is at an excursion; and

if they cannot get buses they can use motor lorries.

Be that as it may, I still maintain that I do not think that the Concessionaires have been giving the people a fair break. I predict that when the names of the applicants for concessions are published and the public sees the businessmen who are among them the public is going to be surprised.

I counsel hon. members of this Chamber to forget this Resolution. It is not fair to bring this in at this time; never mind the suspension clause that is in it. If you are in for a fight, you are in for it. You have made an appeal to the public and if you come to a deadlock and the people have to suffer for a few days you should still do it in the right way.

I think, Mr. Speaker, this is wrong. Why should this Chamber say: "Pass these regulations and put a suspending clause in it, so as to put the entire power into the hands of the Director of Highways and Transport." We should not allow that. There are some things on which we must take our stand like the fingers on our hands.

I am saying that Government is acting right in this matter in respect of bus fares. Look and see that despite the organised efforts of the Concessionaires they cannot use the Opposition in this House against Government in this matter.

You have here as your regulation the following:—

"52A. (1) No person shall use or keep for use a motor vehicle having seating accommodation for any number of persons unless he shall first obtain a permit in writing from the Director in such form as the Director may decide.

(2) A permit may be granted by the Director for such period and on such terms and conditions as he may see fit and may be revoked at any time.

(3) A permit shall be carried on the motor vehicle in respect of which it is issued and shall be produced to any member of the Police Force on request or to any person authorized by the Director.

(4) Any person using or keeping for use any motor vehicle in respect of which a permit has been issued by the Director under this regulation who fails to comply with any of the terms or conditions of the permit shall be guilty of an offence.

(5) For the purposes of paragraph (1) of this regulation "seating accommodation" means any contrivance (whether or not attached to the vehicle or any part of the vehicle and whether provided by the owner or any other person) capable of being used for seating one or more persons, but shall not include accommodation for the driver of the vehicle or any person sitting beside the driver."

11.20 p.m.

The policy is the Government's. You know what that quotation means. Regulation 52A (1) says "No person shall use or keep for use a motor vehicle." The Hon. Minister of Communications says that even when we have approved these amended regulations we are still going to allow vehicles for the purpose of carrying trays etc. I am still a Barbadian; but explain to me. Do you mean that the hawkers will be travelling from St. Andrew to Bridgetown and vice versa in the bus with her tray in the pickup?

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of explanation, Mr. Speaker. The persons who bring in breadfruits, potatoes, yams etc., by way of pick-ups will continue to do so even though the Concessionaires supply new buses.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: How can that be when these regulations are in force?

Hon. M. E. COX: Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to explain to the honourable member. I said that the Director of Transport would supply the permit.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I want to know, Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Minister thinks that I am getting dotish. Let us imagine coming to town from St. Andrew. Mr. Speaker, you are still a Barbadian. What happens in the Eagle Hall Market and those other places? Three-quarters of those people are the ones with trays; therefore, leave them alone, he says; because the buses will never be able to accommodate them. If that is so, Mr. Speaker, why introduce this amendment?

Now I am granting him this: if he says the hawkers must go to the City because they are doing a service to the people of the City etc., and if they must run passenger vehicles of some sort that would accommodate them but that they must be regulated, that is all well and good; but if you allow them to run you should not grant 15% rebate. What the Ministers have said about the bus Concessionaires, the same thing be said about the luggage van proprietors; that is, that you have asked us to bring in this and now you have done nothing.

The Government knew that these irregularities in the public transport service were going on for a long time and they should have advertised for Concessionaires a long time ago. They make concessions for a period of about ten years. What difference does it make? The present Concessionaires had their concessions for a long time. What difference has it made? Have the conditions of service improved?

Let us go to the next paragraph of Regulation 52A:

"A permit may be granted by the Director for such period and on such terms and conditions as he may see fit and may be revoked at any time."

The hon. senior member for St. Lucy used to be a member of the Highways & Transport and he can support me in this. When I was fighting this matter out with them I told them: You are doing wrong. When you refuse to give people a permit to my mind, they understand that you are not to do things as you like.

Paragraph 3 of the Regulations reads: "A permit shall be carried on the motor vehicle in respect of which it is issued and shall be produced to any member of the Police Force on request or to any person authorised by the Director."

Paragraph 4 states: "Any person using or keeping for use any motor vehicle in respect of which a permit has been issued by the Director under this regulation who fails to comply with any of the terms or conditions of the permit shall be guilty of an offence."

Mr. Speaker, I want the Hon. Minister to study these Regulations carefully. According to the Hon. Minister's argument, whoever has got a permit is within the Law. Charlie Brown has got a permit too, but his vehicle is only allowed to carry six people and if he should miss and put in six and a half, the Police will see him before the other half gets in. What happens in the case of the Colony Club? They have one of those vehicles. Charlie Taylor has one. They do not run and take up hawkers. They can say: "We are only taking passengers from the Club." Nevertheless, the seats are there. Having regard to this, are you going to do something for me to come in here and raise a riot? Are you saying that some of these waggons come down specially, or are you saying that these Regulations are being passed that only one type of people may buy pick-ups? Are you doing this for the Colony Club and the Marine alone to be able to work? To Hotel Royal and B.W.I.A.

there are a number of people who do not always want to be in a car; so they resort to a waggon.

I quote paragraph 4 of these Regulations again: "Any person using or keeping for use any motor vehicle in respect of which a permit has been issued by the Director under this regulation who fails to comply with any of the terms or conditions of the permit shall be guilty of an offence."

Paragraph 5:

"For the purpose of paragraph (1) of this regulation "seating accommodation" means any contrivance....."

Well, we all know what that means. The paragraph continues: "whether or not attached to the vehicle or any part of the vehicle and whether provided by the owner or any other person)"

How many make-shift buses have we got in the island? Can the Hon. Minister of Communications tell me that? [Hon. M. E. COX: No.] Well let him tell me that next time he comes into this House. 11.30 p.m.

This offer of 15% rebate is wrong; you are taking people's money and giving it away. As to these Regulations, the Hon. Minister of Communications has admitted that you have not got an efficient service; he has got to admit that. Anybody who went away, can tell you within 15 minutes that we have not got an efficient service.

Within recent weeks I have been going around some of these routes at night; I say that necessity is the mother of invention still; I say that not one of these improvised buses or pick-ups could have thriven if an adequate number of buses had been provided; but you have the Concessionaires waiting to threaten the Government.

You call these improvised vehicles "pirate" buses but I do not know where they got that name from. People who came back from Aruba and other places and having a little money realised that they would eat it out if they did not do something with the money, and so they bought pick-ups and ran them about the country.

I say this: if you have an efficient bus service, if you were putting back something in the business do you think that we would have these "pirate" buses? Mr. Speaker, do you think that some of the people you see packed up in these "pirate" buses would get in them if we had an adequate number of buses? I think it was the hon. junior member for St. Joseph who said that he has seen school children left crying on the road because the buses could not accommodate them.

I am appealing to this Hon. Chamber tonight, and I put it straight to the Hon. Minister, that if he admits that the bus Concessionaires have failed to serve the people, we are on the eve of a break down. I tell you I know that influential people have applied for the concessions, and there will be a lot of rats scrambling in holes [Laughter] It is not that the pick-ups run only on the straight road; and I say that whenever you are reorganising your service the new concessionaires have to provide a proper service for feeder routes.

You have a service to Speightstown on the straight route but what about people up Holder's Hill and so on? You have to re-organise your service; and I sincerely hope that you will not grant concessions just as they are today. Take the Black Rock route; when you had that route you did not have people living in the Belfield area. That is where the pick-ups thrive.

The Minister has said that he will see what is to be done; but they have failed and they are on the eve of a break-down in their negotiations. I do not

know where they are but they will see that the public will travel and get to work on Thursday. If there is no fear as the Minister would say, if he is going to say that there are certain snags which are to be put right, that everything will be all right and you have an up-to-date service, that instead of having 16 buses on a particular route you will have more buses and more frequency in the service, well it is only when that is so that you will take off "pirate" buses.

If you have Ministerial Status and so on, what is the use of bringing in these Regulations? What is the use of the Minister's argument that the Concessionaires have failed? He admits that these pick-ups are doing a good service, that we cannot afford to do without them; but says the Minister, in the interest of appeasing the bus Concessionaires—Well he did not say so in those words.

11.40 p.m.

Let us take as an instance Speightstown, Blades Hill and Balls Corner. Can you imagine Messrs. Dowding Estates Limited or Mr. A. P. Jordan taking up some of the money which they get otherwise and putting new buses on their routes between now and the end of the year? Can you imagine that they will be putting lovely buses on the routes? The Hon. Minister of Communications said that he is not calling upon them to provide buses for carrying parcels. He knows very well that you must cut your cloth to suit your person. You ought to know that you have buses in which you can carry parcels on the shelves. Do you know that the time has come when you must think of a better type of bus to suit the travelling public here?

Human nature is human nature all over the world. Do you think that 18 people will sit choked up in a pickup if they know that they can sit comfortably in a bus; and know that even if they lost one bus another bus would be coming in the next half hour in which they could travel in comfort? Much as I agree with the Government I am going to hammer and hammer to the end these points in order to show the general public that when concessionaires have admitted that their books have shown a loss, that they never showed what their takings were; they have shown us all the other things except that.

Sir, I am wondering whether the Hon. Minister of Communications realises by now that he should accept a postponement of this Resolution. The Hon. Minister tells us that he is doing everything. Why not postpone this for six months? [Hon. M. E. COX. It appears as if you do not believe me.] I do believe you, but do not fool yourself. Let me tell you that not one move is made in this matter. I can anticipate the next move they are going to make and if you keep your ears to the ground, you are bound to know it. It is very rarely that I am with you but I am with you on the stand which you are taking. The Opposition cannot but face the facts and say that you are right. I do not believe there is one hon. member who can say that you have done wrong by deciding not to increase bus fares.

However, you have brought down this Resolution to approve this Regulation at this time and I cannot see any reason for your doing so. It is true that it carries a suspension clause which means that it may take effect six months from now or may be a year. You are saying and have assured us that it will not come into operation until you have an efficient bus service. Why then should there be any fear in your mind? There should be no fear if you are assured of your position. Are you men or mice? Are you assured of your position of running the Government or are you not sure?

I am saying that you should not bring in anything at all to control these pickups. Face the true

position as men and not mice. You have no right to bring this Resolution in and say that you have brought it in so that it will serve as a deterrent to those who might want to go and invest money in a pickup. Do not fool yourself that any of the people buying pickups are buying them to show off; they are buying them to assist them in feeding their family. They are either doing that or selling their houses or mortgaging their land to get money to go to England to work for money to feed their family.

I hope the Hon. Minister of Communications appreciates by now that this Resolution is not necessary at this stage. The passing of this Resolution will not act as a deterrent because you have stated that you are not allowing them to carry passengers in competition with buses, but you are allowing them to carry passengers with luggage. Let me ask you this: Ask anybody if the regular buses now from Sugar Hill do not bring in at the 5 o'clock and 6 o'clock trips in the morning only passengers who have trays? If they do not come with them they would bring in nobody. It is a fact that the first trips by buses which come from the country between 5 and 6 o'clock or 6.30 in the morning bring in only passengers who have trays.

11.50 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed. As a matter of fact, I am going to say this finally: forgetting the argument which I have used, let us only see it this way: you are still negotiating although tomorrow is the dead-letter day. We of the Opposition can aggravate the situation as much as we please but nothing should be done by Government. With all the communications that you have in hand tonight, tomorrow morning you are going to see a lot of rats scrambling for the concessions.

If the Hon. Minister of Communications were at these discussions he would see all kinds of heart failure. The first is angina and the second sign is aneurism. "I do not believe you are not making money," says the Government, "but I will give you 15% as a rebate on gasoline;" that is a sign of weakness.

I beg to move that these Regulations be not agreed to. If you have a view, learn to stick to it. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that I have done my duty in the matter now before us. I do feel that in a matter of this sort we, as an Opposition, have got to face the facts and let the public see where we stand. Therefore, once again I beg to move that these Regulations be not agreed to.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, when there is a crisis—

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member seconding that motion?

Mr. ALLDER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying just now, when there is a crisis the weapon of responsibility is better than the weapon of force. The Government has put itself in a very invidious position because whatever decision it reaches a large section of the public will be vexed. I say that because I am of the opinion that every member of the Government feels that an increase in bus fares should not be carried out.

I have been forced to the feeling that Government is playing more politics on this issue than is generally to be acknowledged. I feel that with the power and influence which the Government has it could have done without playing politics, and led the people in the way, the right and honest path where they should be led.

Mr. Speaker, when these Regulations first came into force in 1950, I was one of those members who,

to use the words of the honourable senior member for the City, threw them through the window. I feel that the arguments used then are just as right today as they were when we first discussed these Regulations. I deduced that from the speech of the hon. senior member for the City.

I hope that honourable members will follow my argument closely and will also observe that I will not base my speech on any past litigation which might have taken place between them in this island, or of any prejudice which one is capable of having because somebody spends his money in acquiring a house or even a plantation. Government's position should not be based on what a person seemingly has heard, because there are no facts to prove the source from which the income is derived.
12.01 a.m.

Therefore I have come to the conclusion after listening to the previous speeches both by the Hon. Minister of Communications and the honourable senior member for the City, that we have wasted a lot of time in introducing argument which should not have been introduced on this matter.

I want to make it clear now that whatever the Government does in this issue I am willing to abide with; if the Government feels that the Concessionaires should be given permission to increase their rates, I agree with the Government, if the Government says that the public cannot bear any further imposition on their income and therefore we will subsidise the Concessionaires directly out of the Treasury, I will also abide by that; because I feel that the Government should realise its strength and influence and do what it should do even if it is criticised in the end, as has happened in the past, when the Government came around to the realisation that the Government is right in what it might have done.

This is the first time that we have seen a Select Committee of this sort appointed by the Government go into matters and report their findings to the House; and the Government has partly disregarded the findings of the Committee comprised of eminent men as its members. The only occasion on which I can remember that Government has turned down a majority report was in connection with the selection of a site for the Fire Station. The House did not accept the findings of the majority of that Fire Committee, but accepted the minority Report.

These "pickups" not only find a reasonable means of employment for quite a number of people who would otherwise have been unemployed, but they also help to maintain quite a few families in this island. That is from the point of view of ownership; but the running of these vehicles has considerably facilitated the trade of hucksters, pedlars and tradesmen who have to travel from all remote corners of the island to come to Bridgetown in order to pursue their daily employment. Whatever you do in the interest of the general public at large, you must permit these "pickups" to continue running.

I have read of the transport services in London and New York and other places in the West Indies; I have also been told that in other colonies although the Government controls the bus services, yet the taxis and other vehicles do a great trade because they offer greater convenience to the public at times than the regular transport service.

Like the hon. senior member for the City I too, Mr. Speaker, would appeal to the Hon. Minister of Communications not to force these Regulations through this Chamber on account of the fact that a large section of the public, (even although the Hon. Minister might feel that this is a most popular method) would be dissatisfied if he were to force the

withdrawal of such buses from the road. As I have said earlier, whatever the decision might be, the Government will find that it is unpopular with a fairly large section of the public.

Sir, I too feel that if the Government did not feel it is necessary to grant this rebate of 15% on the gasoline, the Government would not have made this promise to the Concessionaires; therefore I am forced to the conclusion that the Government has truly been impressed by the Committee's Report.
12.10 a.m.

The Government seems to have been cornered by two decisions: (1) whether to pass on to the public the increase which is asked for in accordance with the report of half cent per section of the route, and (2) whether the Public Treasury should bear it. In my humble opinion, I would not have offered them 15% rebate on petrol which according to the Hon. Minister would come to \$60,000 per annum. It shows a definite weakness and uncertainty on the part of the Government when they agree to give this 15% rebate; and it is not sufficient excuse to say that you offered them that rebate because they have to add new units to their concerns.

You are, in my opinion, capitalising their industry on the one hand, and on the other hand according to the remarks of the Hon. Minister of Communications, they have been making a lot of money and have bought many buildings and plantations. That is confusing. If that is the opinion of the Hon. Minister, that is, the profits they receive from the bus industry have afforded them the opportunity to buy additional dwellings and plantations, then I cannot agree with the Hon. Minister agreeing to this 15% rebate to capitalise their industry. It is weakness and I hope the whole thing will be reconsidered and that justice will be done regardless of who gets vexed.

You have expressed the opinion that bus owners are making a profit and if that is your opinion, are you going to satisfy them to a greater degree by penalising "pirate" bus owners by driving them out of employment? When you do that, you are increasing the suffering to their relatives and dependents. You are increasing the misery on one hand, and assisting others who are getting by alright on the other hand. According to the expression of the Minister you are assisting them to become more affluent and to acquire more properties.

Mr. Speaker, if Government did honestly decide that bus fares should be increased, in my humble opinion, (I am not taking the populace side at all nor am I arguing over the increase) I feel Government is equally as wrong for carrying out their promise of a 15% rebate to the Concessionaires (even although they might have intended that it should be taken directly from the Treasury) as when they increased the postal rates, water rates, electrical inspection fees, customs duties generally (for the addition of C.I.F. cost) chauffeurs' and conductors' licences, increased duties on gasoline, cigarettes, rum, increased charges for the issuance of passports and affidavits, entertainment taxes, increased rent of Government property at the Bay Land, the Pine Estate, Deacons Road, Belfield, the Garrison and elsewhere; and also the intention which Government manifested by bringing to this honourable Chamber legislation to carry out an increase in the hawkers' licences by 100% but which some of us who are free in here were successful in causing the Hon. Minister of Trade to withdraw. There was also the threat to increase school fees and to charge for dressings at the Casualty Department of the General Hospital and also legislation which is at present in the Select Committee stage to increase Liquor Licence Fees and

your Club licences which although the proprietors and business managers will be paying it, when it boils down it will be passed on to the consumers and the general buying public.

I am sorry that the honourable senior member for the City is not in his place now that I am about to review this matter, because I do not like to make statements of anyone behind his back; but I must say that it is the first time since he came into this Chamber that he openly opposed private enterprise.

12.20 a.m.

I should like the honourable member to see the *pros* and *cons* of this matter. Now, it is a fact that those buses are owned at present by a majority of coloured people, most of whom have started from humble origin; rather a motor truck with a top, a single unit bus until they were increased in number. I am told that it is only one of these bus Concessionaires who can be considered as a person of different pigmentation. Hence, I am appealing to honourable members of the Government's bench to pay attention to all the arguments, for the simple reason that they may do harm to a group of persons who should not be hurt, even though you do not give them the permission which they may desire.

I have heard the Hon. Minister say both in his speech today and last Tuesday that there is a group of persons, financially sound and commercially knowledgeable who will be willing to apply for the concessions. I am addressing myself now specially to the Minister of Communications when I say this: have your battles with the present Concessionaires; if you win you win. If you see reason to compromise, compromise; but whatever happens give them first preference in considering the re-issuing of such concessions.

The public suffered worse in the past when internationally, conditions made it difficult for them to run their vehicles. Naturally, there is a lot of money around Bridgetown in the hands of people; and we know that there are many of us who believe in monopolising every possible avenue of money-making in this island. There are some people who monopolise the Sugar Industry, the Banking concerns, the Insurance concerns, and naturally bus concessions are in the opinion of some of them, a lucrative business.

Whether it is so or not it is felt so; and naturally you will get attempts to force the Government to do undue harm to people who have served the public fairly well during trying times because they want the opportunity for themselves. Some of us would add more confusion to the already existing confusion in the hope that in the interval they would come out on top; therefore I repeat that regardless of all political differences of opinion, I am asking the Government that whatever happens in the re-issuing of these concessions not to refrain from considering the applications of the present concessionaires, unless it has been made absolutely difficult for Government to reach an agreement with them.

Now, why I say that I do not like this one-sided approach to this question is due to my observations of the position in recent years. I should like to ask those honourable members who stood and opposed the recommendations for increased fares, not to carry up land values. At least, they are up already. If you are going to say one thing say the other; they are all bound up in the cost of living.

I have heard the argument in here to the effect that land should bring whatever price the purchaser is willing to pay. Absolute freedom or lack of control of the price of land can do more harm than if you permitted the bus Concessionaires to

carry up their fares. But even if that were permitted, it could not do comparatively speaking, one per cent of the harm that the indiscriminate land valuers are doing.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the honourable member is getting far beyond the regulations.

Mr. ALLDER: I know that, sir. I shall try to keep within the regulations. The Electric Corporation is charging a great deal now for months. There are some householders who pay more for electricity than what others pay in their business places. The Telephone Company too—

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the honourable member aiming at?

Mr. ALLDER: I am endeavouring to make some comparison, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think I can permit the honourable member to do that. He is straying beyond the Regulations.

Mr. ALLDER: However, I was just observing that Telephone rates, the cinema and other services owned and controlled by private enterprise have been carried up and you have not heard a howl; nothing was said of it.

I am pleading no special case because I know that a member's speech can be twisted and he can be asked to pay for being honest on an issue. But I make my speech in a general way in order to assist the Government in adopting a more decisive policy in respect of the request of the bus Concessionaires.

12.30 a.m.

If you feel that they do not deserve permission to increase their fares, well say so; if you feel that they can continue to run at all then say so, and do not give them any rebate on the gasoline; because I feel that they should not get it. That is purely assisting them in capitalising their industry, which is wrong; especially when they have been able to purchase plantations and houses out of those profits. If they deserve an increase I do not think it should come directly from the Treasury.

If you give them this lumpsum of \$60,000 the possibilities are that it might be more when you sum up at the end of the financial year. The Hon. Premier has said on occasions that every cent of the people's money has to be watched because of the composition of the Government; certainly the Government could find a more beneficial means of spending this \$60,000. While the Concessionaires are pooh-poohing that amount, it is quite a tidy sum because they were running all the time without it.

I feel that that is very shortsighted because they made a request for an increase in 1953 they have been running up to today and none of them have gone into liquidation. Their units are not very bad because they have kept them in running order; they have continued running their units and the Government has now offered them \$60,000 in rebate on the gasoline. While it is true that the public may not be able to pay increased fares, it may be something unpopular. This is purely a political matter and sometimes you have to do things which do not appear to be so good to the public but in the long run it does them a lot of good.

When the increased entertainment tax was first introduced, a lot of comments were indulged in, but nowadays everybody pays the tax without realising that he is paying it. When the water rates were first carried up a lot of comments were similarly heard. You go all down the line and you will find that the public accepts whatever increases have been imposed upon them. I sympathise with those parents who live in the remote parishes of this island and who have to send one or two children to Bridgetown

by bus. I certainly sympathise with those parents; I heard the Minister of Transport make a Report about that. The alternative to those parents being forced to pull their pockets to send these children by bus, is to carry the schools which are needed to the children and that has been stressed on several occasions in this Chamber. In the country districts where the people would get easier access than they now get to the schools of their choice, those schools are situated in the City of Bridgetown.

As to the Appendix of the Report of the Committee, I would suggest to the Hon. Minister that in regulating the fares for the various sections it would be easier even if you permit increases on the shorter routes, to reduce the cost of the longer routes and stabilize them in their present position. I want to be practical; but I know it is extremely hard on a child who has to come from Pie Corner daily to school, or on workers who have to leave town every day, to pay 32 cents. What I hope to see is a reduction of that 32 cents, even if you have to regain what is lost by increasing the fares on the shorter routes.

To travel to Hastings Rocks cost you four cents I think it is, but the people who travel to Hastings Rocks can pay four cents. The taxis charge five or six shillings, and if you have to pay six cents to go up there from Bridgeown, I do not see that there is anything wrong in that. But as regards the person who has to travel from a long route to Bridgetown on numerous occasions a week they would have to do so by bus; therefore I say give him a reduction and put the increase on the shorter route. The man who has a job in Bridgetown would find it difficult to pay the fare which is charged for the long distance because it represents a great percentage of his daily earnings. Let the people who live in Fontabelle pay 4 cents instead of 3 cents.
12.40 a.m.

Let the people in the Bank Hall districts pay 5 cents, or 6 cents, if necessary; it would not hurt a great deal. I know that in the parish which I represent, there are many youngsters who work in town and have to pay bus fare up and down every morning and evening. I know of a certain family who has three daughters working in town for as low as \$6 a week and they have to pay bus fare from College Savannah to Bridgetown and back every working day. You can therefore imagine what a hole bus fare makes in their earnings.

I am hoping that the Hon. Minister of Communications will take the suggestions which I have put forward into consideration, and if he considers them worthwhile he can make use of them. Personally, I think the Committee which you appointed to enquire into bus fares was not of the best kind; its personnel did not know much of the travelling public nor did they know much of the routes of the Concessionaires. Obviously, the tendency of that Committee would be to sympathise with the investors of capital. It is my humble opinion that that Committee did not go into this matter thoroughly and its findings, in my humble opinion, are incomplete. It is my opinion that a Committee of this sort should have members on it more representative in nature of all sections of the public. Having a Committee like that, when do you expect it to do but to decide in very brief statements that an increase in bus fares is necessary? I think that there was a Mr. Talbot on that Committee. What does he know of the people living in Bank Hall; how often they come to Bridgetown and what is an average of their weekly or daily earnings? You should have on that Committee people who would be able to decide on things

of that sort, particularly when everybody is influenced by their general Statement that because bus fares were not increased since 1939, therefore, there should be an increase. That is a statement which has influenced very many people into believing that there should be an increase in bus fares. I think a mixture of people from all walks in life should have been on that Committee.

As I have said, whatever Government decides so far as these bus fares are concerned I am willing to agree to. If you agree to increase them or not to increase them, I agree with you. To finalise my speech, I must repeat that whatever happens, first preference should be given to the existing concessionaires if they so desire, when you have to issue such concessions in the future. I am warning you not to play into the hand of any small groups, who are just standing by with their money and means to take over these concessions, thereby, causing you to do an undue wrong to a section of people who have served the public even although they may not have served them as well as was expected of them during the trying days of the last war when shortages affected every possible avenue of human existence.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, it will hardly be necessary for me to speak this morning at any great length on this subject; because as recently as last week, I made my position perfectly clear on it, but it is only because we have actually before us now, the regulations which I have been fearing and which I have been notified have been pending, that I am speaking directly on that subject and not on any closely allied subject.

I take it that these regulations were introduced last Tuesday in consequence of the Statement made by the Hon. Minister in question, the hon. senior member for St. Michael on the 26th day of July, of this year in this Chamber, wherein it was stated that the Government intended to introduce in the very near future legislation to prohibit the conveyance of passengers in vehicles, other than in taxis, private cars and in omnibuses operating under a concessionaire agreement.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that in that statement the Government repeated its assurance recently given in this House and in the Press that "pirate" buses will be removed when in the opinion of the Director of Transport, the Concessionaires would have supplied an adequate number of buses to accommodate the public. In the subsequent paragraph of that Statement the Hon. Minister concluded by stating that under the proposed legislation, it will be permissible for vehicles which may be concerned with the transportation of hawkers and their wares to operate under a permit granted by the Director of Highways & Transport in respect of each vehicle for such time and under such terms and conditions as the Director may from time to time see fit to impose.

12.50 a.m.

So I take it that the regulations which we are now discussing were introduced as a result of that Statement of the 26th July, 1955. Now, I think that this whole attitude towards pick-ups and I propose speaking only about pick-ups) is influenced by the misapprehension as to the function that pick-ups perform in this island today.

Perhaps those of us whose views are narrowed by the Metropolitan parish fail to recognise the service which these pickups have been rendering in the Leeward parishes where we have had an inadequate omnibus service. I know the specious argument that has been and will no doubt be again advanced, is

that it is proposed to increase the bus service, and therefore the question of the pickups will not arise. But it is impossible to see such an extension of the omnibus service as to enable these pickups to be dispensed with without such grave hardships to these people who live in the country districts.

I have considered the service which is now being given to the Leeward parishes; and if you were to double that existing service by running one, or by running a half hour service where you are now running an hourly service, those people would still be seriously inconvenienced if pickups were to be taken away from them.

A bus service as we have envisaged it, confines itself normally to a main route; but pickups serve, not only the main routes, but also those routes off the main roads; for instance off Highway 1 and leading in the direction of Trents, Orange Hill and Carlton. One could never contemplate a public bus service large enough to supply every one of those districts; and the people who live in those districts have as great a right to some means of transportation as any of the rest. They cannot afford to provide themselves with private motor cars or taxis as do people who live on the main route.

Having regard to these things, I find it impossible to contemplate any bus service, however extended, which will provide accommodation for those people. It is not until the pickups had started to run that the people in St. Lucy were able to watch a cinema show which people of the Metropolitan parish were able to watch at the Empire Theatre or Olympic Theatre. The last bus leaves Bridgetown for St. Lucy around 6 o'clock p.m. during week days; and Sundays the last bus leaves Bridgetown at 8 o'clock p.m. so you can see what is the unfortunate position of the people from the Leeward parishes who like to visit the City and enjoy an occasional show.

You may say, of course that they have something in Speightstown which looks very much like a garage, in which I understand there is a motion picture apparatus. How many people can that accommodate? Those people want to go to the City, and it is their right that they should be provided with some means of transportation.

Mr. Speaker, you will agree with me that 10.30 p.m. is a reasonable time limit. We have to look at the matter from another standpoint. Pickup owners are in a minority as distinct from the public whom they serve; they have invested their life savings in these machines. What do you expect them to do if and when these regulations are sanctioned?

We are reminded in the suspension clause of the need for a permit. I have something to say with regard to the permits and to the discrimination which we are accustomed to have exercised in this country when it is a question of issuing permits.

Some years ago when buses were being considered for the issue of permits only one type of bus was favoured with permits. People who wanted to go on excursions were permitted to have permits. With regard to luggage vans, you will see that although they have their gearshifts on their steering wheels they are not allowed to carry more than two persons on the front seat along with the driver. But I am told by owners of these luggage vans that other vehicles which are of the same type, but which are not licensed as luggage vans, are allowed to carry two persons in the front seat besides the driver.

As you know, it is only a matter of two years ago that in the case of the taxis they were allowed to take two people besides the driver in the front seat. Formerly it was only one; but they applied when the gear levers were removed from the side;

you will remember how these less modern vehicles were constructed.

Regarding the permits for which application would have to be made, one cannot but fear that discrimination will be practised again as has always been practised in this country. I entirely concede that in issuing a permit you will have to consider what would be a reasonable number for the vehicle to carry; but if you make that number too small that would be another means of driving the vehicles off the road.

I presume that they would not be getting a 15% rebate on the price of their gasoline; therefore if permits were allowed with any sort of discrimination whatsoever, I envisage that these vehicles would surely go out of existence and the people from the country districts would be thereby penalised.

01.00 a.m.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I could hardly believe my ears when I heard the hon. senior member for St. Michael in his opening sentences; I had to make a note of one or two of them. The Hon. Minister counselled us to consider this matter without regard to what the electors of the constituencies might say. Of all members of this House for the hon. senior member for St. Michael to say that, what are we coming to? He is the last person whom we should regard as saying that; do you not think that the people in St. Michael are glad for the numerous standpipes which have been installed in the metropolitan parish?

In so far as the Leeward District is concerned, there is no question of any keen competition at all, because that bus service is so inadequate that the pickups are running a good service. . . . Having regard to the amount of traffic on the road, the Concessionaire has not got the units to satisfy one-third of the demand which there is for public transport along the west coast of this island.

Another statement of the hon. senior member for St. Michael is that these improvised buses have been of immense assistance to the public. I quite agree with that; [A VOICE: They still are.] and the hon. member adds *sotto voce* that they still are. What a poor reward for these improvised vehicles which are of such assistance to the public, if we put directly over their heads the sword of Damocles which is designed to fall at any moment and drive these vehicles out of business?

Personally, if I were the owner of such a vehicle I would sell it when the authorities are satisfied that the bus service has been extended, no longer will permits be granted and these improvised vehicles would have to go off the road. It would not pay them on mornings and evenings to carry people from remote villages to the highways; that would never be economic. The best position of the owners of these improvised vehicles would be to dispose of these vehicles while the selling is good and invest their money in something else which they can hope to carry on indefinitely. They could not carry on under the conditions under which they would have to carry on, not knowing when the Government would decide to restrict their use, or when the time will arrive when, in the opinion of the Ministers, the bus services are made adequate to the needs of the travelling public to which time there will be no means of other transport.

A member of Ministerial rank ask *sotto voce*: "Who said that?" This is what is set out in the Explanatory Note to the regulations:—

"The effect of the regulations will be to restrict the use of any passenger-carrying vehicle (other

than private motor cars, taxi-cabs or motor cycles) unless a permit to operate is obtained from the Director, and if any person operates such a vehicle without a permit he will be liable to prosecution. The Director can impose such terms and conditions as he sees fit or may refuse a permit. It is intended that the Director in deciding whether to grant or refuse permission for such vehicles to operate shall take into consideration, *inter alia*, the availability of transport by a concessionaire service on the route to be covered by the applicant for a permit, and, therefore, as the bus concessionaire services are made adequate to the needs of the travelling public, there will be no need for other forms of passenger transport and the conditions to be imposed will afford protection to operators of concessions."

These Regulations are signed "E. S. S. Burrowes, Acting Chief Secretary"; I feel I am justified in assuming that this explanatory note is not unauthorised and that it has not received the attention of some irresponsible person, but that it is taken to be an explanatory note to the Regulations with which we are concerned. That is why I feel justified in referring to this explanatory note and quoting from it.

As I have said earlier I have, only a week or two ago, spoken very exhaustively on this subject and therefore I do not find myself in a position to be justified in altering my point of view. Rather my point of view has been strengthened since people have been coming to me and making me realise how completely dependent they have become on these improvised vehicles; and if these regulations are passed they will be operating a service entirely on sufferance.

It is all very well to say that there is a suspension Clause in these Regulations, but people cannot run their business like that; they cannot spend money on these vehicles when they do not know at what given time they will be told that the bus Concessionaire services are made adequate to the needs of the travelling public and "out goes you". They cannot continue their business along these lines; and this resolution is the equivalent of the death warrant having been prepared and might be signed at any time. If one sympathises with these people one has a greater feeling and regard for the hundreds of people whom these vehicles serve, and who until these vehicles came on the road had rarely ever seen the City more than twice a year but who can now visit the City every week.

01.10 a.m.

As I have said, one cannot contemplate however extended the bus service may be, that it can be so extended to take the place of the service which these pickups are now maintaining, not only in respect of hawkers and their trays, but in respect of people who come to town and who want transport to take them back home at nights after the regular bus service, and who want to go to places off the regular routes but who cannot afford to travel by two sets of vehicles, even if buses were running to their houses; and by those who cannot afford to get off a bus and take a pick-up to travel to where they want to go.

Sir, I am counselling honourable members who do not travel to remote country districts to think twice before they cause these people who live in the distant areas to be without the one, constituent, reliable form of transport which they have been enjoying for some time, and which the passing of these regulations would inevitably kill. Even with the promise made that they would not be withdrawn until there is an efficient bus service, the effect it would

have is that the people who run pickups would decide it is an unsafe investment and before the sword falls on their heads, they would get rid of their units and would be that the people who patronise pickups would have to walk a couple of miles before they get on a bus route to get transport to where they are going because they cannot afford to hire private motor cars or taxis.

The majority of us around this Table can get in a motor car and in half an hour get to any part of this island, but to some people a car drive is a rarity and something beyond their means to provide for themselves. Let us bear in mind that a pickup is the poor man's taxi.

Sir, I do not think it is in the best interest to make pickup owners to feel that their days for operating their vehicles are numbered, and as from today six months, sooner or later, more likely sooner than later, they would have to go off their routes and the people who travel in them would have no alternative but to go back to the stage to which they long ceased to be accustomed, when they had no means to get to the City at their convenience and to places off bus routes and at times when buses are not normally running. Another thing which you must remember is that these pickups are usually driven by their owners, whereas an omnibus is driven by an employee of a Concessionaire who can only work it in a certain prescribed time. A pickup can carry people at any time of the day or night.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I can sympathise with you and with some other honourable members who at this very late hour of the morning, after having been here so long, are still finding themselves deliberating on a matter like this. Some honourable members have assumed the role of listeners and not as speakers; they are here merely because they have a job to do. The honourable senior member for St. Andrew who is far away from home is still here; the honourable junior member for St. Michael who is not so far away from home, but whom we do not as a rule see here at this time is still here. The honourable junior member for St. George is not very far from home, but those who are committed to his care have got their full complement as caretakers because his wife is not at home and he also is here. The honourable junior member for St. Philip is here with us and we are glad to have him with us, but he has been promised transportation to be made available to him, not in a pickup (those are off the road now) but by the Hon. Minister of Communications; and the honourable junior member for St. John is always with us to assist in times of a crisis.

Mr. Speaker, when a week ago the Leader of the Democratic Labour Party spoke in this House (and I know he would have been here now if he were in the island) he ended his remarks with these words: "this party was not prepared to commit itself on this issue," and to use his own characteristic phrase, he said "we would withhold our fire until we saw the whites with our eyes." We now see the whites with our eyes.

This bus crisis, if it can be called a crisis, has been brewing for some time; according to the remarks made by the Hon. Minister of Communications, as long ago as 1953, and probably earlier than that; even before he was a Minister he well understood what was happening; he had had conversations with the bus Concessionaires and he had made his own and Government's point of view quite clear and had heard their own point of view. However, I charge this Government with a complete mishandling of this whole situation; and I state here and now that it is my view that no quarrel exists between Government and the bus owners, because they are not

Concessionaires now; it is to blow up dust, and the dust which is flying between them does not represent the heat of battle but an all too subtle manoeuvre to deceive the the public of this island.
01.20 a.m.

And the Government has had its attention drawn to it not by the people who are criticising what is happening, but by themselves in the fact that they are willing to take money from the Public Treasury in order to make good a deficit which, according to them cannot exist. They are willing to pay an amount out of the Public Treasury but they are not willing to grant an increase in fares.

I wish to state here now that neither this party nor myself see any reason to champion the cause of the bus owners. Doubtless, they have their own champions; and doubtless those champions will speak and have spoken for them; but I personally believe that they have a case and my belief is based on all that I have heard from the Government's side in connection with this matter. If the bus owners did not have a case there would be no need to bribe them with money from the Treasury; and the fact must be borne in mind that when once you start on the slippery road of a subsidy you will not be able to draw the line.

If you concede \$60,000 or a little more, it may be \$160,000 soon; and since you do not know where to draw the line you cannot, in justice, say: "We will give you 15% but we will not give you the 50% which you have asked for." The Minister of Communications did not tell us all the facts concerning that rebate business. He did not tell us that the bus owners would take 50% but not 15%. I would not give 50, 49, 15 or 1%; but they are quite in order to ask for 5% if you will not draw the line. According to Government's view, it would be substantially, a loss. It is far cheaper from an administrative point of view to grant an increase than to subsidise the bus owners by the underhand method of paying a subsidy.

Next, I am not convinced that the Minister of Communications put this House in possession of all the facts relative to this matter. It is true that he allowed us to know something of what has been going on; but I personally, and this House too do not know what the position will be tomorrow morning; because, considering the time at which I am speaking this is Wednesday now. Are you going to declare a state of emergency? I understand that Messrs. Robert Thom and the Central Foundry, whom I did not know could get buses, have put in their applications and have made out their case.

This House does not know whether we are going to have a state of emergency or not; but I know that in a letter which the bus owners despatched to the Government yesterday, which was the 9th August, they did say that they would be unable to continue to operate after the 10th instant and would be prepared, as stated in their letter, for Government to take over their buses upon terms to be agreed on from the 31st of July. That is the last word from the Concessionaires. They continued in their letter to mention their views of the machinery, at least for the negotiations, which include among other things, arbitrators on both sides and an umpire to straighten out the terms to be agreed on.

Now, here you have a Government which says it is a Labour Government, and is supposed to be activated or motivated by a certain body of political members. I would, therefore, have thought that if a matter came to a head like this, and it even decided in order not to be caught unawares, to use emergency legislation, that your policy for the solu-

tion of the problem would be according to your principles of public ownership and management of the particular service.

I have listened quite carefully to everything that has been said. While the Minister of Communications has said that there is more he can say, nowhere have we seen that they were prepared to live up to what he said were still their principles and that they were going to bring this now unsatisfactory service under public control. That is my view, and I think that that is what they should do.

I am not prepared to say, at this moment, that our party has considered this matter carefully and that what I have said represents our full view on the matter; but I do not know whether, according to our principles, we would see any reason to shy away from taking over this service.

If you were preparing for anything above \$60,000 a year, according to the Minister of Communications' own remarks, you have got to consider for how long you can continue to do it. The task is a simple one; that is, they should act up to their principles and nationalise the service. I do not know what form of ownership they would use, but this I know: that if they fear that, having taken the step of bringing that particular service under public ownership, they might not be able to pay for it, I can assure them that they would not have to pay for it out of the Treasury one time.

A particular portion of the purchase money would be paid over, and if they liked so to do, they could issue bonds at a certain interest, redeemable in so many years; or they may use any other method of acquiring it as a public concern. Then, of course, it would be for them to decide what particular methods they would use to administer the service. They could create a special Authority or they might devise certain powers under the Highways and Transport Act for the administration of the service.

1.30 a.m.

So much for that. Now having skirted away from their principles, they are now before this House trying to take vengeance on a group of people who have not in any way contributed to this crisis; a group of people but for whom this transport muddle would have been even greater, and transport muddle would have even be greater, and to make them pay for what the Government has not done and for what the bus owners have also refused to do.

I have heard it said by the Hon. Minister and by the supporters of this particular Resolution that they are convinced that the Suspension Clause means just what it says; and that no great harm will come immediately to the owners of these luggage vans. Mr. Speaker I am one of those people who do not believe in official announcements made by this Government because of experience which I have had. The head of this Government has said on a public platform that as long as there is a hot hair in his head there would be no bulk shipment of molasses.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: On a point of Order, I have never in my life said that. How could I have said that when I put it on paper that bulk shipment was bound to come?

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member said that at the Parry School pasture during the 1951 election campaign. Well there are still hairs in his head, they are still hot and the molasses is still being shipped in bulk. Time and again more in written than spoken word, that Party has committed itself to free Secondary Education; the latest thing now is that they are pegging the number of children entering the Secondary Schools.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Again I deny that. I will stop replying to the hon. member because whenever he refers to me he tells an untruth.

Mr. TUDOR: On January 15th this year the Premier of this island submitted to the Education Board two proposals. One of them had the object of curtailing the number of groups employed in Secondary Schools and the second was the pegging of the number of admissions to the Secondary Schools. Let him deny that.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If anything went out of my office saying that, I know nothing about it.

Mr. TUDOR: I assume that is so, and proof can be forthcoming. On the 15th January this year two proposals were made by the Education Board with respect to Education. [Hon. M. E. Cox: What has that got to do with it?] Pronouncements made officially cannot be taken at more than face value. I still assert that what I say is true because I have proof for it. Therefore how can we take seriously any attempt on their part to reassure any section of this community that what they say in their published word can be relied on? Let the hon. member say that he does not remember it, but do not let him say that it is not so. I take this stand: I cannot take the word of the Government that these regulations when passed, will not have immediate action and will not be harsh and will not in any way affect people adversely.

I repeat: the constituency which is farthest away from the City is that constituency to and from which quite a lot of travelling is done. We know that a considerable part of the travelling to and from the constituency which I have the honour to represent is done by these vehicles which are offensively known as "pirate" buses but which are luggage vans. I can therefore testify to the fact that the people of St. Lucy and of St. Peter, the parish which Your Honour represents, look forward not to the curtailment of this kind of service but if possible the extension of it. I therefore cannot support or be expected to support any attempt on the part of this Government to penalise the "pick-ups" in order to satisfy the bus owners or even to make their case clear to the Government.

The issue is a simple one. Here you have a Government elected to power on the ground that it champions the weak against the strong, that it looks out for the small man; it is very strange therefore in a test case where the interests of the small man now seem to be of paramount importance, that this Government is now willing not to enforce the discipline which it should enforce on the big or on the strong, but is searching for the weak and most nonresisting on which to enforce its discipline.

01.40 a.m.

I should have thought that so far as their own political support comes, it comes more from the people who drive in and use the pickups than it does from the bus-owners or anybody else. Are they so reckless of their future prospects? Does it no longer matter to them now that in four of five parishes of this island or even more, they run the risk of upsetting a large number of people by a measure which is only indicative?

It is ludicrous for the Minister to claim that Government by introducing these regulations is doing prospective pickup owners a good turn by curtailing and prohibiting any investment which they feel they should make in new ventures of this sort. Mr. Speaker, while it is true that it is part of Government's policy to promote investments, it is not part of Government's policy to pro-

hibit investments or to tell individuals they shall or shall not invest their money in certain ventures. It cannot therefore be a provision of Government to use these regulations as a pattern to other people coming into the trade; and it is certainly not part of their duty to prevent a large number of poor people who cannot rent taxis or who cannot get into buses because the buses are not there to serve them from using the service provided by the pick-ups. It is not their duty to impose this hardship; and it is only cowardly to do it because in doing it, you are running away from the whole issue which is the control that you should exercise over the main transport system to get permanent regularity, efficiency and comfort. When you have done that and when you have really got that situation under control, it would then be time (if that time would come) to bring whatever sector of the whole transport service needs bringing up-to-date or up to scratch.

I do not know the sort of persons whom the Ministers represent or the state of information of their constituents, but it does seem to me to be very strange that the Ministers can sit there and calmly contemplate putting small people out of a livelihood, because that is what they are doing when they bring down these regulations. In whose interest are these regulations? Certainly, they are not in the interest of the vast majority of persons; they are in the interest of the bus owners who are the same people they are prepared to take money out of the Treasury to help. That is what it is, Mr. Speaker. The small persons are going to be crushed and pulled down to help the larger persons in pocket and it is those persons who are in turn going to be helped by commandeering sums from the Public Treasury to subsidise their inefficient service or the smallness of the service which they perform.

Mr. Speaker, I do not care what the honourable senior member for St. Joseph or other members on that side of the Table think of this matter or about such strictures as we have passed on them. This I know, but it is not for me to warn them, that they are doing a lot of harm; more harm than perhaps they themselves understand by forcing these regulations on those people.

Of course, members of the Government are so far removed from reality, they are now living in the clouds, that it is beyond them to understand what it means to deprive a man of his livelihood. But they are not only doing that; they are also depriving a large number of people from getting from their homes to their work in the mornings and back in the evenings by having to wait in the uncertain boat of catching a bus.

Anybody with experience of the Leeward parishes knows that it is only now that the luggage vans have been going into places where the people live that the buses are trying to pursue them. If you were to make enquiries in my constituency, you would be told that there was a time when buses put down passengers at Speightstown, and anybody who lived in any part of Crab Hill would have to get there on foot to their homes no matter how heavily the rain was falling or how hot was the noonday. All of that, to a large extent, is now stopped. Why going into Crab Hill, but because the luggage vans has it stopped? It is not because the buses are now went up and down the parish and started to bring the people near to their homes and to take them into places where buses would not go. Now that the buses are feeling the pinch of competition, and its growth has resulted to bus owners asking Government to

prevent them, this regulation is being imposed on them.

Mr. Speaker, I say this: if you believe in private enterprise, as you say you do, the essence of private enterprise is free competition; therefore, the existence of what is called the "pirate" buses means, first of all that there was a need for it, and secondly, that they would make (and have to a certain extent done so) the concession service more efficient.

It is wrong from any point of view to interfere with the luggage van in the interest of the bus owners. It is wrong because if you do that, you will take away all incentive from the Concessionaires to provide a comfortable, prompt and efficient service. In the second place, you will be depriving a very thrifty people of their means of livelihood and thirdly, you will be depriving a large number of people of the working class of means of transportation which has proved so valuable to them in the past and you will be robbing people out of the confidence which they ought to have in their Government. However, I am convinced that the Hon. Minister has said nothing to convince me that this is a real quarrel between the Government and bus Concessionaires. 1.50 a.m.

I suspect that it is their apparent cowardice which has brought on this crisis. As has been said so often before, if they feel that the Public Treasury is the larder or the cupboard from which the bus owners can be refreshed or replenished, that is only a dexterous method of doing in plain duty what they should be doing; that is, raise the fares. But they are doing what they propose to do in order to save their faces in a political crisis.

You many say that they take up money out of the Treasury and save the bus owners, but they will have saved themselves the odium of raising bus fares. I do not believe in that method. The duty of a Government is to face up to a crisis and to leave the matter to be criticised by the Opposition. It is the Opposition that is to criticise the Government.

If they had felt that a case was made out, they could have come to an agreement between themselves and the bus owners; but such an arrangement would clearly, (if it was to be just) have left free that area of operation controlled and worded by those luggage vans which fulfil a need or meet a requirement; even though it meant that were it not for the luggage vans transportation would be more complicated. If they believed that why do they want to inflict this senseless penalty on these people? Why do they want to deprive these people of their livelihood? It is nonsense. [A VOICE: What else is it?]

These Regulations will prohibit prospective investors in the luggage van business from coming into the service; you are hurting them, and I do not see any attempt on the part of Government to enforce any discipline on the people who ought to be disciplined, and those people are bus owners. Why allow yourselves to squeeze these people because they are small, while you dance around the ring and shadow-box at the bus owners?

I wish to go on record as having no part in this attempt to impose these Regulations. I wish, at the same time, to absolve all the members of my Party in this Legislature from any responsibility whatsoever, and to let the public know that we regard it as a wicked and despicable thing to penalise the small people, whose only crime is that they are helping a lot of poor people to travel around to and fro in a feasible manner, and in a manner which confers actual benefits on the community in which they live.

The question that this Resolution be not agreed to was put and resolved in the negative on a division as follows:—

Noes: Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mrs. BOURNE, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. VAUGHAN and Mr. MILLER,—10.

Ayes: Mr. TUDOR, Mr. ALLDER,—2.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative on a division as follows:—

Ayes: Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mrs. BOURNE, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. VAUGHAN and Mr. MILLER,—10.

Noes: Mr. BRANCKER, Mr. TUDOR, Mr. ALLDER—3.

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next 16th instant, at 3 o'clock p.m.

Hon M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next the 16th instant, at 3 o'clock p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

2.05 a.m.