THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1954—55

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 16th August, 1955.

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

Present :

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, (*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. J. A. HAYNES, B.A., Mr. E. St. A HOLDER, Mr V. B. VAUGHAN, HON. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meetings of 23rd and 28th June, 1955 respectively having been printed and circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

BILLS RETURNED FROM OTHER PLACE

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following:—

The Legislative Council have the honour to return to the Honourable House of Assembly the Bill intituled—

"An Act relating to terms of tenure in respect of small holdings and providing reasonable security of tenure for tenants thereof and for purposes incidental thereto or connected therewith." It has been signed by the honourable senior member presiding and is dated 11th August, 1955.

Also from the Honourable the Legislative Council the following:—

The Legislative Council have the honour to return to the Honourable the House of Assembly the Bill intituled

"An Act to consolidate and amend the Acts of the Island relating to keeping and auditing of public accounts." With the amendments as shown on the paper. It has been signed by the honourable senior member presiding and is dated 9th August, 1955.

Also I have received the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank Report and Accounts dated 30th June, 1955. Also a letter from the Acting Deputy Clerk applying for leave of absence owing to illness.

LEAVE TO ACTING DEPUTY CLERK

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that leave be granted to Mr. D. A. Banfield from his duties for today.

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

The question that Mr. D. A. Banfield be granted leave from his duties for today was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Mr. R. C. Chapman be appointed to act as Deputy Clerk for today's meeting.

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

The question that Mr. R. C. Chapman be appointed to act as Deputy Clerk for today's meeting was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS on behalf of the Hon. Premier: I am commanded by His Excellency to lay —

Message No. 23/1955 from His Excellency the Acting Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly regarding the new Combined Christ Church Foundation School.

MESSAGE NO. 23/1955

His Excellency The Acting Governor
To
The Honourable The House of Assembly

His Excellency the Acting Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that the Secretary of State for the Colonies has approved a grant up to a maximum of $240,000 from Colonial Development and Welfare funds towards the construction and equipping of a new combined Christ Church Foundation School.

2. An amount of $400,100 is included in the Estimates of Capital Expenditure for 1955—56, Part II, Head IV—Education, item 6 for this project and

includes token provision of $100 for the purchase of land. Revised plans for the new school have been prepared to meet an estimated total cost of construction and equipment of $340,000.

3. The proposals for acquiring the land required for the new School involve—

(a) the acquisition of seven plots of privately owned land adjoining Church and School property;

(b) the exchange of certain property owned by the Church and property vested in the Governing Body of the Christ Church Foundation Schools.

As regard (a) negotiations are in train for the acquisition of this land.

4. In respect of (b) the following proposals have been submitted to and have been approved by the Governing Body of Christ Church Foundation Schools and the Church authorities:—

(i) The Government to provide a suitable Rectory on the site of the existing Boys' School and allow the Church the use of the material etc. of the School Annexe (which will be demolished) for the purposes of building a Church Hall;

(ii) the Church to reserve a small area at the eastern end of the Rectory lands on which to erect a Church Hall. The Rectory building and the remainder of the Rectory lands to be taken over by the Government including a strip of land approximately 12 feet wide running the whole length of the Rectory on the opposite side of the road;

(iii) the difference in value of the exchange of the two properties to be made up by the Government by a cash payment;

(iv) the Government to acquire from the Church the Memorial School Hall and lands the remainder of the Glebe lands required for the purposes of the new School.

5. The following valuations in respect of this transaction have also been accepted by the Governing Body of the Schools and the Church authorities:

		$
(1)	(a) Valuation of existing Rectory and outbuildings *excluding land*	14,400.00
	(b) Valuation of Memorial School *excluding* land	4,800.00
	(c) Total area of all Church lands required (including land on which Rectory and Memorial School stand) —— 332,965 square feet averaged at 13½c. per square foot	45,215.00
		64,415.00
		$
(2)	(a) Valuation of land on which Boys' School stands — approximately 24,800 square feet valued on same basis as (c) above	3,360.00
	(b) Value of demolished materials from the existing Boys' School to be handed to the Church	960.00
	(c) Value of the new Rectory converted from the existing Boys' School	24,000.00
		28,320.00
	Difference in valuations—to be paid in cash to the Church	36,095.00

6. The Government is advised that, although the existing Christ Church Boys' Foundation School is vested in the Governing Body of the School, the Governing Body has no power of sale in respect of the property, and that it will accordingly be necessary to seek the approval of the Honourable Legislature for the sale or exchange of this property. It will also be necessary for the Church to obtain the approval of the Honourable Legislature for disposal of the glebe land.

7. In order that the works programme of the Public Works Department shall not be disrupted it is desired to begin the construction of the School during September. In the circumstances, the sanction of the Honourable the House of Assembly is sought for the Government to proceed with the construction of the new Christ Church Foundation School pending the conclusion of the legal formalities and the enactment of the legislation to which reference is made in paragraph 6 above.

R. N. TURNER,
Acting Governor.

Government House,
Barbados,
15th August, 1955.

(M.P. 4003/S.20/T.1)

Annual Report of the Barbados Police Force for the year 1954.

Statement of Revenue and Expenditure of the Barbados Savings Bank for the year ended 31st December, 1954.

Quarterly Return of Transactions in Rum to 30th June, 1955.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 5 Order, 1955.

REPLIES

Hon.C. E. TALMA: Reply to Question No. 26 asked by Mr. J. C. Tudor regarding ex-gratia payments to workers displaced by bulk shipment of fancy molasses.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. M. E. COX: Resolution to place the sum of $30,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955—56, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1955—56, No. 20, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Resolution to place the sum of $16,200 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955—56, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1955—56, No. 21, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to approve the grant of a sum of $1,200 as a gratuity to the estate of the late Alfred Gittens, former Messenger and Library Attendant of the House of Assembly.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of $6,600 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955—56, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1955—56, No. 22, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to place the sum of $320 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955—56, Part I, Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1955—56, No. 23, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon M. E. COX: Resolution to place the sum of $7,000 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. 24, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

3.25 p.m.

SUSPENSION OF RULES 88 & 89

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, with your permission certain Resolutions were circulated for today's sitting of the House. The reason for that is that this House hopes to adjourn today for a few weeks and there are certain of these items which are pressing. Two of these money Resolutions are considered to be urgent and we would like to get through with them. I am therefore asking leave to move for the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 in order to deal with these Resolutions in all its stages today.

There being no objection leave was granted the Hon. Minister.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Rules 88 and 89 be now suspended.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the colony.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply and that it be an instruction to the Committee when the House is in Committee to deal with the Resolutions of which notice has been given earlier today.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE NO. 17

Visit of Princess and Civil Aviation

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is a Resolution for the sum of $4,950. It is a small Resolution and I think we can pass it as it stands, without dealing with the Head separately The first Item is a revote of $50 in connection with the visit of Her Royal Highness Princess Margaret and the next Item is an amount for $3,800 for the purpose of strengthening and replacing the Airport fence at certain points.

We have had no end of trouble in replacing this fence due to the fact that persons who graze their animals on a part of the area cut loose the fence from time to time and soon after it has been reinstated so as to get to the grazing area. Some time ago we were lucky to avoid an accident; I think it was a sheep, that ran across the runway when one of these American planes was taking off with emigrants for the U.S.A. We have blasted the hills in order to make it impossible for them to get over to the grazing area; but whatever we have done they have still found it possible to get across.

It has been decided to strengthen that part of the fence and secondly to employ two watchmen to watch the area in order to prevent these people from cutting the fence and wending their way across the runway.

This is regarded by the Director of Civil Aviation as a very serious thing, in that if at any time a plane touches down and an animal is on the runway it might cause the plane to be damaged and a number of lives might be lost. It is felt that in addition to these things, stronger measures should be taken to avoid any accident which is likely to be caused by straying animals.

I do not think that there is anything more which honourable members would like to know, but if any questions are asked so far as it lies in my power I will endeavour to answer them. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

3.35 p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Hon. Minister in charge of this Resolution is satisfied that this is the right kind of material for the keeping out of small stock. Seawell is very much wind swept; and I do know that any sort of metal is liable to bear erosion unless it is properly treated.

Although we are protecting that fence from being cut by the employment of two watchmen, it is still a fact that the rusting of it will continue, and I hope some attention would be paid to it. In former years they used a wallaba post and pigeon fence, but of course that may be more easy for people to pull down. However it is just a matter of your seeing what is the right kind of fence to use up there, because it is a fact that the sea air plays a great havoc with metal fences in that area.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I promise the hon. member to take the matter up with the Director of Public Works. However, I feel that the Director is satisfied that this is the best type of fence.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: I see that you are employing these two watchmen only on a temporary basis. If somebody is continually cutting the wire, I think the Hon. Minister should consider appointing them permanently; because as soon as you take them off, the cutting and the destroying of that fence will continue, but if the people know that these watchmen are employed permanently they will cease to cut that fence.

Hon. M. E. COX: I would like to say in reply to the hon. member that we are just trying out this idea. If it is necessary to employ them on a permanent basis, by all means they will be employed permanently.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to speak after the Hon. Minister but I would just like to say that it does appear to me to be a waste of time for you to be every now and then having to replace the fence which is regularly cut there as intimatd by the Hon. Minister. And it is a much worse feature after you replace such a fence that you still have to employ watchmen to watch it.

I am wondering if the regulations of the Airport are fully enforced, because in that part of

the district it is not so to speak a great thoroughfare, that is to say there are not large villages around the Airport where you can say that you get a regular passage of people. That being so, you can better enforce your regulations there than in a place where you have hundreds of people passing every day.

The fact is that you should emphatically state that on the eastern or southern side of the runway no stock at all should be permitted. If, as the Hon. Minister says, the sheep get away and run across the runway and therefore are liable to cause damage when a plane comes in, I feel that regulations should be enforced to say that no stock whatsoever should be permitted in that area for grazing purposes. There should either be impounded or their owners prosecuted, because it is true to say that if you allow them to traverse the area you endanger passengers and planes.

I cannot see that besides your spending money to replace the fence which every now and then is cut, you must also pay two watchmen to watch it. You should either do away with the replacement of the fence which because of sea sprays rots out regularly along with being cut by passerbys as you have said, and employ two watchmen permanently; or you should see to it that the regulations are fully enforced and that a suitable type of fence is put up which would not need replacements regularly.

In my opinion you cannot have both. I do not know how temporarily these two watchmen would be employed; the Hon. Minister has not said. The amount set down here is for $1,100. I do not know if that means that these two watchmen will be employed for the balance of the financial year: I would like that to be made more explanatory.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE NO. 18

Education and Fire Station

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this next Resolution is for the sum of $23,732 to supplement the Estimaes 1955—56 Part 2—Capital. The items are set out separately. The first is for three lots of expenditure under Head IV—Education; but the greatest sum of expenditure is for the Fire Station which comes under the other Head — Head VII—Miscellaneous.

With respect to the $3,000 to be voted for the erection of a Library and two class rooms at the Lodge School, which is the first Item, the note sets it out quite clearly. This amount is required for extra excavation so as to provide reinforcement to the foundation in order to make a satisfactory job; and you could not have seen that until you had started the excavation.

The second Item is for the St. Joseph (Western) School, and it is for certain laboratory fittings. According to the note, the Director of Public Works has now received an account from the Crown Agents for $187.30 in respect of those laboratory fittings ordered for that school. The final detailed cost of those figures has exceeded by $23.21 the provision which remained in the vote and supplementary provision of this amount together with the unexpended balance of $164.09 is now required.

The next is for the Princess Margaret School and the note explains quite fully what has happened. In that particular instance it is purely a question of a revote.

As regards the Fire Station, hon. members will see set out clearly why we are asking for this amount of roughly $20,000. The note reads as follows:—

(4) The total estimated cost of this project was $294,300. An amount of $15,923 was spent in 1953—54 and the balance of $278,377 voted during 1954—55. The total estimated expenditure to 31st March, 1955 as shown in the 1955-56 Estimates was $271,300 and the estimated balance of $23,000 was revoted in the same estimates. The actual expenditure at 31st March, 1955, was $251,717 leaving an available balance on the original vote of $42,583. Of this only $23,000 as revoted in the 1955-56 Estimates and the revote of the remaining $19,583 is now required to pay outstanding accounts together with certain equipment and installations not yet completed and for the payment of a final portion of land which is still being negotiated.

I do not think there is really anything complicated about this. If there is any matter arising out of this vote, hon. members can ask me. Frankly, I am not going to answer all sorts of questions. In accordance with the usual procedure in which Items under a particular Head may be voted separately, I beg to move that Head IV—Education, stand part.

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

3.45 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, what strikes me as funny about these revotes is that Government wants all the money that was originally estimated. It is peculiar that you should want every cent of the money that you originally estimated for. If the School is finished, you should be able to say where this $661.23 is. These projects are finished finished as you know; and it only means that if you want $19.57 more you will have to come back to the House for it.

Can the Hon. Minister say whether all the accounts for the Fire Station and Princess Margaret's School are now in. [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: According to the instructions, yes.] What I am concerned about is this: what is the object of coming back here in another couple of months with another Supplementary Resolution for this, when if you had just waited a little longer you would have been able to say that you want so much to complete this Fire Station.

The Fire Station is an expensive building and nobody wants to reflect on the vote of the House, but it is a few thousand dollars which might come with good grace from the Department. But to be able to say that you want $19,583 I do not think that you should be so exact; it does not look right to me.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I think that this Committee should take the opportunity to compliment Major A. G. Bradford on the work which he has effected at the Fire Station, and also to commend him for the wonderful display which he has been able to put on for the people at the opening of the new building.

I was one of those who strongly opposed the expenditure on that building because I felt that it was too much; and also because I thought that the site was not the best. But inasmuch as my opinions have been overruled and the building is now up, I must say that it certainly is an admirable building; and the improvements which are there desire the expression of appreciation for the officer who is responsible for such things.

As regards the additional class rooms for the Lodge School I can substantiate the Hon. Premier's remark on this issue; because I saw the foundations when they were being laid. It is surprising to see

the difference in change which the workmen met while digging.

There were several pockets in which you got stone higher on one side and then a sudden decline on the other which had to be straightened out. The people who were doing it experienced some difficulty.

What I prefer to see is that instead of voting $26,000 for three additional class rooms, the Hon. Premier should have been introducing legislation to give that school the amount of living space for which they were asking. The Hon. Premier has to consider that this school accommodates about three or four parishes in that area; and there is a very big waiting list from which hundreds have to be turned back every school year because there is no room; and the people should have been taken on now that work is being carried out.

It would have been better to give it three or four additional class rooms and have it finished altogether in view of the fact that it is a Boarding School and you have to make accommodation for the boarders.

When the Blackman's School was being built, not a workman from St. John or any of the other parishes was able to get employment on the construction. The edict was, that all the people from that area must be employed in the construction of the school; but now that the work is being carried on at Lodge, you find that the workmen of St. John find it much more difficult to get employment. I do not know who has ordered that policy, but it certainly does obtain.

On the first occasion I went there, I noticed that nearly all the workmen on the job were people who lived outside the parish of St. John. I personally, have no control over that; but for the purpose of the smooth running of such works, as much satisfaction should be given to the people concerned. and an order should be given that the general ruling which was given in respect of the building of Blackman's School should also be carried out when work is being carried on in other parishes.

I do not know if I can make an appeal to Hon. Ministers in this respect, but I hope that the Director. of Public Works will remember that formerly in certain parishes most of the workmen were employed from the immediate area, and that he should put the same policy into practice when he goes to other parishes.

Other than that, I quite appreciate the attempt by the Government in coming to the aid of the Lodge School at last; it has been several years that we were asking Government to come to our rescue. While this can only be termed as a piece meal method to what is really needed at the school, I hope that in the next Estimates Government will come down with further provision to be made to give the school the accommodation which it now needs.

3.55 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Although I do not agree that a member of the House of Assembly because he is a member for a particular parish should, (if I may quote a Guianese gentleman who used to favour us with his political activities in Barbados some years ago) be *ipso facto* a member of the Governing Body, nevertheless I know the honourable member has so great an interest in the Lodge School that he has accused me on the floor of this House of not being sufficiently interested in the Lodge School as to pay it a visit. Well, I tried to amend my ways and I have visited the Lodge School along with Captain Tomlin and the Assistant Director of Education and so on.

I agree with what he has said generally, but if we have turned down the Lodge School at any time we have sometimes turned down Harrison College and the Christ Church Foundation School also, because of the necessity of seeing how far the money will go between them.

I take the liberty now of saying more fully what I should have said last Tuesday or on some other occasion when the honourable junior member for St. Lucy made one of his characteristic untrue statements about myself, as to say that he could not believe anything which the Government or any member of the Government said, because we say one thing and promptly proceed to do the reverse.

The tolerance which you and the Speaker have shown members of this House is something for which we are grateful; but I suppose I cannot let it go by that anything could be more untrue than that accusation by the honourable member for St. Lucy. What the honourable member was referring to is a perpetual habit of certain members in taking a little, —when not completely fabricating something which never existed,) of the truth and twisting it. I say no more since that honourable member is not in his place.

He accuses me of being a member of the Government which says that we are willing to give free secondary education, while on the other hand we are saying that there must be a maximum number in school. Long before Ministerial status started the Lodge School had its documents and requirements completed with the Department of Education as regards expansion and the rest of it. As to the Library, I myself told a distinguished member of the Other Place who is always very keen to push the cause of the Lodge School that I would not be prepared to do anything in the Estimates for the Library until I saw a few old Lodge Boys giving books to the Library. Then the Government would come forward; and gradually the Lodge School would come into its own when we had helped other schools with a Library.

On this question of class room accommodation, I have before me a memorandum sent to me and the Department of Education on the question of extra staff and extra accommodation. The question of the Library does not come in this particular matter.

Instead of it being true that any member of the Government wanted to limit the number going into a particular school, hon. members know how we have said that we would teach under a Breadfruit tree rather than turn children back. What happened was that the Governing Body of the Lodge School wrote to the Department of Education and asked about class room accommodation. They suggested that if added accommodation were made they could have another stream added to the Lodge School, pointing out that one form was running not merely into the 30's but into te 50's; and the Department agreed that they had made out a case. The expression was used that the Director of Education agreed that you should have these two additional classrooms and you could have up to 390 or 400 provided you did not lower the standard of entry.

I will have to see about the extraordinary arguments appearing in the Press by people who ought to go back to school. On this question of the number of boys. the Director of Education has officially acknowledged that with the development of the School Lodge School is streamed with a maximum total of 399 pupils and it does not seem that that development can be postponed much longer.

The Governor-in-Executive Committee agreed that if you added these extra class rooms, you should have additional graduate teachers and you should allow the school to take up to 390. I had a meeting

with the Headmaster of the Lodge School, the Director of Education, the Hon. Dr. Massiah and the Secretary of the Board and we agreed to go ahead on that basis. But the hon. junior member for St. Lucy is accusing me of fixing a maximum beyond which people would not be admitted; I assure the hon. members for St. John that that is not so, because although the hon. junior member for St. John has not spoken he is equally interested and therefore would forgive me if I appear to be personal. I have said harsh things about Harrison College which I have not said about the Lodge School, and Harrison is my old school; I have no bias in favour of one school as against another.

4.05 p.m.

The Lodge School made out a case, the Department agreed with them and I agreed with the Department; and as a result of that, we are doing for the Lodge School what we think is right and can afford to do at present. I can assure this Committee that the position of Lodge School is being taken care of in the same way as any secondary or elementary school.

Before I sit, I wish to say that I appreciate that in this respect the hon. senior member for St. John is not just talking as a politician, but as a representative of St. John who is interested in the educational institutions of that parish.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I am going to make a point which I forgot to make when I first spoke, and I do not think it is necessary for me to get a reply to it, but I think it should be made. Here are we after passing money for a particular school, hearing that on digging the foundations you discovered these pockets in the soil; you must have had buildings erected already in the vicinity, and I take it that this is an addition to some of the buildings which you have already there

Do I understand by this that no attempt was made to test the foundations before the estimates were made? That is the conclusion which one is bound to come to on reading the Addendum. Should you not have found out what were the foundations there before you made out your estimate? That is what you claim you did. However, if the disaster which befell the Combermere School has caused them to be cautious, at least that is a blessing in disguise up to that point.

I sincerely hope that it is not a case of slackness on the part of the Department in not testing the foundations before you got your estimate. It is a thing which should be tested first. Do you mean to tell me that this little piece of land is so different to the other land in the vicinity on which you have erected buildings?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I assume that if you have buildings at the Lodge School and you have a record of them, you will assume that if you had to go say 20 feet deep for the foundation for them that you will also have to go the same depth for your foundation for this building; but occasionally you come across a pocket or two in land around which you are building.

I am suggesting that it is quite possible of course, to drill holes to see what are your foundations for a building you propose to erect although it is alongside other buildings; but how many are so cautious as to do that. Even in private life you do not do it. I do not know if hon. members have been so cautious now as to have their windows boarded up knowing that you may expect a hurricane at any time.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I really mentioned that point so that anybody reading it will see that when you are constructing buildings in Barbados, that you may come across an entirely different subsoil alongside sites where you have buildings erected already.

Mr. ALLDER: I can assure the hon. junior member for the City that an unusual state obtains up there at the Lodge School as regards foundations. I saw them myself when I was taken there. You get solid stone, and underneath it you get soft clay.

It is approximately 20 years now that no building construction was carried on in the area; therefore the present Director of Public Works could not be acquainted with the soil and foundations where they proposed to construct this new building. As I have said, they are putting down strong foundations for this building, and hon. members can only regret that when foundations for Combermere School were being prepared they did not take the care that they are taking now in the erection of this building at the Lodge School. I think everybody should be glad to hear what care is being taken now in seeing that they are proper foundations for this new building.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Before the question is put, I should like to say that quite recently the Fire Officer has pointed out that in case of a fire at the Lodge School there is a death trap. Because of that a Resolution which will be put before the Executive this week, will shortly be coming down for about $3,000 or $4,000 to make certain alterations at the Lodge School. I therefore want hon. members to know that we will be coming soon again with a Resolution to provide for proper staircasing and so on at the Lodge School.

Mr. VAUGHAN: At the risk of being superfluous, Mr. Chairman, I must rise to say that I am glad to hear what the Hon. Premier has just said. I do know that at a meeting of the Governing Body we discussed the matter and it is some months now.

We were told that this was estimated for and sent down to Government and I was rather surprised on reading this Resolution to see that it was not included in this vote. I am glad to hear the Hon. Premier say it would be soon attended to, because I consider a fire hazard is something urgent and more urgent than anything dealing with foundations.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1955—56, NO. 19

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker,—The next Resolution is for the sum of $9,250. As is stated in the Addendum:—

Certain land, about 37½ acres in all, lying immediately to the north of the Waterford Cross Road owned by the Government, has recently become available for its use. It is proposed to use the land for agricultural research into such matters as the economics of small scale agriculture, irrigation practices, cultivation practices, spacing, soil conservation measures, and varieties. The results of this experimental work will be disseminated through the Agricultural Extension Service.

The total cost for the remainder of this year is $12,250, made up as follows:

Non-recurrent	Roads, suck-wells etc.	$ 2,450
Recurrent	Salaries, field staff ..	900
	Preparation of land	1,480
	Establishment and care of cane crop ..	2,220
	Weeding	1,000
	Fertiliser (including experiments) ..	650
	Food crops. Establishing and reaping	1,950
	Reaping etc. of cane crop	900
	Sundries and contingencies	700
		$ 12,250

Of this amount, a sum of $3,000 has been made available from funds voted under Head XXI, Department of Science and Agriculture, Item 44, Contingencies. This expenditure was immediatly required for such items as weeding and fertiliser, in order to safeguard this year's return from the land, and would be necessary whatever the agricultural use to which the land is put.

Expenditure on this land in a full year for the purposes indicated is estimated at $10,750. Revenue for the remainder of the current year is estimated at $5,200, leaving a net deficit of $7,050, and in a full year at $7,100, leaving a net deficit of $3,650.

As honourable members will see, the Addendum is very full. It sets out all the material points; but I think it is my duty to refresh the minds of honourable members on some aspects of the subject. As honourable members would recall, under the (New) Agricultural Extension System, the island is divided into three Provinces:

The Southern Province comprises the biggest parishes: St. Michael, Christ Church and St. Philip with 10,642 Peasant Holdings.

The Central Province comprises St. Andrew, St. Joseph, St. George and St. John with 7,429 Peasant Holdings.

And the Northern Province comprises St. Lucy, St. Peter, St. James and St. Thomas with 9,649 Peasant Holdings. Each Province is under the control of a Senior Peasant Agricultural Instructor who is in charge of the Agricultural stations in the area and also the Instructors in that area.

Honourable members will recall that although there are six agricultural stations in the island there is only a limited area of land available for experimental purposes at the District Agricultural Stations. But few experiments can be laid down at the same time because of the limited area of the stations without upsetting data now being obtained concerning the basic economics of agriculture on small holdings.

Much more rapid progress could be made if an additional *area of land* of say 30—40 acres were made available even on a temporary basis so that a large number of experiments could be laid down to obtain urgently needed information in a comparatively short time.

There is a long Memorandum which sets out this (New) Agricultural Extension System and I think it only appropriate that I should remind honourable members of the salient points. This Memorandum has been prepared by the Director of Agriculture, and states *inter alia* that a considerable portion of the island's available land is held by peasants.

In the year 1947 the total acreage of land held by peasants was 17,282 acres and of this total about 14,000 acres were arable. It will, therefore be seen that about one fifth of the total arable area of the island is in the peasants' hands, and it is felt that this land should be cultivated to its optimum productivity so as to cope with our ever increasing population.

Now, these are attempts to go into research of small scale agriculture which will be demonstrated to peasants by agricultural instructors in an island-wide effort to develop small scale agriculture under the (New) Agricultural Extension System. These demonstrations will reveal such important factors as extent of ratooning, use of fertilisers, manures, soil conservation measures and varieties etc. All those are the finepoints of agriculture which peasants need to know a great deal of.

The object of utilising the 37½ acres of land lying immediately to the north of Waterford Cross Road is ultimately to disseminate the results of the experimental work proposed to be carried out there through the Agricultural Extension Service, and appertains to all peasants; both those who grow canes and those who engage in the growing of food crops as one of the essentials of agriculture.

For the last period (1940—1953) the average number of tons of canes per acre reaped were as follows:—

ESTATES	PEASANTS	DIFFERENCE
M.29.01	20.57	8.44

Sir, the amounts for expenditure are all set out in the Addendum. The Non-recurrent, including roads, suck-wells etc., total $2,450; while Recurrent, including salaries, field staff, preparation of land, establishment and care of cane crop, weeding, fertiliser (including experiments), Food crops, Establishing and reaping, reaping etc. of cane crop, totals $9,100; sundries and contingencies are set at $700, making a total proposed expenditure for the remainder of this year of $12,250.

You will see in the Addendum that the amount of $3,000 has been released from the Contingency Vote in order to enable certain vital work to be proceeded with.

The expenditure on this land in a full year for the purposes indicated is estimated at $10,750. The Revenue for the remainder of the Current Year is estimated at $5,200 leaving a net deficit of $7,050, and in a full year at $7,100 leaving a net deficit of $3,650.

This work is essential and we are asking that these amounts of $6,800 and $2,450 be granted so that the work of agricultural research might be proceeded with and also the very valuable information to guide the peasants for the better utilisation of their land to be secured.

I beg to move that this Resoluton do now pass.

Hon. R. G. MAPP. I beg to second that.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I support the Government in their attempt to utilise this parcel of land in the way in which they intend; but there is one evil the Government will have to seek to remedy, and that is: the Government's treatment of the unestablished staff. Some of these workmen have worked for a long time with the Government. They are not entitled to any pension; but they are looking forward that the Government will agree to give them something at the end of their years when they are no longer able to be employed. The procedure is that there is a long drawn out investigation which sometimes takes years to complete. I want to draw the attention of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture a certain instance, which has been my experience.

There was a certain man who used to be a member of the unestablished staff of the Home Agricultural Station. He was laid off because of his age; and since that date he has been constantly coming to me desiring to know what help the Government intends to give to him. My colleague tabled a question here in connection with the matter and neither he nor that man has heard anything about it yet. That former member of the unestablished staff was under the delusion that he would be taken care of by the Government. I want the Government to take care of the unestablished staff. If you are going to give them a gratuity you should do so as early as possible and do not keep them in suspense.

4.25 p.m.

I feel that a different and better system should have been devised by this Government to deal with the servants of the unestablished staff. These people do a lot of hard work in the Government's fields around, and I think a greater amount of attention should be paid to them especially when they get old.

I hope that the few remarks I have made for those poor voiceless members of the unestablished staff will reach the right ear, and that better consideration will be given to these people. I believe that by the labour laws in existence on the plantations now the plantations are supposed to provide for a pension or gratuity for their employees who work there for a long time and the Government should treat their workers better than how the plantation owners treat theirs.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Those who have listened to me on the floor of this House touching the matter of small scale agriculture in this island will know how welcome a Resolution like this is to me. I am going to quote a sentence from this Resolution as follows:—

"It is proposed to use the land for agricultural research into such matters as the economics of small scale agriculture, irrigatio npractices, cultivation practices, spacing, soil conservation measures and varieties. The results of this experimental work will be disseminated through the Agricultural Extension Services."

There is no more significant proposed experiment than this. In the colony of Trinidad a similar experiment has been going on now for some years in small scale farming, in order to discover the basic foundation of such a scale of farming that would make a paying concern to the cultivators. There is a lot of small scale peasantry throughout the British West Indies; but at present it is almost a total failure as far as economic results to the cultivator are concerned. It is a total failure because of the fundamental ignorance of the small scale farmer with regard to the essentials of economic farming.

There is a wide spread superstition (I call it so) that the size of a holding best determines the economic value of it. That has been disproved time and time again in different parts of the world; and it has been disproved in the West Indies by the Trinidad experiment. But I must warn the Minister that one of the essential things in order to discover the possibility of proving that small scale agriculture can be economic, is that the trial of this experiment be undertaken by a capable manager.

The Manager of the Trinidad experiment was a man fanatically interested in proving that small-scale agriculture in the West Indies can be an economic venture for the small holder. He was passionately interested in demonstrating that and, so far, his experiments have gratifyingly established that it is totally possible that small-scale farming will pay.

I have heard it argued time and time again that if you cut up the estates in Barbados, poverty and ruin will result; I agree with that up to a point. If you cut up estates and leave them to be farmed with the traditional outlook and the traditional ignorance of the average West Indian peasant as far as agriculture is concerned. of course there will be ruin resulting; but eventually in the not too distant future, small-scale agriculture must be the foundation of West Indian economy; and that is why Colonial Governments in these parts have been mainly interested in agricultural experimentation where the peasant is concerned.

We, in Barbados, have been less so interested throughout the years than most other West Indian colonies. There have been Land Settlement Schemes taking place throughout the West Indies, and many of those Schemes have proved to be economic failures. They have proved to be economic failures because there have not been any conscious or studied attempt on the part of the Government to make them otherwise. The agricultural education of the peasant is a thing which. if practised in the West Indies with Land Settlement, will never be a failure.

I welcome this Resolution perhaps more than any other Resolution which has come before this House because its implications are revolutionary. We cannot envisage the birth of this experiment throughout the area unless we see it culminating in the widespread multiplication of the present movement as the foundation of West Indian economy. I warn the Minister that merely to undertake this matter as a cane-farmer scheme will prove to be a failure. In Barbados we cannot think of anything but cane-farming; and we feel that if it is not a question of cane-farming, then there must be failure. I say that is a local fetish which is consciously and unconsciously felt by those who interest themselves in retaining the plantation economy.

I am one of those who have become totally revolutionary when it comes to the building into an essential economy, the plantation system as applied to the West Indies. The plantation system was a child of slavery, and as such it was admirably suited for its time; today it cannot offer employment at the height of the reaping season to the agricultural districts. It does not offer that maximum of employment which would justify its existance; and, consequently, we cannot envisage any widespread industrialisation in order to employ our surplus population and which will be a surplus for a long time to come. We are therefore quite correct in undertaking an agricultural experiment where peasantry is concerned.

4.35 p.m.

I will warn you, Mr. Chairman, that we should follow and direct those experiments along the lines which obtain in Trinidad. Where there are several forms and types of farming undertaken. They are principally, the small plot for mixed farming on which experiments can be carried out with fodder grass to feed cattle; the small plot for growing canes; the small plot for yams and other vegetables, and then the smaller plots for vegetable gardening. You can therefore see that there is not one type of farming to which the Minister of Agriculture must apply himself, but that there are several types on which he must experiment to find out which

would be the most economic; I am using the word 'economic' in the broadest sense of its term.

The essential thing about this type of farming is that it is undertaken by the tenant farmer and his family; they must be the personnel to cultivate and control the farm. Many peasants own not more than one-acre plots, yet that can prove to be sufficient for a well organised family to manage. Broad crops are not essentially the best, and if a tenant farmer has to hire labourers to attend his plot, naturally, half of the real purpose of undertaking peasant farming goes by the board. The best peasant farmer is the one whom he and his family alone cultivates the plot.

I will warn the Hon. Minister of Agriculture again that the type of Manager which is employed in this scheme will more or less determine its success or failure. I do not remember exactly the name of the Manager in Trinidad, but he is a man who has apparently spent his life in trying to establish that small scale farming needs not be a waste of time either to the peasant farmer or to the total economy of the country.

I can recall at once one man whom I am sorry is not still amongst us; but he showed an intense interest in peasant agriculture during his term of office here, and proof of the comprehensive work he did in that respect is left behind him; I refer to Mr. Halcrow. It is my opinion that there can be no greater asset to any country than the establishment of peasant agriculture, and it was that which Mr. Halcrow tried to establish here. I hope one of these days he would come back here and establish this work further. I do know that persons of his type are very rare to find in these colonies, but they are not impossible to find.

I will again warn the Hon. Minister that in his search for a Manager, he must try to find one not with any highfalutin ideas as far as tropical peasantry agriculture is concerned; but one who is passionately interested in peasant agriculture, such as the Manager who is doing that type of work in Trinidad and who has proved that small scale farming can be an economic pursuit and an asset both to the peasant farmer and the people of the colony as a whole.

Sir, I emphasise my conviction despite the skepticism which I have heard here. Small scale farming can be as successful in the building of the local economy as plantation farming has proved up to now; and it offers to our people something which plantation farming never offered; and that is social stability. That is the essential thing about it; it offers a social stability which no plantation system can offer to our people.

With these words, I can assure the Hon. Minister of Agriculture of my great personal welcome for a Resolution like this; and if he so directs his efforts, I am sure that in a few years' time, it will prove all that it can prove to him. He will then go down in Barbadian history as the most successful Minister of the first regime.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE NO. 20

'Bus Concessions

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is for the sum of $30,000 to provide working capital for the running of certain bus concessions which will be relinquished by the 24th of this month and which may not be taken over by other people. Honourable members will remember the negotiations which have been taking place between the Government and bus Concessionaires from time to time; therefore, I do not think it is necessary at this stage to bring in the long drawn out correspondence and discussions that have taken place.

4.45 p.m.

As hon. members know, we could reach no agreement. Eight of the 14 bus Concessionaires have decided to hand over their buses to the Government at prices to be agreed to subsequent to the recommendation of the Arbitration Board to be set up to go into the matter. It is necessary now at this stage for the Government to come to the House in order to get funds to carry on the bus transport service as from the 25th of August. The sum, estimated at $30,000, will be required to carry on for at least three weeks.

We are therefore asking that this Committee agree to the passing of the Resolution in order that the Government may be enabled to meet its commitments in providing transport until such time (according to our hope) as some new Concessionaires should come forward to take up the routes that will be relinquished or handed over by the present Concessionaires.

I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of $30,000 do now pass.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, in seconding this Resolution I wish to say that I hope to leave the island on Saturday next for the United Kingdom where I hope to continue the talks on the Deep Water Harbour with the Colonial Office officials. I wish, therefore before I leave, to make it quite clear, both from a personal as well as from a collective point of view as a member of the Government, that the Government has never said anything in connection with this business that it does not mean.

There has never been the slightest hint by any of us that we were putting out feelers; there has never been the slightest question of bluff or anything of the sort. But we are socialists, and we believe in the nationalisation of public utilities when they are not efficiently run by private enterprise.

When the general public is suffering as a result of high costs or lack of supplies and matters of that sort which the capitalist system inevitably meets with, we do oppose the capitalist on such things, which are possibly not always economic. Nobody can run an almshouse for profit. Nobody can run institutions like the General Hospital and the Waterworks for profit.

Our problem with regard to the nationalisation of public transport has always been that. If we can control the frequencies of a bus service, the wages to be paid and the hours at which the buses are to run, and the amount of service they should provide for the general public, there is no reason why the State should own them. If, however, we are dissatisfied with the service, then public utilities such as transport, water, light and power should be owned by a municipality or a central government; and all our actions in connection with this bus crisis have been actuated and governed by this consideration.

It may be, that in the long run, in considering an efficient service, (we have got to test it out for itself) nationalisation is the only answer; but if, (and I say this with some feeling) I am about to go to the Colonial Office to ask the British Treasury to be as liberal as possible with its financial help, we have got to give much thought to this question of nationalisation. To those of our opponents who keep saying to us why not nationalise immediately, this is the answer: we will always nationalise if we find that it is the only means of running a public utility or

other concern as cheaply as possible for the benefit of all the people of the community. But if that is not the case, we see no reason why we should spend a couple of million dollars in buying out all these buses if it can be avoided. If, however, it is necessary, either temporarily or permanently to ensure an efficient public service, then nationalisation becomes imperative.

As I said before, I shall not be present in this House for the next two weeks, and it is for this reason that I am emphasising these facts. I wish further to say that six of these fourteen Concessionaires have said that they will continue to run their buses. In regard to this, I do not think that we are being optimistic in saying that some of these people who thought that we were bluffing when they see that we mean business, they will certainly agree between now and the 24th instant to join with the other eight Concessionaires in taking similar step. I still believe that on the morning of the 25th instant the Government will be running these six buses among the rest.

We are actually making inventories of these bus companies now because we do not intend to buy junk; we intend to buy what is good enough to run. I am making this particular phase of speech in order to give the last possible warning to any idiot of a Concessionaire who thinks that the Government is afraid of running the buses. If we are forced to run the eight concessions we are going to run them. If any Concessionaire or other interested person were to come forward and say he is going to take over, he can take over. As regards the Government, we would take whatever we are forced to take.

I do not think I would be doing my duty if I did not make that clear and precise statement as to my feeling as a whole. Ours is a collective responsibility; what I am saying is not the feeling of any one particular Minister. We want to make it crystal clear that no Concessionaire can say that the reason why he did not offer to hand over his buses was because he was under the impression that the Government was bluffing. There was no question of bluff on the part of the Government. The other six Concessionaires should fall into line with the rest.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT and Mr. CRAWFORD rose to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for St. Peter may proceed.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT. Mr. Chairman, we all thought that in a matter like this, we would have had a more detailed explanation from the Hon. Minister of Communications who has now come down with this most important Resolution. What has struck me most strangely, is that the Hon. Minister of Communications has taken it for granted that in this new idea of the operation of a bus service, the Hon. Minister did not think it necessary to give a fuller explanation to the House as to what led the Government to take up these concessions and operate the buses on the strength of hoping to get the approval of the Legislature in this Resolution for $30,000.

4.55 p.m.

On Tuesday last he was not dealing with the question of operating buses; this is the first time that he is dealing with this matter because the note to the Resolution says this: "The Minister of Communications, Works and Housing hopes to deal with this Resolution in all its stages at next Tuesday's meeting of the House.'

He could not have dealt with this matter last Tuesday because he is asking the House to deal with the Resolution through all its stages to-day. I am on holiday but I took time off to come here because this is an important matter. I hope to hear something more from the Minister before the debate is closed.

In so far as the history and theory of Socialism are concerned, I do not think that this is any bit of Socialist legislation: because even from the last speaker nothing has been stated about the Government's intention to run the public services in this island. What the Government is saying in this: "Provided that people do not want to run the bus service in this island along the lines we say they should run it, we intend to take over the service." That is a very different thing from saying categorically: "It is our intention to run the public services."

The question of efficiency or inefficiency is not answered at this stage, because the Government has had a Committee of Enquiry to go into the question of the claims for increased bus fares, a Committee which I criticised because it was not a representative Committee, but a Committee which represented one section of the community. The Committee has reported and it is on that Report that the Government is dealing with this matter. The Government need not have been called upon to give any subsidy because the matter could be worked out very simply. If a man is not making any money on the service he is running, you need not subsidise him so as to capitalise something new which he has to provide; there is no need for the Government to say that this subsidy was proposed to be given on the basis of new services.

The Hon. Minister has said that he is submitting this matter to arbitration. This Chamber does not know on what basis he is submitting the matter to arbitration; the Minister has not told us why they are submitting the matter to arbitration, but there is a foregone conclusion that it is not necessary to have the matter debated in Parliament. I ask again: on what basis is this matter going to arbitration? The Minister has not said it. Are you sending this matter to arbitration on the basis of paying eight people who have not yet come to you? What type of arbitration are you setting up? Are you setting up a one-man arbitration or a Board of arbitrators? Can you tell this Chamber and the public who the arbitrators are? Are you going to appoint local arbitrators or people from outside, or are you going to get people from the United Kingdom mixed up with the transport service to become arbitrators for you? Is that not information which the public should have?

They want $30,000; $15,000 for wages for two weeks and $15,000 for gasolene, oil and incidentals. If the Government proposes to take over this service, can't they say on what basis they are taking it over? Are they taking it over with the idea as has been mentioned in the Press, that the employees will become Civil Servants? What are your broad plans for taking over this service?

Another point is this: there is no question of running the service efficiently. You have stated that the service is not efficient; the mere fact that you have these "pirate" buses on the roads means that there is no efficient service. If you have reached that stage to-day then it should be stated publicly: "we feel that the transport service has broken down and we must take it over." But it would be a dangerous policy to take over the buses of these eight people and leave the others to run. On what basis are you running the buses of these eight people? Along the basis that the buses of the other six people are run-

ning? This service which is rendered in Barbados is small enough that any single Corporation can run it efficiently.

Too many employers to-day are working employees on bare brain, and they say that with these economic changes you have to change your economic thinking; you have to revamp things on the lines that each man cannot run a business by himself and expect to make money. I am satisfied that the question of transport is not only a question of £.s.d., but the matter of redeeming the situation and making it a working proposition has not been told to this House. If you need a matter of $3 million to pay these people in order to run the transport service, you need not do that. The Government has nationalised gas in this island, and you have examples in the United Kingdom where they have nationalised concerns; but the British Government did not have to take enough cash out of the Treasury to leave themselves broke. Anyone who proposes that theory is not thinking of the realities of the situation.

At this stage you do not have to worry as to whether this service is efficient or not; we have passed that stage. The Government is satisfied that the offer which they made to the Concessionaires and which was refused by them, is a reasonable one, and the Government is now taking over this service. Well, if they are taking over this service, why do they not tell us how they are taking it over?

5.05 p.m.

All I am saying Mr. Chairman, is that the Hon. Minister should have been able to tell the House about such matters when introducing this Resolution. Is not that a fair proposition as to how the Hon. Minister should have dealt with this matter? Arbitration does not deal with the question of policy; it only deals with what is reasonable to be paid.

Why could not the Hon. Minister say that Government proposes to run this matter as a Government Department, or as a Corporation, or by some strong board? How can members of this Committee make a criticism of it one way or the other? I do know that if Government runs it as a Government Department, the machinery for dealing with it under a Government Department will be too slow.

Will the Minister of Labour be looking after the conditions of employment of the people who work on buses? Will he be looking after the working hours of those people and saying that there should be a shift system? I will tell him that in dealing with the question of wages of those people, we of the Trade Union are not satisfied with the wages paid to them. We do know that it is going to cost you more than $15,000 a week. We are not perpetuating the system under which the people who work on buses are paid by the day. Those people should be paid guaranteed wages and we are going to ask that they be paid a guaranteed wage every week.

We in the Trade Union movement are thoroughly opposed to that antedeluvian method where you take people working in a service like transport and pay from a small daily wage; that should not take place in a Transport Service where a man is required to work every day and to drive a large number of the general public. We do not subscribe to the idea that you should pay a man $2.40 a day, the result of which means that a man has to make up what he considers should be his earnings out of the fares he collects. We do not subscribe to that indignity.

Whatever were the problems in the past, we are going to tell bus conductors and drivers that they have to play a fair game; they must not now play the game which they played when they received low wages on the basis that their employers knew that they were going to steal to make it up.

If I may show you how slowly Government Departments work, I may say that it has taken the Government over two months, nearly ten weeks, before the names of the arbitrators were published to look into a matter between the Telephone Company and its workers who are in the Barbados Workers Union. If we had told them to strike, somebody would say that we are not responsible people. If that is the situation you are going to get when Government takes over this Bus Transport Service, you can imagine what is going to happen. Perhaps, when you make a wage claim, the Minister concerned will be out of the island and the machinery of the Department for looking after that will not be working because there would be nobody there to make a decision. You will have a temporary postponement of your life because of that.

Sir, I must be frank about this matter. Let me ask you again: have you set up a department to deal with this matter? Are you going to deal with it as a semi-department of Government? Would the Labour Commissioner be sending around and asking what wages you are going to pay to those persons who are engaged? Let me make this quite clear to you: all workers have a right to join an organisation and organising themselves for a purpose.

It cannot be based on if someone wants a worker to be organised. Government should state firmly how it is going to run this service. I know they cannot run it like when you send a letter to a Head of a Department, he takes a note of it and then sends it to the Minister. It does not work that way in commercial dealings. My warning on that side of the question is this: I do not think the Government has at its disposal a staff of men capable of running this transport business on a commercial basis. If Government has such a staff, it should have been told to us at an earlier stage. We should not have to ask the Hon. Minister for an explanation.

I wonder why the Hon. Minister did not think it necessary to give us an explanation on that aspect of the matter. You say you want a working capital of $30,000; why do you want that $30,000? What is the income that you expect to receive from these concessions when you take them over? I do not know if the information is still secret as to the reasons why those people have refused the offer made by Government. Is the reason purely that the people are handing over these buses and not running their concessions because the offer by Government is not good enough? Moreover, is the Government prepared to take them over on the same basis as the Concessionaires?

I have heard from someone that there is a Concessionaire who was willing to take over the whole lot of concessions. I do not know if the Minister can say it is a fact that someone was willing to take over all the concessions and run the service as a whole.

It is my opinion that we have now reached the stage where public transport is in a mess and there is no doubt about that. Will the Hon. Minister say what will be the cost of taking over this service? I ask that question because I want to go on record as saying that I am not diametrically opposed to an increase of bus fares. I do not believe anybody who is in his senses would be diametricallly opposed to an increase in bus fares on the supposition that bus fares have reached their limit.

I do not subscribe to that view, because I know that some members of the travelling public pay $2.00 per month for the rental of a Rediffusion set and that can be considered as something which has

not entered their life before. You do not go and buy a refrigerator before you buy a cooking pot; similarly, you should not want to put in a Rediffusion set in your house if you cannot pay for your travelling to work and back.

5.15 p.m.

What I do say is this: You do not raise busfares at any cost to the community unless you are satisfied that it is impossible for that service to be maintained at such a level as would give a fair maintenance wage to all these people. You talk about the capitalist theory and you talk about the socialist theory; but as soon as you admit capitalism you have to admit the question of profit. As soon as you say the opposite of this the natural concomitant is a fair return which means a fair investment.

If Government subscribes to the view that the public should pay no increase in fares for their transport, in order to give the people a profit, then that means that they have agreed that the Concessionaires are making profit already. Yet according to them they are willing to give a 15% rebate to the capital. On the other hand if you are satisfied that it is not making enough profit and you intend to take over his business, then he is to be given sufficient as would enable him to go into any new venture which he may desire.

The most the Government should have said is this: if you want an amount for expenditure I am going to give you part of the amount; but as soon as you make it the full amount it will be regarded as an amount on both the old and the new services. Government is as illogical in its proposition of a subsidy as the report of the Committee itself which said that there was not enough "statistical information to make proper comparisons and reliable estimates." Yet this Committee is satisfied that an increase in bus fares should be made.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that you would like an adjournment at this stage. I therefore beg to move that you do now report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. LEWIS: I beg to second that.

ADJOURNMENT

The question that the Chairman do now report progress and ask leave to sit again was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On Motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS seconded by Hon. M. E. COX the House adjourned for half an hour.

5.20 p.m.

On re-assembling.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Bus Concessions

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, before we resume I should like to say that I understand that the Chairman of Committees will not be present until later. I therefore beg to move that the honourable junior member for St. John be appointed to act as Chairman of Committees *pro tem.*

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

The question that the honourable junior member for St. John be appointed to act as Chairman of Committees pro tem. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, before the Committee resumes I should like at this stage to let the Minister of Agriculture know that it is my intention at some future date to discuss the replies to question No. 10 tabled by me, so that the Hon. Minister may be prepared to reply to my comments.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Question No. 10 relating to what?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Relating to Labour Welfare Funds.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee Mr. VAUGHAN being in the Chair.

Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN: On the adjournment the House was discussing a Resolution for the sum of $30,000 to supplement the Estimates 1955-56 Part I, Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1955-56, No. 20, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Acting Chairman, on the adjournment I had made certain points relating to this Resolution. I said at the beginning that I regretted that the Hon. Minister of Communications did not regard it as "necessary to say more," To use his exact words. That statement was upheld by the Hon. Premier because he himself said more than the Hon. Minister of Communications who was the appropriate Minister dealing with the Resolution. That is something which is a bit unusual for the Introducer of an important measure like this.

So far as the nationalisation of this utility is concerned, I would say that there should be no question whatsoever of the Government not being satisfied that the service is not being run in the best interest of the Community. The Government has made those broad statements.

Now, I cannot propound a theory for the Government, but we do know that the Hon. Premier did say at one time that he would nationalise the Electric Company in six months time. That is one of those statements which people sometimes make as a matter of convenience; but now that sober reflection has taken hold upon him he is saying that he would not nationalise any industry or public utility unless it were in the best interest of the community.

Now, you are satisfied that the private concerns are not doing well; but the mere fact that you are being forced now to take over more than 50% of the public transport system of this country, shows how much you believe that this is so; now you are asking for this Resolution for the sum of $30,000 to be able to run it. When will you be satisfied to take over altogether?

At this stage Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN left the Chair and the House continued in Committee Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that the Government is asking permission to run more than 50% of this bus service. How are you going to run a public utility service in which 50% is being undertaken by the Government and other people are going to run the other part of it? Are you satisfied with the other six Concessionaires who are going to run the other part of the service? You can quite clearly see in this what the Premier himself has said; that is: it is not their intention at all to run public transport. According to him: we are only going to run public transport if the people who are running it now should refuse to run it.

I ask these questions again: are you satisfied with the service that they are giving the public? If you are not satisfied with the service they are giving you should be forced to run it. How would you run

a public service like this? I am not an expert in public transport; but if the Government is satisfied that bus fares should never be increased except over their dead bodies since they are satisfied that the public is paying enough at present, and if the Government said we are going to run this service ourselves, what is to prevent them from saying: I am going to buy all the tyres and all the things that this company is going to use for this service duty free? There can be nothing wrong with that.

Nowadays the Electric Company does not pay any duty on machinery imported by them; with the Sugar Industry it is so; and Cable and Wireless pay no duty. What is to prevent the Government from saying that they are going to nationalise this transport service? Why delay? Why cannot the Government say to-day now that they have an opportunity to do so they are going to see to it that this public utility be in the hands of the Government?

The theory of nationalisation is not based only on the idea of a private company being able to run something better than a public company. They should not be held up to ransom. Nobody can blame the United Kingdom Government when they nationalised the Steel Industry, that it was being run inefficiently. On the contrary it was an efficient service; but the Socialist Government of England did not wish to know whether the steel magnets of England were running it efficiently or not; they thought that the Steel Industry was one that should be nationalised and they nationalised it.

If you look at this question this way you will see that there are certain services that should be in the hands of the Government and not in the hands of private ownership, for the simple reason that the public in general should receive the benefits.

6.05 p.m.

To-morrow if you feel that you should have better buses and better accommodation for the school children, there is nothing to prevent you from doing that. The Government is asking for this money to carry on the service on a temporary basis for two weeks, but the Government does not intend to take over this service as a nationalised service; I say that from the speeches which have been made.

This is a positive example of fright: if the Government were satisfied that they should take over this service they would not have asked for new Concessionaires. The Emergency Powers Bill was passed on the basis that the Government would have to run the service. If you feel that this service should be owned and run by the public, you should say and carry out the principle that the Government intends to take over public transport and run it in the interest of the community. Whether you do it tomorrow or not, the Government must face the question of taking over the transport in this island, but not on the basis proposed here.

If you agree that the capitalist system and the private system must run these buses, you must agree to give a subsidy which is tantamount to an increase in the bus fares. There is no point in saying that you are not agreeing to any increase in bus fares but you are agreeing to give a subsidy; that is like saying that you are not giving a man a 20% increase, but you will feed and clothe him and allow him to live in the house free.

The real income of the bus companies has been increased by the Government's offer of this 15% increase; they have agreed on the remuneration to be given to the bus owners, although there is no increase in the bus fares, and the Government will eventually increase the subsidy on gasolene and other things.

If this matter has been properly analysed by the Government, what are the reasons for not taking over all the buses and running them in the interest of the community; tomorrow if the same thing happened with the Electric Company, would you say: "I cannot take it over because it costs so much money?"

It has been stated that Hon. Mr. Manley was anti-British, but you will still find that he can get a loan oversubscribed for his Government. Some of us who are pro-British have to be going up and down so as to get a loan in connection with the Deep Water Harbour. That is merely *enpassant*.

What is the Socialist theory when it comes to public ownership? That is not based on the question as to whether you can run a service or not; it is based on the fact that it is so important to the well being of the public that there should be public ownership of the service. Some of the Conservatives are now telling the Government: "You are wrong to own the buses". The Conservative thinking has always been that way when it comes to industrialisation; the Government must go out of business; but today, in this modern age, we know that the development of the community cannot be done on private capital alone.

As I said some time ago, some people believe that the time is still 4 o'clock; but 4 o'clock has gone and it is now 6 o'clock. What is the point about trying to be naive in this matter? If you are going to take over the bus transportation service, then do it and tell the public so. Many workers will be out of employment owing to industrialisation; we know that people will lose their jobs through the construction of the Deep Water Harbour; but while the construction of the Deep Water Harbour will provide less for people, it will provide greater efficiency. You will have less jobs but you have to change your whole economic thinking in order to do the best for your community. If you are not satisfied with this public utility service, there is no question of telling me that you are doing this on a temporary basis. Should arbitration decide the policy for you?

The Hon. Minister says that it was not necessary for him to say anything more; but more than what? More than nothing? What are your preparations? What is the Government prepared to do? Let Parliament and the public know. Do not think that the basis which you are now putting to bus employees will satisfy them; far from it.

If any member of this House still carries on the slavish mentality that a worker is only there when you want him, but does not regard him as security for somebody, that is something which must be dealt with. There are people who believe that the Socialist theory prevents them from getting together. When you pay a driver a minimum of $3,00 a day you have to realise that he might have to pay more than one-third of his wages for rent. You know the type of food he has to eat, and he has to sit down behind a public vehicle for hours; all those things have to be taken into account.

6.15 p.m.

I think I have made it clear what is the position so far as wages are concerned, whether they are paid out by Government or by the Concessionaires.

I consider that it is right to let it be known what are the implications in the bus service today. I will go to any part of Barbados and say that if the bus service is to be justifiably improved the community will have to pay for it, whether by your subsidising it or by your paying a direct increase in bus fares. As I have said earlier, I have been watching the progress of the community and there are certain people who have undertaken certain expenditures which cannot be considered to be things of necessity.

Should the Government take over the running of the bus service, the public will have the opportunity of knowing what it will cost. If you are satisfied that the service is adequate enough, then no increase in bus fares is necessary.

To-day, the public is called upon to pay higher taxation on everything. Comparatively speaking, the taxation in this island compares favourably with other countries in the West Indies. In the United States of America where you have the highest standard of living, you do not have the least rate of taxation. There are many places where you have a low rate of taxation, but in those places you also have a low standard of living.

Sir, I regret that the Hon. Minister could not have given us more information on this matter. He has not said if Government is going to run this service for a temporary period of for eight years, or whether it is to be run as a Government Department or by a corporation. I am suggesting that it should be run either by a Board or Corporation because if it is run by a Corporation, the Corporation can make out an estimate of what it would cost to run it and would be able to provide those things which are necessary and by so doing the public will see what is the true position. I see no point in tacking the running of it on to the Government.

You have to read where you will be called upon to pay pensions to the people whom you will have to employ to run it, but that needs not to be so if it is run by a Board. You can remove taxation on gasolene and things you import in order to run a more efficient service when you take it over; and you will be able to know the true valuation of the service.

However, it is unfortunate that in many important matters like this, the Government takes advice from one side and deals with them only from that angle. The Government is more inclined to listen to what capitalists have to say than what other people tell them. It is regrettable that the Hon. Minister did not think it necessary for him to give this Committee more information on this Resolution. He said that it was not necessary for him to say anything more than what he said and I consider that is very regrettable indeed. The Government is taking over the transport service and running it for the first time and the Minister for Communications does not regard it as necessary that he should tell Parliament what Government proposes to do in the running of it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. member who has just sat down, apparently has a very low standard of appreciation for the mentality of the Government In the course of his remarks he said that the Government after having run these buses for two weeks, would then be in the position to see whether or not the service is run at a loss. .....

I perhaps foolishly had assumed that the Government had a considerable knowledge of the available figures that it would take to run the service, and had reached the decision to run it after having carefully considered that the bus service was not run at a loss. There can be no reason for matters reaching this point unless the Government is sure now that when it assumes the responsibility it is assuming by this Resolution, it is not throwing away money and that it can maintain this service without any increased cost to the public. .....

I agree with the hon. junior member for St. Peter when he criticised so caustically the paucity of information vouchsafed by the Minister of Communications to-day; because around this table we are supposed to be 24 business people owing to the fact that we have been entrusted with the expenditure of the funds in the Public Treasury. It therefore can be assumed from that that we have some appreciation of the elementary principles along which business is run.

Sir, I perhaps foolishly took it for granted that the Minister would have told us to-day that the Government had estimated what it would take to run this service and that the revenue from it for the two weeks would be approximately so and so; therefore the Government is convinced that in asking for this $30,000 to run the service for a fortnight, it is not throwing money away. That is all that it boils itself down to. Certainly nobody would think that the Government in its right senses would lightly consider spending $30,000 in the running of these buses for two weeks merely as a pastime.

I am annoyed to think that we have not been taken into the confidence of the Government and that the Government has not presented us to-day with some of the figures on which the Government has based its final decision. I do hope that this Committee is taking this matter seriously. I hope that hon. members appreciate that we are borrowing these buses from the owners for two weeks to run them as a sort of public experiment. I hope hon. members realise that Government has let itself in for the purchase of these buses. [A VOICE: They are not so stupid.] 6.25 p.m.

An honourable member says they are not so stupid. It is regrettable that this matter is being bungled in the way it is; because in an important matter like this the Minister of Communications had no right getting up and mumbling a few words when he is responsible for this bus affair.

What are they doing? We are expecting from the 25th August to run the buses belonging to eight Concessionaires which constitute the biggest services in the entire island; that is, the Leewards, the Nationals and the General. These services comprise over 100 buses. The moment we take these over we are legally placing ourselves in the position in which we might have to continue to run them.

I am at a loss to understand what the Government is doing, because the Seconder of the motion, the Hon. Premier, has expressed the hope that if these Concessionaires persist in their determination not to renew their concessions, somebody else might come along and agree to take them over. I wonder if the Hon. Minister means that this person is going to take the buses over merely by buying the ones which the Government has bought from the Concessionaires. If somebody come along and take them over what is the Government going to do with the rest of the buses.

I am basing my assumption on the statement which the Minister of Communications made over Rediffusion. He said that the Government and the Concessionaires had failed to come to terms with regard to the conditions under which the concessions would be renewed. The Government offered a 15% rebate on gasolene and certain other terms while the concessionaires wanted 50%, which of course, was absurd.

Well now, this is what the Minister has said: "I regret to state that despite the Government's proposals to grant a rebate of 15%, subject to review, the persons concerned in the operations of the buses consequent upon the passing of legislation, all the 14 bus owners refused to operate their buses after the 10th August and said that they would be prepared to hand over their buses on terms to be agreed upon."

Now, let us understand this carefully: the concessionaires refused to operate their buses after the 10th August and said that they would hand over on terms to be agreed upon.

He further said "The Government has therefore decided to accept the owners' offer to hand over the buses to Government at prices to be agreed upon by arbitration."

In other words, the Government has contracted to buy the buses of these Concessionaires who refused to renew their concession. At the time when the Hon. Minister spoke only five of the 13 bus owners had decided to renew their concession. Since then, the position appears to have been changed a little through another bus owner having decided to renew his concession; so that, according to the information we have received today there are only now seven who have refused to renew their concessions.

Well now, in presenting this Resolution today to the House the Government should have intimated more clearly and more comprehensively what it was committing the public to. Only those of us who have the Resolution before us know that the moment we take over this service for two weeks, as we are doing, we may have to continue for more than two weeks. The Government has decided, according to the Minister's statement, to take over the buses of these Concessionaires; over 100 units with spare parts and all extra supplies. A conservative estimate of the cost of these units and spare parts might be anywhere around a half million dollars.

In other words, the position is this: we have got to pay for these 100 buses; we have got to find money to keep them on the road; to pay increased wages to employees and what-not. If only we fully realise what we are letting ourselves in for!

Are we prepared to spend a half million dollars to acquire part of the bus service of the country and to find money to carry it on at current rate whether or not we make a profit or loss? I sincerely hope honourable members will appreciate that when they vote $30,000 to carry on the service for two weeks that before the two weeks shall have expired, they will be faced with a Resolution for a further sum of money to carry on the service, at least, to the end of the current financial year.

It does appear to me as if the hope of the Hon. Minister that some other person will come along and run the concessions on those terms is doomed to disappointment. You can rest assured that if they were other people in Barbados who might be willing to take over this service, no one would pay the prices for the buses which the Government will have to pay after the arbitrators have finished with the matter.

I think that the majority in this House will agree upon the necessity for state ownership of public transport. Transport is an essential public service and as such, in theory, should be controlled by the State; although to my mind the public in Barbados today is not concerned with whether or not the State owns the public service. All the public of this country wants is an efficient service run at a reasonable cost. They do not care whether it is owned by private companies or by the Government or by the communists in Moscow; so that apart from the socialists dogma we have got to convince ourselves at this stage of the economic conditions of this country, as to whether or not we can afford the luxury of acquiring the public transport system which, according to the people who now run it, is in a chaotic state and cannot afford to pay its own way.

6.35 p.m.

While I am in favour of publicly-owned transportation systems, I think that these things fall into the categories of priority; and before I would agree to spend half a million dollars now in buying these buses I would invest that money in some other way to assist in the industrial development of Barbados. I could not take up half a million dollars now and spend it on buses, which would be of no use to the country, when we need agricultural development and diversification.

Can you conceive what a half-a-million dollars investment along the line of agricultural diversification would mean to the development of this country?

We have just said that we are establishing an Industrial Development Board; can you imagine what it would mean to spend another half a million dollars in the capital of this Board and find employment for people? These bus employees are employed to the maximum and we cannot expand that employment. While the time will come, I hope, when we shall own our transportation service and expand it and run it efficiently, that time has not yet come for a country like this which has to import everything it wants.

I hope that this Committee will see in what it is involving itself by agreeing to the running of the bus service on a temporary basis for these two weeks. If the Government were honest in what it is doing, it would tell you that it wants money to carry on this service for six months; but it does not want to frighten you yet. If the Government has agreed to take over the buses and run them, why is it talking about running them for two weeks? They are legally bound to buy over the buses and they cannot get out of it. The Minister says this: "The Government has decided to accept the owners' offer to hand over their buses to the Government at prices to be agreed upon by arbitration." They are bound to buy them but with what? And run them how? Could they run a bus company in Barbados? Do you see any of them with the slightest brain about buses, in a position to run the transportation service in this colony? We are living in a fool's paradise and we are not realising for what we are going in.

The bus owners, I repeat, were utterly absurd, rapacious and everything else to get a rebate of 15% on the gasolene; that was ridiculous, but the Government itself is still leaving the door open. The Premier says that other people will come in and buy the buses; is there any sense in putting yourself in the position of buying these buses? Again, the Premier says: "We want this money to operate this service on a temporary basis;" but he says he hopes that other people will come along and agree to take over the concessions. That means that after they have taken over these buses and they have refused to agree to the terms of the Concessionaires, they intend to offer new terms to people to interest them in some way in taking over the service.

Implied in the Minister's statement in connection with this Resolution, is something which confirms my conviction that the Government intends to offer new terms to prospective Concessionaires. In his statement the Minister regretted that the Government's proposal to grant a rebate of 15% on gasolene, subject to review, was not accepted. The Government was prepared to go into the matter a little later: that gave them the opportunity to say that they were offering something more.

None of us would be so stupid as to believe that if these bus owners who have been in this business for years and were making money, refused to carry on with a 15% rebate on the gasolene, you will get anybody to come in and agree with it; it means that the Government will have to offer new terms. If you expect to offer new terms, say that you are offering

these terms to the Concessionaires; but do not agree to take over the buses.

The position is a simple one, but both sides are bluffing; well, let them go on bluffing, but the Concessionaires have pushed the Government in the position in which they can sit down and say: "I have my arbitrator, you have yours, let us fix prices; if you do not agree we get an umpire. You take our buses."

You would not get one single person in Barbados to pay one half of what the Government will be asked to pay for these buses. I know of two Concessionaires whose buses are only kept on the road by the grace of God; and if they got $30 for them they will be well paid: [*Laughter*] but in arbitration they will get $3,000 for them.

I am deeply concerned over this question, not from any point of view of what is good Socialist practice or not or whether through Socialist pressure they are doing this or not. As the honourable junior member for St. Peter has said, if the Government were approaching this matter on any basis of applied Socialism, it would come right out and say: "We are taking over the bus service."

6.45 p.m.

If the Government were acting on the ground of the political ideology which they claim to possess, we would have been told that the Government as a Socialist Government is bound to consider this decision as advisable and in the interest of the public for the running of public transportation; and therefore, they proposed to acquire the bus services of the island. We have not been told so. All that we have been told is that Government does not agree with the terms of the Concessionaires, and Government wants $15,000 for wages and $15,000 for gasolene and incidentals for the running of those buses since certain owners no longer want to renew their concessions. Then the Minister gets up and says that Government hopes somebody would come along and take over those concessions in the meanwhile. I would like to be told authoriatively and correctly that my assumption of the position is incorrect, but I see no possibility of being told so.

I should like to have been told that we are spending this $30,000 on wages and gasolene to run those buses and what revenue was likely to be collected from those buses in that period. The Minister must have some idea of what revenue these buses collect over a day and what they make on the various routes, and what are the takings on the various routes. If the takings are $50 a day on a particular route, I am sure when Government takes over that route what those takings would be; but I had better not say what they would be.

Sir, I really cannot imagine a Government which professes to have a sense of responsibility to expect to come in here and push this Resolution down the throats of hon. members without any indication of the proceeds it is likely to get after we have given them this money to spend. Who is to run these buses? Is it the Department of Highways and Transport or who? Are we living in a fools paradise? Is it, as the Hon. Minister has said the other night, that Government has to operate these buses because of the lack of co-operation on the part of the bus Concessionaires; or is it in keeping with the Socialist theory of creating a Transport Authority in order to start to run your communication system on a proper basis?

Do not think you are going to run these buses for two weeks and then somebody is going to take them over from you. Nobody in his right senses would sit down and think of doing such a thing. Let me ask another question: where are you going to house these buses? On the morning of the 25th August, the Barbados Government is going to have 100 odd buses on its hands. I do not know where Government is going to put them, neither do I know what provision is being made for servicing and maintaining those units. I do know that the Department of Highways and Transport is not equipped for maintaining and servicing units of that sort.

At the moment, almost each Concessionaire maintains his own service at his business place. The General Motor Omnibus Company enjoys the facilities of Messrs Eckstein Garage; the National Motor Omnibus Company has its own maintenance department and so on; what is Government going to do in this respect? Would it be that everytime a bus breaks down that Government is going to send it to a garage say like the City Garage or Eckstein's for repairs? I am sure that when two repair bills are sent in, they will cost Government more than what it paid for all the buses.

Can anybody in his right senses assume responsibility for keeping 100 odd buses on the road in good and proper condition (half of them has a pre-war vintage) without any repair or maintenance facilities at all? I predict that if the bus service is inefficient now, on the 25th August it will be disastrous, and within three weeks after that when you get your garage bills for repairs, they will cost you more than what the buses cost previously. You may be able to sign the vouchers for the repairs but there will be no money in the Treasury to pay for that.

Sir, I am unalterably opposed to any effort on the part of the Concessionaires to fleece the public. In my opinion, while on the one hand they can prove a case for an increase of bus fares because there was no increase since 1939, on the other hand, I am convinced that the increase in the numbers of the travelling public should very likely compensate Concessionaires for any increase in their operational costs.

Sir, I am also opposed, if possible, to the public being called upon to pay increased bus fares, although I see no argument or logic for refusing to increase bus fares; but I certainly do not agree with your going in this backhand manner and agreeing to subsidise gasolene used in the transport service because, in any case, whether you increase bus fares or you subsidise gasolene, the public will have to pay for it. It may be a good policy not to increase bus fares and to give Concessionaires a subsidy on gasolene but it does not make economic sense.

Sir, I do feel that in this game of transport poker neither side has closed its doors on further negotiations; and that both sides are open to further discussions. It is my belief when the bus owners said they wanted a 50% rebate they were only bluffing, knowing quite well that no sensible Government could agree to anything like that. On the other hand, to talk as the Hon. Premier spoke about not giving them any increase except over the Government's dead body when Government had already offered them 15% rebate on gasolene and after the bus owners have pushed them in the position they are in today, is childish in the extreme; because at the moment, all the good cards are stacked in the hands of the Concessionaires.

It is highly possible that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph with his super-abundance of legal knowledge has ignored the advice of Government legal advisers, or it is possible that the legal advisers themselves have made this blunder; but on whomsoever the responsibility rests

the fact remains that it is the greatest blunder in negotiations that I have seen for a long time; and I hope that there will be some attempt on the part of the Government to extricate the public from the position from which it now finds itself.

6.55 p.m.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, it is not my aim to prolong this debate; it is only that I feel that everyone of us in a case like this would like to render his contribution.

I am going to begin by saying that this Government has been out-manoeuvred and is being led up the river. I do not see how I can support something like this. I am fearful that this matter is going to assume some enormous possibilities. I really cannot understand what is going to happen; the Government is being led into a corner and we are getting some kind of a pinch.

These Concessionaires have waxed fat within the last 20 years at the expense of the public, and now they do not want to assume their responsibilities; they want to unload and must be paid to unload this very day. [*Laughter.*] That is as far as I can see; I hope I am wrong.

As regards this $30,000, if the Government can convince us that these eight bus concessions need $15,000 for two weeks wages and $15,000 for two weeks use of gasolene they should know what the intake will be. [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Even the bus owners themselves do not know.] Well, the Government should not admit it to be their ignorance too! [*Laughter.*]

I really was listening to the Government for some pronouncement to the effect that some new company would take over these buses. If the Hon. Minister of Communications can convince us that there is great possibility for a new company to take over these other buses and run them and they want these to be a subsidised then, I can see with them, because it is the six smallest companies that have agreed to continue to run.

The Government has my sympathy in this matter because I see where they are heading. I am going to leave the matter at that; but I hope that the Government will be able to extricate themselvs out of this dilemma before they go much further. I repeat that it seems to me that the Government was out-manoeuvred by some powerful business men.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, naturally this is a difficult issue to decide. After hearing all the admonitions, some people will be inclined to feel that it would be an advantage to define the policy now being embarked upon by the Government; but I shall never dwell in the clouds of economic illusion nor wallow in the bogs.

I have not yet heard from the critics in this emergency, (because everybody seems to have forgotten that it is an emergency) no critic has yet said: increase the rates as suggested by the Committee's Report. No; they are afraid to say that, because they feel that that is political dynamite! [*Laughter.*] They have criticised from top to bottom but they have not said that.

We are facing an emergency in the passenger transport of this colony. That is the first issue to face. The bus Concessionaires say if you increase rates at such and such a figure we will carry on, if you do not we will not carry on. Negotiations have taken place; no agreement has been reached. The Government is not bound to meet the demand of the Concessionaires, and consequently an emergency faces the colony.

I am not a party to the idea of increasing the cost of living to the working classes who use the buses. Lots of other things have gone up and that is why bus transport should be kept down. If the Government had agreed to make increases, they would have heard more serious admonitions than we have heard today.

7.05 p.m.

They are not in any hot water now; since the bus Concessionaires have refused to carry on unless bus fares are increased to the recommended figure, the Government has to take over the transport system until such time as they can find new Concessionaires. That is the plan as far as I read it; we are taking over the transport system until such time as we find new Concessionaires, otherwise we are having the system run by the Government.

You must grant the Government the simple intelligence of creating a Corporation as it has in other instances; you create a Corporation if you have to carry on the transport system permanently. I am not afraid of defending the Government in this issue; the Government has to find transport for the people of this colony. If the Concessionaires refuse to carry on, there is no alternative left to the Government but to take over and run the system. The cost of running the system is not $30,000; that is the expense. The cost is the difference between expense and revenue. [*Laughter*]

Expense is not necessarily cost; cost is the difference between expense and revenue. If you spend $20.00 to do something and you get back $30.00 you have made $10.00. Mr. Chairman, I may not have given a good example. Agreement has not been reached; it has been tried: there is no alternative but for the Government to take over the buses. [Mr. CRAWFORD: What figures have they got?] That is only a question of accountancy; putting aside the question of the increased cost to the travelling public, there are several reasons why the Government could not agree to the increased fares. The Government was simply not convinced by any figure shown, that the Concessionaires were losing money; the Concessionaires could not put forward any figures to establish their claim.

In these circumstances, why blame the Government for not granting the increased fares which have been asked? It is all very well and easy to condemn the public transport; as common in many parts of the world, if you lose money, there is a subsidy. Many things are subsidised, many Departments are subsidised and if it comes to the position that transportation is subsidised, there is no crime in that.

I am not a prophet and I cannot prophesy any loss to the Government; that would be sheer prophesy without any foundation. I only know that the idea of public transport being undertaken by the Government should be nothing which is beyond the imagination of this House. I must say we fail to realise that we are facing a passenger transport emergency. The argument is this: do not touch the fares, but do not take over the buses: you have no right to subsidise the Concessionaires or run the buses; that is the essence of the argument I have heard [Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: From me?] From all the speeches I have heard.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: On a point of Order. If the hon. member is saying that I said what he has just said, then he does not understand English. I never said any such thing. I went so far as to say that the Government should nationalise the buses, not the tripe that the hon. member is talking.

Mr. VAUGHAN: If I am misinterpreting him I cannot interpret his English; but what I have said

is the essence of the interpretation of all the speeches I have heard. It is that the Government must not increase bus fares; they must not subsidise the buses and they must not run the buses. Any other argument I defy any rational man to deduce from what has been said here this afternoon. I say that the Government is right to run the buses until such time as they can find new Concessionaires to run them.

7.15 p.m.

The fact that the expenditure is $30,000 for two weeks does not mean that it is a loss to this community by that amount. If your revenue becomes equal to your expenses or greater than that, it is not a loss. If you spend $30,000 and you collect $25,000, you lose $5,000; you do not lose $30,000. But what you must bear more in mind is that the emergency has to be faced and the only way it can be faced is by the Government assuming responsibility for the bus transport service of this colony.

Sir, I will never support any measure to give an increase of 12 cents on the rate of fares of bus transport to the travelling public of this country. I do not think the Government has anything to fear when it realises that in supplying public transport for the purpose of the travelling public, it has prevented a substantial increase to the already sensationally high cost of living.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is—

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Before the question is put, Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister should give some sort of reply. The Hon. Minister of Communications really has not said anything on this matter when he introduced it. After all, you are asking this Committee to vote $30,000 to provide capital for running these buses for two weeks and something should be told us on what it is based.

You have heard the hon. junior member for St. John make some reference about not a loss. Tell me, how can any hon. member come in here and say your takings are going to be $28,000 if he has not been told so. Of course, every hon. member knows the whole political history of that hon. member. You know the reason for the type of speech he is making nowadays.

At any rate, the Hon. Minister has not said anything on this matter. Where would you get anyone coming and suggesting, other than in Barbados, that with this sort of thing you do not propose to give any information. I say that we are getting too near to a dictatorship form of Government. This money is public funds; it is not money which is put up by the Ministers and members of the Labour Party in the same way as people get together and put money in a meeting turn. This is public money and the public is entitled to know from the Minister what are the facts to this Resolution.

We as members of this Chamber, are entitled to know why this $30,000 is needed for two weeks, or whether it is based on some system which Government proposes to run the service. Can the Hon. Minister go on a platform and tell the people in any part of the island that he came for $30,000 to run the bus transport service and he did not tell the House or the public anything about it, and the public said that it was alright?

We are not accusing the Government of losing money by this venture, but we are saying that the public should be informed of the details of how the Government proposes to run this service. I go further by saying that none of the five Ministers would sit down in Executive and agree to anything without getting full details. A lot of papers must have been circulated to them on this matter. I am sure they received copies of documents with long notes explaining all information on the Minute Paper. In addition to that, the five Ministers will sit down tomorrow afternoon before they go to the Executive Committee on Thursday and discuss everything that is on the Order Paper. I will go further and say that the Hon. H. A. Cuke, who is not an elected member has got all the information which I have asked for today. He is not elected by the people of Barbados and if he asked a Minister any question on the matter at Executive Committee meeting, the Minister will be in duty bound to give an explanation.

Sir, are we not in the position to get even more information than a nominated member? The whole thing which annoys me is when you ask for information which you are entitled to get, you are not treated with the courtesy of a reply. This is a Resolution which the Hon. Minister of Communications brought in here today and has asked us to deal with throughout all its stages today. How can you do so when you are not given any information and when you ask anything on it you are not given any explanation.

Sir, the Ministers feel that they are aloof and the people are not entitled to any information. How can you tolerate this sort of thing? It seems to me that some of us must be martyrs. Read the debates of this Chamber. Sir, I am sure when the debates of the hon. junior member for St. John is read back to him, he is going to leave this island again; he has made several hypocritical speeches. What does he know of the profits which Government is going to make out of this matter?

Sir, all we are asking the Government to say is how are you going to run this service? Are you going to run it as a departmental service or by a corporation or by a board? How do you propose to run it for two weeks? What are your plans for running it after the two weeks? Is not that something which the public is entitled to know? Suppose after two weeks this system breaks down, what are you going to do?

Hon. M. E. COX: Lest any hon. members think I want to be discourteous, I would just like to say that I am doing what the hon. junior member for St. Peter did when he had this portfolio to deal with. When he was a member of the Government, he waited until hon. members spoke on a question and then gave his reply. When I know that they are other hon. members who are prepared to speak on this matter, what is the point of my making a reply now, when perhaps I will have to reply to some other question?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: But the question was being put.

Hon. M. E. COX: I did not ask that any question be put. I was prepared to reply.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: But the Premier did not want you to reply.

Hon. M. E. COX: The Hon. Premier runs his portfolio; I run mine.

7.25 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I wish really to make an appeal to the Hon. Minister of Communications. I am suggesting that, at this stage, he should say something more than what he has already said. If the Hon. Minister does not, the chances are that it might prevent other honourable members from making speeches which they might be desirious of making.

I am of the opinion that this principle of Hon. Ministers replying after every honourable member of this House has spoken may be alright in most

cases; but in a Committee of a whole House, where honourable members may speak as often as needed, I think that critical situations are sometimes reached in which the Ministers' intervention might be salutary. I think that is the attitude which should be adopted in such cases. Whenever the Ministers are posed with anything of great importance we find them seeing and sawing. I am making this appeal because I wish to make a contribution to this debate.

The Hon. Minister of Communications gave no particular answer to a certain question, and on the whole he has made no contribution to the debate on this very important measure; and I repeat that at this stage it would do him and his Ministerial colleagues a world of good if he could make a contribution to this debate.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the privilege of having allowed me to catch your eye. I am all for nationalisation of public utilities in any part of the world. I do not want the Hon. Minister of Communications to feel that I am against what he has said. I may be against the method which he may employ.

Hon. M. E. COX: I did not wish to speak at length and I gave my reason for that. I spoke not directly on the Resolution but I explained my view on the bus situation as far as I thought was necessary.

Last week I spoke for about 1½ hours during which time I read letters and part of the Committee's report, and generally gave the House a full detail of what was going on between the Government and the bus Concessionaires. Unfortunately, the honourable junior member for St. Peter was not in the island then. Had he been in the island he would not have made the statement that I was brief; because he would have heard a lot of what I said prior to my introduction of this Resolution.

This is just a temporary measure. As regards the bus Concessionaires I pointed out that on the 10th August the Government had asked them to continue the service until the 24th August during which time an inventory would have been taken. As regards the question of spares, tyres, accessories, etc., this is an extract of a letter which Government sent in reply to the query of the 10th August:—

"I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 10th August and to state in respect of paragraph 3 thereof that all new major assemblies, spare parts and such spare bodies, tyres and accessories as are in good servicable condition will be included in the purchase. As pointed out in your letter of the 10th of August, it would be necessary to make an inventory of the items and units to be taken over by the Government. To expedite this operation, the Director of Transport has been authorised to contact you with a view to his making the inventory in good time."

This will, I hope, satisfy the hon. junior member for St. Peter. As pointed out in that reply to their letter, it would be necessary to make an inventory of the items and units to be taken over by the Government. To expedite this operation, the Director of Transport has been authorised to contact you with a view to his making the inventory in good time.

As I said before, I must emphasise and reiterate that this is a temporary measure. We hope that in the near future we will get bus Concessionaires applying. [Mr. LEWIS: Tell us about the ones who have not applied.] Regarding that, I hardly think that we can be very successful at this stage in view of the fact that persons who may be willing to apply may feel that since negotiations with the old Concessionaires are still going on their applications might prove fruitless. That is, that the Government is likely to come down on the side of the old Concessionaires and not on the side of the new applicants. In other words, they may be ruled out. The Government is, therefore, hoping—[A VOICE: How do you mean ruled out?] When I say 'ruled out,' I mean that although inventories are now being taken, at the same time, if an old Concessionaire desires to operate, the Government would not refuse to let him carry on.

We need the $30,000 for which we are asking in this Resolution because we must have some capital with which to work. It is true that you are going to collect fares; but you are going to have to look for gasolene, oil, etc., besides money to pay the employees, including the conductors and drivers. We do not know what our takings will be. We have never since the negotiations have been going on, had any day to day figures from any of the Concessionaires. They have never produced way-bills, which would show the number or average number of passengers which drive in them in each day. In view of those facts we cannot, therefore, estimate what revenue we are likely to get for the few days. We have calculated that salaries and wages for a minimum of 314 employees would be approximately, $4,500.

The hon. junior member for St. Peter may be glad to hear that we also intend to increase the wages of these employees. [Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Yes; but we do not want it to be too paternalistic.]

Two weeks ago we had a discussion with the Labour Commissioner with a view to fixing the wages for drivers and conductors. Under the present Regulations governing the granting of concessions the Labour Commissioner is authorised to fix the wages and conditions of service for drivers and conductors in co-operation with representatives of labour and employers. As a matter of fact, if I remember correctly, in 1954 when we were discussing the question of transferring the authority for fixing wages and conditions of service for drivers and conductors, I held a meeting to which I invited the hon. junior member for St. Peter as representative of the Workers' Union. He is aware that at that meeting we were unanimous that that authority should be transferred from the Director of Transport to the Labour Commissioner.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of Order. I wish to say that I had no discussion whatsoever on the question of wages that were paid.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I never said that. What I am saying is that the hon. member agreed then that the bus drivers and conductors were a people difficult to organise in the Union; [Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: They are organised now though] and therefore he saw no reason why he should object to the proposal to transfer that authority to the Labour Commissioner. [Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: A more private Department.] I am showing the authority for our discussing this question with the Labour Commissioner.

We have had a discussion with the Labour Commissioner and we have agreed with his recommendations for an increase in wages for the conductors and the drivers subject to the approval of the Legislature. We have agreed to the increases suggested, not much higher than what the hon. junior member for St. Peter suggested not so long ago. That part of the matter is clear.

As to the question of the taking over of the buses, the hon. junior member for St. Peter is strong in pressing for the Government to run the transport service. I am very glad to hear that he has changed his mind in favour of nationalisation especially since that debate in the House sometime ago on the nationalisation of Rediffusion service. If I am per-

mitted to quote from the hon. member's remarks on that question in this House sometime in 1952, these are some of the remarks made by the hon. member:—

"We realised years ago that things are needed in this community and we cannot fulfil them. We have a twelve-million dollar economy and the expenditure is greater than that. This is a colony of 166 square miles; our resources are limited and can anybody of serious people really believe that we can deal with things which are merely frills and trappings and not with the necessities of life? This idea of nationalisation is only making people who would be willing to come to Barbados and invest capital refrain from coming here because they feel that their business might be nationalised. We are committed to educate the children of this community; in an ignorant community you have more people going before the Courts than you would otherwise have, and we who have to work by our sweat and not wait until vice is committed, have to see to the necessities of the community. An hon. member asks about the nationalisation of oil; how can you compare that with the nationalisation of Rediffusion Service."

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: On a point of Order. What comparison is there between the nationalisation of Rediffusion and the nationalisation of public transport? I ask, what would you nationalise Rediffusion for, when everybody is putting the service in his house?

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member said at that time that nationalisation would run people from Barbados.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am one of those human beings who, if I say anything 10 years ago, I still maintain my view today. The Hon. Minister is referring to an Address which was moved by the hon. junior member for St. George for the nationalisation of Rediffusion and I was speaking against nationalisation of that service. The Hon. Minister cannot take nationalisation out of its broad context: I spoke against the nationalisation of the Rediffusion service and I drew a comparison between oil and Rediffusion. Is the honourable member saying that I am not in favour of nationalising public transport today when I have said that I am in favour of that? I say, nationalise it.

Hon. M. E. COX: I feel that nationalising Rediffusion service would be as important as nationalising the transport system. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Shame! Stupid! Oh, No.] Rediffusion is educational.

The hon. member referred to the Rediffusion service in people's houses and he considered it as a luxury. [Mr. LEWIS: That is not the debate now.] —People do not put Rediffusion in their houses because they think it is a luxury.—

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I never said that Rediffusion was a luxury. I related how poor people are putting Rediffusion in their homes and paying $2.00 a month for it, and from that I went on to speak about refrigeration. If your income has increased you should provide refrigeration. I said that I do not subscribe to any increase in bus fares.

Hon. M. E. COX: If the hon. member says he did not feel that Rediffusion was a luxury, I will not worry with that. I am convinced that Rediffusion is an educational service to the people of this island, because they want to know what is happening.

As I have already said, I cannot give anything concrete this afternoon because, for example, there are two persons who have applied for concessions. Nothing, however, can be done at this stage in view of the fact that the present owners of those buses are contracting with the Government. Unless and until the contracting is finished, nothing can be done in that matter. We are responsible to them, they are responsible to us, and not to somebody who might be successful in getting a concession.

As I told the hon. member, I would have to be vague on the question until we have settled matters with the present bus owners; I have pointed out that the Government is prepared to take over the buses and all serviceable accessories from these Concessionaires or bus owners who are unwilling to operate the service.

7.45 p.m.

If it reaches that stage as was suggested by the hon. junior member for St. John, the Government would run the service on any route it has to as a corporation and not really as a Government Department. That has been a decision of the Government.

There is only one other thing to which I would like to reply and it is something to which the hon. senior member for St. Philip made reference when he talked about playing poker. I want to assure him that I know nothing of playing poker; the only gambling which I understand is buying a sweepstake ticket.

The hon. junior member for St. Philip in the course of his remarks said that the Government seemed as if it were led up a river. I want to assure him that the Government is not led up any river despite what the hon. senior member for St. Philip has said; that is, if Government has to buy these buses, for a bus which is worth $30 the Government will have to pay $3,000.

Sir, in view of the fact that negotiations are still going on, I will not comment on anything so far as that is concerned. However, I should like to tell this House that the Government has appointed as their arbitrator the Hon. K. R. Hunte; and Mr. D. Sayers of Department of Highways and Transport, and Mr. Leon Alleyne of the Fort Royal Garage will be Government's valuers. Negotiations are going on in the matter and we are asking this Committee to vote this $30,000 as working capital to start the buses which Government proposes to run on the 25th instant.

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS; seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave for the Committee to sit again

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for three quarters of 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.

7.55 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY C'TD

Bus Concessions

On re-assembling,

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

Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. Smith being in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for the City may proceed with his speech.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, this is undoubtedly one of the biggest questions that this House has had before it for a long time; it is a question of

nationalisation. On the previous occasion when this House had some form of nationalisation to consider, it was a case of Government taking over the Gas Company. Of course, that was only a partial nationalisation; because it was only natural gas they were distributing and it was just a case of changing the persons who are now going to distribute it. But the matter now before us is one of far-reaching consequence. It is one that is far more difficult to control than the mere distribution of gas; and it is finally, one in which the Government can be taken literally for a ride, if they make any mistakes. Therefore, in the light of what I have just said, it is imperative that they should secure people of the highest integrity and strongest will to work in this proposed Corporation, if it is to be a success.

I am one of those people who favour the nationalisation of the public utility services of any country, and that is no revolutionary idea. In some of the biggest capitalistic countries of the world, the public utility services are nationalised, and rightly so, in the interests of the people of the country as a whole. I am therefore, a bit sorry to hear the timid way in which this socialist Government is taking this matter of the transport system of this island. Even now it appears that they are still hoping that they will not have to assume the responsibility of running it but that some other interested and enterprising parties will apply for the concessions which they themselves anticipate taking over as from the 24th instant.

It would seem that this is another opportunity to tell the Government, and rightly so, that they have or seem to have no policy. If they had a policy towards nationalisation they would be able to fit these services into it just as they have fitted other things like industrialisation into their pioneer system by the principle of granting concessions. Instead they dally with matters of crisis; and I must say that in some instances, they have brought on this crisis themselves.

There is no getting away from the fact that the bus Concessionaires are either unable or unwilling to supply all the necessary evidence to prove, beyond doubt, that they are losing money. The Government on the other hand has no evidence to prove that they are making money and that is where the dilemma has arisen. I go so far as to tell the Government that I agree with them that there has been no bluffing so far as their intentions regarding the question of nationalisation is concerned. I can vouch that at some time or other they must assume that responsibility; and if they have it thrown upon them so much the better. They must learn to get out of a crisis.

It seems ironical that this House has gone on record as having passed an Address on the nationalisation of public utility services to His Excellency the Governor; and it is ironical that the very public utility service that was not discussed on that occasion is the very same that the Government now finds itself in the position of having to take over.

Now, I have read many articles in the local newspapers and many letters about what is now termed as 'this emergency'; but I am afraid that no newspaper in this island has seen fit to devote a page (or two if one is not enough) to the printing of the proposed increases in the bus fares. It may have been done, but I have not seen it.

I gather from what I have seen in the newspapers that the Report of the Committee appointed to investigate the claims of the bus Concessionaires etc., has been published in the local press; but nowhere have I seen any publication of these increases as set out in the Appendix to this Report neither in the Government press nor anywhere else. [A VOICE: The Government has no press.] Well let them get one.

I am wondering why the increases have not been published. I know that the daily press have stated that the Government is engaging in a great deal of correspondence regarding final arrangements with the bus Concessionaires; but why could they not publish these things? I understand that the press would have done it if they were paid.

My argument is that Government should allow the travelling public and the rest of the populace to know exactly what the increases were. The maximum charges are all set out here in the Appendix to the Committee's Report.

In Route one, for instance, the maximum charge was originally 18 cents, and is now 22 cents; that is, the maximum increase for that particular route at least, is four cents. In another instance the maximum increase is 8 cents, and I heard one honourable member say——I think he mentioned six cents.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, it was I who used the figure 6 cents; and that means only from the terminal to Town. But the honourable member has forgotten the return to the terminal. What I really meant was 6 cents going and 6 cents coming.

Mr. LEWIS: In another instance it would be an increase of 18 cents. I feel that the information in this Appendix is information that should be passed on to the general public. I cannot see why the Government has not taken steps to publish it, since they are of the opinion that the fares should not go up even though they admit that they should subsidise the transport system of the Colony.

Now, if the Government had a policy, as I said just now, they could probably make terms to include something like this: if any bus Concessionaire does not accept my terms and he refuses to run, then the entire system in the island will be taken over. I will not be a party to this idea of partial taking over of a public utility. You cannot take it over effectively in that way. [A VOICE: By advertising the people?] I am nothing to do with advertising somebody; all I am concerned with in that particular case is that you should get something for the public's money. It is no use telling me that you are putting some poor person out by taking away their buses; because you have already brought legislation in here that will result in the taking away of the living of the man who runs the 'pirate' buses.

Now, my own opinion is that it is probable that the Government may feel that they have some mandate to take over the buses because they refused to grant the Concessionaires the increases recommended. But I would have liked to see the debate on this subject postponed so that the Government might know that this question of spending money out of the Treasury should have had the views of both Houses of the Legislature; that is, that some Message ought to have been sent to the entire Legislature and their opinions on this question ascertained. The Government is, therefore, in an awkward position. I do not know if nationalisation was not an item of their campaign policy and that is why they have endeavoured to dodge it.

I have constantly repeated this: that the morning after a Report is handed into the Government it should be in the hands of the local press and published as soon as possible. It is public property since it is paid for out of public funds.

If nationalisation had come about as a result of an expression of opinion of both Houses of the Legislature, the Government would have had certain views put before it. They might have been told to negotiate; they might have been told that,

at least, there are certain inter-route fares that might be increased; although the overall run need not be increased.

9.00 p.m.

It means that those people who are living far in the country will have to pay a lot more for the system, and that could be helped by the Government taking over any set of concessions. A public utility system like this must be run in such a way that what you lose on the roundabout you gain on the swing; you must not give somebody around the street a lucrative concession and make it difficult for others in the country to run unless it is done at an exorbitant price.

In an earlier debate, the Government would have had an idea as to whether it should set up a Corporation to run this transport service. I am sorry to see the way in which the matter has been handled; I wonder who is responsible for misleading the Government in this issue, because somebody has misled them. It might have been said that the Government is anxious to run this service and it is discovered that it is not so. If the Government has not got the Corporation set up as yet, they might be able to use the service of the Highways and Transport Board in a temporary capacity in the same way as they make use of the Bridgetown Housing Board for doing their business outside the Bridgetown area. If we could have got the views of honourable members not at the time of the crisis but at the time when clearer thinking would have been the order of the day, more wholesome ideas and workable suggestions would have been put before the Government.

If this Government does take over this service, it cannot take it over for any two-week period; that is absurd. If all we have heard from the Government is true, this Resolution should have been for an amount of at least $300,000. It is of no use telling me that you will get revenue because if you have not got a Corporation you will have to put that money into the Treasury.

What are you prepared for? You have not told us that you are going to use the bus fares when you receive them; what method are you going to adopt? Do you not think that you could credit the gasolene for two weeks? People will be willing to credit you with the gasolene and the oil because they will have these items on their hands.

I do not think that any member of this Government has any right to say that an impartial person could not take up this matter and show that they themselves are not bluffing at this late hour. Let them show the bus Concessionaires that they mean business. I have heard that they are getting ready to build cages so as to receive the money from the bus conductors. If you are running anything like seven or eight concessions and leaving somebody else to run the others, then get the gasolene free of duty, along with the oil and everything else; otherwise you will have to allow them to increase their bus fares.

What arrangements have you arrived at with these six people about paying increased salaries to their employees? These employees are now in the Trade Union; the crisis has done them the favour of opening their eyes to the fact that they should have been in the Union ever since. With whom are you going to negotiate in this matter? Does the Labour Commissioner deal with the Union as employer or does he come in as mediator? In an earlier debate you would have had a few suggestions from honourable members.

There are two more suggestions which I have to make. Let the Government consider seriously giving the people a bus service and try out the method of abolishing the Bus Stand. Let them employ a sufficient number of people on shifts to run this business, and if there is any waiting for a bus to be done, let it be done at the other end of the line. The only Bus Stand you want is the Bus Stand for country buses; when a country bus goes into the Square, let it take up passengers and go back out. You can regulate the time and the rate of travelling so that passengers would not have to be carried at any great speed. It does not appear to me that the Concessionaires wanted the passengers who wait on the road for them; when people are left on the road, why do they not send cars for them?

The next thing is that the Concessionaires should not be allowed to feel that they have a perfect right to the passengers on the road, that passengers must be reserved for them and that the buses can pass people who are waiting at "bus stops" without any signification being made that there is no more room for passengers.

9.10 p.m.

Now, Sir, I come to the things called "pirate" buses. That is a very difficult question. Really and truly, those buses are not "pirate" buses; they perform an auxiliary service to the regular passenger service; and I hope that if you force them off the routes on which they run before you have luggage compartments in the buses, that the people will take action against you.

There are many people who come out of their homes or places of work to catch a bus and if nobody offered them a lift, they would not get to town or get out of the City. There is only one bus route with which I am familiar and that is the one on which I travel from my home to the City. I know of the inconvenience suffered by people waiting on buses; therefore I can speak of it.

Sir, I think the speech of one honourable member is going to make his means of transport rather acute. I also know that there is one other honourable member who shares my misfortune in having to use buses as a means of transport. The bus service which we have is of great inconvenience to us and I think every motor car should be taken away from every Minister and compel them to use buses so that they would know what it is to travel by this mode of transport. It is a fact that bus Concessionaires would not move their bus unless it is full, so whether they carry half or more passengers, they are going to make money. You cannot know what is going on in the business until you feel the pinch of the shoe. I know all about it.

Sir, do you mean to tell me that if some person must come from the end of St. Lucy to the City to buy some necessary item, which is not a heavy item but a rather large one, that when he goes to the bus with it, the people who operate them can tell you: "Not in here with that?" What is that person to do? The Ministers and other members of this House have their motor cars which can carry such parcel or they can telephone and ask the store to deliver it. Even if they take it on approval, the particular store would deliver it for them. Sir, what is known as "pirate" buses is something which has grown out of necessity. The people who run them are doing what the bus Concessionaires should have thought of doing. If bus owners were aware of the needs of the people, they would have introduced those "pirate" buses themselves.

I hope that Government would not say that the bus service is adequate. A parcel service or van service is also necessary because the people cannot always travel with a mere handbag; they want

something to transport their goods as well. The "pirate" buses perform a necessary service to the colony. Were it not for that service many people would not be able to get in and out of the City.

I do not think that it would be any dangerous secret to let out if the Government gave us a skeleton idea of the departmental manner in which they are going to take over the buses. Tell us what you have done so far. In the absence of that information, we can only think that you are bluffing. If you have not agreed to take over the buses and set up an organised system of transport, that is still bluffing.

It seems to me that the emergency is not that the public transport service would be suspended, but that the Government is taking it over and taking it over in too timid a manner. Do you mean to tell me that you are going to spend money on it and you have no idea of the amount of revenue you are going to receive? By what authority are you going to spend this money? I am willing and I am sure honourable members are also willing not to only give you $30,000 but $300,000 or more for this purpose. We feel that you should not only run this service for two weeks, but that you should have sufficient money to run these buses for over three months, because we consider that is the shortest period in which you can run them to get to know the various intricacies of the service. There are lots of things which you have to learn about it and lots of things you have to unlearn; because some of the people who are giving you information are not giving you with the best possible intention.

Now, I must tell the Hon. Minister of Communications that when he was reading from the previous debates about nationalisation, he particularly said that the Rediffusion was an educational service; and that it was such a wonderful thing that he was a bit surprised that the honourable junior member for St. Peter would take it as one of those things which should not be nationalised. But, Mr. Chairman, do not I remember correctly when I say that the loudspeakers of this same educational service which Governement had caused to be installed at certain places to broadcast to the people were withdrawn by the Government. We were made to understand that the Government used to pay for them. [A VOICE: They were put up to give the people information on the war that was going on at the time]. They were left at those places long after the war ended; and the service from them came to be something which the people looked forward to, and if you say it was of an educational value then the small expense of them could be borne by the Government.

However, Sir, I am not one of those who believe that taxation is going up because the Government has taken over these buses; because I know that the people of this country are being taxed now in such a way as to take care of this surplus expenditure. I know that the present rate of taxation can take care of anything like this.

I am also of the opinion that it will pay for itself because several people at one time did make a profit out of it; and it is my firm belief that if you adopt the right method in running these buses and you buy gasolene at the taxed price and run this service as a business concern, only by doing that would you be able to make a comparison with the business that accrued to the people from whom you took it over.

I am hoping that the Government would take this service over and when they do so they would employ capable people to run it and do not hand it over to some "jack of all trades" to make a mess of it. Government should have some person to direct this who has some sort of socialist outlook or conviction, and who would be able to educate the employees and the public that if they rob this concern, they are robbing themselves. I am saying that you will have to get some person to educate the people into the fact that if they rob this concern, they are robbing themselves.

It is a fact that in many respects your expenses are going to be increased if it is run as a Government Department, but in some respects it is going to be decreased if you run it as a public utility service. I really do hope that we would be able to find some other method of doing this; as I do not like this idea of putting this money under Miscellaneous Services. To whom are you voting this money? Who is going to spend it? Into whose hands are we putting it? Is the Hon. Minister of Communications going to act as Head of a Government Department and run this thing? Cannot we hear who is the head of this service which you propose to take over?

9.20 p.m.

Is it a fact that the ubiquitous Mr. Chase is going to take over? I heard so. I did not get the information from Mr. Chase or any member of the Government; therefore, I can afford to say it. Do not tell me that they are going to ask the Director of Highways and Transport to run this; because at present a great deal of money is being spent on certain roads and he has some intricate road business to undertake.

As a matter of fact I am one of those who feel that this transport business should have been taken out of his hands long ago. You might let him become a member of the Board in the same way as the Commissioner of Police is a member. I have reason to believe that members of the Government share my views on that.

Now another matter to which I should like to draw attention is the statement about Miscellaneous Services. Miscellaneous Services is not a Government Department. Certainly we should have had some skeleton idea of the organisation that will have to run the new transport service, so to speak. The Government may have in mind some people who may be able to look at an engine and repair it for them, but that is not running a business. Could we not have a Corporation consisting of a number of persons? If you have to run it for a few months in the manner proposed, you should afterwards introduce legislation with the object of establishing a corporate body for the purpose.

In the mean time, let the money taken in under the existing arrangement be paid into the Treasury promptly, and let us vote new sums of money from time to time so that we may have a clear idea as to the total expense of running the service. You can forward periodic statements relative to the running of the buses; but do not interfere with the money taken in. I am counselling you now because I heard you say that you are going to take in revenue.

I do not like the idea of saying that a conductor brought in $50.00 today and you spent $6.00 out of it for something or other, and now you do not know where the rest has gone to. Let there be some check. On the contrary, I wish to hear something rather like this: a certain bus has brought in so much to-day, and it has been paid into the Treasury. I am saying it for the last time, I hope, let all sums arising from this service be paid into the Public Treasury as from the morning of the 25th instant. It is the best method that I know.

Let us suppose you came here and said that you are going to prorogue this House and you want money for two weeks, where are you going to get the money from? Do not go and use Revenue illegally. As a matter of principle I counsel you not to do that; the day you go and do that you are putting yourself in trouble; and you are in trouble enough already. You can easily get some Inspector or other person to go around and see to matters and all the money you collect carry it and put it into the Treasury. The buses have been running before you came to the Legislature and decided to run them. I sincerely hope that this House is not going to give to the Government any mandate to run the revenue from the buses.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I suppose I would be running true to form if I should show clearly that I am diametrically opposite to my colleague in my views relative to this question of nationalisation of public transport. I am absolutely opposed to the Government taking over the bus service.

You have a lot of little children (some members of the House remind me of little children) who seem to think that all members of the House are members of the Government. Let me make my position crystal clear relative to this bus or 'bus setup business. When I attempted, a few weeks ago, to discuss the matter for the benefit of the public, I tried then to get the Government to express some point of view on the matter. I exercised my right as a member of this House and raised the question as a matter of public importance; and I tried then to get the Government to give us some idea of the position.

9.30 p.m.

What the public got then, was merely a *sotto voce* remark from the Premier agreeing with me practically. When he said that only over his dead body would bus fares be raised, I thought that meant that he agreed with me politically and otherwise.

I am going to repeat what I said then; if it is felt that on this occasion or at one point on this occasion I am with the Government, I must make this clear. If something is done by the Government which I feel is right, I am with them; if they are wrong, I will say that they are wrong. As regards the Report which has been laid on the Table of this House, with the greatest respect to the members of the Committee which prepared it, I still contend, and no reasonable person could do otherwise, that no case has been made out for any increase in bus fares. If that Committee had been able to get evidence from the Concessionaires to show what their receipts were as against their expenditure, then they would have been on the way to making out a case for such an increase.

As I have already said, if the bus Concessionaires can show from their receipts when compared with their expenditure that there is a case for increased fares, then I would be the first person in this House to agree with an increase in the fares. I can say that the people in the City have not got to travel by bus and I am playing politics; however, every member of this House will have to agree, however friendly he might be with the Concessionaires, that from the Report which has been put before us, they have not been able to say: "We have been carrying so many passengers over quite a number of years and these are our receipts."

From my position in the St. Michael Vestry I started this row nearly four years ago when nearly all Concessionaires on one lovely morning sent in a Report stating that they had lost money. My whole contention was that while they have been contending that they have been losing money, they were saying: "Let us begin to play the game of Bragg, Poker, Romie" or whatever you call it. [*Laughter.*] It was always my contention that when a case has been made out and the Concessionaires can say that they have got the facts to prove that they are losing money then I will agree with increased fares; but the public has not been shown that these Concessionaires are losing money.

I will say something now. This whole matter has been a very delicate one for all the Parties in this House, but I want to make this point clear: whether it be friend or foe concerned, I have a public duty to perform. I know as a matter of fact, that behind closed doors plans were laid that practically every member of this Chamber would have to speak on this matter.

As far as this Resolution for $30,000 is concerned, when I received the Resolution I read it and weighed it carefully. I was not in time to hear the Hon. Minister introduce this Resolution, but I understand that he merely introduced and said that it would not be expedient to say anything more at this stage.

At first, what was operating in my mind as regards this Resolution until the Hon. Minister spoke last, was that they had been carrying on this little game with the bus Concessionaires. The Government hastily passed the Emergency Legislation, certain negotiations were made and I thought that the Government was playing a sort of French Draughts. I got the impression that the Government had been saying to this Branch of the Legislature that the negotiations were still going on, they did not know whether or not all the Concessionaires would come back and say: "We will go on to work," but the Government was putting itself in the position that in case the negotiations were to be broken down, it would say: "Give us this $30,000 as a stand-by." I said that there was nothing wrong in giving them this money in case the public would suffer.

But when I listened to the honourable senior member for St. Philip and the Hon. Minister of Communications telling this House: "As far as we are concerned, the negotiations have already been broken down"——

Hon. M. E. COX: I have never said that.

9.40 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am going to be strong and very strong upon this point. I pointed out to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that I would vote for this $30,000 if it were for the purpose of allowing the Government to take over under the Emergency Regulations should negotiations between the Concessionaires and the Government break down, and if the Government has decided to accept the offer by the Concessionaires to take over their buses and run them until such time. Let me say that this decision rests with one man and one man only; and that person is the Hon. Premier. I therefore hope, he will pay great attention to what I am saying, because my remarks are addressed to him.

I also am aware that the Hon. Premier is leaving the island soon. I am saying that if we have to give them money for a standby I would vote for it. When you listened to the speech of the Hon. Minister of Communications over the radio he made it quite clear that the Government was taking over the buses subject to people valuing them.

I have been told that Government has agreed in writing to take over the buses of these people; if that is so, this Resolution for $30,000 is a bit prema-

ture. I do not think you are right; I think you are wrong,, and for this reason: when I introduced the debate in this House to enlighten the public on the matter, although I could not pull the Government in the debate, I think the Hon. Premier said then they would give 15% rebate if Concessionaires agreed to put new buses on the route. I made it clear that if you are admitting that the bus Concessionaires have given no proof and have not made out a case for increased bus fares, then to come back and say you offer 15% rebate on gasolene was wrong.

I went as far as to say that an action such as that is dishonest and could be termed a collusion with the Concessionaires. All that the Premier said was that we are giving them 15% rebate because Concessionaires have to put in new buses. How can one take money out of a concern and invest it in other things rather than to put it back into the same concern. If the admission is that you are giving this 15% rebate so as to enable them to acquire new buses, you really do not have good buses or a good service.

If you are going to admit that this House is the place to enlighten the public of what is happening, tell me, what on earth will you be taking over when you take over these buses? If you admit that bus Concessionaires have not made out a case for an increase in bus fares but you say you are giving them a 15% rebate on gasolene temporarily you want them to get proper buses, you admit that they do not have proper buses and what they have are in a deplorable condition.

If you admit all of that, why come in today and say according to what the Hon. Minister said over the radio: "We have agreed to take over those buses". Are you going to please the public to satisfy one or two people? Why do you not be decent and tell us something? Why is this whole matter clouded in secrecy? As soon as one sees so much secrecy in the dealing with anything, one is bound to be suspicious.

The next thing about this matter is that an advertisement came out in the Press calling for tenders for these concessions. Have you told the public how many of these old bus Concessionaires have applied to run their concessions again? Have you any new applicants? How many services are you taking over?

9.50 p.m.

You have advertised calling for Concessionaires including the old ones. The most the public knows to-day is what they saw in the Press that five or six companies including the Liberty, the Rocklyn, and the Lincoln Bus Company have decided to run. I predicted in this House that they would continue to run and I am still holding fast to my conviction.

I am saying here on the floor of this House that if, with proper investigation they will show the facts and make out a case I will be prepared to say: these are the facts let us go into them. This Chamber could do that. But no case has been made out, the matter is shrouded in secrecy and therefore in my considered opinion you are not justified in this case in coming to this House with a Resolution for $30,000.

One or two things are wrong. The Minister of Communications has objected to my saying that negotiations have broken down. Then what are they coming to this House for? [Hon. M. E. COX: It means that negotiations are over]. Well, if negotiations are over then you are a law unto yourself. I personally feel that you are fooling the public.

If you intend to take over these buses and then sell them over to other Concessionaires (the public is watching) why are you afraid to say that to the public of Barbados? The Hon. Minister of Communications has advertised; we have not got anybody he said; [A VOICE: You said all that last week.] Do not mind what I said; I am not the Government. Has any Minister been honest enough to tell the general public that they had old Concessionaires applying?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the honourable senior member for the City has just made a statement saying that the public are watching. I wonder if the honourable member knows that by law, every new Concessionaire has got to take over the buses of the old Concessionaires if they agree on a price.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Premier has asked if I know that every Concessionaire will have to take over the buses of the old Concessionaires. Can you say who is selling them? If you have 14 Concessionaires eight of whom are saying I am willing to run and six are saying I am not willing to go on running, why not tell the public then who are willing to take over. [Hon. M. E. COX: They are the new Concessionaires].

Those are questions which must be answered. The Hon. Minister of Communications has said that I mentioned all this in my speech on the last occasion; but after all if you hear something and you mention it on the floor of this House, it is for the Government to get up and say whether we should pay regard to it or not. But if they say nothing then they leave the public with but one impression; and that is, we cannot get anybody to do it and therefore we have to take over the transport system. If they did that I would be prepared to say let us put the Government in a position so that the Concessionaires would not be able to put *their* backs to the wall.

Let me ask the Government this other question: last Tuesday they passed Emergency Regulations; the Premier said then that the Regulations were being passed in case the bus Concessionaires felt like stopping any one morning, then they would be in a position to commandeer the buses and run them; is this Resolution for that purpose? Are you saying that you never passed Emergency Regulations? Why did you pass Emergency Regulations? If you passed Emergency Regulations because you felt that negotiations would have broken down before the 25th instant, have you not got power to say that these buses will have to be operated under Emergency Regulations and that this money will have to pay for operating them? But no, you say that you are asking for this money actually to pay for the operation of the buses for two weeks. This is a dishonest attempt to extort money to run something for two weeks when the Government knows that they have decided to take over these buses by buying them out between now and the 25th August. You are not talking to fools.

Mr. Chairman, today is the 16th; tomorrow will be the 17th; between now and the 25th it will be a question of the people having a claim ready to get the money. I hope the Hon. Premier is listening to this. He has said that the law now is that we will only grant you a concession if you agree to take over these old buses. In other words what the Hon. Premier is saying is tantamount to this: if you are going to grant Messrs. Robert Thom Ltd., a concession to run the Belleville or Hastings route you can only do so if they can agree to take over the old buses. I would rather hear you tell me that that cannot happen.

I see no reason why the Government should come here with a Resolution for $30,000 under the pretext that they are only trying out something when they know they are actually buying the buses. If they

intended to work it under the Emergency Regulations I had intended to vote for it.

I will never be a good party man because I do not care how many Universities somebody has been to, I am going to express my view. There is one thing more I should like to say and it concerns the gentlemen who have been talking about nationalisation. I think the Hon. Premier will agree with me that the bus business is worth something like $4,000,000. According to the amount charged by the Government on gasolene if my honourable friend the honourable senior member for St. Joseph who is one of the economic luminaries of this House had worked it out, he would have brought it at approximately $2,000,000 [A VOICE: Their share for selling the gasolene?] I cannot see the wisdom of Government taking it over. 10.00 p.m.

I will never vote for the Government to take over any business which could be run successfully by private enterprise. I know that some of my friends in this Chamber feel that they are wedded to nationalisation as a new-fangled idea because of their big experiences and how well they think it will work in other countries; but they will agree with me that it is the capitalised countries in the form of free enterprise which have been feeding the hungry world. I refer to the United States of America which has had to feed the entire world. I had to remind the hon. junior member for St. Peter about that.

The bringing down of this Resolution is, to my mind, a game of bluff. When I discussed this question about the transport service recently, I believe it was said: "Not one will come out tomorrow morning". I offered to bet that the buses would all come out, and they have all come out.

I understand that throughout the negotiations there were still those who were decent enough to say: "Although we are not actually making sufficient money, we are not losing any money". I have asked in this House that they separate the buses on the short routes from those which go to the country districts and see what portion of the alleged $37,000 is lost outside.

I do not believe myself that the Government is approaching this matter in the right spirit; I feel that they are somewhat timid. I congratulate them on the stand they have taken in not granting the Concessionaires the amount for which they had asked; however, I say that it is not a blunder but a dishonest and reckless mistake, if it can be termed a mistake, to offer them this rebate of 15%. It is dishonest to say: "I will give you something in another way."

I still say that the Government should have been stronger in this matter. I still repeat that they have no right even to attempt to ask for this $30,000 knowing that they are actually going to take over these buses. You are taking over buses which, according to the method of taxation, the Concessionaires have already paid for and they are over 12 years old. Mark this: you are going to take over the buses; you have agreed to buy them; on the other hand you have passed Emergency Legislation which you have told this House would put you in a position to prevent the travelling public from suffering because you could commandeer the buses and run them; but you tell me now that you are taking over some of the buses because one or two people are saying that there is no strength of character.

Let me digress here for a moment to say this: you have a recommendation made to the Government by the Director of Highways and Transport, and the feeling of the Government is that no Director would have made any recommendation for any increase unless he had consulted the Minister of Communications. I see that the Premier is laughing. One wonders in what position Mr. Barron would be if he had done anything without the knowledge of his Minister.

There is also the feeling that a promise has been made to increase bus fares; if they did not make that promise, I will like to know by what stretch of the imagination are they making this dishonest mistake of offering this 15% rebate?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: On a point of Order. The honourable member continues to use the word "dishonest". It is only his enthusiasm that has made him forget what the Hon. Minister has said. This is what the Government has said:

"The Governor-in-Executive Committee view with great concern the failure of the Concessionaires to face up to the pressing needs of the general public calling for considerable improvements in the operational methods and improvements in the types of motor omnibuses to provide better travelling facilities. They decided, after lengthy deliberation, that immediate steps must be taken to bring about a marked improvement in the conditions of public transport. It was concluded that an increase in bus fares would not, in the circumstances, meet the case, but, that a rebate of 5 per cent of the cost of petrol per gallon consumed solely for operational purposes for motor omnibuses operating on service routes could be granted, provided the Concessionaires agreed to enter a Concessionaire Agreement requiring them to carry out essential improvements to the public transport services within a specified time."

That is what we offered the 15% rebate for. We offered it provided the Concessionaires did so and so within six months and so and so within twelve months. All those things have to be done before they get that 15%, 5% or 2%. We said that we are giving the Concessionaires this 15% if they carry out these improvements and not otherwise.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: We had better get that straight. Then the six Concessionaires who have continued to work will not get this 15% rebate. I say that that is dishonest; show or bring proof that I am wrong. The Premier has said that it is only if the Concessionaires do these things that they will get this 15% rebate. I ask: will the people who are continuing to run their buses get this 15% rebate? Take care we understand that they are getting it. [*Laughter*].
10.10 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I said provided the Concessionaires carry out those essential improvements to their services.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I did not understand; you have it that way; I am ignorant; I was never good at playing Old Man's Bluff. Let me say again, that this thing rests with one man only; and there is nothing wrong with my saying that.

Let me ask the Hon. Premier this question: despite all the facts and figures which I brought in here and although I know that representation was made to the Hon. Minister that the statements which I made were not correct, I invite the Hon. Premier to say——

Hon. M. E. COX: I would like to know to what representation is the honourable member referring.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I will soon tell you. I am saying that despite the statement I made in here and you have made a mistake, say so. If your policy is nationalisation, well then, there is no hard feeling. I came in here and said "No nationalisation for me"; but there is no hard feeling if you want to nationalise. I came in here with figures and with

statements on this matter. We realise that you must have these buses.

I asked you: is it not a fact that all these Concessionaires have been allowed to deduct 20% for depreciation for every single unit they have been running before they are liable for taxation? You said that you were giving the 15% rebate because you must have proper buses. You felt you were right when you were doing it, but I am saying, you are wrong. I distinctly told you that these people were taking out this 20% for depreciation each year from the time you regulated them. They have taken out that money and have put it into their own pockets. Is that true or not?

If it is true, are your actions honest to the public of Barbados when you know now that they have taken this out and you are going to give them 15% rebate on gasolene? Ask the Income Tax Commissioner or Mr. McDermott if that is not true. With those facts staring you in the face, are you not seeing now that you have made a mistake to——

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Finish your sentence. What has the Commissioner of Income Tax to do with this?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Do not try to draw a red herring across the trail. You say that you will be giving them that rebate for rehabilitation; that is what you said already. You felt you were right when you said that, but are you going to give somebody money to do something when they have already taken that money out of the business and done something else with it?

I am saying how are you going to do that when for the past ten years they have been taking out 20% to rehabilitate their buses and they have not put one new bus on their route. You could have agreed to that if they had put in one new bus.

As a matter of fact, if they had put in new buses, there would be no necessity for "pirate" buses. You would have been able to say that the Concessionaires had carried out their obligations, and there is no necessity for any improved transportation. You would have been able to say that such and such a Concessionaire had made so much money out of his business and he had put it back into the business; instead of his having ten buses as when he started, he has 15 buses. But when it is brought to your notice that Concessionaires have taken out the money out of the business and put it into something else——[A VOICE: What? Real Estate?] Yes. [A VOICE: That is a joke.] If you say so, you ought to know. If you know that they took money out of the business and put it to their own use, how then can you say you are justified in taxing the people of this colony to give them 15% rebate on gasolene? What you are really doing is taxing the people of this colony to put money into the hands of 14 people.

10.20 p.m.

If my greatest friend were in the Government I could not refrain from saying that this action is a dishonest action. I will not be a party to a vote like this. My colleague referred to the attitude of some members of the Government by saying that when they are removed from travelling in the buses and are in their cars they seem to forget. Well, I say that it is good at times to remember; and in this game surrounding this bus business I do not see why the Committee should have made recommendations without first seeing what were the takings of these bus Concessionaires. [A VOICE: I do not agree with that.] If that Committee had had absolute proof and had shown that a Concessionaire had invested $50,000 for instance, and had been unable to make 3 per cent or 4 per cent on his money, I would have been one of the first to say that he should have an increase in bus fares because he would be entitled to some profit on his money so invested.

Mr. Chairman, when the promise was made to increase bus fares, (you hear what I say) when the promise was made to increase bus fares the Government did not give their reasons. I cannot imagine how they could make that recommendation without the Government's knowing. There are those of us who do not want to keep on our heads in here only but will listen for certain things which they ought to know.

The Hon. Minister of Communications wanted to know when I quoted the returns made by certain buses to the Vestry, whether I was sure that they were correct. I understand the Hon. Minister to say that certain Concessionaires had informed him that there was no truth in some of what I had said. I consider that the Hon. Minister of Communications should call on the Vestry for that information. I defy any Vestry to deny the Hon. Minister that information on behalf of his Government. I made those the Hon. Minister to have those figures brought before him since they will help to solve this matter.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, somebody said to me yesterday morning something that will show the conditions that those buses are in. Many of the buses that have been bought he said, are so bad that he was in one and when the rain started to fall everybody in the two back seats had to get out because there was no glass or anything else to keep out the rain. If Concessionaires in any other country besides Barbados had done this they would have been locked up.

I am telling you this with the greatest respect: for you to take the money of the people of this country and buy these broken down buses you are doing wrong. [A VOICE: Buy new ones then.] You do not have to buy new ones then.

I heard it mentioned just now that we never knew anything about Government's arbitrators until somebody rung it out of the Minister of Communications. Then somebody else wrung it out of him you have got Mr. Leon Alleyne and Mr. K. R. Hunte, the one a very reputable mechanic and the other a shrewd business man.

The Hon. Ministers of the Government have a habit of looking across here and saying that somebody is an arbitrator. Arbitrator for what? [A VOICE: A shrewd business man!] Arbitrator for the subsidy? Does it make much difference?

It is difficult for some of us to make speeches on this matter. For instance, Mr. Chairman, I saw in one section of the Press that you have a business transaction to get over; that is that you are to make some concessions. One section of the Press has said that the reason why I was raising opposition was because I had interest in it. Whatever you go to do you should do it well; and I am sorry to say I cannot vote for this Resolution. It is not enough to get up and say what the Hon. Minister of Communications has said.

I am putting a proposition to you now: rather than actually now going and buying out these buses, why not get together with your new Concessionaires [A VOICE: You have Concessionaires who are willing.] I am a business man [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: A shrewd business man!] No, I am only a simple business man.

The Hon. Premier has reached the stage where he has not got to worry about what happens politically in Barbados. With regard to the six Concessionaires why not call on them and say: "Are you not willing to take this or that route?" Let me in-

form you on this: the cost of the gasolene that is used in these buses is approximately $4,000,000.
10.30 p.m.

I am asking this question: instead of buying these buses, why not call upon these people and ask them if they are willing to take this or that? If you buy a motor car to-morrow at 12 o'clock just as it come off the boat and you carried it back at 5 o'clock after it had done 5 miles, there is an amount to be allowed for depreciation. You say: "I do not like how the back seat feels, it is not serviceable enough," as the honourable senior member for St. Lucy would say; and when you carry it back, an amount would be taken off for depreciation.

You have a section in this House which is in favour of nationalisation, but there is some wisdom in the heads of a few people who feel that you should not nationalise now that there are so many other things to be done. I can see with that idea. Be like Caesar's wife. If you go and take over these buses and pay $50,000 for them and then turn them over to Concessionaires even for the same money, you are doing wrong. You invest in anything to make money.

I remember that when one Concessionaire was granted a concession, everything was bad. Of course there are some honourable members who want the Government to buy these buses; of course you will have some buses in such a condition that you will have to put a taxi in front of them to pull them; of course there are some buses which will run only for a day. But what should be the Government's approach in this matter? What I would suggest to the Government is this: (I call the Premier the Government) in the first place, exercise your right under the Emergency Legislation which we have passed; if the Concessionaires say that they are losing money, suppose you came down under the Emergency Regulations and said: "Let us have your buses: we are paying for gasolene, repairs, and so on." On the other hand, call in the Concessionaires which you have now and ask them to take over a few routes. Thirdly, call in those persons who have applied for concessions, before you do one stroke of buying and ask them: "Are you willing to take over these concessions?" But do not make these concessions for any three or five years.

The Hon. Minister of Communications has said: "We will pay what the Labour Commissioner says should be paid."

Hon. M. E. COX: We have passed Regulations transferring the power to fix wages from the Director of Highways and Transport to the Labour Commissioner.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Minister has said that on the question of fixing wages they are putting that matter into the hands of the Labour Commissioner. Any way, I am not worrying about that: what I am suggesting is that you should not grant any concessions for any three or five years. If you grant the concessions for 10 years, people will be able to get backing from the Banks.

I am not voting for this $30,000 because I think a false impression was given to this House. In fact, this Resolution is for the purpose of a deposit which is not called for in the real estate business. You are taking our money and buying broken down buses and the public want to know, sooner or later, why this is happening. Something fishy is going on about this matter; this thing will smell. I warn the Government about it; you are penalising the people when you know that there is not one bus Concessionaire who has gone even near to bankruptcy.

I sit down by asking you: now can Government take money out of the Treasury to give to those people when your own Income Tax Commissioner called on one of them to put back $56,000 which he took out of his business. I say that for the benefit of the public. I will say finally that I am not going to vote for this Resolution.
10.40 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I am probably at a disadvantage in that I did not hear the entire debate this afternoon as I was forced to be elsewhere; but this Addendum, on my first cursory reading over the weekend, made me so thoroughly pleased that I said to myself that the Government has at last got the courage, if not of its own convictions, of mine, to make its first move after so many years to nationalise public utilities.

There is no gainsaying the fact, that when the people voted at the last General Elections, the vast majority of them voted for a programme which they anticipated and they were made to believe included nationalisation at every turn and at every available opportunity. There is no use attempting to deny that. That was the factor which more than anything else, (even the giving of free hot meals to elementary school children and free secondary education) which operated in the minds of people who cast their votes at the last General Election. Therefore, when I read the Addendum to this Resolution stating Government's decision to take over and operate some of the concessions, I felt pleased that Government at last had taken this courage in its hands.

But then, some most unfortunate words "on a temporary basis the buses of those owners who no longer wish to renew their concession agreements" have been put into it. The snag is too awful. In other words, you will be nationalising some on a temporary basis and others, you will not be nationalising at all.

I would like to say that it would be putting a very great strain on the employees of those owners who are renewing their agreement when they see running at the same time, almost alongside them, buses which are being run by the Government; and whose employees would be in receipt of substantial increases and whose employees would be working much shorter hours than they, and whose employees will be liable to pension rights and security of tenure.

Sir, consider how would those employees of those people feel when they see that their brothers in the same line of business are working in happier and better conditions when these concessions are being actually renewed and signed by those people who have declared their intention of carrying on.

I must advise Government to make sure that there be some Clause that whatsoever is paid to the employees of those buses run by the Government and whatsoever are the working hours of such employees, are also applicable to those employees of those bus Concessionaires who are operating their concessions; and that those Concessionaires must make provision for pensions for those who are working on their buses so that they would be in line with the employees of the buses which are run by the Government.

Several transport workers have discussed with me during the past week the question of their wages; and they maintain with considerable justification that there is no reason why a driver of a bus with the responsibility which he has, should be paid less than an "A" Class mason or carpenter. They can see no reason why they should be paid less than 15/- a day for the work which they are required to do and for the hours which they are required to work.

I must confess, enthusiastic as I am for nationalisation, (it is the only hope and salvation) that I see

no reason why this Government should not be behind the Attlee's Labour Government when it had a similar majority in the House of Commons of bringing nationalisation into effect.

The Addendum goes on to state; "I hope that in the near future" (I presume it means between now and the 24th instant) "that Concessionaires might apply." The Government is suggesting a very timid and lukewarm taking over. In other words, they are saying they would not be running the show for any length of time; and possibly one of those firms whose names we have heard mooted around as being interested, such as Messrs. Robert Thom Limited, and Messrs. Musson, Son & Company, Limited, might apply.

The honourable senior member for St. Michael went on to state that Government is still hoping that at the last moment any Concessionaire who wants to renew his concession would come in and do so. That again is wrong; that is lukewarmness and a bad approach to nationalisation. In other words, you are hoping against hope that somebody would want to renew their concession or somebody else might apply for it.

10.50 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, if the Government runs the entire service for which no one has applied [A VOICE: Who told you so?] I do believe you must absorb the other people; and the moment they realise that, they have got to follow that up.

The hon. junior member for the City speaking on the Resolution for $30,000 said that $30,000 is a considerable sum to have in hand before you start. But then it would hardly have justified him saying that more fares would not be coming in—

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I condemned the system of using the revenue of the buses and I counselled the Government to see the wisdom of using the method of placing all sums received into the Treasury promptly. Therefore the hon. member need not say what he has said.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I have not misquoted the hon. member. If he wanted to get up he could have said so. During the fortnight however, bus fares will come in and they will be sufficient, obviously to finance the running of the buses. You will have two weeks accumulation of funds which will not be touched and then you will have your third week. In short you will have enough money to carry on.

Reference was made to-day to a subject which we discussed last week; that is, the question of the pick-ups. The Government would be well advised to leave these people alone. I must admit that I personally would not suffer professionally or otherwise but they should be left alone; they should not be interefered with.

I have good reason to believe that at least, in one rural area, certain members of the Police Force are subsidised by a certain bus owner; because certain of those pick-up owners often find themselves on some fictitious charge. As a result they waste their time in answering these charges in Court and are very often forced to spend money unnecessarily. It is not fair to them. Furthermore these are the people upon whom after the 25th August you will have to rely to carry on the transport of the island.

This Committee has recommended an overall increase upon only 30 to 50 new units. If you make that increase you still leave a void which can only be filled by the pick-up. You will find (and this is where I recall the remarks of the honourable senior member for the City who in speaking about permits said that permits are only to be granted to bus owners) that permits will be granted to "X" and not to "Y." You will find that the luggage van people will not be able to get permits to carry two people besides the driver outside of the fact that the gear shift is situated on the steering wheel. Others are permitted not only to carry one but two; therefore I conclude that that is discrimination.

In the case of the luggage vans, if you limit the number of passengers to so small a number that it is found uneconomical to run it, that will be another way of putting the vehicle off the road. Lest hon. members should feel that it is only the pick-ups who want to make a living, let me remind them that there is a vast number of people who say that they want to travel by the pick-ups. They say that if they do not have money the pick-up owner will allow them to owe him the fare. That is not so with the Leeward Motors Co. That is why I have reminded hon. members that these pick-ups have become integrated into the life of the colony and is the poor man's taxi.

For all these reasons, we cannot conceive of this service continuing without the aid of these vehicles. They provide a service which has never been before provided.

But to revert to the financial side of this matter, I am supporting this vote but I depricate the apparent nervousness of the Minister who is responsible for its introduction. He seems lacking in confidence that the Government can take over and run the service efficiently. Let him understand that it is only the capitalist element which is endeavouring to scare him. [Hon. M. E. COX: The capitalists never had any influence over me and never will.] I hope I have misread the mind of the honourable member.

After due consideration, honourable members will see that there is hardly anything that Government should be more in control of than passenger transport. I feel that Government should not hesitate to take it over today. You will hear criticism coming from your extreme right. It is there that the forces of reaction assemble and foregather; but that is the very reason why they are against it; because they realise that certain private business men will be losing and the Government will be making what they have ceased to make.

11.00 p.m.

If the Government is running this bus service, you are getting petrol and oil free of duty, and you do not have to provide any margin of profit; you are just covering your expenses and you are getting your essential commodities duty free. It might well be decided that you run the whole show so as to effect at least a slight reduction in the fares. [*Cheers.*] You cannot get away from that, and I do not think I need stress that any more.

I trust that when the honourable senior member for St. Michael goes to Rediffusion again at 8.30 o'clock p.m. he will not be telling us that he has awarded anything to Messrs Robert Thom Ltd., Central Foundry Ltd. or any of those people, but that the Government has accepted its responsibility to the electorate and has decided to nationalise the first item which has presented itself as a gift, and we will have our Bridgetown Passenger Transport Service.

Mr. HAYNES: I do not want to delay this meeting, but I think it is proper that I should say a few words on this matter. As a rule, I do not agree with the majority on the other side of the table. I was a bit shocked when I saw this Resolution for $30,000; it gave me the impression that no thought had been given to one of the most import-

ant matters which have been discussed here for a long time.

In the first instance, I should have thought that the policy of this Government would have been to realise that unless they do something of some value to improve our transportation service in Barbados, and do it quickly, they will never improve the service. When one looks at these so-called buses which you see at the various terminals, you can almost compare them with some fowl coops or something of that sort. If one of these vehicles over turned, there is no way of getting out of it at all.

Wherever you go you will find that within the last 10 years the cost of public transportation has increased considerably; it has increased not only in England but in other countries as well. Let us take the United States of America; in 1945 you paid 5 cents to travel by the subways and you could go any distance. In 1955 the cost has been increased to 15 cents—an increase of 300%. And why is that? Because obviously, the cost of everything else has gone up and you have to try to keep things as they should be kept, otherwise there is no progress.

It reminds me of the sign which you sometimes see: "Drugs administered or carefully compounded."

In the other Acts on the Statute Book, we generally see, "the Board may make regulations generally for carrying out the provisions of the Act;" not administering the provisions of the Act. Now, they specify and then there is a general clause at the end. [A VOICE: That is a precautionary method.] It would appear to me when this whole Bill was drafted that somebody was sleeping. You then have as subclause (2):—

"Regulations made under this section shall be laid before each House of the Legislature as soon as possible after they are made, and if either House, within the period of forty days beginning with the day on which the regulations are laid before it, resolves that the regulations shall be annulled, the regulations shall thenceforth be void but without prejudice to the validity of anything previously done thereunder or to the making of new regulations."

The Regulations which this Board would make are only domestic in nature and can only affect the internal economy of the corporation. What new contingencies are being made by the provision of Clause 18 of this Bill? I wonder if the Hon. Minister of Communications knows that himself and whether he can give an answer to the queries raised. This whole paragraph is complete hash. Nothing has been put to the public to say that you have set up a Board which is a step towards nationalisation. There is nothing in this Bill well thought out or drafted.

If the Hon. Minister of Communications has assured us that this Bill was thoroughly discussed in Executive Committee, it would appear to me that the Executive members of this House had no sleep at all, It is laughable, but it is really true.

I do not think it is worth my saying more because my words may be falling on deaf ears. It is my belief that hon. members have made up their minds already and I think they will remain where they are. However, I think it is a pity to say that one or two younger hon. members than me may regret it in the near future.

11.10 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I would first like to congratulate the hon. junior member for St. Peter and the hon. senior member for St. Philip on having made very good speeches on this whole situation, especially in view of the fact that I considered them to be better socialists than any hon. member of this House who is on the Ministerial benches. I also congratulate the hon. junior member for St. John who is not with us for what he has said.

Firstly, I must congratulate him as being the first member of the Opposition who has been enthroned in the Editorial Chair of the Government's Newspaper and I would secondly congratulate him——

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, I object to that statement. I am not in the Editorial Chair of any Government Newspaper.

Mr. BARROW: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, my congratulations are premature; but the hon. junior member for St. John informed me two weeks ago in the Lobby of this Chamber of his appointment in that respect.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Again, Mr. Chairman, I object to those remarks. I have been accused of several things which I have never confirmed or denied.

Mr. BARROW: I am not accusing the hon. member of anything; I am just congratulating him on being the first member of the Opposition who has achieved the Editorial Chair of the Government's Newspaper.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I am the only Independent member of this House, Mr. Chairman; I am the only one now existing since my colleague has joined the new party. My status is politically independent, and therefore I can take any stand I like.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am going to ask the hon. senior member for St. George to keep to the particular Resolution.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I am entitled to congratulate hon. members.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking you to listen to me. You may speak for the whole night until tomorrow morning, but you must speak on this Resolution.

Mr. BARROW: I am speaking on the Resolution; I am congratulating hon. members who spoke on it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But the hon. junior member for St. John is not thanking you for so doing.

Mr. BARROW: Whether he thanks me or not it is immaterial to me. As an independent member, who on his own information has achieved distinction on a newspaper which is losing $4,000 a year, I have congratulated him.

Mr. Chairman, I should also like to congratulate the hon. senior member for the City on having spoken three times on this Resolution and said the same thing on each occasion, and also has been able to keep hon. members as interested in what he had to say on the two subsequent occasions as he did on the first occasion.

I would also like to congratulate the hon. senior member for the City for on 17 occasions getting up and distinctly accusing the Government of dishonest acts and not having been named or called upon by the Speaker to withdraw the remarks. I think that is a matter for great congratulations. I would like also to congratulate him for suggesting that you were in the position of being a prospective Concessionaire.

However, sir, my congratulations are advisedly withheld from anyone in the Government or the three hon. members on their left who reminds me of the saying: "Hear no evil, see no evil, and speak no evil".

Mrs. BOURNE: Mr. Chairman, I am one of three members immediately on the left of the Government, and I would like to tell the hon. member to speak for himself. I would never like to adopt his attitude as long as I remain in this House. [*Cheers.*]

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, this is the one occasion which the honourable member thought she had heard evil; or perhaps, Mr. Chairman, by supporting the policies which can only lead them down the Galilean slope to destruction, I can call them both faithful and charitable.

My congratulations are advisedly withheld from the Hon. Minister of Communications and I do so purposely. I warned him two weeks ago that I was going to refrain from making any disclosure on this matter until he was man enough to say that by their taking over the buses to run them, they were under the legal obligation to buy them from the Concessionaires. That moment has come today, when the Government of this country in coming for his Resolution to operate the buses for two weeks, has at present a legal and binding obligation to buy over these buses from those Concessionaires; and although a virtual Minister of Trade is at the head of the commission I will still like to predict that the taking over of these buses is going to cost Government a sum in the vicinity of $576,000.

On the 26th August, this month, members of the Government are going to come down here with a Resolution for $576,000 to purchase these buses which they took over. If they do not come for that amount they will soon be put in Court, because the recently introduced Crown Proceedings Act makes them liable. We are still waiting for the Minister to disclose that.

Even now, he does not seem to realise the enormity of the crime he has committed against the people of this country. Up to now he is still sleeping when I have already pointed out to him that they have already entered an agreement in which it is published and declared that they must buy these buses. It took him four hours after he was goaded by the honourable junior member for St. Philip to confess, much to the consternation and dismay of the honourable senior member for the City, that they had already agreed to accept the offer of the bus Concessionaires to purchase approximately 100 of their buses.

In other words, as the honourable senior member for the City said just now, it seems that the $30,000 which we are asked to vote tonight is more of a down payment to pay to the thieves of the transaction.

11.20 p.m.

I am not going to go over the ground which has been so ably traversed by the two honourable members who have already spoken (the honourable junior member for St. Peter and the honourable senior member for St. Philip). Nor to go into the mechanics of the administration of a transport service which has been so ably covered by the honourable junior member for the City. But I do feel that every Minister of the Crown (because in the last analysis although they regard themselves as Ministers of the Premier they are Ministers of the Crown) should get up and explain clearly to the public exactly what is happening, and what would be the effect of any Resolution which is introduced into this Chamber.

The honourable member for the City has said that certain parties are afraid to speak their minds on this matter. I said two weeks ago that when the Government comes clean and when the Minister of Communications explain more, we would be prepared to speak then and not before. The three speeches including the one made by the honourable senior member for the City was a kind of supererogation on his part because he was inveigled into taking over the buses, he being convinced that they could not lose money; today he is saying something different.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member has this impression which he said he read in the Official Gazette; but I forgive him since the creation of those impressions depend largely upon the state of his mind. I said that I would never support the Government in any attempt to take over the bus transport.

Mr. BARROW: To-night I was under the impression that the honourable member was still saying that the Government should call off the bluff with the Concessionaires and take over; but the honourable member seems to be slightly disappointed that (according to the senior member for St. Joseph) the deal is already closed and the Government has already agreed to pay for these buses but he wants to keep this a secret. That was the impression I got.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to make one or two interesting disclosures. The Emergency Powers Act which was passed by this Chamber a short time ago (I believe on the 12th day July,) has absolutely nothing to do with the bus crisis. It happened to be introduced on the night when the negotiations were still going on; but the Hon. Premier had reasons then which will be disclosed within the next five minutes or thereabout and that is why he passed this Emergency Legislation.

I am sorry that the honourable junior member for St. Peter is not in his seat tonight to hear these comments. This Emergency Legislation was passed in anticipation and at the behest of certain overseas interests of which the Barbados Electric Supply Corporation forms part, and for the purpose which I predicted three years ago. I have said it and it will be proved in the result that the Act will never be used because there is no bus crisis.

This Government owns these buses already; so how then can they invoke this emergency legislation? The only persons the Government can now invoke emergency regulations against are the members of the Barbados Workers Union. The Government have already signed on the dotted line not literally but in effect, since they have sent back correspondence saying that they have accepted the proposals of the bus Concessionaires. The bus drivers have been foolish enough to have gone and joined the union. All that the bus owners are waiting for now is their money. The Committee has not met, so nobody can say that a member of the Committee told me of this important figure of $576,000.

Time and again I have pointed out to the general public of Barbados what is happening in this country; that is that with one voice they say that the merchants got the coin and the Union got the men; but now it is that the Union got the men and not the money! [*laughter*].

I am saying this: this situation is not due to any perspicacity or business acumen on the part of any single person in Barbados including myself, not even Mr. McDermott or the Financial Secretary; but to the people who have an economic stranglehold on this colony. As we have been reminded by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph himself, we in this Chamber do not control the destiny of this country at all; we are merely a debating Chamber. When you set up an Arbitration Board and put Mr. Hunte on it, and when you take the 1953 Customs Act and you allow exemptions from duty on oil, copra etc., coming into this country specially for the Roberts Manufacturing Company for which Mr. Hunte is the Managing Director, that is a matter specifically for the Minister of Trade. At one conference the Minister of Trade—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is this something to do with the Minister of Trade?

Mr. BARROW: Yes. There is financial policy involved in this matter; it is a trading concern which deals with gasolene etcetera.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am warning the honourable member that he must keep to the Resolution.

Mr. BARROW: Is it a fact that tonight for the first time the Minister of Communications has disclosed that the same Mr. Hunte who has concessions for the Roberts Manufacturing Co., is going to be Chairman of the proposed Transport Board; is that right or wrong? No matter what their political propositions may be, you have to look to see how the country is going to be run. When it comes to the bus company or any concern for that matter there is a lot of inveigling in it.

When the price of cooking oil went up—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This has nothing to do with the Resolution.

Mr. BARROW: Yes it has something to do with the Resolution. I am dealing with the increase in the cost of living. Everyone knows that if 4 cents per pound on the price of margarine is—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I repeat that that has nothing to do with this Resolution.

Mr. BARROW: But it does have something to do with it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Has the increase on bus fares got anything to do with the increase on margarine?

11.30 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: I know that when they wanted the public to pay a cent on Fats, the promise was made long before so that the Commission which was set up was only a political shield to say that they were doing it on the advice of the Commission. That was when they wanted the public to pay a cent on Fats.

This is where I join issue with the honourable senior member for the City; on three successive occasions he got up in this House and said: "If I had a brief for anybody in this matter, I would not be in this Chamber." I invited the Hon. Minister to see that the first thing he should do would be to clear the air. I saw the eagerness and approbation displayed by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph and the honourable senior member for St. Michael, and for the first time I saw the Premier taking copious notes to be used as argument to beat down the Concessionaires.

They have been led up the garden path in this matter. On three occasions the honourable senior member for the City said that the bus Concessionaires were making money. The Commission which was set up to investigate the claims of the bus Concessionaires for an increase in bus fares, was comprised of the former Income Tax Commissioner, Mr. Clairmonte, Mr. Alkins and Mr. Armstrong, and they did not say either what the Minister of Communications is saying they said, or what the honourable senior member for the City has misinterpreted them as having declared. [A VOICE: Where do you get that from?]

Mr. Chairman, if the glasses of the honourable junior member for St. Philip are not as good as they should be, I would move a Resolution to the National Health Services as soon as possible. I would only like to say this: in offering my congratulations just now I left out the hon. junior member for St. Philip by an oversight; and I must congratulate him on having the temerity to make a speech in view of the fact that the Minister of Communications is his sole means of transport after the meeting of this House.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: On a point of Order. From what document is the honourable member quoting.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will find out as soon as he has finished.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, it is rather remarkable that members of the public are being put in the same ignominious position as the honourable junior member for St. Philip who is dependent upon the Minister of Communications for transport to and from his home, and he does not know that we have not had this Report debated in the House. You can have a copy of it. (*The honourable member threw a copy of the Report across the Table.*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What does the honourable member mean by throwing about papers like that?

MEMBERS: Protest against that. He does not have any culture even if he has brains.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Leave him alone.

Mr. BARROW: Now the terms of reference of the Committee were: "To investigate the claims of the bus Concessionaires for an increase in bus fares and to make recommendations....." What recommendations? Recommendations for the increase in bus fares. This is what is stated in the Official Report from which I was reading and which I have had the honour to hand, perhaps perfunctorily, to the honourable junior member for St. Philip. Why did the Minister not start off and clear the whole atmosphere by discussing the Report?

As the honourable junior member for the City has pointed out, not one newspaper has gone into the prospective increases. As I was saying, this is what is stated in the Report as regards statistical information:—

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

There is absolutely no suggestion anywhere in the Report that they do not have revenue and expenditure accounts.

11.40 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I must quite seriously object to that statement by the honourable member. He said that I suggested that I have never seen any statistics for expenditure and revenue by these bus Concessionaires. Apparently the honourable member was not in here at all when I spoke on this matter. What else did I say but what was reported by the Committee; that is, that they were unable to get from many of the Concessionaires any statistical information. He is saying that I misquoted what the Committee reported. I said nothing more than what the Committee reported. In the course of my speech I said: how can you very well make a recommendation if you really have statistics of expenditure but none for receipts.

Mr. BARROW: I am sure that the impression which for the past two weeks members of the public and of this House have, not only from the remarks of the honourable senior member for the City but from the Minister himself, is that those people could not show how much money they were making.

What does the Commission say? They said that in the course of the enquiry they found themselves at some disadvantage in that adequate statistical information was not available from many Concessionaires to enable them to make proper comparisons

and reliable estimates. What does that represent? That represents that interesting statistical information as to the number of passengers carried, the number of miles which were run during the year, the average consumption and the percentage of expense. There is no suggestion in the Report that none of the Concessionaires could show what was their revenue.

I would also like to congratulate the honourable junior member for St. John for coming to the interesting conclusion that there were profits. He is now the extra-mural Economic Adviser to the Government; so no wonder they find themselves in the mess in which they find themselves to-day.

The paragraph of the Committee's Report which I just quoted ends thus: "We recommend that concessionaires should be required in their own interest to keep full records of such details in the future." I entirely agree that they should keep full records of that in the future.

What I am saying is that if you set up a Committee to look into an increase in bus fares, what do you expect from that Committee? You can only get one or two things; they are that an increase is not justified at present, or that there should be an increase.

When Government decided to set up this Committee, its members must have been chosen for their integrity, knowledge of accounts and their disinterestedness in the political arena or the bus service. If the Government were acting properly, and we must presume so, what then activated Government in the choice of the members of that Committee. Can Government now talk of increasing fares over somebody's dead body? To use a local expression, however the corn is selling, whether you take it out of taxation or you take it directly from the actual consumer who is the man who enjoys the service, there will be an increase in the cost of living and it must be so. Therefore, it is only a matter of political slight to suggest that there will be no increase in the cost of living when you deprive the revenue of the island of $60,000 a year to prevent bus fares being increased over one's dead body. And, because in the final analysis whichever decision you make eventually there will be an increase in the cost of living whether it be that the travelling public pays increased fares or the bus Concessionaires enjoy complete tax relief concession of petrol like the Roberts Manufacturing Company, the sugar factories in Barbados, the Barbados Knitting Mills, Messrs Cable & Wireless, Limited, or the Barbados Ice Factories including that of my colleague.

Why doesn't the Minister of Communications tell the public that? Why is it that Messrs Cable and Wireless, Limited, one of the greatest monopolies in communications in the world, not only in Barbados, does not pay one cent taxation and get all their equipment in tax free and on top of that, pay the Barbadian worker lower wages than the European workers and the Minister of Communications condones that.

I would like to ask: have any terms been made to the honourable senior member for St. Joseph or the honourable senior member for St. Michael by the bus drivers and the bus conductors in their perilous job of hanging on to buses while they are doing their work, in that there will be a platform set on their wages? Does that mean a further increase not in the mythical cost as expressed by the member on my right, but in the real cost of operating the bus service, a cost which will now fall on the shoulders of the over-burdened taxpayers?

The honourable senior member for St. Lucy is the most surprising person in matters of this kind. How by any stretch of the imagination does he consider this an occasion of congratulation on the introduction of the policy of nationalisation on the part of the Government? How can you have nationalisation when the Resolution itself is misleading in that it says that this is for the temporary taking over of certain bus routes, when in truth and in fact they have already agreed to take them over? How can he call it nationalisation when you are only nationalising 60 percent of the industry.

I would like to say that I see no mention of the Government ever contemplating to take over the Barbados Gas Company or the Barbados Transport Service in the Five Year Plan.

11.50 p.m.

I should like to see it anywhere in the programme of the Labour Party with which they went to the electors. It is said that they approved general nationalisation. I should like them to name a single country in the whole world that has nationalised part of an industry and left the rest of it in the hands of private enterprise. Name one country in the world and I would sit down. How can it be nationalised when you are saying that you are hoping that somebody would come along and take over the buses.

The Government have found themselves perched on the two horns of a dilemma. They started playing politics; they relied on the alleged business acumen of the hon. senior member for the City without giving enough credit to his political perspicacity. Having given a promise they now find themselves in the invidious position of having to justify the unjustifiable; instead of having the heart to come right out and say: we already own these buses, all the spare parts and everything else.

What about goodwill? They have got to pay for that too; in two weeks time we will have to give a down payment. They have given all assurances to these eight Concessionairs and yet they cannot tell what the revenue is going to be. How can they, in a case like that, he said to be acting in the interest of the island?

We on this side of the table are strongly in favour of nationalisation of essential services. We are not in favour of monopolies, and we are not in favour of Government taking the taxpayers' money to buttress people who are now on the verge of going into liquidation as was the case with the Gas Company.

The hon. senior member for the City has touched partially on this point: that the bus owners have not been setting aside that portion of their depreciation charges which would have enabled them at this stage and now that their rolling stock is outmoded, to maintain an efficient standard of service; and it is rather ridiculous for the Government to suggest that they should spend $270,000 to rehabilitate this industry at a time like this when the bank rate has gone up and money is hard to borrow.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am sorry for the digression. What I am saying is this: they are going to allow them $60,000 a year in order to spend $270,000. That is higher arithmetic which I cannot appreciate. In inducing them to spend $270,000 per year with depreciation charges at 20% per annum, it means that within 20 years you will have to spend the same sum again

Mr. Chairman, I am just trying to illustrate to you how incompetent the handling of this situation has been. The whole difficulty which confronts this community today is that at no time were the interests of the public taken into consideration as much as the political interests of the Ministers and the individual private promises which had been made.

So serious is the situation that various Ministers in the past week (although Government has made the

1412

there will be a man at top looking through the hole in the roof. I hope that they will make a frank and full disclosure and take the people of Barbados into their confidence. It is not what the editorial of the *Advocate* says or what the hon. junior member for St. John reads in his own editorial columns, but what the man in the street feels about it.

Mr. LEWIS: Before you put the question Mr. Chairman, I am appealing to the Hon. Minister of Communications to let me know whether he has revised his opinion as to the use of the revenue which will be coming in. If he is working along the lines of a Government Department, we have just altered the method of dealing with the money to be kept at the Treasury.

I would suggest that the House be adjourned until Thursday or Friday and let this amount be increased; I think we should give him money to run these buses for a sufficiently long time and the money which is realised should be paid into the Treasury of this colony or into the Bank. The amount of money which you give a conductor every morning whether it is ten dollars or eighteen dollars, he could arrange to have that out of the revenue which is paid into the Treasury of this colony or into the Bank. If you find that you are running the bus service or that part of the service which concerns eight concessions you have time enough to set up a corporation; you can get men and women to assist you in the running of this concern.

You are leaving yourself open to great criticism and you will probably leave yourself open to easy robbery and all kinds of things, if you say for instance, that you had $25 and you spent $10 or $15 out of it. If you have a Corporation it does not matter what they pay; and then they should have a method of having their revenue separated. That is an excellent thing when you have a Corporation or some corporate body for the purpose of running your transport system that can sue and be sued; and you have a system of audit although a Government Department in this colony is not allowed to use the revenue coming into the Department. You have a Transport system now—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: We are well aware of the position in a matter of this sort. The whole question of finance is, of necessity, still being investigated. We do not know what is going to happen with these bus companies. I quite agree with the points which the hon. member is making, but we have had to come down with this provision and I am sure hon. members will appreciate the position. Somebody may fall in when we did not expect him to fall in; all of these things we have to consider.

Mr. LEWIS: What the Government is paying for the buses is a different matter altogether. This is expenditure——

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: We may not have to spend a half penny of this money at all.

Mr. LEWIS: If you came tonight for $300,000 or for $3 million you may not spend one cent of it; but as sure as night follows day if you have to use it this $30,000 will put you "in the soup". It will land you in that bad method from which you may never recover at all.

Hon. M. E. COX: I can see the course of the hon. member's argument; and I will tell him that I will take up the matter in Executive Committee on Thursday.

Mr. LEWIS: I have been hearing about a long adjournment and I know that His Honour the Speaker can call a special meeting. However, I feel that we are stepping off on the wrong foot. You have come here and asked for a token amount of a dollar to build a school for $\frac{1}{4}$ million; that is O.K. I am glad to hear that they are taking up the matter seriously.

Mr. ALLDER: This matter has reached a stage where we are about to take a vote on this Resolution and I think I should make my position clear on this issue. I am inclined to vote for the Resolution but if I do so, it is not because I feel that the Government has approached the matter in a reasonable manner.

I did not think that the matter was of this serious magnitude until I listened to some of the speeches tonight; and they make me more apprehensive of the whole affair. I feel that the public should be prepared for a matter of this magnitude. No one seriously thought that the Government intended to take over the buses of these eight Concessionaires at all. Up to now as a responsible member of this Chamber I have had the feeling, with the disclosures which have been made here tonight, that the matter is made more confusing when, in one statement the Hon. Premier said that the negotiations have been closed and the Minister of Communications said in another voice that the doors are still open.

12.40 a.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I want to explain that again. I have said already (and it is the Government's intention) that at the last moment if a Concessionaire wants to come in to renew his concession, we would accept him.

Mr. ALLDER: I feel Government should have been very deeply impressed by the speech which I felt came from the heart of the honourable junior member for St. Andrew. He was not here last Tuesday night when I made similar appeals to the Government. I said then not to make it impossible for you to reach a successful conclusion with the Concessionaires. I appealed to the Hon. Minister of Communications then, and even at this stage I am still hoping, that we would not have to spend this $30,000.

The reason why I may vote for this Resolution is because I do not want the Government to feel that now they are cornered in the issue, we are refusing to give them the vote to carry on. However, certainly I am dissatisfied with all the transactions carried out by the Minister of Communications. It prevents one from doing justice to the electorate who has sent one here.

Sir, I feel very deeply in this matter. I regret I have no other alternative but to vote for the passing of this Resolution. When I vote for its passing I am no wiser over the matter; and it is because it is unlike the Transport Service in England where the Minister of Transport causes the public to become aware of his intention long before something happens. You must prepare your public for your intentions before you throw something suddenly on its shoulders; and as a responsible member of this Chamber, I can say that I was not aware that you were going so far.

It does appear to me that this $30,000 is only a drop of the amount which we will have to spend on this issue; and I am appealing to the Hon. Premier (not the Hon. Minister of Communications) who I feel should be more responsible, to see that if it takes five days or five years to negotiate with the present Concessionaires to continue to do so; do not close your doors.

Sir, I am going to vote for the passing of this Resolution because I feel out of a sense of responsibility I should not do anything to tie the hands of Government, but I hope they will reciprocate the feelings which I have expressed.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. SPEAKER, Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. Cox, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. BRANCKER, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. VAUGHAN, Mr. ALLDER and Mr. LEWIS—14.

Noes: Mr. TUDOR, Mr. HAYNES and Mr. GODDARD—3.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, as was intimated earlier today, we had hoped we would have concluded the business we had to do in order to adjourn for a short holiday but that has not been the case, and as it is a late hour now, I am asking honourable members to come back on Thursday and finish this work this week. I believe members of the Opposition would agree with that.

I beg to move that you do now report the passing of four Resolutions in Committee and the postponement of five.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

Mr. Chairman reported to Mr. Speaker, who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. Dr. Cummins, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox in each case, the four Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

12.50 a.m.

PAROCHIAL EMPLOYERS PENSIONS (COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCE) BILL, 1955

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, under Private Members business I am asking leave that Order No. 27 be taken now as Order No. 1.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking leave to take Order No. 27 as Order No. 1 and unless there is any objection leave will be granted.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I did not have an opportunity of moving the passing of this Bill before; this Bill has held up the payment to parochial pensioners since last March. In this Bill all the parishes are not covered. For the last two years the Vestry of St. Michael did not pay cost of living allowances to their pensioners. The other Vestries continued to pay this cost of living allowance to parochial pensioners for those years, and they then discovered that the Bill had not been passed and they are now seeking permission in this Bill to make the payment retrospective from then until the new Maude Bill comes into force. In the mean time when the House gets into Committee we will have to make an amendment to Clause 3. I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

Mr. LEWIS: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that you do not leave the Chair and this House go into Committee on this Bill.

Mr. ALLDER: I beg to second that.

The question that this House go into Committee on this Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the honourable junior member for St. John be appointed to act as Chairman of Committees for the time being.

Mr. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

The question that the honourable junior member for St. John be appointed to act as Chairman for the time being was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee Mr. Vaughan being in the Chair.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Preamble be postponed.

Mr. LEWIS: I beg to second that.

The question that the Preamble be postponed was put and resolved in the affimative without division.

Clauses 1 *and* 2 *were called and passed.*

Clause 3 *was called.*

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, the present Bill states "an allowance at the rate of 20% in respect of the first £100 of pension or any part thereof; at the rate of 7½% in respect of the second £100 of pension or any part thereof;" I beg to move that 80% be inserted instead of 20% and 50% be inserted instead of 7½%. That is correct; the Bill was printed incorrectly. The amended section should now read "an allowance of 80% in respect of the first £100 of pension or any part thereof; at the rate of 50% in respect of the second £100 of pension or any part thereof; and at the rate of 5% in respect of the third £100 of pension or any part thereof;"

I beg to move that Clause 3 as amended stand part.

Mr. LEWIS: I beg to second that.

The question that Clause 3 *as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Clause 4 *was called. It reads as follows*:—

"No pensioner shall receive an allowance under this Act greater than the sum of £32. 10s. per annum."

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, in Clause 4 the maximum allowance payable under this Act is £32. 10s. I beg to move that £32. 10s. be amended to read £35 instead. I beg to move that Clause 4 as amended stand part.

Mr. LEWIS: I beg to second that.

The question that Clause 4 *as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Clause 5 *was called and passed.*

Clause 6 *was called. It reads as follows*:—

"Nothing in this Act declared or expressed shall affect the rights of Her Majesty her heirs and successors or any person except such as are mentioned in this Act and those claiming by from or under them."

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, an amendment to this Clause should be made. In printing the words "all bodies politic and corporate and all others" should be inserted after the word successors in line two. I beg to move that Clause 6 as amended stand part.

Mr. LEWIS: I beg to second that.

The question that Clause 6 *as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Preamble stand part.

Mr. LEWIS: Now, Mr. Chairman, before I second that motion I have to make one or two observations. If you alter the conditions of a Bill you have to alter the Preamble to suit. If a preamble is brought in here asking you for one thing, and you have changed something in the Bill, you had better see if it is right or wrong in the Preamble too although the alterations in the Preamble on this occasion do not seem to be many. However, I second the motion with the understanding that the consequential amendments be made to stand part.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed and reported accordingly.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, earlier today there was an intimation that we are going to have a few weeks adjournment, and consequently there were certain money Resolutions which we had hoped to get through today. We are therefore asking honourable members if they are willing to come back to this House on Thursday next so that we may still be able to have that long adjournment I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Thursday next at 2 o'clock p.m.
1.00 a.m.

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

POST OF CLERK OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LEWIS: I really intended to take the opportunity on the motion for the adjournment of the House to ask whether honourable members can be enlightened as to what happened with so simple a matter as that of the advertisement appearing in the Press relative to the filling of the vacant post existing among the Officers of this House. There have been no fewer than two advertisements appearing in the newspaper, both of which I understand were wrong.

I was not here when the particular debate took place, but I think the recommendations of the Committee were accepted by the House with an amendment; but not an amendment which affected the salary attached to the post; and still the advertisement did not seem to carry the recommendation of the Committee right. An amended Notice has only appeared this morning, but that is not good enough. A Notice like that will have to be paid for; the House may not have any money to pay for it, but I do not think that we should let a Notice of that sort appear in the newspaper as a Government Notice.

In the very constitution of this colony, the Servants of the House have been divorced from the Government Servants; and I do not see why that Notice should have appeared as a Government Notice. There are two mistakes which have occurred in the Report of the Select Committee; the Report was not signed, but it has got me down as being present; whereas it should have been put down that I came in after the decision was made. And at the end of the Report it was put down that the Minister in charge would be dealing with it. What Minister would deal with that? There is no such thing as a Minister in charge of the staff of the House. When an occasion like that takes place let us not feel that we have any leg up by Ministers meddling in things of this sort.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to let the honourable member know that in the daily newspaper the salary scale appeared wrongly in the first issue, but a correction was made.

Mr. LEWIS: (Sitting) It was corrected wrongly.

Mr. SPEAKER: That might have been the fault of the newspaper.

Mr. LEWIS: (Sitting) The correction went out from this House.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to move for the rescindment of a former motion. If we do have this long adjournment the question of the appointment of the Clerk will not be proceeded with. That means that whereas Mr. Thomas and Mr. Banfield were appointed to act as Clerk and Deputy Clerk respectively until the end of August, I think a motion should be made that they continue to act in the respective offices until the 30th September. That will give us a chance to appoint the Clerk.

There being no objection leave was granted the Hon. Minister.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Mr. Thomas be appointed to act as Clerk until the 30th September, 1955, and Mr. Banfield be appointed to act as Deputy Clerk until the same date.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

Mr. LEWIS: I think it would be in order for us just to have some small card or cyclo-styled notice sent to honourable members who are not now present saying that at the meeting of the House today the House was adjourned to meet on Thursday next. If such a Notice is put in the mail by 10 o'clock in the morning it will reach the homes and offices of every honourable member, and no honourable member will be able to say on Thursday that he did not know that there was a meeting of the House on that day.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Thursday next, the 18th instant at 2 o'clock p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.