

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1954-55

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 21st June, 1955.

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

Present :

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*); Hon. G. H. ADAMS, C.M.G., Q.C., B.A., (*Premier*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*); His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS, (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Chairman of Committees*); Mr. T. O. BRYAN; Mr. F. C. GODDARD, (*Leader of the Opposition*); Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN, Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); and Mrs. E. E. BOURNE.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 29th March, 1955, having been circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour I am commanded by His Excellency the Acting Governor to lay the following:—

The Customs (Petroleum Products Bulk Storage) Regulations, 1955.

The Exportation (Drawback of Duties on Manufactured Articles) Regulations, 1955.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 4 Order, 1955.

REPLIES

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:—

Reply to Question No. 16 asked by Mr. J. E. T. Brancker regarding the giving of time off to casual employees for Sports Meetings, etc.

Reply to Question No. 35 asked by Mr. F. E. Miller regarding the installation of water services in St. George.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:—

Reply to Question No. 42 asked by Mr. T. O. Bryan regarding the erection of Communal Baths and Latrines in the Jackson area, St. Michael.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$10,000 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. 12, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

2.25 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, in connection with the Resolution to place the sum of \$10,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee etc., I beg to give notice of my intention later on in the day to move the suspension of Rules 88 and 89. The Resolution is to provide for some money to be sent to St. Lucia to help those people who have suffered in the Soufriere disaster.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Resolution to sanction the Regulations entitled "The Customs (Petroleum Products Bulk Storage) Regulations, 1955".

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 4 Order, 1955".

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Bill to consolidate and amend the Acts of this Island relating to Factories.

PRIVATE NOTICES

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to give notice of my intention to move the adjournment of the House to discuss a matter of public importance. I refer to the Speech of the Headmaster of Harrison College made at the last Speech Day.

QUESTIONS

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: (On behalf of the hon. senior member for St. Philip).

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:—

Will the Government consider the granting of a gratuity to Mr. James Weekes who has been called upon to retire after eleven (11) years service at the Home Agricultural Station, St. Philip.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move that the Bill to consolidate and amend the Acts of this Island relating to Factories, be now read a first time.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.
The question was put and agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF RULES

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Rules 88 and 89 be now suspended.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am not opposing that motion; but when the hon. member gave notice to-day of his intention to move the suspension of Rules 88 and 89, did he mean that those Rules should be suspended for the whole day's sitting merely to deal with the Resolution concerned? Because if the hon. member has asked leave to suspend the Rules for the entire day's sitting, there must be something else new that he intends dealing with to-day. What else is it that he intends to bring in?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, there is no other money Resolution given notice of to-day that we shall be dealing with to-day. Only a person with a mentality like that of the hon. junior member for the City could suppose that we would be bringing in something else or some other money Resolution to-day and also dealing with it to-day.

Mr. Speaker, I decidedly used the words "in connection with Soufriere" when giving notice of my intention to move the suspension of the Rules in order to deal with the Resolution for \$10,000.

RESOLUTION FOR TAKING OVER OF GAS COMPANY

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, you will remember that at the last sitting of the House, we adjourned before the Order paper was fixed. Anyway, I am asking now that Order No. 2 be proceeded with as the first Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to proceed with Order No. 2 as the first Order of the Day. Unless there is any objection leave will be granted.

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

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker, after the explosive nature of the criticism coming from hon. members on last Tuesday, it is absolutely amazing to discover that the majority of the statements made by those opposing the Resolution have, in reality, no function to the Resolution. I, and I do not know how many others, got the impression that the Resolution proposed to sanction the payment of one million dollars by the Natural Gas Corporation to the Barbados Gas Company. Another impression which was given by the manner and statements made was that the Natural Gas Corporation was buying nothing but land from the Gas Company at the price of \$2.25 per square foot.

Now sir, I want to dispel the illusions which legitimately can be held by those people who heard those statements made by certain hon. members on this side of the table. I propose to dispel those illusions by taking the Resolution Clause by Clause and commenting on the nature of each clause.

Now sir, in the introduction to the Resolution, Section (b) states:—

"That the Natural Gas Corporation be authorised to raise a loan of \$1 million by instalments for the purpose of acquiring the assets of the Barbados

Gas Company Limited and the Natural Gas Well known as Turner Hall No. 1 and generally for acquiring and utilising other further sources of gas and renovating and expanding the Gas distribution system."

There are three distinct things that relate to the purpose of seeking the sanction by Government of the proposed million dollar loan.

Section (c) of the Resolution says this: that approval be given for the guaranteeing by the Government in accordance with sub-section two of section 18 of the Natural Gas Corporation Act, 1950, of the said loan to be raised by the Corporation;"

I will take the Schedule and deal with it section by section.

3.35 p.m.

Section 1 of the Schedule establishes the legal formality of the Natural Gas Corporation paying \$1 to the Gas Company for the option of negotiating the purchase. Now the purchase from the Gas Company includes lands, buildings, plant, office furniture, motor and other vehicles, stock-in-trade and implements enumerated in the valuation etc. That was paragraph (a) of Section 1. Paragraph (b) of the same Section establishes the right which previously existed with the Gas Company as a business concern, that these rights be transferred to the prospective customers. Paragraph (d) establishes the price proposed to be paid for these lands, buildings etc., plus the rights etc.; and the price stated in that section is £31,000 or \$148,000, and not a million dollars which could easily give the impression that the price is one million dollars. Approximately the corporation proposes to pay \$150,000 in round figures for the assets of the Gas Company as mentioned in the different paragraphs of Section 1.

Section 2 of the Schedule establishes that "the option shall be exercised by a notice in writing of its intention to purchase." An Agreement had to be made; it has not yet been made, it is the proposed Agreement to be sanctioned by the Government. The Agreement is not bound to be sanctioned by the Government; the Agreement does not become operative until the Legislature passes it. The price is not calculated on any area of land but on the entire assets of the Gas Company, and to carry the matter further the impression was given that \$2.50—

Mr. SPEAKER: I am hearing more than one speaker and the rules of this House particularly state that there must be no interruption when an hon. member is on his feet. If I hear any interruption I will rule it out of order.

Mr. VAUGHAN: This \$150,000 is for the land, buildings etc. It is not calculated, as the impression was given and received, that \$2.50 per square foot is being paid for the land. Nowhere in this Resolution can that be interpreted. I shall establish that by skipping the other sections for the time being and quoting Section 7. That section says this.

7. The quantity of land is believed and shall be taken to be Thirty-nine thousand square feet but if the same shall be found by a survey and plan, which the intending vendor will furnish, to be incorrect compensation shall be allowed or given by the intending vendor or intending purchaser as the case may require calculated at the rate of Two dollars and twenty-five cents per square foot.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have heard the hon. senior member for St. Philip interrupting. I warn the hon. member that if he persists in doing so I will have him named.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am merely telling the hon. member that he was misquoting.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has not the privilege to make an aside which may lead to interruption.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Speaking in an aside?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is interrupting; he cannot speak now.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I have quoted Section seven which I interpret to mean that if the land is found to be more than 39,000 square feet whatever is the difference between that area and the final survey, if it is 50 square feet or 500 square feet; the Natural Gas Corporation will pay the difference. If the final survey is less than 39,000 square feet then the Gas Company has to pay the difference of whatever it might be to the purchaser which is the Natural Gas Corporation. [Cheers.]

3.45 p.m.

Section eight deals with the delivery of the title deeds of the Gas Company.

Section 3 says that "during the period of the option the intended purchaser and its staff and advisers shall have free access to the premises of the intended vendor and every part thereof and of its undertaking and every part thereof with full free right liberty and licence to interview all or any of the employees and other persons having business with the intending vendor."

Section 4 seeks to establish the time for the completion of the purchase and goes on to say that "the intending vendor and all necessary parties (if any) will execute all proper assurances of the property to the intending purchaser but the stamp duty or duties thereon will be paid by the intending vendor and the intending purchaser in equal shares."

Section 5 makes arrangements that if the intending purchaser shall exercise the said option and duly complete the said purchase according to this agreement the intending vendor shall give credit to the intending purchaser on account of the said purchase price for the said sum of One dollar and the amount of the said deposit. If the intending purchaser shall not exercise the said option the said sum of One dollar shall belong to the intending vendor absolutely and if the intending purchaser shall exercise the said option but shall subsequently fail to complete the said purchase in accordance with this agreement the said sum of One dollar and the said deposit shall become the absolute property of the intending vendor who may re-sell the property as it shall think fit and recover the expenses and any deficiency in price on such resale (after giving credit for the said deposit) from the intending purchaser as liquidated damages and it shall not be necessary for the intending vendor to previously tender an assurance for the property to the intending purchaser.

Section 6, as I have said is for the title to the land and buildings. I have already interpreted Section 7.

Section 8 establishes that the intending purchaser shall deliver in writing to the intending vendor's solicitors its requisitions and objections, if any, in respect of the title to or description of the freehold property sold or otherwise arising out of this agreement within fourteen days from the delivery of the title deeds and its observations, if any, on any replies to such requisitions and objections within ten days after the delivery of such replies and every requisition or objection not so delivered shall be deemed to be waived.

Section 9 establishes that if the intending purchaser shall make or insist on any objection or requisition which the intending vendor shall be unable or unwilling to satisfy or comply with it may (notwithstanding any attempt to remove or satisfy the same or any negotiation or litigation in respect

thereof) by notice in writing to the intending purchaser or its solicitor rescind this agreement upon repaying the deposit without interest costs or compensation to the intending purchaser who shall accept the same in full satisfaction of all claims under the contract or otherwise howsoever. The intending purchaser shall thereupon return to the intending vendor the title deeds and all papers belonging to the intending vendor in its possession in connection with the said sale. If the intending purchaser within seven days after receiving notice to rescind withdraws the objection or requisition the notice to rescind shall be withdrawn also.

Section 10 seeks to establish the right of possession to the purchasing Company and the division of parochial taxes as they should be between the two parties on the date of completion of the purchase.

Section 11 deals with the matter of insurance.

Section 12 deals with pension rights of the employees of the Gas Company, it says that if this option is exercised the intending vendor shall make its own arrangements with regard to pensions for those of its employees or ex-employees whose services are not required or retained by the intending purchaser. As regards those employees who continue in the employment and service, of the intending purchaser, the intending vendor will meet any liability in making provision for that part of the employees' pensions attributable to their period of service with the intending vendor.

That is, the new purchasing Company, the Natural Gas Corporation, will not be responsible for the pension of employees who would no longer be employed by the Barbados Company and that the Company will be responsible for part of the pension of those remaining in the employ of the new purchasers. Those who will not remain in the employ of the Natural Gas Corporation will not receive any pension from the new purchasers; those who will be retained will receive part of the pension calculated at the time that they became employed by the purchasers.

I said just now that the Agreement has not been sanctioned. Before it can be an Agreement it has to be passed by the Legislature of this island and has to be ratified. [A VOICE: It does not say so.] It does say so. Section 13 says:

13. This agreement is conditional upon:

- (a) The same being ratified by a resolution of a general meeting of the intending vendor;
- (b) the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee;
- (c) the Legislature of Barbados;
- (d) the Public Utilities Board.

The Agreement is conditional on that.

Section 14 says that any notice under this Agreement shall be sent by a registered letter to the intending vendor addressed to its registered office in this island, and to the intending purchaser by a registered letter addressed to its office in this island. Let me say that if this Legislature does not sanction this Agreement nothing takes place.

Those are the sections which deal with this Agreement.

We come now to the Addendum which is the explanation in detail of the proposed loan of \$1,000,000. The first cost we see is for renovating the system of distribution, and it comes to \$161,507. The second item is for the acquisition of the assets of the Gas Company for which it is proposed to pay \$150,000. I have mentioned already what comprised these assets. Well sir, it was represented that this \$150,000 could be the only payment for a White Elephant. I will quote some figures which show the sale since the establishment of the Natural Gas Corporation to the Gas Company and these figures are

for the first three years of the operation of the Natural Gas Corporation. The Natural Gas Corporation sold to the Gas Company the following amount of Natural Gas:—

1951—52			\$ 41,640
1952—53			\$ 69,924
1953—54			\$ 72,830
Total			\$184,394

They have proposed in this Resolution to buy that entire Company for \$150,000.
3.55 p.m.

I will repeat what I said: for the first three years the Natural Gas Corporation sold gas to the amount of \$184,000; and they are proposing to buy this same Gas Company now for \$150,000.

Sir, it seems to me that the Natural Gas Corporation proposes to buy a business; that is the proposition. They are not buying land; they are taking over a business if the Natural Gas Corporation could sell the Gas Company gas at the rate of 77 cents per cubic foot. The Gas Company has to cover operational expenses, administrative expenses and make a profit. It is a private enterprise. [A VOICE : It makes no profit, it pays no income tax.] The same business may be carried on by the Natural Gas Corporation at a loss, since it has not got to make the same profits as a private company would be expected to make. Incidentally, since the Natural Gas Corporation has taken over from the B.U.O.C. they have charged 23 cents less to the Gas Company for a thousand cubic feet. The British Union Oil Company sold gas to the Gas Company at a difference per thousand square feet. The Natural Gas Corporation can afford to sell 77 cents per thousand cubic feet; and they have sold gas at that price and still made money. For the three years of operation there is a surplus amount of \$30,282 after paying all expenses, income tax, parochial tax and everything else in the year 1951—52; and an hon. socialist on this side of the table says that is no money. That shows the conception of this period of socialism.

Mr. SPEAKER : To whom is the hon. member referring?

Mr. VAUGHAN : I am referring to the hon. member on my left. In the first operational year this Natural Gas Corporation had \$13,364 after paying income tax of \$8,000 to the Government; all other expenses of course already paid. In the year 1952—53 they earned a net income of \$17,000 after income tax of \$11,000 was paid, and in 1953-54 all the salaried and operational expenses having been taken out, they earned a net income of \$5,424 after paying income tax of \$21,000 and odd dollars. It will be realised then if in their wholesale trade they could earn the surplus and earn the net income as I have quoted, after paying income tax of \$20,000 up to the end of the last operational year, that is 1954, it will readily be realised that after they take over the Gas Company and its business, they have not got to charge the new customers at the same rate at which the Gas Company charges them. They have an asset; they are the suppliers of the gas. The gas only cost them the expense of running it and that can be reduced by the accountants of the Natural Gas Corporation.

So, Mr. Speaker, you can well see that this is a business venture. I have no doubt about it, this is a business venture that is proposed by the Natural Gas Corporation. There are many speculations and there are only speculations; and one speculation is as good as another. Why is the Gas Company closing down?

A Company expects quick returns; quick returns mean substantial returns. A private company may

well be justified in refusing to invest such an enormous capital for the small returns which they would be receiving, but a public corporation does not have to operate on the same principles. My speculation is as good as any other. Rather than invest a substantial sum for equipment, they are prepared to sell the business; especially to the Government who is not looking for [VOICES Hear! Hear!] and who does not have to reap the same profits as a private company. It is a public utility and if Government requires it, then it will be for the benefit of the consumers who use the gas. I am sure that the consumers of gas of the public corporation will pay less for a thousand cubic feet than they are paying to the present Gas Company; and the corporation will still clear expenses. The corporation made a profit wholesaling the gas to their biggest customer, that is the Gas Company whom they are now proposing to buy over.

4.05 p.m.

Therefore, it may be an entirely different good business venture by the Natural Gas Corporation. They do not have to operate on the same basis. I have shown that they have sold to their biggest customer cheaper than the B.U.O.C. sold to the same customer and still they have made a profit.

Now, sir, it is interesting when we hear remarks about purchasing a "white elephant" and more interesting when we hear of the criticism of paying \$78,000 for the new Gas Well to be acquired and known as Turner Hall No. 1. I may inform this House that I have figures here of the cost of the Natural Gas Plant including one Gas Well, and from this one well the Gas Company has been selling all its gas. It has been operating with one well and the sales from that well were \$71,000 for the first year, \$102,000 for the second year and \$97,000 for the third year making a total of \$270,000 for the three years. They paid \$90,648 for the B.U.O.C. Plant including its well from which they sold that \$272,000 worth of gas. They acquired a new well at \$78,000. Sir, at the latest test of this gas well the number of cubic feet still remaining for distribution or still capable of production was 1,748,374,000, and after three years of operation the Natural Gas Corporation produced and sold an average of 115 million cubic feet from this one well. My point is that the Natural Gas Corporation has earned \$272,000 in three years and they have remaining gas which if produced at the same annual rate, there would be sufficient in the well to last for 15 years. Make the calculation of 1,748,378,000 and divide it by 115 million, and you will see that it will give fifteen years' reserve if produced at the same rate. You will see quite easily from those figures that \$78,000 is in no way fantastic to pay for a producing gas well.

I am totally in agreement that the Government is not paying one penny too much to the Gas Company for the prospective business which can legitimately be assessed from the history of the Natural Gas Corporation's business so far, because it must be remembered that they have sold to only a few customers; and with the acquisition of the Gas Company they will be adding a considerable number of customers. By their own proposals of extension of the gas business, in the proposals for the expansion of the distribution which is included in this \$616,000 to be paid for the equipment of the Gas Company and which the Company is shunning away from, it may well be seen, and I am convinced in my mind, that just as the acquisition from the B.U.O.C. of this plant and well has proved to be profitable business through this Government's agency, the acquisition of the Gas Company by the Corporation will be a profitable venture by the Natural Gas Corporation.

I have shown figures which unless the plant and the project fail, will be acknowledged as a logical deduction. I have shown that the Natural Gas Corporation is not purchasing land merely; it is purchasing a business. It is not paying \$1 million as the erroneous impression has been given by some statements. I at one time actually felt that what was being done was fantastic, but I had not yet studied the Resolution. I have studied the Resolution minutely since, and I have come to the conclusion that the statements made, so far as I know and the atomic-like voracity of the attack could have been reserved by those members who made it for a more necessary occasion and for a less august occasion in this ancient and honourable House. I am satisfied that the proposed Agreement gone into by the Natural Gas Corporation and the Gas Company which is before this House for ratification—I am quite justified in giving my vote for it; I am justified in doing so by my political conviction and business commonsense [Laughter]. I have shown that the Natural Gas Corporation has not got to make in the same amount in the operation of the Gas Company; they have not got to expend \$616,000 a year. This is a permanent asset and the figures which I have quoted showing the profit and the accumulated surplus of the Corporation come after covering a multitude of substantial expenses in renewing and extending the purchase from B.U.O.C.

Lots of money have been spent in capital. Salaries have been raised; prices have been reduced and yet the Corporation has made a profit. I have no more argument to make, and the answer if there is any, can only be one of prejudice.

4.15 p.m.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, in defence of public political morality and the good of the public, I unlike my hon. colleague would have to vote against the passing of this Resolution. I have listened carefully to him and he has convinced me very successfully that he is wearing his harness very uncomfortably. The hon. member opened his speech by saying that one anticipated hearing something very constructive on the Resolution, but all those hopes had been thrown to the ground. The reason why he said so was because he wears his harness very uncomfortably. One knows how difficult it is when one has to walk a taut rope.

Sir, the reason why I cannot vote for the passing of this Resolution as it stands, is because those who have the knowledge of the history of the Barbados Gas Company are saying that the concern has been failing for a considerable number of years. During the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries when we depended on the snuff-bottled lamp and candles for lighting, the introduction of gas was considered revolutionary. It was our best means of heating and lighting until electric current came about. Since then it has been fading gradually; and as far as the Barbados Gas Company is concerned, this Company has been fading faster than other companies in England, Canada, America and so on. I have had something to do with this company; I dealt with its appliances some years back by way of marketing them, and I can say that the then manager of the Company, Mr. Brown, tried his best by experimenting at that plant in producing by-products from gas, and he did so only in an attempt to make the company a paying concern. He failed and he left the Company and went back to England. Mr. Young, the recent Manager came down and tried his best and he too has failed.

I was a member of a Select Committee that was set up by this Honourable Chamber to go into the possibilities of permitting that company the opportunity to increase its rates. We had the Government Analyst to advise us on that Committee and

the findings were that the Company, according to the price it was then paying for natural gas was making sufficient to pay its way at that time. However, there was much discussion and eventually, against the recommendation of that Select Committee, this Chamber gave the Company permission to increase its rates. Statements were made at that time to that effect that gas was leaking from the Company's lines, and the hon. junior member for St. George spoke very determinedly in the interest of the consumers; and the then Manager of the Company, Mr. Young, admitted that the whole set of pipeline was in a bad condition, therefore the gas was leaking in an extensive manner into the earth. It was also told by the Manager that the existing well or wells from which they were acquiring natural gas had a very limited supply, therefore they were not sure for how long they would be able to operate this well. It is surprising to hear now how generous is the supply of that well or wells, and what a great potentiality this Company would be to the Government's investments.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of explanation. The capacity of the gas well as referred to by me may be found in all three of the reports so far issued by the Natural Gas Corporation. That Corporation would have to be the liar, not me.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, I did not refer to my hon. colleague as the only medium from which that information would come. Certainly, I do feel that he was quoting from the Report. I have not said that he gave that information, but I said, that the well or wells had a very limited supply, therefore there was an uncertainty of the future of the Company. I am saying now that it is very surprising that whoever was responsible for the drawing up of such a report could express such optimism in respect of the supply of Natural Gas which might be or might not be there.

The hon. member has certain theories and he uses them very conveniently; at one time he uses them for one purpose and at another time he uses them for another purpose. I am disappointed to hear that the hon. member after boasting of his business acumen should also forget this point: there are some principles in commerce. Regardless by whom they are demonstrated, where whatever methods private investors may use in obtaining the profits on their investments, the same principles should be applied by Government. Principles are principles; and they do not change when the individuals concerned have changed. Why should the Government be only interested in running private Schemes? Why should the Government be encouraged to invest only when they will fail?

The fact is that there are several factors which will prevent the Government from achieving sufficient benefits after taking over this concern. The assets which the Government proposes to pay \$150,000 for have been reducing themselves for many many years, and there is a greater possibility for them to continue reducing themselves in value. I will give this instance: if this Company were a paying concern, the present owners in England and the local shareholders whom we know are astute business men would not be so willing to release it for Government purposes. We see the same shareholders holding shares in other public utility companies; and the mere suggestion to bring about nationalisation caused them to get up in arm and assist their kind in London. Why don't they suggest that Rediffusion Ltd., which is an educational institution and a source of propaganda which any Government should control and which any intelligent Government should make an attempt to control, why do they not suggest to Gov-

ernment to make an attempt to take over control of that. No, they do not say that. The suggestion about the Electric Company caused a big row; and the hon. senior member for St. Joseph knows that too.

The Telephone Company whose rentals are sometimes higher than rentals of certain business places around this island, has made no suggestion about selling to the Government shares in that company. From 17 years ago when a former manager Mr. Brown was here, the Gas Company started to lose its business; and the only thing that kept them alive was the fact that the St. Michael's Vestry allowed them to keep a few lights burning around the streets merely because certain members of this body had interest in the Gas Company.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of explanation. Not a single member of the St. Michael's Vestry is a shareholder in the Gas Company.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for Christ Church is a business man in private enterprise and he knows much. The hon. member knows (and other members know it too) that there are some members of that Vestry who have or still have interest in that Company; I do not want to call names. The hon. member knows that too. One can easily see why having such influential local shareholders as guardians of the company, it is being dumped on Government. It appears to me that if it were owned exclusively by an English firm, the Government might not have been so willing to throw a million dollars into the street.

The hon. member who has just spoken has tried to compare the successful running of the Natural Gas Corporation with the running of the Gas Company. The profits made by the Natural Gas Corporation should be nothing to do with the Barbados Gas Company. All that the hon. member in my humble opinion was suggesting, was that because you have made a couple of thousand dollars in the Natural Gas Corporation you should throw it away in running the Barbados Gas Company; that is what the hon. member has suggested in his argument. There are two commercial concerns and one has shown a profit; and the hon. member thinks that when he says that the Natural Gas Corporation because it has been able to show profits for three years, that these profits for gas will have been—

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of explanation. The profits have actually been more than that. I said "the accumulated surplus". That is a different thing from profits.

Mr. ALLDER: The hon. member said that for 3 years they sold \$272,000 worth of Gas. The hon. member also said that the Government bought the B.U.O.C. plant and an Oil or Natural Gas well for \$90,648; and he wanted to justify the purchase by the Government of a single well for \$78,000. He further said that every cent would be well spent; there need be no objection to that. If the B.U.O.C. can see their way to sell their equipment and their well which produces all the thousands of cubic feet which the hon. member quoted for \$90,648, how can he then justify the purchase of a single well for \$78,000?
4.35 p.m.

There is no logic in that. If the B.U.O.C. can see their way to sell their equipment which is the entire plant and the present well which produces the cubic feet of gas which the hon. member has quoted for \$90,648, how can he justify it taking into consideration that inasmuch as the Government would be the virtual monopolists of the natural gas in this island, they need not pay the price which

the vendors are asking because they have no alternative but to negotiate with the Government if they want their well sold. What is more, I have often heard the Hon. Premier suggest that all natural elements such as minerals and so forth should be commonly owned. The hon. member has said that on many occasions especially when we were discussing the Oil Company. It has been suggested that this Natural Gas was being wasted, and the Oil Company has been burning it off because they have no use for it. Hon. members who have spoken against this Resolution have done so because in recent years modern house-keeping methods have been introduced and householders are no longer looking to the Gas Company to supply them with their service. That is the threat which will fall against this Company when the Government takes it over; that is why the visionary owners decided to see if they could get this concern dumped. You have Bottled Gas which is being bottled in Trinidad; and I hear that the containers for this gas are made here and shipped to the various firms for resale to the various owners of houses. Housewives have found that it is very convenient because all you have to do is to have your stove which the same Company sells on the hire purchase system installed and every couple of months they send for a new container to replace the one which they had for months. They have found that it is more economical and convenient than having to run pipelines for several yards before they can get the gas and then pay the high rate which the Company has been permitted to charge. Even in St. Joseph in the constituency which the Hon. Premier represents they have just introduced at the Almshouse the modern means of cooking by gas, and it is not the one which will be supplied by the Government. If you have the institutions beginning to instal these modern kitchen implements you will see that the Government will be left with a "white elephant". What is more sir, is that there are many housekeepers who are resorting to the use of cooking by electricity; and when the extension of the Electric Company comes about and thereby the rates are lowered, then you will see that the electric system of cooking will supersede even the Bottled Gas much more the Natural Gas when the Government takes it over. All these things have to be taken into consideration when we are discussing the possibilities of Government taking over a concern which existed before our times; a business man looks into the future to see that after he invests his money, he must make a profit out of it. Although we have the Water Works Department being run by the Government, thousands of householders are still pleading to get it run through their village; and although some of the pipes have already been laid in certain districts for months, yet the householders cannot go in their avenue and draw a pail of water. Slowness in bringing the service to the public still causes people to have to go long distances in order to get their requirements. Many people would like to pay for the water which they use but they cannot get an attachment. I am told that even nowadays you will have to consider it a special favour by some official or politician when you get a service. Water is a necessity which mankind cannot do without, and if you take so long to extend it to reach all and sundry, what are you going to do when you have Natural Gas which about 99.9% of the population do not know about? After you have spent this million dollars, there are only two parishes which stand to benefit; and there is a small percentage of householders in these parishes, namely, St. Michael and Christ Church, and they are looking away from Natural Gas since Bottled Gas has been introduced. There

are some modern "Phillips" stoves which Messrs. Manning and Company have introduced; they look very patent and they take kerosene oil and convert it into something which gives a flame like Natural Gas, but which gives a cleaner, brighter and hotter flame. The modern market is filled with this means of cooking; and what will the Government be doing? The profits which they have made from the Natural Gas Corporation they are now paying away on the Gas Company. At this stage if the Government wants a monopoly to supply Natural Gas in this colony they have it right now; they need not take over these dilapidated tanks which when we were born we saw in Bay Street. They have no use for these pipe lines, but now that the Government is buying this old place, the only thing Government can do is to call in Mr. Chase and sell out the pipes as old iron. Even if the Government takes over the assets of the Company it need not take over the property as it stands here.

4.45 p.m.

I have been told that although the Natural Gas Corporation sold Natural Gas to the Barbados Gas Company and although they repiped it to the respective districts for supplying the householders, it had nothing to do with the Company's headquarters in Bay Street. That is a thing which many members of the public think takes place. That does not take place; therefore what is being done here is something extremely generous to the dying company. The company was so bent on pulling out that its manager has left here over a year ago and they have only left one lady clerk to run the whole concern. If they had valued that business, would they have done that? It was a good opportunity when the manager of that company left Barbados, because thinking intelligently, the Government would have seen that the directors of that firm were willing to disband it; and therefore they would have attempted to get it at that time. If they had done so at that time they would have got it at a more reasonable price than the one in this Resolution.

Sir, not only are you taking over a concern at that price but you have to put in in order at a very high cost. Sir, various items in this Resolution give cause for questioning. I presume that the condition of the pipeline owned by the Company has not been fully stated to the Government, because it will be very difficult for any engineer to say what is the exact condition of the miles of pipeline which this Company has under the earth. You might find in view of the fact that over those years when the Company decided to pull out, they might have allowed their pipeline to deteriorate knowing that they may not turn it over to anybody. Therefore it is a gamble as to the condition of the pipeline as you have it here. When it is said that the replacing of that pipeline would cost \$300 a mile it is sufficient to cause hon. members who are interested in preserving the interest of this community some concern. That is nothing to be proud of; and it is definitely not a correct way to approach a system of public ownership. Public ownership is quite alright but that is if the thing which you are taking over would produce benefits for the community. If you take something over, the taxpayers and the people of the island should be able to get returns from it immediately or as soon as possible. But that is not the case; this is a false system of public ownership; and I hardly think that there is anyone who believes that there should be common ownership of the natural resources of public utilities of a country than myself. At the same time while that is my opinion, I am saying that the public utility to be owned by the people must be

something substantial and beneficial. If the suggestion were to be made that you needed land for the public benefit and for the public use, and you threatened to use the compulsory purchasing Act you will see that because land has its permanent valuation that its owners, whether it is worth \$1,000 per acre or not, would not consent to let you have it; therefore, it calls for some questioning as to why the directors of this Company are so willing to give up the concern to Government as they want to do.

In case this Resolution is passed by this Chamber, the only alternative for one to do is to make suggestions as regards the most successful use of the scheme. I would suggest that if the existing well or wells owned by the Government or the Natural Gas Corporation have such a generous supply of gas as the Reports tell us, that Government needs not purchase any additional gas wells in the immediate future, because such wells would be always there. When the time comes that the existing wells are running short of supply, then negotiations can be opened for the purchase of any such new wells.

My next suggestion is, that if there are things which the Company now owns which will be helpful to the Natural Gas Corporation when and if the Company is taken over, then they can very well acquire such things, but those encumbrances which the Gas Company owns but which will not be of any benefit to the Natural Gas Corporation when and if that Company is taken over should be left out of deal, such as the land and buildings at Bay Street. Most of the buildings there are wooden structures. The most imposing buildings there are the two tall tanks which are in disuse.

As I have said before the Company never had anything to do with the selling of Natural Gas from its headquarters; Natural Gas is sold by that Company directly to its consumers from the well at Turner Hall. They do not have anything to do with it at headquarters in Bay Street. The Government can say to the directors of that Company that they do not want the headquarters in Bay Street, because the Natural Gas Corporation already has its headquarters; and besides that, the Government has numerous offices and departments where at one of which they can conduct the business of supplying of Natural Gas to the consumers. I am saying: leave out buying the headquarters at Bay Street.

I was saying that the Government need not face the high prices which it proposes to pay for the buildings and plant which the Gas Company now owns in Bay Street, inasmuch as it does not appear that the buildings are needed. Even if the Natural Gas Corporation takes over, and while my hon. colleague tried to say that there is no land to be purchased, I do not see how a—

4.55 p.m.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of explanation. I said, that in the statements made on this side of the House, they gave the impression that the Gas Company was selling and the Corporation was buying land from the Gas Company at \$2.50 per square foot. I defy any of them to establish that. Nobody knows the price of the 69,000 square feet of land.

Mr. ALLDER: The hon. member brought up another point about if the land was more or less. He said that if the land was more the Natural Gas Corporation would pay the difference. But listening to the debate last Tuesday, one heard some hon. member stating it is proposed that after the acquirement of the concern known as the Barbados Gas Company, that the buildings and equipment up there would be demolished and that that area of land would be made an open window to the sea. Even

that would be a wrong proposal inasmuch as the Government already owns the Esplanade which is an extremely lovely window opening on the sea in that area; and therefore unless it was intended also to have all buildings and encumbrances removed from the sea coast, would this window be of any particular use to the island? I repeat that it would be unnecessary unless they intended carrying out a scheme as extensive as that; and therefore, the suggestion is to me unnecessary. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Barbados is passing through a very prosperous period financially speaking; we can boast today of some \$14 million a year revenue, the greater portion of which is calculated from customs which means that the bulk of people even the unemployed, all contribute to the greater portion of money with which this Government runs the affairs of this island. That, however, does not mean that the Government must continue to indulge in a false socialist policy, by suggesting that by increasing taxation on the rich you are doing the island a good. It would be doing a good if it were backed up by legislation which would prevent the same people whom you are increasingly taxing from indirectly passing on that increased taxation as usual to the ordinary man or woman in the street. There is nothing to boast about as regards the taxation policy of the Government. What is very clear is this: while you increase your customs duties and therefore you get more revenue from that source, in schemes like this it is all given back to the people from whom you thought you had taken it. This is a negative and destructive policy which the Government has persisted in carrying out continually in recent months. Everything they have attempted to purchase under the slogan of 'public benefit' Government has had to pay too much for it. Most of the schemes have resulted in a total loss to the people of the island.

What is more, Mr. Speaker, the Natural Gas pipeline runs through four parishes, but people in four parishes do not benefit; people in only two parishes benefit; and the law regulating the running of the Natural Gas Corporation does not make it compulsory that the service should be carried to all parishes. Even if the Government intends to carry this service to the other parishes (and they have not said that they intend to carry it to all the parishes) the insecure tenure of householders in the country parishes does not permit them to make much of a service which Government do not want to give the authority to carry to them.

I heard that they had thought of extending that service to all and sundry. The exclusive areas have got it already. What is more, (and this is another suggestion I would like to make to the Government) the reason why Government is not getting enough revenue from the Waterworks Department is this: the most of that revenue is under the Head plumbing; and the dissatisfaction with householders is that work done on their premises such as installation and repairs cost too much. If the Government wanted to get more revenue from a utility service such as water, the easiest way to do it would be to reduce plumbing costs and the cost of installation to such an extent as to make it easily possible for the poorest householder to install water. It is better if you had 99% of the houses with running water than to have 25% (above which the present regulations do not permit) and charging them high rates per month.

5.05 p.m.

You will have more people paying for the water which they consume and for the service which brings it to their taps in the kitchen. If water which is a necessary item is handled like that, how is the Gov-

ernment going to handle an item like Natural Gas and make it a success? This is an item which very few people in this community have ever used or heard about.

It is said that provision will be made to take care of the present employees of that Company, and the smallest paid employees of the Public Utility Companies of this island are the employees of the Barbados Gas Company. As regards their pension rights, I hope that the Government's position about signing the Agreement with the Barbados Gas Company will be different from the Agreement which they carried out with the Gulf Oil Company when they were being sold the rights to explore for oil in this island. If that had been done the employees of the Gulf Oil Company would have been drawing the same rates as their employees worked for in Texas, Alabama, Venezuela or Iran, because oil, wherever it is found in this world, whether it is next door to the consumer or in the Sahara Desert, is sold for the same price. Therefore the gas exploration should be the same regardless of the country; but of course, this is Barbados, and anything can happen.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of prolonging this useless debate, but the last speaker opened his remarks with the statement that he had risen as a defender of public morality. I think that the morality of the public is in poor hands if it depends on the honourable member to defend it.

Mr. ALLDER: On a point of Order, I object to the implications which the honourable member has made. There is nothing which will justify the charges which the honourable member is making.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to withdraw that statement.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: At your bidding I will withdraw the statement, but the honourable member must be very careful in his speech. As representatives of the people of this island I think that before we can intelligently approve this Resolution before us, we should first ask ourselves this question: Is gas as a public fuel obsolete in this island? If it is useful fuel in this island then I think we should buy it. [Cheers.] I do not for one moment claim to be an expert in matters of this kind, neither do I believe that the Government's members have not got a modicum of intelligence to assess the value of these things. I am not defending anybody; I am protecting the interest of the people of St. Philip. I will not be guided by any special clique or to be turned about. It is either that the Gas Company is worthwhile being procured by the Government or the Government as represented by its members is well, I do not want to use any strong language. It is either that there is some good in the Government taking over this Gas Company or there is nothing in it. However I feel that it will serve a useful purpose if the Government takes over this Company and I am therefore voting for this Resolution. If it is that the Gas Company is suffering from defects, who is not suffering from defects now? There is suffering from defective thinking, and from defective actions: everything is defective in this generation! [Laughter.] Truth, righteousness and justice are all going by the wind; I am not one who believes that the best cure for bad things is to make them worse. I do not subscribe to that view. If we cannot remedy bad things then let them remain as they are.

There is a lot in this Resolution, sir, that has to be commended as well as a lot that can be questioned; so I leave it for those experts who know about finance. But I do want to state that the one thing I do not

like about it is the attempt by some to throw dust in the eyes of others. [Cheers.]
5.15 p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I was not present last Tuesday, when I would have heard more of the debate on this Resolution. I presume that in the presentation of this Resolution, the Introducer must have left out a lot of information or else a lot of the statements which I have heard this afternoon would not have been made. I have heard some figures quoted and as far as I know, these figures are correct. There have been strong arguments made as to why Government should not take over this gas concern, and those arguments seemed to dissolve around different points. One of those points is that the Barbados Gas Company is not worth \$150,000 which it is claimed to be worth in this Resolution. Another point made was: why spend \$1,000,000 on the development of gas in this island? Is it necessary at this stage of our development?

Well, sir, let me get first to the question of the Gas Company. In the particulars that are submitted in this Resolution, roughly \$50,000 are for pipelines which I understand are less than ten years old; I have been made to understand that no pipe which was over 10 years old was considered. For that reason you may say that all that was estimated for was equal to the service of a new pipe. You may say that the Gas Company has decided to shut down and for that reason they must leave the pipes there and you can have them afterwards, but should that be the action of the Government? Because you know some concern is shutting down and it cannot take up the pipes and therefore it has to leave them, are you going to say because it cannot take them up and has to leave them I will subsequently get them? You can do that, but I do not think that a Government of all persons should act in that manner.

The balance of the equipment and buildings is estimated at \$100,000; that is for the land and the buildings. Certainly they are building there. I do not profess to know what equipment is there, but I am going to say that the estimates were made out by two reputable Barbadian engineers, and I am prepared to take their estimate on this occasion. As I have said, I think the Government should purchase the property because I am one who feel that you should not confiscate people's property. Of course you can confiscate their buildings and land, and can ask them to leave their pipes; but I do not agree that that is the way in which business should be done.

As regards the question of the gas well, the Gulf Oil Company has spent \$1,000,000 in drilling the well. That Company is here for the purpose of finding oil, not gas; but incidentally gas was there, not oil. They have fixed their price for that well of natural gas, not on the existing gas in Barbados, but more or less on what price is paid for a gas well in bigger countries like England or Canada. That price is not at all in relation to the price the Government had to pay for No. 19 well from B.U.O.C. Government paid much more for that well. I do not have the figures and I cannot argue strongly on the price, but be that as it may, the No. 1 Well of the Gulf Oil Company has a much greater capacity than any of the two wells which were taken over by the Natural Gas Corporation. If I am incorrect on that statement, I would like that to be stated by the Hon. Premier when he gives his reply.

A lot has been said about the price of Natural Gas today in relation to the price of Bottled Gas. From all the estimates I have seen and heard, Bottled Gas is about 40 percent. higher than the present price of Natural Gas supplied by the Barbados Gas

Company. I am not one who advocates that the Government should undertake industries which can be run by private enterprise, because I have always held the view that those ventures cannot be more efficiently run by Government than by private enterprise; but in an industry such as Natural Gas which is so vital to the economy of the island and which for reasons cannot be run by private enterprise, I do say that Government should come in and take it over. I do not say that Government should come in and take over something which is losing money, but I am of the opinion that if capital could have been found by the directors of the Barbados Gas Company, they would have continued to operate. There is no reason why that Company could not have continued to operate and make a profit out of Natural Gas when the potential amount of fuel used in this colony is imported and expensive. I am sure that there are enough industries in Bridgetown alone where large quantities of that gas can be sold. I can only say that it is through bad management by the Barbados Gas Company that they have not pushed their sales up with many of the large consumers. The Company just did not follow up would-be potential consumers of Natural Gas. Of course, the Company did a great service to householders; and anyone of them who has it installed would tell you of its convenience and cheapness. But there are would-be large consumers who would really install this service if they were given better conditions. I have had first-hand knowledge of this. In my bakery I can use Natural Gas, but I now use gas which is manufactured from kerosene oil and which is more expensive to use than Natural Gas. I would prefer to use Natural Gas because I know it is cleaner; but for me to pay the Gas Company what they are asking for it, of course, it would be more expensive than gas from kerosene oil; and that is my reason for using gas manufactured from kerosene oil. I have been trying to get that Company to bring their price down to me but they have refused; and I consider that as bad business. It would pay that Company better to come and sell gas to me or any other large consumer than to have 400 small consumers using it. I am not saying that the Company should only be interested in large consumers. There is no reason why Government should not make a success of it; but it must be run properly.

When it comes to the installation of Natural Gas that is another important matter which Government should give plenty consideration to. Let me say that the price for the installation of water is much too high for the ordinary consumer to pay. I know of a case where the price was in the vicinity of \$60 to turn in water which was only a matter of ten feet from the main. I have had that experience from a resident in Christ Church. That is something which needs to be taken up by Government, because it is not lending itself to the installation of water in private homes where you want it to be turned in; and it is much more sanitary and better for Government to have those houses equipped with their own water supply. The same thing will apply to the installation of gas. If Government intends to operate this concern on the same basis as the installation of water is operated by the Waterworks Department, I am saying now that they should consider doing something about it. I am not an engineer; I do not know anything of the installation of gas, but I think the present price to consumers is too high. I do believe if these installations could be made by some businessmen, they will do them at one-third of the price now charged.
5.25 p.m.

Fuel is so vital, so important to our economy, and not only to the many householders in St. Michael and Christ Church but to all parishes, that there is no reason why if we have sufficient gas on the spot, that the same Corporation could not bulk their gas there and send it out to the rural districts; it would save the trouble of sending an empty cylinder drum back up to Trinidad. Let the pipes go to the thickly populated areas because it is more economical and cheaper in the long run. With gas you have only to read a meter; but it is cheaper to do it that way than with kerosene oil. Gas is coming out of running wells.

My argument is: let the money stay here in Barbados. I cannot follow the arguments against this, nor do I feel it is fair for a company that has been losing money and has to pay for management, to say to them we do not want your pipelines we are going to put down something else.

The Company has miles and miles of rusted pipelines; but I do not think that that is calculated in this estimate; I learned that from reliable sources. All the pipes that are being taken over by Government are pipes that the Gas Company laid down since ten years ago. I do not think that they have deteriorated very much within that time.

These estimates have been furnished us at the beginning to show us where we are leading and what will be expected with development. The entire amount of money will not be required one time; it will be spent over a period of years. The largest sum on this estimate \$616,000, is for the putting down of new pipelines; the next largest sum is \$78,000 for the acquisition of Turner Hall Well No. 1. As I said before, that \$78,000 has been based on the very cheap price of gas in a big country; and if this is taken into account, I see no reason why the reduction in the price of gas cannot be more substantial. You are buying a very cheap raw material, and therefore this is an advantage that should be passed on to the consumer. We next come to the purpose of Paragraph (d) of the Resolution. Replacement of present two-inch field line — \$11,000; that is necessary. Paragraph (e) states additional field line; and paragraph (f) says: Earmarked for purchase of any other wells that might be acquired in the future.

I understand, (and this is what the Government must know through their oil experts) that wherever oil is drilled they have found pockets of gas. I have told them before that if the actual oil supply were to fail to-morrow there are sufficient sources of gas remaining in here, that Government could bring some commercial concern to drill for gas only. It will not be an expensive operation, because it will be achieved by a small-bore system which is much less expensive than the system of drilling for oil. If these wells become depleted in ten or fifteen years, Government would not have to be without a source of gas in large quantities throughout Barbados.

As I said before, those are facts that I have learnt from outside and from enquiries which I have made. If these facts are correct or have any basis or any foundation of truth, I do not see why hon. members should think that Government is going to have to throw \$1,000,000 down the drain. It is so peculiar to Barbados (because fuel is one of the big problems of Barbados at present) that we should be using fire-wood from British Guiana and oil from Trinidad. We should consider trying to husband our economy; and this can be done by the development of our Natural Gas resources. My only regret is that the Gas Company could not have found sufficient capital to make it a first-class job. I only hope that if Government takes it over that Government will make a

really first class job of it. If that is their aim, there is not much to do but to keep their pipelines and pressure up-to-date.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I do not propose speaking at any length on this matter; I am only speaking because I am depressed by this lack of Government's warm-heartedness in their approach to the question of nationalisation, when they could have displayed a little more courage or a little more fortitude. As we are now on the question of Natural Gas, I think I should risk a suggestion of my own; and as it tends towards the nationalisation which this Government had proposed to bring into effect and which it has been so wary in implementing, I think it is necessary to remind them that even if it is a small approach to nationalisation, it is the first in the series. My suggestion is this: the purchase of at least one sugar factory would give Government a chance of running an organisation of that kind, and would show whether or not the Government of Barbados is capable of managing a sugar factory in the interest of the people as efficiently as private factory owners have done in the past.

There is just one more suggestion which I would like to make: whenever a matter of valuation comes before this Chamber, one cannot help for being concerned with the fact that this Labour Government is still using the same method in which the Conservative Government have placed their implicit trust. When hon. members read in this agreement that the Government is taking the valuation made by Messrs Joseph Connell and Frank Hutson hon. members will begin to see the force of my argument. If this had been done in the times of former Attorney Generals you would have had Messrs Joseph Connell and Frank Hutson making the valuation; but to-day there are others to whom the Government can turn. It would be superfluous to say that they could turn to a firm of consulting engineers like Messrs Miller Bros. for instance, who may be equally capable of making valuations, and who are not tainted and saturated with the Tory views particularly with their reactionary business connection. I am putting it to the Hon. Minister that whenever they have to make a valuation of land to let us go into St. Philip for the valuers if you are valuing in St. Philip, instead of continuing with the policy disclosed by this Agreement which states that the Government have turned to these same people for making the valuation. They are a clique; these are persons who will not do a thing unless they are satisfied that is in the interest of certain people.

I have no hesitation in saying that the price which we are paying in this case is high; there is no question about that, but it is better to pay a high price rather than make any further delay in this long delayed move towards nationalisation. I am therefore supporting this Resolution.

5.35 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this House go into Committee on this Resolution. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye," those against please say "No". I think the "Noes" have it.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

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

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

On re-assembling:—

HOUSING BILL—(Cont'd)

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to take Order No. 1 as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is to resume Committee on the Bill to make provision with respect to the Housing of persons of the working classes and other classes and for purposes connected therewith.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House resumed Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the last occasion when we were in Committee on this Bill Clauses 2 and 4 were postponed.

Hon. M. E. COX: When we were last in Committee considering Clause 4 of this Bill, the hon. senior member for the City made a point as to the life of the Board and he was given the assurance then that the question would be discussed. Government has considered that question and we have decided to make the period one of five years which normally speaking is the life of the Legislature.

I am asking leave to delete the the word "such" appearing in the second last line and the word "a" be substituted therefor; and that the remaining words of the Section be also deleted and the words "of five years" be substituted therefor.

Mr. LEWIS: I can see what the hon. member means. We have been putting into these Bills that appointments to Boards should be for a period the same as the life of the Legislature but the hon. member must realise that another Bill to clarify this point will have to be brought in, or there must be at present some understanding that these appointments will cease on the dissolution of the Legislature or that they will be reappointed on the election of a new House. [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: What has that got to do with the life of the House?] One gets the impression that these Boards are to run concurrently with the life of the Legislature. The very Board which is being abolished by this Bill was appointed at every new session or period of the House; therefore it is something new for the hon. member to ask "What has that got to do with it?" If you start off and appoint this Board, when will it ever catch up with the Legislature itself? I feel that there should be some provision relative to these appointments to the effect that the members will be reappointed at the beginning of the life of a new General Assembly; that is what I feel should be done as that was the case before. It would be a good thing because if the Executive Committee has to do with the appointments, the personnel of the Executive Committee might change; and it is at that stage that they may feel that with the life of this Board as it is at present in this Bill there would be no offence if the Executive Committee felt that they could dismiss those on the Board opposed to their view and put on who they want. It is not right to hold it over the heads of a Board that you can dismiss them whenever you like; to say that you can appoint people and then kick them out

when you like savours on something from which you should get away.

6.20 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The hon. member is completely wrong. That does apply when the administration is making the appointments. You cannot jump and change when you have an administrative authority. Obviously, when you have the Other Place appointing one person and this House another person, you have to go by the life of the House. Somebody may lose his seat. It was done for that reason.

Mr. LEWIS: I hope the Hon. Premier understood what I said. The five years are linked with the life of the Legislature. That is what I was told before. I was told that it was purely an oversight that appointments were not linked with the actual five years of the Legislature. It is but right that the Housing Authority should be appointed by any new Government. We have had administrative boards that were appointed by the Legislature paying out pensions. I hope the Hon. Premier does not think I have it wrong.

If a new Government is appointed by the Governor to-morrow and they feel that certain people whom they do not like are on certain boards, the Government should have the opportunity to appoint other members to the particular board. It has not caused anything wrong in the past. The old Hospital Board and the Road Board used to employ people and pay them pensions, so it is not detrimental to have it done that way.

I am hoping that some Bill will come in with an amendment that where an appointment is for the life of the Legislature, that that appointment should take place after the elections.

The question that Clause (1) as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 5 was called. It reads as follows:—

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that Clause 5 stand part.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Now, Mr. Chairman, with respect to sub-clause (3), I would like the Hon. Minister to tell me if he thinks that this is the right sub-clause to be inserted, or whether he thinks it should be taken out. I do not think he will find this sub-clause in any other Bill of this kind. I agree that it should be left in, if it were an indeterminate time. If there is some other reason for having it there, I am willing to agree to it if I am told the reason.

Hon. M. E. COX: I really cannot see the fears of the honourable member. Nobody contemplates the Executive Committee dismissing an individual who has given good service to the Board. It is merely a case for where an individual may become useless, or may be that it would be in the interest of the good administration of the Board if a certain member were removed. You can see from the Bill the terms under which such members can be removed. Of course, it may also be a case in which the interest of the Housing Authority might be in jeopardy if a certain member remains on the Board. It is only under those conditions that you can reasonably assume that the officer will be asked to resign.

I am sure with the Housing Board as it now stands, that members are re-appointed from time to time and year after year, because for one reason or the other it is felt that they have given good service; therefore the necessity for changing them does not arise. I very much doubt that any Government would remove an officer without justification. As I have said, if you set it down in the Bill that a

member of the Board must serve for the life of the legislature, we may be doing something detrimental to the proper functioning of the Board and we would not be able to do anything about it. It might be necessary in the interest of the Board to remove a member before his five years of service have expired.

Mr. BARROW: There is a principle on which British justice and democratic institutions in advanced constitutions in the world is based. Now, it is within the discretion of the Executive Committee, whom we now understand can be no less a person than the Leader of the Government since the advent of Ministerial Status, to call upon a member of a statutory board which according to Section 3, sub-section (2), shall be a body corporate and shall have perpetual life, to resign without putting any qualifications in this Clause as to the grounds on which that person may be called upon to resign. It does seem to me to be an act of tautology on their part. If mere failure to attend four consecutive board meetings forfeits the right of a member of the Housing Authority to remain on the Board, how much more should any offence more serious than that be stipulated in the Bill itself with which we are now considering.

6.30 p.m.

But the history of Boards in Barbados is well known to all those who have had the misfortune to be associated with the present Government. Persons are relieved from their responsibility to the community not on the grounds of misfeasance or malfeasance, but on their failure to accommodate the rather strange political attitude of the existing Government. There is a long list of Boards that this House and the Governor-in-Executive Committee fill from session to session; and at the earliest possible opportunity, no matter how useful a member of the public or a member of this House has been to a Board, no matter how great his technical skill or qualifications may be the minute that not only the member, but anybody immediately associated with the particular member of the Board disagrees on questions of policy or of principle, that member is relieved of this position on that Board. There is Combermere School Board for instance.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am reminding the hon. member that we are dealing with Clause five. Let us keep to Clause five.

Mr. BARROW: I am speaking on the question of relieving members from Boards.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have not seen Combermere Board mentioned in this clause.

Mr. BARROW: You must, Mr. Chairman, appreciate something which is very elementary. This Board has not been established yet, and if by timely warning we can avoid the pitfalls which we have fallen into in the past, it is my duty to give them to the House. It is not merely to fulminate against clauses of a Bill that I am speaking at length. The very essence of parliamentary debate is founded on the ability to draw analogies however invidious they may appear to Your Honour, and that is all that I am saying.

In the past, persons on Government Boards have been relieved of their positions and we should not follow that which the Government specifies in sub-section (3) of Section (5) without stating the grounds on which they may be relieved from service to the community. What you are going to find is this: if in view of the past history of Governments in this matter, and especially this particular Government, and in view of the clause which we are now contemplating, the vesting in section (5) sub-section (3) of the power of the Board to revoke an appointment

made in the Governor-in-Executive (which is really in the five Ministers) you will find then that no self-respecting persons in the community will accept an appointment under terms such as these, owing to the vagaries of the political life in this country. If you do not make it clear, (that is, if you will not make the appointment for a statutory period, but you merely say you have appointed them for five years for instance, and then you can revoke their authority) you will not find responsible persons willing to take such appointments; you will only find political touts and parasites to occupy positions on those Boards. That applies to any Government, but especially to this one. That is the danger I am warning honourable members against. How can you ask anyone who has had a distinguished career in the Civil Service or in a Parliament either in this country or in any other country, or a person say in a mercantile firm, to place himself in the hands of say, the senior member for St. Michael in an appointment on this Board? You could not expect it; because as soon as the honourable member has seen some ninth cousin to someone who has not voted for him, then that person would be automatically removed. If we look around this Chamber we will find members in this Chamber who have been relieved of their offices on certain Boards, and complete strangers to the public life of this country and of this House have been substituted in their places. I do not have to go any further because these things are well known to all the members of this House. This is not the second reading of the Bill as Your Honour would assume, and therefore I am going to bring the whole matter to a head by moving that this sub-Clause three of Clause five be—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is a person who at least has had some acquaintance with the law, and therefore he must know that any person who has power to appoint has power to release. The Natural Gas Corporation Act says exactly the same thing.

It reads as follows:— Section 7, sub-section (1)

“The Governor may at any time remove from office all or so many of the members of the Corporation as he may consider necessary in the interests of the effective and economical performance of the functions of the Corporation.

(2) The Governor may at any time remove from office any member of the Corporation who has become incapable through ill health of performing efficiently his duties as such member, or who has been absent from all the meetings of the Corporation during a period of six months.”

That is an indication of the lines on which a non-appointing body can act. The honourable member keeps introducing the word “arbitrary.” No Government can act arbitrarily; it is responsible to the Legislature and responsible to the people. As soon as you use the word “arbitrary” you are bringing a very gross and offensive accusation against the appointing body whether it consists of one person or more. The whole object of a Ministerial Government is to teach people to be careful how they exercise power. The power exists now whether this section is in the Bill or not.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I would have expected the honourable senior member for St. Michael to answer the question which I posed; but in view of the inadequate answer of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, I am surprised that he did dare to rush into the breach created. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph always creates pitfalls for himself.

I was pointing out to the honourable senior member for St. Michael that it is unusual to have the power of this nature in a Bill of this kind where you are appointing a statutory body, without stating the grounds on which a member of that Body may be relieved of his service as in the Natural Gas Act; and this Bill itself (the one now before the House) states in Sub-section 2 of Section 5 "Any member who fails without reasonable excuse to attend four consecutive meetings of the Authority shall cease to be a member thereof." In this they have a Clause which is obnoxious.

I am very glad to hear that the honourable member for St. Joseph has been reading some constitutional law. It was not so long ago that he got up in here and told honourable members of this House that this Chamber served only as a debating Chamber. Since the inception of Ministerial Status we had no other power but to debate. It touches me to hear him say that. Honourable members of this Chamber will remember the honourable senior member for St. Joseph getting up and saying this is nothing but a debating Chamber. He does not realise that he says these things sometimes; and when he began to read out just now, I knew specifically that he would disclose the same thing to-day. If honourable members wish to listen to him let them go along and listen to him.

6.40 p.m.

If you appoint a person for five years, we presume that you are appointing a fit and proper man. If he becomes ill he will resign in his own interest; but why should we insert in this Bill a provision which is not in keeping with the spirit of the other laws which we have passed? I am submitting that if you appoint a man to a job you can dismiss him, but in the case of a Statutory Board, there may be other considerations. It is an act of supererogation on your part to make a provision of this kind because you have already the power to dismiss a man whom you have appointed; this provision should not be in this Bill because you will scare off a lot of people.

Mr. LEWIS: I do not think that this is a matter on which there needs to be generated a lot of heat. I would agree with this Clause if it were at the pleasure of the Executive Committee, because Sub-clause (3) of Clause 5 follows directly on Clause 4. You are not appointing them for life, you are appointing them at your pleasure and therefore I feel you can dismiss them. If the provision in the other laws is put in here, I am still willing to vote for it. Here is a political body at whose whim you can be dismissed; politicians are not put on it, but a political body at its own whim can say "I put you there, I do not like something which you say and I can just write you a letter dismissing you." Let us put in the Bill that dismissal should be on a question of ill health or something like that which is in the Natural Gas Corporation Act. I know that this provision will be inserted in the Other Place; and that is what makes me feel that since the ability also exists in this House, let us make laws of which we should be proud. When we send Bills up to the Other Place let them be in proper form; do not let it go out that christian democratic principles have to be shown by the Other Place.

Mr. MILLER: I should just like to make a few remarks in connection with Sub-clause (2) of Clause 5. I am anxious about this Housing Authority being set up and I do not want to hold up the matter. This Sub-clause says "Any member who fails without reasonable excuse to attend four con-

secutive meetings of the Authority shall cease to be a member thereof."

I feel that this Clause will entail much danger; this will probably apply to the present Housing Board, having regard to the number of meetings held by this Board over a certain period. But this Authority will probably be meeting every week and perhaps twice in some weeks. This is a tremendous thing which is now taking place in this colony, and any decision taken by the Authority in connection with slum clearance will be far reaching. According to this Sub-clause if a member ceases to attend four consecutive meetings of the Authority, he is no longer a member of the Authority. The Authority will have to inform the Minister that you are no longer a member of the Authority and in the meantime another member will be appointed.

The provisions of this Bill will entail a lot of work and travelling; and at least you may have three or four meetings a week. If for some reason or other you cannot write a letter stating that you are ill, I feel that you will have some upsetting on this Board. This Board is going to have more work than what the Minister envisages; and I am just passing on to the Minister what I anticipate. There will be much fear and anxiety on the part of a member of the Authority that he will lose his seat if he does not attend four consecutive meetings of the Authority. I hope the Hon. Minister will give some assurance in this matter.

6.50 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Perhaps the honourable member will appreciate the fact that if at the first meeting a member cannot send a telephone message, he may be able to do it at the second, the third or fourth meeting. He should be able within sometime between those meetings to send a message stating his inability to attend. He could even do it at the end of the meeting.

Mr. LEWIS: I do not pay much attention to the point that you should send in an excuse after the meeting, because in any case the meeting will be held. I am not quibbling about that at all because on the Authority sitting at meetings, there would be members to whom the same condition would apply. I really do not see anything in that point made by the honourable junior member for St. George. Four meetings are quite a large number for one to miss; and if you miss two meetings, you still have another two meetings to miss before the time that you can be reasonably relieved. Since the same people who would be judge of an excuse would be in the same position as the person making the excuse, I think it could be safely left in their hands; and we should expect that they would act reasonably. I am not saying that you should encourage slackness. As a matter of fact, I think that there should be an excuse for three meetings instead of four. This is quite reasonable and if that were amended to read that way, I would agree with it. I cannot see the reason for the fear by the honourable junior member for St. George.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I am that old-fashioned type of person who does not agree with anything savouring to be arbitrary. I entirely agree with the whole Clause up to sub-section (2), but the Hon. Premier does not think of the finite nature of the word "power" but power is finite. A time will come when you will not have an Executive Committee of the goodwill which the Hon. Premier knows exists on the Executive Committee of today, and for that reason I feel that sub-Clause (3) should be deleted. I fear of anything with arbitrary power. I feel that any political body must be guided by some law or regu-

lation; it should not be left to do anything to its own free will; it should be guided by a law or regulation and that is the essence of democracy.

Sir, I do not support sub-clause (3) as it now stands; I think it is unnecessary.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If it were academic, I would second the motion for deletion because the result would fundamentally be that the existing law would operate. We do not have to say that it is the Executive Committee who should dismiss because that is the law today. Every power including that of a Judge has to be exercised judicially, although of course, sanction in one case has nothing to do with sanction in another case. Every power given to you must be used according to your discretion; it is not given arbitrarily; it means that you have to exercise it judicially. There is a case where although the Governor had powers in his hands to expel a person, an appeal was made to the Privy Council. You cannot fire a person out of the island without saying why he should be fired; because British Law (because of the very fact that it is democratic) is not arbitrary. If you were to expel any person without hearing his defence, that person can bring a case to the Privy Council. The law as regards arbitration is covered except so far as sanction. You cannot sue a Government. You cannot even expel a man from a club because in many cases he has a remedy. It may be that you may be able to bring a case of libel or slander against the club for having expelled him from the club, because expulsion may mean that he could be unfit to sit with his fellow men. British law is not arbitrary; even a Governor or a Governor-in-Executive Committee has to act judicially; but sanction may be different sometimes. I repeat; if it were academic, I would vote for the deletion of this sub-clause. That is the law of England and the law of Barbados.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I am going to make this appeal to the hon. member. I have already told him that if he puts in what is in the Natural Gas Corporation Act I would vote for it. This subclause is worded as it is because of the way in which Clause four was printed. It is here stated that the Governor-in-Executive Committee may at any time revoke the appointment of any member of the Authority without any reason. Do you mean to tell me that any self-respecting member of this Authority will get a member off this House to raise his name in here to say why you fired him? I am telling the hon. member that no self-respecting member of that Authority would do it. I would never be the one to come on the floor of this House to try to justify the character of someone who is fired. I am saying that this sub-clause is wrong as it is. For anyone to come here to justify the character of someone who is fired, he will have to come with an innuendo. I am not saying that some of the firing cannot be justified, but it is a serious thing to come in here to ask about it. As it stands it is repugnant. No member can do anything by himself; it takes even two to sign a cheque. I am appealing to him to see the reason. It may be alright once he is on the Executive Committee; but everything comes to an end. The day may come when he might not be on the Executive, and then he will see these things in a different light. I am appealing to him to see that this is not in any other Act. I would have agreed with it if Clause (4) was left as it was.

I would leave it so and let it be for five years. The next Executive Committee would have to get rid of them for him. It was put in in this arbitrary manner for some reason or the other; because when I read Clause 4 as it is printed here I said this sounds funny to me, but it is in keeping with the

Clause (5) that is following. I think if you change Clause 4 by putting in something definite, that would be better.

7.00 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I refuse to consider persuading the hon. member who has just sat down. Reading it or saying it makes no difference to him. I was merely addressing my remarks to the hon. junior member for St. John. Those are only specific instances that may operate with the Governor-in-Executive Committee. If a man on the Highways and Transport cannot get on with the Technical Engineer, the thing to do is to get rid of him and keep the Technical Engineer. In a proper administration if any differences arise involving a member of the Board, the proper thing to do is to remove the man on the Board. When the hon. member talks about the Natural Gas Corporation Act this is what it says:—

"The Governor may at any time remove from office all or so many of the members of the Corporation as he may consider necessary in the interests of the effective and economical performance of the functions of the Corporation.

(2) The Governor may at any time remove from office any member of the Corporation who has become incapable through ill health of performing efficiently his duties as such member, or who has been absent from all the meetings of the Corporation during a period of six months."

I said to the hon. member for St. John that he should not let any member influence him to conceive ideas that would interfere with his reasoning.

It is my duty as long as I happen to know, not to sit and say nothing. If I had wanted to be a Machiavellian, all I had to do was to sit and smile and agree to ask the Committee to take it out. I must apologise for having spoken so often. But I must repeat that if a vote is taken and the matter gets out of control, immediately the Governor-in-Executive Committee will have to resort to its power.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I am going to enjoin the hon. senior member for St. Michael in the same way as I have enjoined the electors of St. Michael to find out things for himself. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph says that the Natural Gas Corporation contains exactly the same Clause as this Bill. [A VOICE: Yes, it is in the Government's Bill.] Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. Joseph said that the hon. junior member for the City pointed out to him what I had already pointed out to him; that is, that it has never happened that we pass an Act without putting a limit on the power which it gives. While the hon. senior member for St. Joseph was reading from the Natural Gas Corporation Act, I made a little challenge to the hon. member on my left to the effect that the hon. member for St. Joseph would not get to the end of Clause 7 and at that moment he stopped short. He does it everytime.

The Natural Gas Corporation Act says this: "that the Governor may remove on two grounds." No. 1, is found in Section 7, sub-section 1, it reads as follows:—"The Governor may at any time remove from office all or so many of the members of the Corporation as he may consider necessary in the interests of the effective and economical performance of the functions of the Corporation."

Now, sub-clause 3, of clause 5 of this Housing Bill states:—

"The Governor-in-Executive Committee may at any time revoke the appointment of any member of the Authority."

And the very next thing on the paper is Clause 6.

The Natural Gas Corporation Act, 1950, which the hon. senior member for St. Joseph refused to read fully, states this: (section 6 sub-section 1) "The Corporation shall consist of a chairman and not more than four members all of whom shall be appointed by the Governor".

From Section 6 we pass on to Section 7 which reads as follows:—

7. (1) The Governor may at anytime remove from office all or so many of the members of the Corporation as he may consider necessary in the interests of the effective and economical performance of the functions of the Corporation.

(2) The Governor may at any time remove from office any member of the Corporation who has become incapable through ill-health of performing efficiently his duties as such member, or who has been absent from all the meetings of the Corporation during a period of six months."

Now, the very next thing is Section 8. I want to say this for the benefit of the hon. senior member for St. Michael. I am asking him to go and look into "Broome's Legal Maxims" (I am giving him Chapter and verse) and look for this expression: *Expressio unius est exclusio alterius*.

Therefore if in the Customs Tariff Act, it was stated that the Customs should give a rebate on Motor cars or horses, it does not mean that the Customs Authority has power to give a rebate on a refrigerator. He said the grounds on which the Governor can revoke an appointment are contained in Section 7 of Natural Gas Corporation Act, 1950.

Mr. Chairman, I am not abusing anybody. I am asking the hon. senior member for St. Michael to question things for himself. If he thinks that a British Parliament or any other Colonial Parliament would pass laws which would give him unlimited power he is mistaken. When a certain Bill was introduced by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, the Secretary of State pointed out that they had not disclosed to the Board or any member of that body the grounds on which they had dismissed anybody. Mr. Oliver Lyttelton said that. Although we are to understand that even the Queen cannot tell the hon. senior member for St. Joseph when to dismiss a member of the Board, yet thousands of such cases have happened during his tenure of office.

7.10 p.m.

This is the worst thing I have ever seen in any law; this is the sort of thing for which the Barons drove King John to Runnymede to sign the Magna Charta. The Act of 1701 placed further restriction on this arbitrary exercise of power, although the hon. senior member for St. Joseph will tell us that when you appoint a Judge you cannot dismiss him arbitrarily; but what were they fighting against in England in the early years? I am not saying this for the benefit of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph because he is beyond redemption; but this is for members of this Chamber who still uphold the principles of democracy. I am asking those hon. members to look at the Act of Settlement and the Magna Charta and if they feel that anything that emanates from the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is God made, it is a matter for them.

Mr. LEWIS: Whenever the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is up against stubborn facts, he is famous for saying that pathological things cannot convince him. How many things the Other Place have sent back here? This is a Bill which has been in British Guiana since 1946; it was probably sent back here by Sir Alfred Savage and therefore nothing can be wrong with it. If you look at the arrangement of the Clauses and the Comparative Table you will

see what has happened; Clause 5(1) is new, (2) is modified and (3) is adapted. Adapted to what? To every day at a meeting; is that ill health? The Government to-day—[Hon. M. E. COX: Adapted to suit local conditions.] What are the local conditions that an appointing body wants those arbitrary powers to dismiss somebody? It is arbitrary because there is no restraining influence at all in it. I am perfectly willing to have in this Bill something which you have in another Act.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Suppose a man gets drunk every day at a meeting, is that not ill health? The Governor-in-Executive Committee can dismiss a man because he is drunk every day at meetings.

Mr. TUDOR: I disagree with the Leader of my Party in one respect. I feel that he has been unduly severe on the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. When the hon. member is using so many different arguments and so many sets of facts to justify those arguments he may be forgiven for not only confusing us, but also for confusing himself. He is actually saying: "if he had drafted this Bill he would not have had that provision in it; but if it is in, let it remain in." It is a common saying in respect of young people: "those who are in stand in: those who are out stand out". That is all right for keeping a tidy house but it is not the best principle if you want to have proper legislation.

It is clear that the Governor-in-Executive Committee must have and must retain the power of the dismissal of people who are appointed on Statutory Boards. What had been clear until the hon. member spoke was that they should not be able to dismiss anybody merely because they wanted to dismiss him; and if reference is made to the Natural Gas Corporation Act, it will be seen that the power given to the Governor is to be exercised in accordance with certain conditions, ill-health or otherwise; but you cannot say that the same thing is operating here. It clearly says that the Governor-in-Executive Committee may dismiss at anytime any member of the Authority, but it does not say if he is this, that or the other. That is clearly arbitrary; because there is nothing in the Clause to illustrate the conditions under which such dismissal may be exercised. So much for that.

The danger in not deleting this Clause is this: knowing the hon. senior member for St. Joseph as we do, we would not be surprised if on another occasion when another Corporate Authority is being set up, we should not at all be surprised to hear him say that we allowed it in the Housing Bill; and he will argue with us very strongly that we allowed it in the Housing Bill inasmuch as we allowed him to convince us from his reading of the Natural Gas Corporation Act that there was no new departure. We have got to be very careful with the hon. member's line of argument; it becomes more misleading since more and more cases need application to certain principles.

7.20 p.m.

There is another reason why this Clause should not be left as it is. I now come to the honourable senior member for St. Michael. I am going to tell him that shortly he will have reason to see the force of the argument which has been put up on this side of the table, because I am disclosing to the House now that a problem is going to be put to him in his capacity as Minister for Housing by some person whose judgment and opinions he values, but who will tell him some unpalatable things. If anyone such a person were to be appointed as a member of this Housing Authority under these terms, from the sort of advice which I know that they will tender to the Minister, that person would not have a second longer,

on this Housing Authority. If you leave this sub-clause like this, and independent minded persons are appointed to Statutory Authorities and they tender advice in the interest of the people which may not be to the liking of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, they will be penalised by dismissal. If you leave that Clause like this, knowledgeable people who will be of value to the Housing Authority by the wealth of their views, will not accept membership on that Board when they are exposed to dismissals without any reason given.

Sir, I feel very strongly about this because you cannot allow the power of dismissal to remain without underlying conditions. I wish this Committee to take the honourable senior member for St. Joseph at his word. He said that it was established and if that is so, whether you have to go to the Privy Council or not, and whether actual cases come out to test it, that is sufficient. From the honourable member's own admission, the Clause is unnecessary; so that even if the argument that it is wrong is allowed to slide for a moment, this Committee would have to ask itself whether it can afford to pass legislation which even on the admission of the Government, is unnecessary. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph was very careful to say that if he had done the drafting, he would never have put it in. Sir, we have no right to pass legislation which is unnecessary; and we certainly have no right to pass legislation which is wrong, and certainly less right to pass legislation which is both unnecessary and wrong.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, this section appeals to me in the following way: first of all, I understand that the previous section (section 4) was amended to read that the persons who hold office should hold office for a period of five years. In other words, section 4 gives an element of permanence to the persons who are on the Committee; therefore, it would seem illogical to me having decided to appoint them for a period of five years, to proceed in the following section to say that the Governor-in-Executive Committee may at any time revoke the appointment of any such member. Having said in one section that the appointments should be for a period of years, you then immediately afterwards should not put in something to mean that the appointments can be only for a period of five months.

Then, there is another aspect to it which strikes me. I am prepared to conceive that the wording of section 7 of the Natural Gas Corporation Act is a great deal better than the wording of this section—section 5. What I feel would be the result of this sub-section, if it is allowed to remain, is that it might be very difficult to get any self-respecting person to be willing to serve as a member of this Authority if he is told that we are appointing you for a period of five years, but at any time without reason given or for no reason we can revoke your appointment. Sir, we are passing legislation for any Governor-in-Executive Committee, not for a particular Executive Committee.

I do not recall what were the arguments when the Natural Gas Corporation Act was debated in 1950, but I think that Act is quite wide enough. Section 7 of that Act says that the Governor may at any time remove from office all or so many of the Corporation as he may consider necessary in the interest of the effective and economical performance of the functions of the Corporation. There is no reason why we should make this Act wider than that. Certainly, we should not make it as wide as Section 5, sub-section 3.

The Hon. Premier cited a case of an officer of the Department of Highways and Transport. Suppose you even thought that an officer could not get on with

the Technical Engineer and you wanted power to get rid of him, you would have ample power to remove him and deal with him as a person whom the Governor may consider necessary in the interests of the effective and economical performance of the functions of the Board to remove; because, obviously, if he is holding up the work of the technical expert, if that officer is only a nuisance in that office, then it can be truly said that he is a person whose advice would not be necessarily in the interest of the effective performance of the Department.

Lawyers revel in precedents; and I do not know what motivated the draughtsman of this Bill not to follow the drafting of Section 7 of the Natural Gas Corporation Act. This section of this Bill is definitely too wide; and I certainly would adopt the phraseology of Section 7 of the Natural Gas Corporation Act to enable any person who is not pulling his weight to be removed; but it should not be so wide that such person should be removed for no reason whatsoever. In this Bill, you are giving them power which is quite necessary but this wide, unrestricted power should not be placed in the hands of any body. Sir, let us be guided by Section 7 of the Natural Gas Corporation Act. I certainly support the amendment of Section 5 of this Bill to conform with section 7 of the Natural Gas Corporation Act.

7.30 p.m.

The question that sub-clause 3 of Clause 5 was put and resolved in the negative on a division as follows:

Ayes: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BRANCKER, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. BARROW, Mr. TUDOR, Mr. GODDARD—(6).

Noes: Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mrs. E. E. BOURNE, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. MILLER, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. VAUGHAN—(9).

The question that Clause 5 stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 6 was called and passed.

Clause 7 was called and passed.

Clause 8 was called.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, this is the first Clause which gives power to the Governor alone. It does not say "Governor-in-Executive" this time. In line three the word "Governor", I think should be followed by "-in-Executive Committee". All the other Clauses contain the phrase "Governor-in-Executive Committee". Sub-clause 1, of Clause 8 reads as follows:

"The Authority may appoint and employ a Manager whose appointment shall be subject to the approval of the Governor, and such other officers and servants as the Authority deems necessary for carrying out the purposes of this Act."

I do not approve of the word "Governor" at all; the phrase should read, "subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee".

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Chairman, I am going to second the motion of the honourable junior member for St. John. It seems to me that the phrase "Governor-in-Executive" is used throughout the whole of the Objects and Reasons; and appearing in Clause 8 as "Governor" alone, it strikes me as an oversight. I would therefore over-ride it by seconding the motion of the honourable junior member for St. John.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, If any honourable member on this side of the House had expressed the view just expressed by the honourable junior member for St. Michael, he would have been called the biggest ignoramus in the world by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph.

I think that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph should have pointed out that with the appointment, the terms and conditions of employment are two separate and distinct matters. Because

in Sub-clause (1) of Clause 8 of the Housing Bill it is stated that: "the Authority may appoint and employ a Manager whose appointment shall be subject to the approval of the Governor".

Sub-clause (2) says that the "terms and conditions of the manager and all officers, servants and agents of the Authority shall be subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee."

I want to make it quite clear that I do not necessarily agree that in these days the Governor should have to ratify the appointment of the manager of a statutory Authority. I said I do not necessarily agree; but I am in favour of retaining it for this reason: when I look around at the personnel of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, not only present in this House but who come into this Chamber, I think it is a good idea for the Government to confine the appointment to the Governor.

In sub-clause (2) of this Bill it is a different matter. I am not really ridiculing the honourable junior member for St. Michael, but I do feel that if the honourable members on the other side of the table had met in conference with the honourable junior member for St. Michael before they came into this House, they would have argued out all these little technicalities and smoothed out all the little differences which the honourable members on this side of the table would not have had.

Mr. Chairman, leaving that aside for the moment, I think that the honourable junior member for St. Michael appreciates the distinction between the two powers. I think that even he understands; in fact others have understood, and he seems to understand.

I do not agree that we should allow clause (8) to stand as it is, because there is a move afoot to take a non-technical officer and make him manager of this Housing Authority. I have warned certain honourable members in this House about that already; and now that you are going to vest such a large amount of the taxpayers' money in this statutory Authority, it would be self-evident that the manager himself is going to play a great part, not only in the actual expending of the money, but in the design and construction of the houses. He will be advising the members of the Government or the present Board as to the design and construction of the houses. Now, I understand that they originally anticipated asking a qualified architect (the present Director of Public Works) to accept this post. It is a highly technical post. We should have a Town and Country Planning Authority, not a technical officer. It is not an extremely technical job.

We are vesting wide powers in this Board, and we have a technical officer from the point of view of aesthetics of housing! Now, what I understand is that with the same dexterity with which the Government usually handles Government business and the business of the taxpayers of this country, they having suggested to the Director of Public Works that he should take the job at a certain salary, they then turned around and offered the same job to the present Manager of the Housing Board at the same salary. 7.40 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of Order. There is absolutely no truth in what the hon. member has said. No Director of Public Works has been offered any job at any salary or anything like that.

Mr. BARROW: Of course the qualification or stipulation which the hon. member has made is in connection with this Bill. This Bill has not been passed up to now, but you cannot help people from hearing things and that people are preening their feathers for the jobs which they will occupy. The hon. senior member for St. Michael must know that other people in the country will know whether he is

telling the truth or not. I am only warning the Government that if they intend to do anything like that.

I have received that information in going around in the same way that you heard of the nativity and the way that Herod was going to act. Herod had more authority than the senior member for St. Michael. Anyhow, we hear this thing mooted all around and the results will prove it. There are people who may not have direct contact with the Minister and they will know whether he is telling the truth or not. I am asking the public to follow these appointments; a job has been offered at a certain salary and the person's claim to it is that he was selling cloth. The buildings of Barbados and the disorganisation of the streets and communication system are a disgrace to the community. For the past 70 years we have had on the Statute Book of this island legislation enabling Statutory Boards to restrict the distance within which people may erect buildings in Bridgetown, Holetown and Speightstown and they have not done anything about it. The General Board of Health has been given specific powers which they fail to perform; and I am warning the Minister not to foist any non-technical man as Manager under this Housing Authority. I have nothing against any Civil Servant or any employee in this island, but I am saying in the interest of the people of this country that you will find people more amenable to your suggestion beside a man who has professional qualifications and who is able to tell you his mind and get another job at a moment's notice; therefore it is sometimes more convenient for a Minister to have a man who is subservient to him. I think that Clause 8 of this Bill should be amended to say that the Manager of the Housing Board should be a qualified architect or a qualified Civil Engineer. That is all I am saying.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I do not quite agree with the view which has been expressed by the last speaker to the effect that the Manager under this Housing Authority should be an architect or a qualified Civil Engineer. As a matter of fact, I feel that it is infinitely better at times to have the actual administration and management in the hands of laymen in comparison with engineers. I feel that you should leave the management to an experienced person qualified in administration and local knowledge and that you should have an architect attached to the Department. I must say this: whatever happens, I agree with the point of view that there is room for an architect in an organisation like this, for the simple reason that we have the old fashioned way of building properties. In connection with the buildings which the Director of Public Works has erected the average builders have gathered much from his designs and have been able to cheapen the cost of some houses very much. We had an expensive way of designing buildings 60 years ago and we have still been continuing in that way. I am of the opinion that when this Housing Authority is established we should have on the staff some person with a knowledge of architecture; I do think that in these matters we should separate the technical know-how from the general management. 7.50 p.m.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, I entirely agree with the last hon. member who sat down when he said that it was not necessary to have a technical expert as manager of this Authority. There are many departments where a technical administrator as an administrator is a failure, and it is more often the case than not. We are now building houses in Barbados for a certain class of person and we would be much safer with the type of manager who has the

experience of what houses are needed for those people, and who is accustomed to local ways and outlook. There are some Englishmen with a fixed idea as to the type of houses which suit natives in the colonies; and if you were to get such a person, he would begin to build houses entirely obnoxious to the wishes and feelings of the people. A local man who has experience in housing would not make that error. That, sir, is my fear in appointing an expert.

I have heard that remark made about Castries which is rebuilt by English experts from out of funds contributed by Colonial Development and Welfare. I understand that when the rain falls in Castries the streets are flooded for hours. Not only were the experts ignorant of the rainfall, on which account they did not allow for proper drainage of the town, but they went to work and built houses which are entirely unsatisfactory to the people. Certainly, you can admire the town from a purely architectural point of view, but those English experts did not study the climatic conditions which exist in Castries and they built houses which should be built in an English town.

Sir, nobody would be able to change their minds on what they think is their architectural right. They are going to build according to what they think is architecturally right; and because of that, we are not safe with a foreign architectural expert. The person whom we should get should be one who knows the people's wants. Let the plans be submitted to him; let him be the final arbitrator of those plans.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I am going to be very frank about it. The Housing Authority for which we are making provision cannot be regarded as a Town and Country Planning Authority; as a matter of fact, I am wondering if and when such an Authority would be brought before this Chamber in the not distant future. I was hoping that provision for that Authority would have been brought in here with the provision for this Housing Authority. I do know that with respect to the Town and Country Planning Bill which was brought before this House a few years back, of the 48 sections, there were one or two which were on slum clearance.

This Housing Authority will be spending more money but will be building the exact type of houses in the same areas, probably only more than what is being built now. Another point is that the type of houses which you are going to build would be conforming to about the three or four standards now seen in this island. Barbadians do not change from those standards. Whether democracy would object or not, we have to bear in mind that an individual only thinks in terms of his own house. All that you will be doing is to repeat the same type of house that has been built and build more of them.

Sir, to make any change as regards your present Manager-Secretary of Housing will be fool-hardy and will only endanger your Authority. Your Manager of Housing need not be an architect, because, as I have said, all that you will be doing is to build probably between four or ten types of houses of the plain background of drawings that you follow. He will not be even given a free hand to adorn the houses with embellishments which contemporary architects of this period or architects of the period of over a century ago use. He will be restricted to the type which we are building because it is purely a question of economics. I am not attempting to praise your present Manager-Secretary of Housing; as a matter of fact, I have no reason whatsoever to feel sympathetic towards him; but his fine characteristics and noble qualities and the manner in which he handles the people with whom he deals are such that we can

rely greatly on him; and I believe he will be the same to any Authority.

What are you going to do with an engineer when you are only going to construct houses of a particular size and of simple drawings. All you would be doing is to waste that man's time. Human dignity would make him refuse the job of sitting in an office and wasting time when he could add some contribution to building constructions of another country.

All this Housing Authority which we are creating seeks to do is to build more houses of the same type and size in more districts than we are now building. The only thing I fear is that if the Government makes the mistake again of building wooden houses which will only be building a habitat for wood ants and which before the money which you borrowed to build them is repaid, you will be wondering if you will be able to get another loan to rebuild them.

What I am hoping is that we are going to change that condition where, when a million dollars of lumber is brought in here—
8.00 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member seems to be straying. I do not think that what he is saying has anything to do with this clause.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, this is dealing with clause 8 and I am talking about the Manager of the Housing Board.

The amenities of housing which this Bill seeks to offer mean a great deal to the thousands and thousands of people who have been dreaming of homes for themselves and their families for a long time. This is not the type of Authority with which you can toy; it actually indicates their heritage. I hope that the Minister is persuaded that the present man has done a gigantic job; the manner alone in which he handles people is sufficient to disprove any doubt.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to make some remarks about this clause. On previous occasions I have heard the senior member for St. Joseph criticise this question of the appointment of civil servants on Boards, and to-night the Government is accepting an amendment which says that the Governor-in-Executive must appoint servants to this Board.

Hon. M. E. COX: It was originally written that way. This is a different matter altogether.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, this is a corporate body. Do you mean to tell me that the Governor-in-Executive wants to get mixed up in the appointing of the manager and things like that? As far as the particular personnel is concerned, it is the Government who will put up and appoint the whole personnel for this Board. [VOICES: Only the Manager] That is only a slip; because even the Premier says so. [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Order! Order!]

If they approve of a salary for one man who might be a higher salaried man, then that is a different matter. I thought that this was the reason for sub-clause 2 being in this Bill.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have not followed the argument but I will begin by quoting clause 8, sub-clause 1: "The Authority may appoint and employ a Manager whose appointment shall be subject to the approval of the Governor, and such other officers and servants as the Authority deems necessary for carrying out the purposes of this Act."

(2) The terms and conditions of employment of the manager and of all officers, servants and agents of the Authority shall be subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee."

I view that with suspicion. If the Opposition had made this amendment, they would have been told everything about it. I was wondering this: you have a system of ministerial government now, and yet throughout this Bill you have everything "Governor-in-Executive Committee, Governor-in-Executive Committee"! I thought that in keeping with a ministerial government, wherever the words "Governor-in-Executive Committee" now appear in these clauses, the word "Ministry" would have been used *instead*.

Now I come to this sub-clause 1 of clause 8. This Board has to appoint a manager; and here in sub-clause (1) it is stated that the "Governor" has to approve of the appointment. [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Which is the right thing]. It is strange. It is unlike you to accept that amendment. Once a Bill is drafted and sent down here it is strange for you to accept an amendment. I mean that to change the customary way of doing something is a rare thing for the Premier to accept. This is what the fact is now. I do not know what were the reasons given; but I understand that this amendment came about due to a motion made by the hon. junior member for St. John, seconded by the hon. junior member for St. Michael. We cannot prevent the Government from accepting it; but I am going to be just to myself and have it taken out. I think that I have a right to do that just as they have a right to accept it.

I have taken much pains with these Bills especially when it comes to Housing or anything of that nature; and this is the first occasion, that I can recollect, on which the Hon. Premier has accepted an amendment.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Has the Premier accepted it?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: When I say the Premier I mean the Government. It is hardly likely that any other Minister would have accepted it unless the Premier agreed. I take it that this Bill must have been in the hands of the Members of the Government for sometime, and therefore, this Bill must have been discussed by the Ministers in Executive Committee.

It is not a suggestion that instead of appointing three members you should appoint four and have a proviso that the members of the Board should not be paid anything exceeding so much; I am suggesting that this should remain as "Governor".
8.10 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: For once the Government is being consistent. As the hon. junior member for the City has pointed out, you will always find that the members of the Government are always ready and willing to pass any legislation which puts a little power in their hands. In so readily accepting the amendment moved by the hon. senior member for St. John, the members of the Government and especially the Minister in charge, have confirmed the allegation made by the hon. junior member for the City. I am not reflecting on the Clauses which we have already passed, but the instance will readily come to the minds of those hon. members who were present. Like the hon. senior member for the City I myself must confess that I was under the impression that Bills of this nature are discussed in Executive Committee; and as the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is so often wont to tell us: they have threshed out every single detail, the best legal brains in the country have worked on them, the Crown Law Officers, the Financial Secretary and the Officer Administering the Government himself. It seems unfair to Her Majesty's representatives in this colony that after you have sat in Executive Committee and given the Officer Administering the Government the impression that certain powers should

be vested in his hands, you should accept the amendment made by the hon. junior member for St. John to vest the powers in the hands of political members of the Executive Committee.

I do not like to make suggestions which would appear to be out of place, but I must confess that this is the first time since I have been in this Chamber that I have heard the hon. junior member for St. Michael make any suggestion as to substance or form. In principle he is just as good as any of us over here, but when it comes to substance and detail such have not been displayed by the hon. junior member for St. Michael. I would like the Officer Administering the Government of this Colony to read these debates very carefully and he will see the kind of somersaulting which is taking place between the passage of a Bill in Executive Committee and its passage in the Legislature itself. I am not going to say that the hon. junior member for St. Michael moved this amendment and the hon. junior member for St. John seconded it or *vice versa* at the instigation of a Government Minister, but I am warning the Ministers that it does not look good for them to vest full powers in their own hands in such an easy fashion especially when they have reminded us time and time again that they have threshed out these Bills carefully in Executive Committee. What is happening in Barbados today is that one side is playing against the other; I would say that the House is being doubled-crossed. We are inveigled into certain positions and then the Secretary of State for the Colonies is told that it is the feeling of the House that such and such a thing should be so and so. I must pay the hon. junior member for St. Michael the compliment of paying that attention to detail which is usually left to the hon. junior member for the City; and I hope the hon. member will stick to those principles. I beg to second the motion of the hon. senior member for the City.

Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN: I moved the amendment because on the very first occasion on which I read this Bill it struck me as extraordinarily strange when I saw that everyone of these things was to be approved by the Executive Committee. In Clause 8, however the words "in Executive Committee" have been omitted. My first impression was that a printers' error had taken place. Now that we have Ministerial Status, the Ministers should have some say in appointments made to such an important social department.
8.20 p.m.

That is my personal view of it. This is not a department to be compared with the Post Office or the Auditor General's Office or even the Public Works Department. This Department is a Social Department since it deals directly with the living habits of the people. It deals with the housing of the inhabitants of the island; not selling them stamps, or building public works or other things like that where as an administrative department, the appointment of the Head of the Department is made by the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

Sir, in a highly Social Department like the Housing Authority, the Minister of Housing should have every say; and I would make that my contention right through the Bill. This Department is not on all-fours with other Government Departments. How much say has the Governor in the appointment of Social Welfare Officers? If he has any say alone in the appointment of these officers, that is entirely wrong. These departments are too important in the lives of the people to be diverted from the Minister and that is why I moved this amendment. I do not think it is

anything strange so far as the Government is concerned, and I see no reason why they should not accept it.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the honourable junior member for St. John who has just sat down brought me into it and I wish to say—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable senior member for the City caught my eye first.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: What I want to say, Mr. Chairman, is this: after listening to the honourable junior member for St. John, I am more surprised at the motion; and I am not saying so with a view to casting any aspersion on the Hon. Minister for Housing.

Hon. M. E. COX: That does not worry me.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: When I listened to the honourable junior member for St. John, I am more than surprised that the Hon. Premier has allowed his suggestion at all. Like the honourable junior member for St. John, I read the Bill thoroughly and as I went through it and noted the absence of authority of the Minister of Housing, in my second reading speech, I said I wanted an explanation as to why with a system of Ministerial status, all through the Bill one saw reference being made to the Governor-in-Executive Committee. The Hon. Premier in reply said that it was a collective responsibility and nothing to be dealt with directly by the Ministry and I accepted that suggestion.

The section reads thus: "The Authority may appoint and employ a Manager," and then goes on to say "whose appointment shall be subject to the approval of the Governor," and if you read it carefully, you will see that it deals purely with the appointment. As to the appointment of the Manager, the Governor alone, not the Governor-in-Executive Committee, must approve of the appointment. The sub-section to the Section goes on to say that the terms and conditions of employment of the Manager and of all officers servants and agents of the Authority shall be subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee. Now, the Governor-in-Executive Committee is going to appoint the Board; and I am saying that if the Hon. Premier accepts that suggestion by the hon. junior member for St. John, it will be giving control to what he has said that he was against at the time of Ministerial status; that is, he said that Ministers should have nothing to do with the appointments of Civil Servants. If you accept that suggestion, this would be purely a political appointment, and the whole idea behind all of this is to prevent it from being a political appointment. What the Board will do is to look around for a man and recommend him for the post. His appointment must then be approved by the Governor. The Governor can say "yes" or "no" to the appointment. If you put it in the Bill to be approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee, it is going to be a political appointment because the Board would not be able to appoint anyone to the post since the members of the Governor-in-Executive Committee would always be around telling the Board whom to appoint. It may sound stupid when I say so, but that is so. That is my considered opinion. It will turn out that if the Minister of Housing does not get whom he wants to be Manager, he will refer the matter back to the Board.

Sir, if you accept that suggestion, you are going to tie the hands of the Board. The word "Governor" is put in the Clause and for a very good reason. The appointment should be approved by the Governor alone but the Governor-in-Executive Committee should have the power to say what are

the terms and conditions of employment in keeping with the standard of the duties of the officers. It is the duty of the Governor-in-Executive to say whether a man should not get more than £300 or £400 per annum.

Sir, I am submitting that the Clause was worded as it is to prevent these posts from being political appointments and to give the Board a free hand. What the Hon. Premier said was correct; that is, that the Governor is bound to take the advice of his Executive. The whole reason for leaving this in the hands of the Governor is that when the Housing Authority recommends a man for the job, nothing political can be brought into it; but if you put in "Governor-in-Executive Committee" no Governor can suggest or do anything in Executive Committee if his five Ministers do not agree. If the Authority recommends a man to whom the Hon. Minister of Housing or some other Ministers are not in agreement, he is blocked if the appointment has to be approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. He might be the best man in the island for the post but he will be blocked. That is an absolute fact.

8.30 p.m.

When my colleague and I got in here and made certain remarks concerning the Social Welfare Officer, the Hon. Minister and his colleagues said nothing. Does the hon. member say that when the Social Welfare Officer draws a thousand pounds a year, the appointment should not be approved by the Governor but by the Governor-in-Executive Committee? You have a ministerial government and the policy should be that of the Ministry. If I understand it rightly, we are to pin the Ministry down to policy; whether they decide individually or collectively, it is for them to decide. By an act of legislation, you have decided to set up a body corporate, and they have decided that all appointments, with the exclusion of the Manager should be subject to the Governor-in-Executive Committee; but that the actual management which must be divorced from the Government should be with the approval of the Governor. I submit that if the best man in the island was an experienced draftsman and had a difference of opinion, (that is, a difference of political opinion) from the Minister of Housing he would say that it should not be the "Governor-in-Executive." [A VOICE: The hon. member thinks this is the St. Michael's Vestry!] You are talking about the St. Michael Vestry; but you cannot say that they have any ulterior motives.

I repeat that I view this question of the approval of the appointment of a manager by the "Governor-in-Executive Committee" with suspicion. Sub-clause (2) of clause (8) gives the Governor-in-Executive Committee the entire authority to say whether or not the terms and conditions of the employment of the manager and all the officers and servants are satisfactory to them. What more power could any Authority want?

Here is my impression of the situation that is likely to arise under the provisions of clause (8) of this Bill: The Authority recommends "A" and "A" is appointed; the Governor-in-Executive Committee says: this man "A" has been appointed at five thousand a year; then, under the provisions of clause 8 subclause (1) the "Governor" has power to say, this cannot be.

When you look closely at the question of the appointment of the manager, you cannot help but feeling that this is put in here with a special meaning.

I would say this for the Premier: on Boards on which I have sat with him, I have never really seen him go out of his way to get a job for or to push a friend; although I do not always regard

this as a point in his favour. I will tell you this: what I have just mentioned concerning the Hon. Premier is something which cannot be said to be among my virtues, however much it may be needed. If a man has been loyal to me, I think I should be loyal to him.

I submit that this particular clause was put in for a reason; and I am surprised at the Hon. Premier agreeing to the acceptance of the proposed amendment to include the words "Governor-in-Executive." When you read sub-clause (2) you will see that the Governor-in-Executive still has the power; because the terms and conditions must be approved by them. That is no mistake; I have it noted. You raised the entire question in the second reading speech, and I submit that this was absolutely no mistake. If we record to-day that this was a mistake, then it would be interesting, no doubt, to listen to the opinions of the Other Place when the Bill should go before them.

Let us suppose that the Hon. Premier must have been busy and that he did not observe this particular clause in which we find the word "Governor" in the phrase "approval of the Governor" in line 3. Even if it slipped him it could not have slipped all the others. And there is also the Attorney General whom we must consider; it would have had to slip him too.

I do not say that the hon. junior member for St. John is wrong; that is his view and policy. If you are talking about the permanent institution of a Ministerial Government, then the responsibility should be on them; this same Government might not always be in power. When I make a speech of this nature I know what I am talking about; but what I argue is this: if you have this system of Ministerial Government, the more responsibility you have the better it is for our future. The hon. member for St. John made a motion, but did he read sub-clause 2? If this had said, "subject to the approval of the 'Governor' instead of 'subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee,'" I would have said, "oh no; that is nothing to do with the Ministerial Government, that is taking money out of the Treasury."

8.40 p.m.

On the other hand, when it says that the Governor should approve these appointments, it means that the Governor should approve them in order to avoid what we so often say and fear will come with Ministerial Government. You have established an Authority and said "although we have given you the right to do something, we do not trust your integrity for making selection." Because the hon. junior member for St. John makes this amendment they are now saying while we are establishing this Authority this Authority can select; but if you do not select the right person we have the right to say "no." They are saying "if we say 'no,' the Governor cannot say 'yes'". That is not the correct procedure in respect of making appointments. The Premier has said "we have nothing to do with the making of appointments" therefore I feel that the motion of the hon. junior member for St. John should not be carried.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Had the hon. member refrained from making so much noise he would have realised that he has almost answered his own objection. Of course it is his right to raise a riot, and it is one of the most effective means of his political success. No one can approach him with regard to the impression which he leaves with certain masses of the people in making a riot; that is his supreme quality. I do not blame him for it; but

what does sub-clause 2 of Clause 8 say? It says the Manager and of all officers, servants and agents of the Authority shall be subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee". That is why they left in the words "in-Executive-Committee" as they did. Without Sub-Clause 2 they would have left it to the Governor alone. Clause 2 gives the Governor-in-Executive Committee power over the conditions and terms of employment; and when you give anybody power over the terms and conditions of employment you give them power over the appointment. If it is an appointment they disapprove of they will make the terms and conditions such that the appointee would not be particular about accepting it. They have retained the terms and conditions in their own hands, but in sub-clause one of Clause eight they have left the power to the Governor alone. If Sub-clause 2 were not there, they would have seen that they could not leave the words "in-Executive Committee." They realise that they have the power in Clause two and that they need not change it; but I say it erroneous to have the power in Clause 2 and leave it out in Clause 1. The Governor-in-Executive Committee controls the conditions of employment and therefore they control the appointment. In Clause 8 sub-clause 1, you should have the words "in-Executive Committee".

As to the term "political" that is broad and it is not to be used in any narrow sense. Any Government in any community is highly political. In the United States of America the President employs the heads of most of the important agencies; his is an elected office not an appointed one, and the power of appointment resides in him through the people. The power of appointment should rest with the Ministry which would be the Governor-in-Executive Committee. Having this power in Clause 2 it is folly not to add the words "in-Executive Committee" in Clause 1.

Hon G. H. ADAMS: As the honourable junior member for St. John has said, the honourable senior member for the City has answered himself. I was at pains to say that the time must come when the words "Governor-in-Executive Committee" will come out altogether and the word "Minister" will appear. With a Ministerial System the Minister should be responsible; but as long as we have this set up of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, it is appropriate to use the Governor-in-Executive.

I have said that where it is a question of Civil Service appointments the Public Service Commission will be the appointing body. I saw what was happening. When I saw what is here in print I realised that it was a mistake and I turned to the Clerk. I think it was during the consideration of the Local Government Bill, that wherever the word "Governor" appeared we changed over to the words "Governor-in-Executive Committee."

8.50 p.m.

The Manager of this Board is a Civil Servant; you therefore give the Governor power by an Order to say he should have a pension. Again, like every Civil Establishment Order, it must come before the House. It is purely a question of the Governor ex-Civil Establishment, the person does not get a pensioning his right. When a post is not within the pension; but you give the Governor the power and the right to say that you can make this office pensionable. With Ministerial System it comes back to the Executive Committee because who else is there to answer for wrong appointments but the Ministers responsible?

How can the Governor ever appoint somebody against our wishes and hope to get by with that? We have to say if we agree with it, because eventually if we have to defend an appointment with which we did not agree we are not going to do it. As the honourable junior member for St. John has said, if it were a political appointment, and if we were so dishonest as the honourable senior member for the City by implication is trying to make out, we would say that under the section we have the right to appoint you to the Board but remember, when you go there, you have to appoint so and so as Manager. All we would have to do is to make sure that we put on the Board only those people who would vote for the Manager.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I said that the word "Governor" was put in so as to avoid political appointments.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Look at the absurdity of it. You say "Governor" should remain in this section, but you have said that the people to put up the name of the Manager are going to be appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. What is to prevent us then from saying to Mr. A, B, C, and so on, "We want you seven people as members of the Housing Authority but remember, you have to vote for so and so as Manager." The honourable senior member for the City said that it would be a political appointment if you change it from Governor to Governor-in-Executive Committee. All we would have to do if that were so is to appoint seven people as I have said.

I have not got to say anything more on it. I would say again, like the honourable junior member for St. John, the first time I saw it in print I realised it was a mistake. As soon as I opened up my file I said it was a mistake. Look two or three lines down and you will see the mistake of the word "orders" instead of "order." I say again that if eventually a Minister has to defend an officer, the Minister should be in a position to anticipate and to prevent rather than to defend the man. We cannot have Ministerial system and at the same time put in somebody's hands things over which you do not have any control, or things which you may have to defend. Civil Servants must be kept out of politics. We are not like the U.S.A., where when the Democrats win a General Election, out go all the Republican Judges. Could anything be more un-British than that? Our Civil Servants remain and they must serve every Government. I have said this already. Some things are delegated to the Minister responsible who does not even have to go and get the advice of the other Ministers; and everything for which he is responsible will be delegated entirely to him in the course of time. It is coming to that. For instance, on the introduction of the Ministerial system, the first thing I had to do as Minister for Police (and therefore responsible for certain police matters) was to approve as a member of the Executive Committee that a police horse which was too old should be shot. Obviously, you should delegate that to the Minister directly, because in all probability, before the matter was dealt with by the Executive Committee the horse would have been shot long time. In the course of time everything will be done by the Minister himself, although by his act, in certain things, the whole Government may have to resign. Everything in short should go towards putting the responsibility on the Minister under a ministerial set up; but that responsibility, he has always got to remember, is collective responsibility because he may pull down a whole Government with him by his act. Inasmuch as this is an early stage in our setup, we sit down and dis-

cuss collectively some things which I hope in a couple years' time, (that is the most) will be done by the Minister himself and only reported to the full Cabinet. Until we reach that stage, we will go on pushing in the words "Governor-in-Executive Committee."

The hon. member is mistaken if he thinks I disagree that this was inserted for a particular reason. I say that, when it comes to a statutory Board, you have already given power to the Governor-in-Executive Committee to appoint its members; and those members are the persons who have to appoint the Manager. Why bring in the term 'political appointment'? That is like swallowing a camel and straining at a gnat.

9.00 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I know the circumstances prevailing and I would not like to prolong the debate. But from all the debating which has taken place before, I too have got the impression that the Minister should concern himself with policy and not with appointments. I felt that that was the very reason why the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and the hon. senior member for St. Michael resigned from the Housing Board.

I should like to say this: in the Natural Gas Corporation Act which has been quoted, it will be noticed that Section 13 says that the Corporation can appoint such officers, agents and servants as the Corporation may from time to time determine and there shall be paid to them such salaries and remuneration as the Corporation may determine with the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee. That is a case of the Executive Committee having to come to the House to adjust certain salaries in cases where a certain amount of balance has to be preserved; but now that has been changed. That is the impression that I got.

This matter has been debated for the very reason which Members of the Government, and the Premier in particular, have enunciated time and again. That is: that the policy of the Housing Board must be the policy of the Minister of Communications and Housing.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like the adjournment moved at this stage or I shall ask the Leader of the House to appoint someone to relieve me of the Chair. Considering the long hours during which this House has been sitting, I want to be relieved.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, am I not entitled to my view?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But I am asking the Leader to appoint a Chairman to relieve me and then you can go on talking until morning. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: That is an unreasonable attitude].

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The Chairman left the Chair. Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

On re-assembling.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I am asking leave to take Order No. 28 as the next Order of the Day.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: 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 Resolution of which notice was given earlier today.

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

The motion was put and agreed to.

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

Resolution for \$10,000 for the Victims of Soufriere

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable members have the cyclo-styled copies in their hands, I propose to deal firstly with this Resolution which was given notice of earlier today. This matter needs very little for me to say; this is a Resolution for \$10,000 to be sent as contribution to the Government of St. Lucia in connection with the relief of fire victims of Soufriere, St. Lucia. As honourable members know, food and clothing have already been sent to St. Lucia; the Government has sent blankets and ex-army supplies which were available. The St. Lucia Government has intimated to other Governments a list of priorities generally of the things which were needed, and food and clothing came first. They have had a good quantity of these items sent to them but they suggest that money is needed as well. The calamity has been very great. I do not know if honourable members know what Soufriere is like, but it is obvious that many houses have been burnt. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. GODDARD: This is one of those Resolutions which we regret the occasion on which we have to pass it. Not so long ago we made a gift of \$25,000 to Castries in connection with a similar calamity, and it came as a shock to us that a similar thing should have happened again even although it did not happen in the same City. I read where the fire got out of hand and after great difficulty of help being sent from a neighbouring town, the fire was quickly put out. I am wondering if that town is so small or so unimportant that they did not seem to have some semblance of a Fire Brigade. Knowing the frequency with which fires sweep St. Lucia, we would have thought that some step would have been taken to combat any conflagration which might happen again. However, we are in sympathy with the people of St. Lucia; and I think that this help should be sent them. This \$10,000 is but a token. I am sure that it will require many thousands of dollars to repair the lost which has been incurred. We do hope that the construction will be started at an early date and that steps will be taken so that assistance in the case of fire can be given more speedily.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I cannot allow a Resolution of this sort to be passed without some sort of comment being made from this side. I want to register my sympathy with the people of that island in the suffering which they have undergone at Soufriere. This \$10,000 is but a mere drop in the bucket so to speak; it might sound as a lot of money, but it is a drop in the bucket, having regard to the suffering of the people. We cannot entertain for one moment the suffering which these people at Soufriere have experienced in this catastrophe. I want to add a word of sympathy and of condolence to these people because I think that such a word should be accompanied by this gift to those people who have lost

their loved ones. We do not know when our time will come. In spite of the necessary provision which we have made to cope with such a disaster like this, when such a disaster comes to us this provision might prove to be inadequate. I hope that the people of St. Lucia will accept this small contribution coming from the representatives of the people of this island of Barbados as a measure of our appreciation of their suffering. We feel that if a greater demand is made we will be able to answer in a greater measure than giving this mere \$10,000. We are hoping to form ourselves into a family and take our place in the community of nations as we approach a Federal structure. This contribution is an expression of our sympathy with the people of St. Lucia, and I hope they will take it as coming from the soul of the people of Barbados.

10.05 p.m.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I am touched with the remarks of the last speaker. We judge our conduct by our consciences more often than not. This amount may be regarded as a "widow's mite" for the relief of the suffering of the people of St. Lucia. This little town of Soufriere has had a rather awkward and ugly history. It has been twice swept away by volcanoes and brought to the water's edge.

I believe the less that we say the better. My only regret is that it is a pity that the Government could not have contrived to make it a little more.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, this is our method of offering sympathy to the afflicted; and he who gives early, gives twice. I would not like to delay the passing of this Resolution. There has been great suffering there through neglect, but perhaps the neglected are not responsible.

I would just like to remark that the last sentence in the Addendum to the Resolution says: "A telegram has been sent to the Government of St. Lucia expressing the sympathy of the people of Barbados with the people of Soufriere." I do not know if any other honourable member has seen a public announcement of that, but I have asked some honourable members if they have seen any public announcement of it and none could say that they had seen it. I, too, had been wondering whether such a thing had been done. I think it quite amiss that such a statement should be made in the Addendum to the Resolution and no member of the House could say that they had publicly seen this action of the Government. I sincerely hope that this is a case where the Press is to be blamed and not the Government.

Mr. BARROW: While I am deeply touched by the remarks made by the previous speakers, I would like to say to the people of Barbados that this fire took place before the last meeting of this House; that is, over a week ago. It is rather remarkable that the Government of Barbados has only made this gesture after it has been published in the local Press and in the *Trinidad Guardian* that the neighbouring colony of Trinidad had made substantial contributions both private and public towards the relief of the suffering in the neighbouring colony of St. Lucia. I would also like to draw to the attention of the people of Barbados that this Legislature has the most stringent laws of emigration in the Caribbean, and that this same colony of St. Lucia allowed the Government of Barbados to purchase a considerable area not very far from Soufriere in order to settle Barbadian families there. I would have felt that the gesture now made by this Government would have been far more sincere if the people of Barbados had set the lead instead of being the last mentioned colony in the West Indies to make a contribution, and more particularly so when it is borne in mind that we had plenty of opportunity to do so on the last occasion

as we are doing today. We could have done something even if we had expressed as a House our condolence to the sufferers of St. Lucia. But, unfortunately, in the West Indies today politicians are not permeated by the normal condition of morality, but by the question of power politics or vying with each other for the graces of the smaller colonies in the Federal set-up.

While I would advise the people of St. Lucia to accept this gift with Gaelic indifference and grace, at the same time I do not want them to be deluded that this Government in contradistinction to the people of Barbados, are at all interested in their suffering. I would like to go on to say that it was in our intention today to move an Address to His Excellency the Governor and to ask leave of the House to do so in relation to this same matter. Whether that urged the hands of the Government or not I am not in a position to say; but it is rather regrettable that in the West Indies where we have considerable portions of the several islands living from day to day in situations bordering on that of calamitous, that we have to wait on some spectacle of nature, like a major conflagration or a volcanic eruption to be aware of the dire conditions of workers of the whole West Indies. The township of Soufriere is a township which is abundantly equipped with the supply of water. As a matter of fact, the available water resources of the township of Soufriere are probably superior to any other town or village throughout the West Indies. This is a township of a population, roughly to the best of my recollection, of 2,000 human souls of whose existence prior to this calamity, the average Barbadian was completely unaware. The term "Soufriere" was indicative of a volcano dormant or extinct so the fact that there was such township connected with another part of St. Lucia by road communication is a fact which is not generally known by our citizens.

The British Government was very magnanimous in rebuilding Castries and making substantial contributions from C.D.C. funds for that purpose. I, for my part, and speaking for those members who are associated with me, when it comes to the rehabilitation of the people of the township of Soufriere, know that it would be far more salutary if the day-to-day problems of those people, (such as the question of communications to get out their produce and to link them up with the civilised community inland and between island to island) were a matter of active consideration both by the Metropolitan Government and by the other West Indian Governments who now evince such grave concern over the plight of those people. It is a seven-days' wonder, but with this House it takes seventeen days and next week the Government of this country is going to forget everything of Soufriere. If we move towards Federation it is our business and duty to take an active interest in the problems and concerns of the citizens of the smallest West Indian islands and to agitate, if necessary, for an improvement.

Mr. Chairman, at the risk of being tedious, I should like to say this: 'Ask not for whom the bell tolls, for it only tolls for thee.'

A committee of this House recommended unanimously that fire appliances should be placed at strategic points in this island and not at any one particular spot. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that as a result of the rejection by the Government of that recommendation of a Select Committee of this House (which I personally considered at that time an affront to the dignity of the House) Barbados will not be confronted with a similar situation in the near future.

I do not like to sound a warning note in proceedings of this nature. I only want to join with

other hon. members in supporting this Resolution; but at the same time I should like to say how much I regret that the Government of Barbados chose not to be in the vanguard, but to bring up the rear in giving aid to the people of St. Lucia; not to encourage but to chill.

Finally, I hope that our contribution will not be too late; and that it will be of some assistance to the St. Lucians in the problems now facing that Island.

The question that the Resolution be now passed was put and agreed to.

Resolution for Combermere School

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is not on the Order Paper. It is to consider in Committee of Supply a Resolution on Combermere School for the sum of \$4,500 under Head (25) Public Works, No. (30) \$1,000 and a New Item, No. (87), Temporary Accommodation, Combermere School, \$3,500.

Hon. members know the facts affecting Combermere School. During the month of April of this year extensive cracking appeared in the walls of the double storied block of Combermere School. The condition of the buildings has been kept under constant watch by the Public Works Department, and early in May the Governor-in-Executive decided that it would be in the best interest to shore up with timbers the wall where the cracking was most obvious. For this purpose the Governor-in-Executive approved of the release of the thousand dollars which is provided for in the Estimates of 1955-56, under Head (25) Item (30), Minor Works. This Supplementary Resolution is asking for a special amount (\$1,000) to assist in this work.

Since then, in the same places where cement had been used to stop them the cracks have begun to show again. The Governing Body of the School has made a recommendation to the Government and the proposal contained in the Addendum to the Resolution is in fact suggestions agreed on by the Director of Public Works. As was done before part of the school will go back to the ex-Army huts in the compound of the Regimental Headquarters and also in the three buildings at the Garrison which now house the Departments of Education, Social Welfare and Housing. In order to meet the point raised by the Governing Body that the School should not be divided into two for too long, the Director of Public Works and myself visited the site and we came to the conclusion (which has been accepted by the Governor-in-Executive Committee) that the three buildings in the Garrison which housed the departments of Education, Social Welfare and Housing should also be used. In that case the whole school will be able to go up to the Garrison; The Headmaster and the Governing Body are quite satisfied that there is enough accommodation there. It is proposed that the School should remain there until the School buildings at Roebuck Street have been repaired.

The Director of Public Works has assured us that you can build at Weymouth but that it will have to be a steel structure with approximate foundation. It will take approximately a year to complete. I must remind hon. members however, that the recent railway strike in Great Britain may make it a month or two longer to get the steel out to Barbados.

All sorts of suggestions have been made about using the buildings in the compound of the Regimental Headquarters. The buildings at the compound might hold out. We have been putting off the matter but the feeling that the Governing Body's point

should be met, that is that the School should not be split in two for too long a time, has caused us to agree to the suggestion that the whole School should be removed to these two buildings. It had been suggested that the Department of Social Welfare should remain in the Compound. However, it was pointed out to us that there were certain old ladies who would find it difficult to go up to the Compound and eventually we agreed that the front portion of Combermere which is now the administrative side, (that is the portion right up on Roebuck Street,) should be used by the Social Welfare Department so as to meet the case of those old ladies who do not want to travel too far. That is the present position; and to help matters further the Headmaster proposed, (and the Governing Body accepted his suggestion) that the Junior School as soon as they got through their examination should be sent home a fortnight earlier; otherwise they would have had to be sent up to the Garrison too. I should also like to mention that the ex-Army huts are now being used by the Department of Education for examination purposes too.

Everybody is satisfied that the accommodation at the Garrison is sufficient for the Senior School which will remain there until the end of term, while the Junior School will start their vacation earlier than they otherwise would. The Housing Board and the Department of Education will be removed, and the Social Welfare Department will go to the present Combermere building.

10.25 p.m.

This Resolution is for the purpose of making alterations to these buildings and it is estimated that they will require \$3,000. We have to remove these departments and it is estimated that \$500 will cover that. Then the unforeseen minor works are estimated at \$1,000. That makes a total of \$4,500. We will soon be coming to the House as soon as the design has been finished by the Director of Public Works for a new Bay Street Boys' School; it is proposed to put this School on the former Wanderers' pasture, if I may put it that way; because when the Ministerial buildings are finished, it is not proposed to keep the School where it is now. This building will house at least the Education Department and it may be, the Social Welfare Department too.

It is proposed to let off the junior school at Combermere a week earlier and keep the senior school until the examination has been finished. The Bay Street Boys' School will be shifted to the Bay and the present Bay Street School will be converted into a permanent home for the Department of Education and the Social Welfare Department. Of the many Schemes proposed this one eventually meets with the approval of everybody and it is the quickest way that we can see to get Combermere School out of its present state of affairs. A child who sees a crack stopped in one week and reappear in the next week will be afraid; the children are afraid and we should get them out of this building as quickly as possible. As I have said, that is the quickest way in which we can remedy the situation.

It is proposed that the new school will be constructed of steel, concrete blocks and so on. Now it is estimated that the new school will take about a year to be built and the Bay Street Boys' School will take about four months. The permanent removal of the Education Department and the Housing Board into their new premises will take place at the end of those four months. I now beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. GODDARD: As the Premier has said the arrangements which are being made seem to be quite

good. It is regrettable that Combermere has come to this present position. I think that steps should be taken very decisively to erect a new building on that site. I am sure that some place can be found where a suitable building of that type can be erected. To remove the School from those premises you will be losing the facilities at Weymouth and it is not so easy to find such an open space around Bridgetown. This present site is centrally situated and I do not think that anybody could select a better site for this School with the adequate playing fields and so forth.

The removal of the Social Welfare Department and the Education Department to the Bay Street Boys' School is something new. I am sure that we were told in this House, and we have seen the Plans, that this building at Bay Street would be used as some sort of Civic Theatre. I know that the Government is pressed for public offices; the Education Department will be near to the Ministerial Buildings the Social Welfare Department can be housed there too and be very beneficial to everybody. Only last week I heard somebody likening education to the senior Social Service and I hope it will continue to be of the importance which it is.

I saw in the Newspaper a suggestion to remove Combermere School to Queen's Park and also to make use of the Steel Shed. That is a suggestion which is not nearly as suitable as the arrangements which the Government has made for the removal of this school. The ex-Army huts and buildings at the Garrison however need a little more ventilation. I remember going there to attend some meeting of the Education Board and I found that those buildings are rather close especially if you have a number of boys there. The mere fact of having 100 or 200 boys in one of these huts would show the necessity for some adjustment to be made where the ventilation is concerned.

10.35 p.m.

One of these huts was used as a storeroom in the days of the Army. However, as I have said, I can see no better arrangement and for that, I commend the Government for acting speedily.

Sir, moving up to the Garrison is going to create some difficulty as regards transport. On the last occasion when the Junior School went up there, I do not know whether arrangements were made about it, but I do know that they had some difficulty and you may have to pay some attention to it. Some of the parents of pupils at that School are at their limits now to keep their children at the School, and to add more transportation would cause them an increased burden.

There is also the question of the Canteen service. I do hope that the Canteen service would be taken up because it plays a very important role in the life at that School; it has come to stay and there are many boys taking advantage of it. I would like to be assured that the Canteen service would also be removed to the Garrison and under the same conditions where a hot meal can be served to those children. They come from all over the island and they do not get back home until late at night and they should not be excluded from that scheme.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, it seems that a terrible series of misfortunes have overtaken this school ever since it was erected at Weymouth; and not the least of those of misfortunes are those changes which have been made structurally particularly after 1948. I think we should all agree with the hon. senior member for St. Joseph when he says that while the building may be safe, and no matter how we feel about it, it is as well that the children should be got out as quickly as possible. I do not know whether the shoring up of the Building which is showing the

cracks and breaks like that can do anything except to prevent it from collapsing immediately. However I take it that the Government is acting on the advice given it and has decided that nothing can be done, because I see that a new school is going to be erected on those same premises.

With respect therefore, to changes which have come about as a result of the unsuitability of the School, I think it is a good thing that the whole School is going to be removed to the Garrison. From what I have observed and heard on the last occasion when a similar movement did take place, the arrangement did not work out as happily as it was hoped. The dividing up of the School at that time where one part remained at Roebuck Street and the smaller section went off to the Garrison was bad; not so much from the point of view of discipline but from the point of view that the Headmaster found it impossible to be two places at the same time and to keep a proper control over both sections of the School in the course of a single day. This is no reflection on the staff, but it was not conducive for the good running of the School divided as it was in almost two equal parts with one half on this side of the town and the other half on the other side.

I do not know how long this arrangement will remain; but I would like to say however, that it should be for as long as it would take to erect a proper school. There certainly would be no need to make the temporary arrangement to build a proper school only to discover that the school built will be the subject of the same service as this.

I have not the time to look up the debates of this House when the present Combermere School was being erected, but I understand that at that time or shortly afterwards some very searching questions were asked. I cannot recall the number of questions asked by the then hon. member for St. Peter [A VOICE: There were 25] Twenty-five I have been told, but I believe that they were comprehensive in their scope and if they had been answered satisfactorily, no doubt we would have known by now what actually was happening to that school.

If a new School is going to be erected, let us make sure that the new school would not give the same kind of trouble.

It is inevitable in a Resolution of this nature that a School or anything to do with it, some criticism would have to be made in respect of one or the other aspects of its causes; therefore some questions must be asked on which enlightenment must be given. One of the things which troubled the hon. members is that during the recent debates on the Estimates, the decision was made by the Government to cut out the sum of \$440 which it had previously given to the Governing Body to subsidise the Canteen at the School. As far as my memory serves me it was for the purpose of providing wages to pay the Staff of the Canteen during holiday time and the Hon. Premier did not listen to any entreaty made to him to restore that small amount. He was quite unsympathetic; he gave the impression that the women could find work during the holidays. I have since learned that he has written to the Governing Body saying that the Government proposes to give that money back to the School for the purpose on the recommendation of the new member of the Governing Body who is the hon. junior member for St. George. In other words while the hon. junior member for St. George—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of Order. This is a Supplementary Resolution dealing with the removal of Combermere School to the Garrison. Is the hon member in order to be

raising points which are not relevant to the debate? Neither the question of the Canteen nor the decision of the Governing Body, I humbly and respectfully put to you, can be dealt with in this Supplementary Resolution which only deals with the question of repairs to the School buildings and its removal to the Garrison.

Mr. TUDOR: The little observation, Mr. Chairman, by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is doubtless quite interesting but irrelevant. If the School is going to be removed to the Garrison one takes it that the feeding arrangements will be moved also unless they intend to keep the Canteen at the Combermere School while the rest of the School is carried to the Garrison. Why when the hon. junior member for Christ Church mentioned something about it, it was not out of Order? I am doing nothing more than what the hon. junior member for Christ Church did.

10.45 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of Order. How could I interrupt the honourable junior member for Christ Church when the Canteen is up there? The honourable junior member for St. Lucy is out of Order.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, how is that irrelevant to this?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If the honourable member is being pontifical you will see that he is out of Order.

Mr. TUDOR: But, Mr. Chairman, I have not got to go to the May's Parliamentary Practice to find out whether a woman who works at Combermere should be paid, or whether, as the honourable member has said he has decided to put back money which he has taken from the Governing Body. If he has taken away money from the Governing Body and we hear that it has been given back since the honourable junior member for St. George has been made a member of the Governing Body, how does an honourable member get out of Order for asking something which vitally affects a school? What is going to happen to the Canteen? Will it take more money, or more staff, or what? As I said before, Mr. Chairman, we should like to know whether that is so. Not only must the actual teaching facilities be considered but the comfort of the children must be considered as well. I am sorry that the honourable junior member for St. George was not in his seat then; but when he gets up to speak he will say whether it was on his recommendation or not that the Minister of Education agreed to restore to the Governing Body the money which the same Minister had got taken out of the Estimates. Perhaps the honourable junior member for St. George did not know that he was going to sit on that Governing Body.

There is one other point which I would like to make, Mr. Chairman, and I expect to be told that this, too, is out of order. I have put down some questions on this school which have not yet been favoured with answers. One such question had reference to the Preparatory Form of that school in relation to a public advertisement. I expect that the entrance form has been abolished; that is, that there is no Preparatory Form since 1954 at Combermere School. Up to now the Government has not answered the question on that issue. I wanted to know whether the Minister himself had that form abolished on his own instructions or whether the Governing Body had it abolished.

Is an honourable member not in order to speak on something that he has asked questions about already? If the Hon. Minister of Education would answer that now—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I would not answer anything he asks.

Mr. TUDOR: We are discussing the question of a school which has to be removed and he has to say what are the conditions. This has nothing to do with whether he thinks I am out of order or not. These questions affect the parents who would like to know what is going on. Parents will want to know whether all the arrangements that obtain at present and as stated will be carried through if you are removing the school. I therefore do not think it is out of order to ask questions on that. I would appreciate very much if the Minister who has introduced this Resolution would say something about this matter particularly about the money which was taken away from the Governing Body. I hope he will take this opportunity to answer.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think this is a matter in which everyone of us will agree that the Government had no easy task in making their decision. Nevertheless, any observations on the position must not be taken as criticism because we all appreciate the fact that the Government did everything possible as soon as they were faced with the difficult question of housing these children in an atmosphere more conducive to safety. I should like to make one or two suggestions.

The Leader of the Opposition commended the Government for the idea of selecting the site at the Garrison which is truly the best site. I myself agree with that. I have been thinking of it from every angle and I still believe, taking everything into consideration (and, Mr. Chairman, I want you to believe me that I considered it from Pickwick grounds right up to the Garrison) that the Garrison is the one place to which you can carry the entire school without disrupting the whole organisation, so to speak. But as the honourable junior member for Christ Church has said, there is one thing which the Government must bear in mind and it is this: that with the 550 children in the school you are going to get approximately 300 children who must entail a greater expenditure in getting to and from school; and I should like to suggest that you should make some arrangements in respect of a reduced price, (say a penny instead of three cents) for dropping them at the Garrison. That, according to my estimate should work out to about three to four thousand dollars for getting them there.

Relative to the Combermere Canteen, I must say that I agree with the honourable junior member for St. Lucy. I am in a position to say that we will regret it very much if the Canteen facilities were not offered at the new centre where you have proposed to remove the school. I shall like to remind the Minister of Education that besides the paying pupils at the school, there are over 50 from a single Vestry besides other Vestries, who look forward to the services of the Canteen; and I should like you to do everything possible to see that the canteen be stationed in the surroundings of the school; that is, in the area at the Drill Hall where you proposed to erect new facilities. We hope that that will be done.
10.55 p.m.

What I would like to say is this: I am glad to learn, (whether it came from the honourable senior member for St. George or anybody else it does not matter to me) that arrangements were made by the Government for the attendants at the Canteen to be guaranteed permanent employment and that they would not have to look for work outside. I want to say this: when members of this House raise questions in here and any Government official is prepared to write in a Minute that it is only on the recommendation of some member of the Government's Party that something is done, my tongue will not be stuck in my cheek when I have to speak about that. If Heads of Departments play that game, they must be very careful as to how they play it. If the Government does something wrong, it is not

for anybody to say: "I led off the debate." However, I am glad that the Canteen will be carried on and I would suggest to the Minister of Education that there is the necessity for a Canteen at Harrison College, because the Canteen at Combermere is used for some of the boys at Harrison College.

I hope that the question of reduced rates will be gone into with the bus concessionaires; there is a tremendous number of boys who are at their bare ends in meeting the normal fare. I am sounding a warning now that the matter of increased bus fares must not come before this House otherwise the lid will be blown off. The bus concessionaires are making a lot of money.

The other suggestion which I am making is this: it has been suggested that the Education Department will be removed to the Pine, but to carry the Education Department up there will create an undue hardship. That part of the Pine is not served with any kind of bus service. The suggestion has also been made of removing the Housing Board up there and of taking the Social Welfare Department at Combermere. I want to suggest that arrangements could be made that the Cathedral and the Church House could be used for the Education Department. I cannot imagine the Head of the Church at any time refusing the use of a building which is shut up all day for this purpose. This building has more room now than the present Education Department. I am sure that if the Government were to approach the Head of the Church for the use of this building he would only be too willing and ready to grant them the use of it. I know that to some members of the Government that suggestion would be like a red rag to a bull, but I am addressing my remarks to the intelligent members of the Government. I am suggesting that where you have teachers every day and all day and people who have to attend the Education Department on business, there is absolutely no chance of getting any bus service after 8 o'clock in the morning to get employees to the Department, and after 4 o'clock to get them back to Bridgetown from the Pine.
11.05 p.m.

I am making a simple suggestion. You have wonderful facilities there, you have parking facilities and you can borrow it for the entire time until you can get the educational department done. Of course the Government usually tells you that they have made that decision and that they have made the irrevocable decision of so and so. Anyway I am still throwing my suggestion out for what it is worth because I feel it would relieve the situation very much.

Finally I would say that I can think of no better place for these children of Combermere than the Garrison. I have thought so much of the suffering of the children of Combermere as regards to a school building that I went as far as to say that we should use the Cathedral if necessary as a building to teach those children in, and because I see nothing wrong in doing so. To my mind it is the highest form of christianity to use any Church or edifice for the education of the people, I feel that you can use a sacred edifice six days for the education of the people and then use it for religious worship on the seventh day. If you could not have got anywhere else, rather than have a disjointed school it would be far better to use the Cathedral. I feel this is a true christian way of looking at it.

I hope the Hon. Premier would note the suggestion which was made about the Canteen and about your getting some kind of transport service for the children. I feel that the Government should assist in meeting that extra cost of transportation.

I have been made to understand that the \$440 for service in the Canteen has been refunded already.

Finally I would say that it would be infinitely better for the general public and all concerned if you made that offer for the Education Department to be housed at the Church House instead of carrying it to the Pine. I am sure you will not be refused.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I will promise the honourable member to seriously consider that suggestion. I did not hear all that was said but I have heard some talk of some elementary school teachers going to the Department of Highways and Transport and to the Minister of Communications to permit them to get a bus concessionaire to go through the Pine and that he had arranged it already. The suggestion of the Church House was not put to me. The only thing I have heard of the Church House was that it is in great need of repairs. I do not know if the Church would put it into repair and then put it at our disposal. However, I promise the honourable member that I would get in touch with His Lordship the Bishop or whoever is in charge and will ask the Director of Public Works to get in touch with the Director of Education.

Obviously, if you are going up to the Garrison for a year or so you cannot do without a Canteen. If necessary, you might have to build a chattel building. It might be possible, as the Hon. Minister of Communications actually suggested, that the old Police building which is just above could be used as soon as the new Police Station is finished. Obviously, we have to try what is the most convenient. However, you could not reasonably carry the School up there and ignore the Canteen side of it. I did not know of the point as regards Harrison College where there should be a single Canteen service for Combermere School and the College so as to save overhead expenses, but since I have heard it, I thoroughly agree with the member on that point. It is true to say that there is a number of poor parents who have children going to Harrison College as there is at Combermere School.

There is one other point which I would like to mention although I have mentioned it already. It is the policy of the Government when building new schools (secondary modern and so on) to build them with a larger hall than is absolutely necessary for the School itself so as to make use of it as a Community Hall; and it is proposed to build the new Combermere Hall as a Civic Theatre rather than putting the Civic Theatre as was proposed at the Bay Street Boys' School.

The estimates for the Hall as given by the Director of Public Works, is to provide a Hall big enough to serve as an Assembly Hall for the School and for concerts etc. on other occasions. That is my reason for saying now that the old Bay Street Boys' School will be used as the temporary headquarters for the Director of Education.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of saying a word on this affair but since the Hon. Premier mentioned something about a Civic Theatre, I must say something. It is rather disappointing to me to learn that it is not proposed now to use the old Bay Street Boys' School building as a Civic Theatre and that it is proposed that the new Combermere will be built with a Hall which could be used as a Civic Theatre. I do not think the new proposal would be suitable for a Civic Theatre because a Civic Theatre requires a hall much smaller than what is envisaged to be built at the new Combermere and one which would have a more intimate

atmosphere. I really am sorry to learn that the other suggestion has been cancelled and it is very disappointing. Our plans for that Civic Theatre were out for almost two years and at the moment, the University College of the West Indies is about to put on a performance of Shakespeare's play "Hamlet" so as to get funds for our Civic Theatre. It is regrettable that our hope for this little intimate Civic Theatre is lost.

11.15 p.m.

However, there has been so much talk about Combermere School and the Canteen that I do not know if we should say that we have a rather energetic Board fully aware of all the questions to be attended to by this Body. On the question of the Canteen it has been refreshing to learn of the decisions of the Governing Body. Arrangements could be made for the transfer of food to the new site. I did not imagine that honourable members would have any fear about this; but I believe that the remarks of the honourable senior member for the City referred to the transfer to the Pine. The question of School fees has been considered; but I was hoping that you would put in something about it today. I must close my remarks on this note, although it is regrettable, because we have quite a few Bodies affiliated to the theatre group that have been planning to use the Bay Street School.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think the honourable member is out of Order there.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I apologise if I am out of Order. I do not want to be out of Order, but I am thinking of the terms of the Canteen. I just want to remind the Minister of Social Services that he did promise us that this little theatre would be provided.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, there is one thing which I forgot to mention just now and I do hope that the Hon. Premier will bear it in mind: that is, that all these alternatives in school buildings will delay the building of the proposed Christ Church Boys' Foundation School [A VOICE: Is that not out of order?]

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Definitely it is.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I will allay the honourable member's fears by telling him that the Bishop, the Director of Education and myself went up to the Foundation School and the question as to where the foundation for the proposed new school will be laid has been decided. I assure him there will be no delay.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, this Chamber has heard on several occasions from no less a personage than the honourable senior member for St. Joseph who claims to have been in here for 20 years that this is a debating Chamber; but it seems now to have degenerated into a mutual admiration society.

I think that the taxpayers should know a lot more of this matter which we are now debating. On the 13th April, 1943 a former member of this Chamber Mr. J. T. C. Ramsay asked 25 questions relating to the —

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking you to keep to the Resolution.

Mr. BARROW: The Resolution is about the Combermere School building and the construction of Combermere School.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Resolution has nothing here about construction.

Mr. BARROW: It is here in the Addendum to the Resolution. I will read it. . . . "extensive cracking appeared in the walls of the double storey block at Combermere School."

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not making any laughing sport. I am only asking you to keep to the Resolution.

Mr. BARROW: I am asking about the 25 questions put by Mr. Ramsay, and I am entitled to say—Well I do not want to say that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You had better not.

Mr. BARROW: There seems to be a silent conspiracy surrounding the people who built this School, and I feel that the members of the public are entitled to know about it.

Now, sometime ago the Minister of Education informed the House that the Director of Public Works had made an inspection of the building and all that was necessary and we were assured (by way of correcting myself: it was the Minister of Social Services who had been asked to introduce it in the absence of the present Minister of Education) that all that is necessary to be done to Combermere was to remove the top storey of the Hall. On that occasion honourable members referred to this series of questions asked on the 13th April, 1943 by Mr. Ramsey and the interest he displayed on behalf of the people of the island in this building. I do not want to go through what he has done in detail; but it is the official reports of the debates. [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: He would know]. Then it is true.

The precise state of affairs is that 25 questions were asked about the School when a Supplementary Resolution was engaging the attention of the House, bringing the total cost of the building to £230,000 to the best of my recollection.

On the 14th December, 1943, Mr. Chairman, the now Minister of Education came in here, and the only restriction which he had to make on the building of Combermere School at that time, —

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Again I must remind the honourable member that we are not talking about the building of Combermere School now. I am not going to entertain it. This Resolution is not for the building of Combermere School now.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, nobody appreciates that more than I do. But it is the school to which I have had the privilege to go; it is Combermere School.

On the 14th of December, 1943, the only restriction which the Hon. Minister of Education had to make was that the Headmaster's House was not artistic; that it was a pigeon loft. He had nothing to say about the school, or about the 25 questions.

Now, I want to pass on to the next point in my argument. It is true that the present Minister of Education was not, as far as I know, responsible for the building of that School. But he was a member of the House and a member of the Executive. As far as I know, I am not quite sure of this particular point because I was not a member of the Education Board.

11.25 p.m.

This present Government came to this Chamber for money to remove the top of Combermere School and gave the House the assurance that if the top of the building had been removed the building, to the best of their information and belief, would be reasonably safe and adequate for the purpose for which it was constructed. At that time hon. members of this Chamber wanted to know whether any legal action would be taken against the persons who had constructed the School. No answer was given but we were assured that we had nothing to fear there was no point in our asking any questions. It was just a formality to come to the House because the Insurance Company had decided that they were liable to pay for these defects because they were

the result of an earthquake and the Policy under which the School had been insured covered that damage as an act of Providence. It would be a logical deduction to make therefore, that the Government found itself in the position where it expected money from the Insurance Company for removing the top of this School. I should like to ask this question: in expecting that money, did they absolve the Insurance Company from any further liability as a result of the same calamity? I feel that the taxpayers of this colony would like to know that. If they did, and we have not been given any answer to the question, it would seem to me that the Insurance Company, having said that the faults in the structure of the School were due to an earthquake, the Government has not had any recourse either to the Insurance Company or to the Contractors. Due to their lack of foresight the taxpayers will have to suffer the burden of the reconstruction of Combermere School at a colossal sum.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are not talking about construction now. This Resolution is for the temporary accommodation at Combermere School and the hon. member is talking about reconstruction.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I am going to read the second paragraph of the Addendum. This is what it says: "It is proposed that the School should remain at the Garrison until the buildings at Roebuck Street have been rehabilitated" If you prefer me to use the word "rehabilitation" I will use that term, but rehabilitation at a colossal expenditure.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That part of the Addendum is telling you what will happen at the Garrison.

Mr. BARROW: Why has the rehabilitation of Combermere School been mentioned in this Resolution if it has got nothing to do with the Resolution before the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Government is telling you what will happen at the Garrison. This \$3,500 will not reconstruct the School.

Mr. BARROW: If the rehabilitation is not contingent upon this Resolution then the Government has got no right to put that in this Addendum. Do not blame me if I take it that they mean what they put in the Addendum. My colleague talked about a Civic Theatre in Bay Street and you did not stop him; the senior member for St. Joseph talked about building a new school, he said that it would be of a steel structure and you did not stop him. [ASIDES].

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for the City must allow me to speak. I am speaking and the hon. member is speaking too. Let the hon. senior member for St. George proceed with his remarks on this Resolution.

Mr. BARROW: What are "Unforeseen, Minor Works?" Has anybody talked about that item yet? If I cannot talk about the steel structure I will talk about "Unforeseen minor works". I have not heard any explanation as to these unforeseen minor works I do want to say this: I feel that the public would be entitled to the information for which I have asked I can always find out, but the members of the public would not be in a position to find out. All I would have to do is to go straight to the Insurance Company and ask them if they have signed a waiver with the Government when they paid the money for taking off the top structure of the School. I invite any hon. member to do that. The members of the public have not got the time to investigate matters which are in the public interest. I would like to say that since the Government by its neglect has made this imposition on the taxpayers of this colony, the best gesture it could make would be to allow the

pupils of Combermere School to go into the new Ministerial offices. The Ministers are at present in offices with the administrative staff surrounding them, and therefore it would be a good gesture to allow the pupils of Combermere to go into the Ministerial Offices built at a colossal expenditure to this colony.

11.35 p.m.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that when the history of the twentieth century is written and when a diagnosis of the psychology of the peoples who live in it is made, it will be found that their main characteristic was their lack of the propensity to be shocked. We do not know whether they have become inured to corruption and dishonesty through the physical strain and cruelties of the last war and through the threat of the atom bomb, but it seems to me that the facility with which members of the community such as this have potentially towards democracy to accept matters which they should not accept without questioning and without showing in a constitutional way their indignation of corruption and dishonesty, does show that they have lost the ability to be shocked by any kind of disaster. I feel that the only safeguard of constitutional government is that which was so ably demonstrated by the then member for St. Peter in 1943; that is to ask questions which should be answered in a democratic assembly. But I must say that the present Government has fallen into the same state of submission to the same effect as that which its predecessors were prone.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to ask one question, Mr. Chairman, and it is this: in an important matter of the condition of the Combermere School and especially as it is a second happening of the same kind, why should the Legislature of the colony be kept in ignorance of those conditions for this length of time, and why should nothing be told to them until money is needed for the transfer of the School to another site temporarily? I feel that the members of the Legislature should start off by protesting against the fact that the Hon. Minister of Education for so many meetings which he had the opportunity of making a statement, in addition to the fact that he was out of the island for so many talks, did not make such a statement about the condition at Combermere. All that he needed to say was that another series of cracks had appeared in the walls of Combermere and that they are keeping their eyes on them for the safety of the children and would say something later as to whatever is to be done to the School. You should make a statement like that so as to let the Legislature know you have the matter in hand; and it would be a medium for the parents to know that the highest authority is in possession of the facts. It would be courtesy to this branch of the Legislature to which you will have to come for money to repair the damage. I feel that is something that should have been done, particularly with the Government as it is supposed to be constituted to-day. Members of this Government should have great respect for the Legislature; and when they show that respect they put others in the position to respect them. They should always respect and uphold the dignity, rights and privileges particularly of this branch of the Legislature, and I do think they have fallen down in that respect.

I would like to say that I have visited Combermere and have seen the shoring up of the walls as we have heard to-day and it does not give that guarantee of safety. The walls of the School have moved considerably since the shoring up took place, so that is not so safe as one would think. My view is that it is not the children that take fright at the condition

of the school but it is the adults; and I am very glad to know that alternative accommodation has been found. I am also glad to know that a new school will be built on the same site because I think it will be a waste of money in rehabilitating the old building. In spite of the fact that the second storey of the front structure was taken off and certain adjustments made to keep the walls together, even the walls of the front part that are there are now cracking; so it shows very plainly that there is something definitely wrong with the foundations of that building, either through climatic conditions or other conditions or a combination of both.

I do think we should have been told something of that aspect of it, if nothing more than that compensation can be had. It is regrettable at a time like this when Government has to build more schools that Government has to rebuild one of the schools which it has recently reconstructed. However, I will commend Government for the alternative arrangements and the further suggestion that has been made. I do sincerely hope that it will not be long before we have a new building on this site. It would be a pity to abandon that site entirely for the school.

Before I sit I would like to say that while it is true that we were told some months ago when the previous cracks caused alterations to be made, in fairness to the person recommending those alterations, I did hear that they were temporary and nothing could be guaranteed that further cracks would not appear. I heard that stated at the time.

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

11.45 p.m.

Resolution For Visit of U.K. Parliamentary Delegation

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution stands in my name and I ask leave to postpone it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Member has asked leave to postpone the Resolution standing in his name. Unless there is any objection leave will be granted the hon. member.

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

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is for \$600, under Head XXIX—Miscellaneous Services, Item 63 (New) visit of Delegation from the United Kingdom branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

Hon. members will see from the Addendum how it is made up. There are seven people coming. One of them whom I had hoped would have come here was originally Minister of Commonwealth Relations in the Labour Government. They are expected now in July. They were to have come in May but the English Elections was due to take place and on that account they were detained.

The break down of figures is as follows:—

Hotel accommodation	\$225.00
Travelling in Barbados	50.00
Entertainment	305.00
Contingencies	20.00
	\$600.00

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Resolution For Access Roads to the Harbour

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is for the sum of \$50,000 to be placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955-56, Part II — Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1955-56. No. 11.

Hon. members will remember that on Tuesday last the Report of Sir Eric Millbourn was placed on the table of the House and at the same time notice of this Resolution was given in order that the Director of Highways & Transport might be enabled to proceed with these access roads to the Harbour. The Addendum explains fully what is proposed to be done immediately in so far as the roads are concerned. You will see them set out as follows:—

(a) Improvements and new road connecting the harbour area and Hincks Street:		
(i) Roadworks, say	\$16,000	
(ii) Seawalls, Revetments ..	9,000	\$25,000
(b) Various improvements, Eagle Hall to Welches, [A VOICE: Which Welches?]		
Hon. M. E. COX: From Eagle Hall to Welches, means that you pass from Eagle Hall through Bridge Road and then on to Welches.		
(b) Various improvements, Eagle Hall to Welches, say	\$15,000	
Those are the improvements on that road not a new road.		
(c) Contingents, Supervision, etc. ..	\$10,000	
Total	\$50,000	

Although the Item Contingencies appears to be on the big side, it does appear that some improvement may be made which has not been anticipated at present; and that is why it has been decided to set the figure at \$10,000 for Contingencies. I should like to mention at this stage that the whole road programme might cost the Government something like \$180,000; but I do not think I should say much at this stage because we have got to get a survey draftsman and have plans prepared before anything final is brought to the House. [A VOICE: I would like to know the full cost.] You will hear the full cost.

Suppose you wanted to have a back road, you could run it to Eagle Hall behind Richmond's School. [A VOICE: All that is to the harbour? This whole Resolution?]

As I said before, I would not attempt to go into details because a survey has to be made before anything further is done; but it is proposed to take these steps as a means of getting ahead as quickly as possible. This improvement does not present any great problem and therefore the Government feels, on the recommendation of the Director of Highways & Transport, that we can go ahead with it immediately. I beg to move that the Resolution be now passed.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I am one of those people who feel that these things for which money must be spent in connection with the Harbour should be confined to loans in connection with the Harbour itself. I also think that if it is felt that the building of the Harbour will throw an extra burden on the particular roads, money from the Harbour funds should be appropriated to General Revenue ear-

marked 'Highways and Transport' for this purpose, otherwise we are not going to know what this Harbour is going to cost us. Here we are, voting \$50,000 with the understanding that we are voting things for the building of the Harbour. This has to do with the actual building of the Harbour and in my own opinion some adjustment should be made. It was for that reason, I think, that the Loan Act for six million dollars was passed. You should put in an amount from the Harbour Scheme Loan and keep that Loan separate and distinct from other loan funds. I do not know why it has been done this way.

The next thing is that you bring in a Resolution asking the House to agree in principle to Sir Eric Millbourn's Report and before you debate that Resolution, you are setting out to do something that is recommended in the very Report itself.

Now, sir, you cannot have it both ways. You cannot come to ask the House to agree in principle to Sir Eric Millbourn's Report and at the same time tell us that you have already adopted it and you are putting certain features of it into operation. It does not seem right to me. I do not think that I am peculiar in looking at it this way. If you lay a Resolution about a Report and at the same time you give notice of a Resolution for the spending of money connected with the very same Report, you are really not asking the House to assist you by agreeing in principle to it; you have adopted it already.

I, once again, am warning the Government to try and keep this matter of the building of the Harbour by itself. At the end of the time let us be able to say that this is what the Harbour cost us.

This method is going to cause confusion. I support, to a certain extent, the motion for the postponement of this Resolution. Paragraph 2 of the Addendum says: "An approximate estimate of the roadworks necessary has been given at \$180,000 by the Director of Highways and Transport who emphasises that the estimate is very approximate as he is not yet in possession of detailed surveys." You have a Resolution to debate and to recommend a Report in which this programme is mentioned. You are giving the impression that you are being magnanimous and yet it seems that you are not after all.

11.55 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Before any other hon. member speaks, I would like to say that I quite agree that there is a bit of logic in what the hon. junior member for the City says in connection with this Resolution to approve proposals put up by Sir Eric Millbourn. [Mr. LEWIS: What does the Report say?] It says that we will get this Scheme for £3 million which is less than the amount previously estimated and that we should start with it immediately. I thought it was a foregone conclusion that we would approve of the recommendation. The House has already agreed with a Scheme costing £4 million and now Sir Eric Millbourn says that it will cost £3 million and it is necessary to build a breakwater. I cannot see any real argument as to what should be debated first; but the argument which has been put forward for starting immediately is that the sooner we get this Resolution through this House and through the Other Place the quicker the Director of Highways and Transport would be able to rearrange and reconstruct these roads. We can always debate the Resolution because we have already agreed with the recommendation.

Mr. LEWIS: This House has debated the Harbour Scheme already. [Hon. M. E. COX: And agreed to it.] To say that we have agreed to it strengthens my argument. A delegation goes to Eng-

land and was convinced that a modified Scheme was necessary; there is a further modification and what has this House really agreed to? You set up a Deep Water Harbour Committee, you send a delegation to England and the Premier was convinced that what they went for was not necessary. The Premier should have stuck out on what the House wanted. We said "we want four berths" and we have invited your experts from England to tell you that a further modified scheme will be sufficient. What has this House agreed to? The only thing you can say is that we have agreed in principle to a Deep Water Harbour. I have not got the Schemes before me; these are things which the members of the Government should keep in their hands. We have had two or three reports and how do you know and how am I to know? You have not sent out the report—

Hon. M. E. COX: The Plans have been deposited with the Clerk of the House.

Mr. LEWIS: I am not saying that the Plans have not been deposited; the hon. member should have said that a Report was being circulated to-day. The report was cyclo-styled and brought in here to-day by the Hon. Minister and why was it not said that the Plan had been deposited with the Clerk of the House? [Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member knows what the usual procedure is.] What else have you deposited with the Clerk of the House? You have not even sent down the Plans for the Ministerial Buildings; I feel that they should come to earth and try and understand what they have been doing. The previous report on the Deep Water Harbour says that something should be accompanying it but it has not been deposited with the Clerk of the House. Sir Douglas Ritchie made a report and the Plan was not circulated to hon. members; everybody said that it was a big drawing and it could not be circulated with the Report. The Hon. Minister must sympathise with the ordinary hon. member of the House who has not got the facilities of looking at the details of the Harbour Schemes. We had a Harbour Scheme discussed in this House on the strength of which a high-ranking delegation went to England and the experts came out and told us something. [Hon. M. E. COX: What Experts?] 12.05 a.m.

Those experts who came out and told you so. I forgot to mention the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph as an expert; but when you get him as an expert along with the Governor and the Financial Secretary who went up to England with him, the people up there "cauffled" them. [A VOICE: Wow! That is not a Parliamentary word]. It may not be, but it has its meaning here. They did not know what they went up there for; they went on a joy-ride. Mr. Chairman, in the Report which we have here now by Sir Eric Millbourn, in the second sentence he has said that he came down here and all the people (and I am sure he included the Hon. Premier and all) whom he thought knew most of it did not know anything of it at all. [A VOICE: He never said such a thing.] He said that they were most ignorant of the report. If any member of this Committee has a copy with him I will show him the paragraph. He said that it was amazing to find the ignorance among the people who should know the most about this harbour. [A VOICE: He never said that.] However, Mr. Chairman, I can speak again, and when I sit I am going to look up the relevant paragraph and let you know.

Mr. Chairman, a member has handed me a copy and what I was telling you about is in paragraph nine. It reads as follows:—

"We found a surprising lack of knowledge on the part of those whom we met as to the likely cost of the new port; indeed we were frequently told by the Scheme's strongest opponents that in principle they agree with the scheme, but could not see how the Colony could possibly afford from six to seven million pounds."

He said that when he came here. He thought so many reports were made on the Harbour that the people should have known something about it. [A VOICE: He did not say anything of the people whom he met in England.] They did not know what they wanted because people who were 3,000 miles away had to tell them what they wanted. Instead of getting a little emigration for the people when they went up to England the delegation came back to send another delegation about that. When they went on that delegation one of the objects was to go around and look for emigration for the people. They could have arranged for emigration there if they could not arrange for the Deep Water Harbour. The most regrettable thing about that delegation was that a member of it was taken out of the island when he had obligations of a private nature that would cause him to be in the island at that time. Going on that delegation caused a serious dislocation in that man's life.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I rise because—

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for St. George caught my eye first.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I am wondering how many Ministers there are in the Government. Only one has spoken for the whole night. When we put a question we get this particular member of the Government getting up, yet up to now not one single question asked on the floor of this House has been answered. The Hon. Minister of Communications is the name which is on the back of this Resolution. It says:—"Notice of this Resolution was given by Hon. M. E. COX, M.C.P., on the 14th June, 1955," whom I understand is the Minister of Communications, Works & Housing. If he has any self-respect or dignity he should be given an opportunity to speak.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I must object to the remarks made by the hon. senior member for St. George.

Mr. BARROW: I am not accusing him of not having those qualifications.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I object to the remarks made by the hon. senior member for St. George and I insist that they be withdrawn.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for St. Michael has made objection to the remarks.

Mr. BARROW: Let me hear the remarks.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: He is objecting to the remarks which you made just now.

Mr. BARROW: In the middle of a sentence which I was making he got up and said "I am raising objections to those remarks."

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I object to the remarks made by the hon. senior member for St. George.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. senior member for St. George take his seat? Will the Hon. Minister remind him of the remarks he made?

Hon. M. E. COX: He jumped up saying "if he had any self-respect or dignity" and I object to those remarks.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I suppose the hon. senior member for St. George has heard the remarks. In order to save time will the hon. member withdraw those remarks and go ahead?

Mr. BARROW: I never said he had no self-respect or no dignity. I said, if he had any self-respect or dignity he should be allowed to answer questions; and if the other members of the Government have any respect for him they would give him the opportunity of doing his work. If he thinks I said he does not have any self-respect or dignity I want to say he has all dignity and self-respect.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman,—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will you allow me? The Hon. Minister has asked you to withdraw those remarks. Will the hon. member withdraw the remarks and let us go on?

Mr. BARROW: If by anything I say he is given the impression that he has no self-respect or dignity I withdraw them, because I could never, never mean that he has no self-respect or dignity. He has all self-respect and dignity; but no hon. member in the Government seems to hold that view because they treat him as a boy in the yard.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I object to those remarks about hon. members treating me as a boy in the yard.

Mr. BARROW: I am not calling him a boy in the yard.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I myself would take it as an insult. I refer to the remarks which the hon. member used about hon. members treating him as a boy in the yard.

Mr. BARROW: If he thinks I am calling him a boy in the yard, Colonel Duke was referred to in this Chamber as being treated as a boy in the yard.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But Colonel Duke is not a member of this Chamber.

Mr. BARROW: If he thinks I am calling him a boy in the yard, I withdraw that remark, but I do not look upon him as being a boy in the yard. It looks bad that they would not allow him to get up to reply to a question. The hon. senior member for St. Michael brought in this Resolution asking for \$50,000 for highways, and as the hon. junior member for the City pointed out, there is nothing in the note to the Addendum of the innumerable references which were made of plans. Not a single member of the public or members of the House have seen any plan of the Deep Water Harbour or of the road construction involved. It is true that they send every plan to the Clerk of the House, but for what purpose? We were not told about these plans; but these plans apparently have been sent to the printers and if that has been so I am sure they would suffer the same fate as the other plans sent there. Not one single member of the House outside of those on the Ministerial benches has been given the opportunity of seeing these plans. Before we agree to the programme we are entitled to see the plans. We should see what the Government is doing with this money because the next thing which we are going to hear is that having voted this \$50,000 which may be spent somewhere else, we would be told that you have voted this money and you did not ask whether the roads were going to be constructed on private land or elsewhere.

12.15 p.m.

We would like to see the tie-up between this \$50,000 and the proposed Deep Water Harbour modified. If the Government contemplates buying quarries, Government should tell the House now that they have bought those quarries in a particular district; because this is in the Millbourn Report and members of this House should know the relevance which this road bears to the situation of the quarry and to the site of the Deep Water Harbour. The chances are that the Minister of Communications

may come to the House now for \$50,000 and the next thing you will hear is that this road has absolutely no connection with the source of the rubble and the raw material which they are going to dump in the Harbour. Is that good enough? I say it is not. Had they come to the House and disclosed to the House any intentions they may have of purchasing quarry lands for the supply of raw material for the Harbour and disclosed the situation of the particular land or quarry, the House would have been in a position to make recommendations as to better and more accessible sites and other recommendations of that nature, but we are being asked to vote money for roads for the Deep Water Harbour which are not in the Harbour programme, and so far as I know, related to any supply of raw material or rubble.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say this: had the Government given that information I would have been able to make a recommendation to them. I believe that they already own some of the land in the district which I recommend; and that is no less than River Bay in the parish of St. Lucy where I would say that there is some quality in the raw material. I do not have the honour to represent that parish, but I do have the honour to have been born there and I do think that some part of the land which is not related to the commercial activity that an industry of that kind would be more advantageous to the same parishioners of the island. [Cheers].

River Bay is a natural harbour. There is a good road which, had it not been for the omissions of the Minister of Communications, would have been finished by now. If the vote of \$80,000 for the widening of the roads had been properly spent that road would have almost been finished by now; but he has disclosed that he has taken some of the \$40,000 and spent it in another direction.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that none of the money which I mentioned here when the debate took place was allocated for any widening of any No. 1 or No. 10 road. That was something to do with capital that was set out in the Estimates for each year; I do not spend any money; I do not spend one red half cent.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, he said that he had taken money out of a vote which was for widening corners and highways, and further said that he had spent it for other purposes.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, what other purposes?

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to go into that. I do not want to raise the question of misappropriation of public funds; but he said that it was for widening corners and highways; and we pointed out that he had misread it etc. But we do not want to go back to that.

I was talking about the failure of the Minister of Communications to tell honourable members of this House in what way this road is related to the supply of raw material. I am saying that we should have known and then we could have put forward our alternative suggestions in the interest of the people of this island. If I see a way in which the Government could increase the value of the assets of this island, it is my duty to point it out to the Government. I do not think that with the recommendations such as those I have put forward for increasing the over-all prosperity of the country, I should stifle my actions; but when they do not act in good faith, we cannot advance anything. I said that many times.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I must object to the honourable member's remarks referring to the Ministers not acting in good faith. I insist that they be withdrawn. [Mr. BARROW: You do not get tired?]

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman I will repeat what I said. I said that when they do not act in good

faith we are not in a position to advance anything. I am not withdrawing any of those remarks.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I insist that those remarks be withdrawn.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I see nothing in those remarks to be withdrawn. It means that no member of this House will be able to get up and say anything about the Government except that it will be taken that you are accusing the Government of dishonesty.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, again I want to refer to my demands that the remarks be withdrawn.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member has raised an objection to the remarks made by the honourable senior member for St. George; and in order to maintain the harmony of the proceedings I am asking that those remarks be withdrawn.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, you cannot have that member dictating to you on parliamentary procedure. I said that when they come in here and do not act in good faith, what must they expect us to do?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member is not withdrawing the remarks then I shall have to refer the matter to His Honour the Speaker.

Mr. BARROW: Would you, Mr. Chairman, say that there is anything objectionable in those remarks, and would you allow yourself to go on record as saying so?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: In my own opinion you referred to the Ministers when you said: "when they do not." That is my poor way of putting it, and that is my objection too; that is, that you are accusing them of something. If that is what he thinks, you cannot blame him for it.
12.25 a.m.

Mr. BARROW: Well, Mr. Chairman, if you say I am accusing them, I will withdraw. That is the misfortune of having people like the honourable senior member for St. Michael in this House.

I would like to serve warning on the members of the Government now that on every occasion in the future when I suspect them of not being honest enough and of not acting in good faith, I will proclaim it from the house-top. I will exercise my right to expose any Government which does not act in good faith and is dishonest. This is not an accusation because it applies to this or any Government. I want to say that no citizen of Barbados should get the impression that because people arrogate to themselves certain offices they become honest overnight, because the people have not had any control over that.

Mr. Chairman, if we can return to more serious matters, I am saying that it is the duty of the Minister of Communications, not to deposit a Plan with the Clerk of the House to be sent to the Printers, but to lay it on the Table of the House and explain to honourable members in respect of a supplementary Resolution of this nature, in what way the road works envisaged in the Resolution could relieve the harbour of the traffic problems. It is unfortunate that after we have had all these Committees, not one single Plan has been presented although innumerable references have been made in the Reports to plans. I understand that the only occasion on which a Plan was ever available to members of this House was when the present Acting Harbour Master out of his own goodness drew up plans for the use of the Committee which met last year. There is no Plan attached to the Millbourn Report or the Ritchie Report and there is no Plan attached to the Report of the Deep Water Harbour Committee. There is no Plan made to the rather cursory Report made by the delegation which went up to England to bring down the Deep Water Harbour as they put it, but every-

thing is being rushed through now for one particular purpose. I warn them that things like this if persisted in will backfire on them, they being so indiscreet in a matter of this sort.

Mr. GODDARD: In his Report, Sir Eric Millbourn draws attention to two facts. The first is that it will be necessary to provide road facilities from the port area linking the port itself with the main trunk roads which radiate into the country from Bridgetown and secondly that with the work of road construction, the laying of an 8" water main should take place.

No mention is made of the eight-inch main but if we have to order this main I think that something should have been said about it. This pipe will take about 18 months to get here. In this Report it says that the eight-inch main should be laid at the same time as the roads are made. It would be interesting to know what plans they have in connection with this main. It is unfortunate that we have not got the Plans because, probably, we would know where these roads are being constructed or what roads are being widened. I had in mind that if this scheme is to be used the roads leading to the port should by-pass as much as possible the city of Bridgetown. The sugar which is coming from the north should not go to Black Rock, it should go through the Cholera Ground and go through some of the reclaimed land. All that is probably on the Plan but we have not got it. I think that plans of this nature are so important that we should have that information here. Sugar coming from the south would have to go down Hincks Street and by way of the Princess Alice Playing Field. If the Hon. Minister can tell us what the arrangements are in respect of this eight-inch main we would appreciate it very much.
12.35 a.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: These roads are already established, for example, when it comes to that of Hincks Street, that road will be widened at the corner. With respect to the Fontabelle Road, that will be widened at the part which leads into the road leading to the Reef. At any rate, this has nothing to do with the water main. The water main will not take anything like 18 months to lay down. While it is true to say that the Report stated that it will take anything like 18 months before we get going, I want to say that we do hope that it will not take that time.

Relative to the approaching road from Black Rock my own feeling is that instead of using the Brighton Road that we should come in from Bats Rock. That is the obvious road which should be used to get to the harbour and it is the old public road. Unfortunately, it has not been recommended in our network of roads for immediate construction. The suggestion is, up to Eagle Hall Corner, as I have pointed out, or near there; and from there you will get a main road leading to Pickwick where the corner will be widened and you will then keep straight to the harbour from that road.

As I have said, there will be a comprehensive plan of developments on the roads. In addition a water main will be installed. This is just for a temporary bit of work which can be done now and for which it is not necessary to have a survey. We want to see to this immediately so as to get it out of the way. I do know that we would have to remove some houses and re-site some when the survey is made; so if we get this out of the way, we would be able to proceed with that at a quicker pace.

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

On motion of Hon. Dr. Cummins, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, Mr. Chairman reported the passing

of four resolutions in Committee and the postponement of one.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

The Order Paper having been fixed:

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: The Order Paper, as can be seen, is becoming voluminous. We on this side of the table feel that we should meet on Thursday next in order to reduce it. Probably next week we may have to meet on Tuesday and Thursday. We have some lengthy Bills to deal with such as "The Representation of the People Act." I am therefore moving that this House do now stand adjourned until to-morrow, it being after midnight; that will be Thursday, 23rd June, 1955, at 3 p.m.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I was not listening very carefully from the beginning. We have to leave our private business to come to the House, and there is such a thing as preparing your work. [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: It is only the Housing Bill that we propose doing.] Oh, just the Housing Bill? If you tell us what you intend to come to the House for at the next meeting, then we shall be able to prepare for it. When we have a large Order Paper to contend with it means that we may cover subjects which might not be debated in the House.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, we shall be doing Housing and Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this House be now adjourned until Thursday next at three o'clock p.m. Hon. Members in favour of that will please say 'aye' those against will please say 'no'; I think the 'Ayes' have it. This House now stands adjourned.

12.45 a.m.