THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1956

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 3rd July, 1956

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

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*); Hon. M. E. COX (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*), Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Chairman of Committees*), Hon. R. G. MAPP (*Minister of Trade Industry and Labour*), Mr. F. C. GODDARD (*Leader of the Opposition*), Mr. J. A. HAYNES, B.A., Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY Mr. E. St.A. HOLDER, *Mr.* V. B. VAUGHAN, Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*), Mrs. E. E. BOURNE, and Mr. J. C. TUDOR, M.A.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meeting are not yet ready for confirmation.

DOCUMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Financial Report of the Accountant General of Barbados for the month ended 30th April, 1956.

BILL RETURNED

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

The Legislative Council have the honour to return to the Honourable the House of Assembly a Bill intituled an Act to acquire certain lands and rights over lands to be used in connection with the establishment of an Oceanographic Research Station and for the payment of compensation therefore and for matters connected therewith which has been passed with an amendment which is shewn written on the Bill.

H. A. CUKE
President.

The Legislative Council Chamber,
19th June, 1956.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a letter accompanied by a Medical Certificate from Dr. A. L. Stuart certifying that the Marshal is unable to attend the meeting of the House today.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded by His Excellency to lay the following:— "Statement of Post Office Advances for payment of Money Orders to 30th April, 1956."

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded by His Excellency to lay the Report of the Public Utilities Board for the year 1955.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of $1,398 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1956—57, Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1956—57, No. 10 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Bill to amend the Medical Registration Act, 1911.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with the Money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

PRIVATE NOTICE

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to give notice of my intention to move the passing of the following Address to His Excellency the Governor:—

The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Governor

The House of Assembly is of the opinion that some record should be made of the signing of the Order-in-Council setting up the British Caribbean Federation.

2. The House therefore respectfully requests Your Excellency to consult the Governments of the participating territories with a view to securing their approval of an entreaty of Her Majesty the Queen, that Her Majesty be graciously pleased to permit a departure from custom by allowing a photographic record to be made of the signing of the Order-in-Council.

3. The House makes this request feeling certain that the citizens of the future Dominion should be able to follow with pride the unfolding chapter of their history and affectionately associate Her Majesty with it.

4. The House further suggests that, if the Governments agree, the Commissioner for the preparation of the Federal Organisation be asked to take the necessary steps to have the request laid with his humble duty, before Her Majesty at an early opportunity.

3.25 p.m.

I am also asking leave to proceed with the passing of this Address today.

QUESTIONS

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. junior member for St. Michael I beg to give notice of the following question:—

To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:—

Is the Government aware of the fact that there is in existence certain maps and surveyor's plans, showing a Public Road along the seashore leading from Lower Fontabelle, Land's End, Old Burial Ground, Goodland, Brighton, Spring Garden, Danesbury, Walmer Lodge, The Fort, Bats Rock and Prospect where the above road joined the Black Rock Road?

2. If the answer to the above question is in the affirmative, will Government give immediate and favourable consideration to the repairing and/or rebuilding of the said roads, so as to provide:—

(a) an additional ancillary road to and from the proposed Deep Water Harbour, and

(b) the restoring of the use of the said roads to the general public.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move move that the Bill to amend the Medical Registration Act, 1911 be read a first time.

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

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921 be read a first time.

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

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

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921, be read a first time.

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

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

AMENDMENTS TO OCEANOGRAPHIC BILL

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr, Speaker, I am asking leave to take the amendments from the Other Place to the Act to acquire certain lands and rights over lands to be used with the establishment of the Oceanographic survey and compensation therefor and matters connected therewith.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I have no objection in facilitating Government in doing the amendments first, but would certainly like to see a copy of them because we do not know what they are. How are we going to accept these amendements without copies? If they can produce copies, I will be prepared.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the Other Place has cut out a portion of the section which the House passed which said that:—

"In determining for the purposes of this section whether the annual value of any land is diminished by reason of the exercise or enjoyment of any scheduled right, and in assessing any compensation under this section in respect thereto it shall be assumed that the land cannot be restored to the condition in which it would be put for the exercise or enjoyment of any scheduled right."

For the purposes of this section, no account shall be taken of any diminution or depreciation in value ascribable only to loss of pleasure or amenity."

From what I read of the debate from the Other Place and from correspondence in the daily newspaper it appears that there is some dispute as to whether the existence or non-existence of sharks is an amenity. The Other Place has cut out this section so apparently if the existence of sharks makes the land more valuable they will pay more money for it. That is all I can see in it.

The question for proceeding with the amendments from the Other Place was put, the House dividing as follows—

Ayes: Mr. SMITH, Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. CUMMINS; Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. T. O. BRYAN, Mr. VAUGHAN and Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY—11.

Noes: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. TUDOR, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. HAYNES and Mr. GODDARD—5.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, as I said, the Other Place cut out Sub-section 4 of Section 8 which speaks of compensation in respect to scheduled rights. The whole of section 8 deals with compensation and it speaks of giving it compensation in respect of which any scheduled right is exercised in the schedule and it should be payable if the Value of land should be diminished; the rights being to put poles in the land outside the Research Station in order to take lines or cables to the sea and so on.

3.35 p.m.

That is the meaning of scheduled rights. It makes provision for the payment of compensation to the owners of the land across which you are taking these cables and in which you are erecting poles. In one of the sub-sections, it says this:—

"For the purpose of this section, no account shall be taken of any diminution or depreciation in value ascribable only to loss of pleasure or amenity."

That is an ordinary provision which you put in Bills and conveyances dealing with things of this sort. The Other Place in its wisdom, (I hope I say it without offence,) has seen fit to cut that out, although in normal circumstances, I would suggest that we should refuse to accept an amendment of this sort because in the circumstances, at that part of the Island, it is difficult to say that there can be any diminution or depreciation in value due to loss

of pleasure or amenity. Nobody can bathe at the North Point; however, if I am in order to say this, according to accounts appearing in the Press, the point was raised as to whether sharks are in that vicinity or not. Apparently, the owner of this land is annoyed that it was said in the Other Place that sharks are there.

Whatever may have operated in the minds of the Other Place, we have to assume that they have acted on the highest principles in cutting this sub-section out. The United States Government has been asking us since January to treat this matter with the utmost urgency, and this is now July. There is no point therefore in my asking this House to reject the amendment of the Other Place; we have been prodded by the Colonial Office and the United States Government to get this matter through. For those reasons, I do suggest to hon. members that they accept this amendment, although it is the sort of amendment with which in normal circumstances, we would not be willing to agree. If the owner of this land can say "as a result of my having to sell to you, I am losing some amenity or some pleasure," seeing the rising sun or the setting sun, whichever it is, the assessors will take into consideration what he may have lost.

I do not think that we should waste any more time in this Chamber with this matter, it being so simple; I suggest that we should accept this amendment. I therefore beg to move that this amendment be now read a first time.

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

Mr. GODDARD: I opposed this matter purely on the principle of our not having on this side of the House any copies of this amendment. I appreciate very much the urgency with which this matter should be handled and for that reason, I am quite prepared to go on with it now. As regards the encroachments which may or may not exist, that is purely a matter for the Arbitration Court whenever they decide to sit.

Many of us have heard about the area being a shark infested area; the owner of this plantation has stated that in his lifetime, he has never known anybody to be bitten or attacked by a shark. He is entitled to his rights. Whether this sub-section is left in or not should not make any difference to him. On these grounds and with the urgency with which I know the Government of the United States expects this matter to be handled, because it has been delayed for a very long time, I am prepared to go on with it today. The only reason for my objection to proceeding with this matter today is that we should have been given the amendment in a written form before we come into the House, and if that is too late, then let us have the amendmen when we sit in the House. We cannot do any business without any documents in front of us, and expect us to refresh our memories of what took place in the Other Place from the newspaper report.

Mr. ALLDER: As long as the Government Bench disrespects other hon. members on this side of the Chamber, we have the right to refuse to handle any matter which is presented to us regardless of whoever wants it done expeditiously. The amendment could have been considered today if the written formality had been adhered to. It is customary for copies of amendments made by the Other Place to be presented to hon. members of this Chamber so that they can be guided; but the Hon. Premier knows that he has a majority to vote and deal with the matter today and therefore he proceeded with it. That is great disrespect to this Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not disrespect the vote of the House.

Mr. ALLDER: I am not doing that. The hon. member knows what I have just said, and therefore he is taking advantage of us in this respect that the amendment in itself seems to be very technical and he cannot claim to be speaking for all the members of this House. He can make a statement, regardless of how technical a matter is, and he has his members to vote for it. As regards other hon. members, a copy of the amendment is due to us especially since the Hon. Premier has read it out. Since the Hon. Premier has read out the amendment, it seems to be a highly technical matter; he cannot just read it out and expect hon. members to follow it. I cannot follow it, and I hope that I will not be asked to vote in one way or the other on the matter, because I shall abstain from doing so.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Rules of this House do not allow any hon. member to abstain from voting as long as he remains in the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I agree in the main with the arguments advanced by the hon. members on my left, but I rise to say that this is the first time that we have had an admission from the Government Bench that the American Government has had to prod the British Government, the Colonial Office and the Local Government into activity in this matter. Some weeks ago, when I rose in this House, and said that the American Government was very apprehensive over the delay, and were expressing concern about it, I was told that that was not true. Now today, we have heard for the first time that the American Government has been actually accusing them of temporizing in this matter and have expressed apprehension over the delay or inactivity (or both) of the Local Government and the British Government in this matter.

I repeat what I said on that occasion; the American Officials in the West Indies, not necessarily in Barbados have claimed that they were of the opinion that the British Government was holding up the matter. It now appears clear to me, from what has been said by the Government, that the allegation has been justified even now, because of the fact that there appeared to be such an unnecessary delay in bringing the matter to a conclusion.

3.45 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, now that the single copy of this amended Bill which is in possession of the House is now in my hands, I am in a position to speak better on it. It is interesting to know (and I think this ought to be said for the record) that we have been asked today to consider a matter without the document and to consider it on the spur of the moment.

I listened to the Hon. Premier recommending to the House to accept this amendment and I understood from him, because all he had to say was all all that was said, that the amendment was of no great importance and it could be accepted. From a preliminary glance at it, he seems to be right but the point which I wish to make is that it is quite impertinent to expect us to consider this amendment with such haste and without even having seen it before and not to upbraid the Other Place for wasting the time of the Americans by having sent back this amendment to us which in my opinion might well have not been moved.

If the argument is that we must not waste time, and if the admission by the Hon. Premier himself it is not the sort of amendment that there needs to be any controversy about, then the Other Place needed not to have made the amendment, since the

amendment does not effect the main purpose of the Act so as to prevent the place from being bought.

I think it was was my colleague—the hon. senior member for St. Lucy — who when the Bill was before us, drew attention, just as the Other Place has done, to this Clause which is the subject of controversy between the Other Place and us and the arguments which were used by the Other Place were partly used by my colleague. I wish to say that there is nothing wrong with what they have suggested, but since this amendment is so slight, they need not have wasted their time and ours.

I have no objection to this amendment but I wish to enter this protest. I agree with the hon. junior member for Christ Church and the hon. senior member for St. John that great discourtesy has been shown to this House. I am not reflecting on the vote which has just been passed. But even on a slight matter like this, could it not have been found possible to type 24 copies of this proposed amendment and treat the House with the courtesy to which it is due?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to apologise to the Opposition for assuming that in the case of a simple amendment like this, it was unnecessary to go to the expense of typing and cyclostyling copies. The non senior member for St. John seemed to suggest to the Government that the Opposition has no intelligence whatsoever. Let me say that we have in the past have had corrections from the Other Place in the form of a semi-colon in place of a comma; we have had corrections as to the year in which a Bill should date.

I am sorry if I am interrupting the hon. senior member for St. John from reading the *Advocate* Newspaper but inasmuch as he made the point seemingly against the Government, I am assuring him that the Government will not disrespect the protest which he made regarding the intelligence of the Opposition. I want to assure him that so long as our finances will stand the expenditure, in future every comma will be typed out and handed to the opposition.

This is a simple amendment. We say we must not take into consideration what was difficult to assess. For example, if a man has his house facing east, that means something to him. We say that could not be assesed in pounds, shillings and pence, therefore that could not be taken into consideration. The Other Place has said that you must take that into consideration. All I have been able to gather from the debate in the Other Place through the perusal of the Press report is that a remark was made that it was a shark infested area and objection was taken to that statement. Personally, if I had a place to sell which was a shark infested place I would boost it but apparently some people think that such a place would not raise as much money.

The Opposition have proclaimed to us that, never mind however simple the amendments to a Bill may be, we should let them read them. In future, we will set out every letter from A to Z so that the Opposition will not have any opportunity of saying that we did not tell them about it. I apologise to the House for having wasted this time in replying.

The question that the amendment be now read a first time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On separate motions of Hon. G. H. ADAMS. seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS in each case, the amendment was read a second time and agreed to.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Supplementary Estimate No. 9 Transport

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is divided into six parts. It deals with, first of all a sum of $110,000 to meet the deficit on the working of the Transport Board from the 24th August, 1955 until the 30th June, 1956. The second item is for the sum of $2,245 to engage the services port services of Barbados. The third item is for the sum of $750 to pay an honoraria to certain members of the staff of the Department of Highways and Transport who were engaged in the taking over of the buses.

The fourth Item is a revote of $8,795 to which the House has already agreed to engage the services of an expert from the United Kingdom to give evidence on behalf of the Government in a case which will come off very soon regarding some of these buses. The fifth Item, Mr. Chairman, is the sum of $25,000 to purchase a Leyland Diesel Bus to seat 44 passengers in order to demonstrate to the public the type of transportation facilities which Government intends to provide for them: and the last item is for $75,500 to provide accommodation for housing these units and also for work shops.

Now, Sir, I am well aware of the fact that the criticism of the Transport service and Transport Board has more or less gained momentum in these recent days not because, Mr. Chairman, the service is so bad or because it is worse than what it used to be when owned by private people, but because Sir, as we know this is Election year: and as such the Opposition—those who wish us well but on the other side—have to find something out of which they can make capital. In addition, Sir, more particularly with the local Press, we are all aware of the fact that the Government can do nothing that is right where the *Advocate* newspaper is concerned; and this newspaper of course being interested in big business, would at all times be opposed to the Government running any sort of service in this Island. As a matter of fact as you know, Sir, they always support free enterprise irrespective of whether or not the price of the commodity is within the purchasing power of the community.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as regards the other item, perhaps I should say before going further, how much I thank the Hon. Leader of the Opposition for sending me a questionnaire in advance in order that I may be able to prepare the necessary replies: and while I may not make specific reference, I hope the hon. member will be following me as I make various points which even indirectly will be a reply or replies to the questions which he posed.

Now, as regards the $110,000, the operating deficiency to the 30th June, is $95,000, unlike the rumour in the Press that it was half million dollars and also from the hon. junior member for St. Lucy that the Government had been operating at a loss of half million dollars and all that nonsense The operating deficiency up to the 30th of this

month is $95,000; the other $15,000 is to purchase 50 new tyres for these buses at an average of $100 per tyre. Now, perhaps if members will follow me, they will see from the figures I shall give that while it appears to be a loss, in actual practice it is not a loss when you take these points into consideration; and even if it were a loss, I am sure that when we took over the buses, when the Resolution for $30,000 was before this House, the Government did not at that time give the guarantee that this service would be operated at a profit eve though our ultimate aim is that is should operate at a profit.

4.05 p.m.

Now, Sir, the fact is that the number of buses taken over, as members will remember was 116. Now at the time it was agreed by letters between the Government and former concessionaires that the Government would take over all serviceable vehicles and spare parts, though unfortunately for us—perhaps I should have said it at an earlier stage—there were some vehicles, I think between five and six, which were taken over and which have not up to now proved to be serviceable. I should say that because it is common property to quite a number of people, and the buses are still lying on the ground and I am not sure if any hand can be made of them. They have never worked from the time they were taken over.

Perhaps at a later stage some investigation will reveal the true situation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, since we have taken over these buses, we have had to purchase———

Mr. BARROW: On a point of Order. The hon. member is revelling in having taken over buses, but my recollection is that this Tranpsort Board Bill was dealt with sometime in August last year, and the buses were handed over to an independent Statutory Board. I am therefore asking for a Ruling Mr. Chairman. I presume that you are still the Chairman of Committees and not the hon. senior member for St. Joseph whom I wish would keep quiet. I am asking whether the hon. senior member for St. Michael took over the buses or whether the Act which provides for the establishment of a Transport Board has been repealed and the buses are now in his custody and possession.

Hon. M. E. COX: That is not a point of Order. The hon. member is only interrupting me.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, you will make your own Ruling in the fulness of time. My point is that these two Resolutions are out of Order because there is no authority under any Act for bringing forward either of them. If you scrutinize the Transport Board Act, you will see that an independent Statutory Authority was set up with powers to borrow money, to raise loans and to look after matters of that kind. It is not a Government Department; it is an independent Statutory Board, so much so that His Honour the Speaker made Rulings on two separate occasions that even questions concerning the running of this Board were out of order at the time when the questions were submitted.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member is only interrupting me.

Mr. BARROW: I am explaining the point of Order on which I have risen, and if you experience any difficulty, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that you send for His Honour the Speaker to Rule as to whether these Resolutions are not out of order. There is no authorisation for them. We cannot take money out of the Treasury unless there is some Statutory Authority enabling us to do it; that is an elementary principle. If none of the members over there understands that, it is regrettable. I hope that Your Honour has grasped my point; it would be very interesting to hear the hon. member say that he has taken over the buses; only the Transport Board Act could give the right to take over the buses. You cannot get money out of the Treasury, unless a Bill is passed, to put a shelter over these buses at this late stage; if the hon. member reads the Transport Board Act and the Local Loan Act, he will see that there is no Statutory Authority———

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Has it ever been said in 300 years what the hon. member has just said?

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, if you want the hon. member to speak for you, you must invite him to do so.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is not speaking for me.

Mr. BARROW: It sounds so.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The hon. member and others have raised the point with His Honour the Speaker as to whether hon. members cannot speak on a point of Order. However, to say that the Crown cannot ask for money is sheer nonsense, and I am amazed that even the hon. member has wasted our time in raising this point.

Mr. BARROW: I am not suggesting that the Crown cannot ask for money. I am saying that they cannot come into the House with this Resolution because there is no Statutory Authority for it. Of course, the Constitution of Barbados is flexible in the hands of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph; we know that he can do anything which he wants done. There is a way to do this thing, but this is not the way to do it. I hope hat the hon. member who expurgates the debates of this House does not eradicate from the records the interesting statements now made by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph; I would like the debate on this Resolution to be another one to remain on the records for the benefit of posterity.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman,———

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what is the hon. member speaking?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Obviously, on a point of Order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must say so.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I wish to enquire since when has the Crown began running these buses. We, in this Legislature, created a Transport Board, as a separate entity, to run the buses. That Board is empowered to borrow money, to acquire property and to do anything it likes with the buses under its control. If the Board wants money now, they have to raise it by way of a loan from Government or from any other source; but the Government cannot now borrow money to run these buses. The Transport Board is a separate entity which was formed to deal with the entire question of Transport. Before we had a Transport Board, one could understand the Government asking for any amount to make an advance for the operation of those buses; but the moment you establish a separate entity to deal with this matter, the Government has no power to do what they are now doing. What the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has said is by no means an answer to the question raised by the hon. senior member for St. George.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The hon. member should read the Resolution. On the Estimates of this Country today, there is a Head dealing with Transport; the amount which has been voted under this Head has not proved to be enough, and this Resolution seeks to increase the amount which we have

already voted. Those hon. members should pay the Committee the compliment of reading what is before them; all this supplementary estimate asks is to make more money available for this purpose. Do we need to waste any more time with this alleged point of Order? But they have been filibustering from 4 o'clock, that is all that it means.

Mr. TUDOR: A Ruling has been sought of you, Mr. Chairman, and I think it should be given before we proceed with this matter. [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: This is purely filibustering; we will sit here until morning, we are not afraid.] [Mr. CRAWFORD: We will sit here until next week.] There are two Resolutions before us today, and the Hon. Minister did not indicate to us whether he is dealing with one or the other, or with both of them. You will notice, Mr. Chairman, that that is what has established the point of Order. Although, there are two distinct Resolutions, the Hon. Minister did not say with which of them he was dealing. At the end of these Resolutions, we read these words:—

"*Resolved* that His Excellency the Governor be asked to assent and take the necessary steps to give effect to this Resolution."

I take the preliminary objection to the coupling of these two Resolutions. The first Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is embodied in the other, and the second one must have an Act authorising the loan. You know from your own experience that the Appropriation Act and the Resolutions on the Estimates in respect of Capital Expenditure are not done together. That is why we are seeking a Ruling in this matter.

4.15 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, The Hon Minister needs not show his nervousness like that. What he must do is to answer the questions put to him if he wants the debate to proceed. What I want to know is if the Crown can come in here with a similar resolution for something in respect of the Natural Gas Corporation. That Corporation is also a separate entity set up to control natural gas in the colony. It has a similar Board to that of the Transport Board. Both Boards were set up by similar legislation.

While it is true that in respect of the expenses as regards the Transport Board a Resolution was brought down to grant this money before the Board was set up, I am not at all satisfied in my mind that the Government is entitled to seek for funds as it is today in respect of the operation of the Transport Board.

There are one of two items in the Resolution, such as "Legal Expenses" which were involved in the take over, and the "Honoraria" for remunerating the Mechanic-Engineers who worked overtime in putting the buses in order before the Board was established, which the Government can afford to come here for those funds under a Supplementary Resolution; but if they are entitled to come in this fashion, well then, if the Natural Gas Corporation wants something all it has to do is to tell the Government that it wants more money. I am not at all satisfied in mind that the Crown is entitled to ask for what the Hon. Minister wants for this Transport Board.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I was saying—

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of Order.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, for what is the hon. member bobbing up and down every minute?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: (*to the hon. junior member for St. Lucy*) Are you asking a question?

Mr. TUDOR: Your ruling has been asked on certain questions.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The ruling which I have before me is the Addendum to the Resolution which reads as follows: "This Resolution is to authorise the supplementary provision included in the Supplementary Estimates, 1956—57, No. 9."

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, with great respect to you, when a member of the Committee asks you for a ruling, he means a ruling as regards the procedural question which is involved. That has nothing to do with whether Government should spend money or not; that is something different. We are asking you to say whether this method is a correct one.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I was saying that there was quite a considerable lot of expenses for the short time the buses have been operated by the Transport Board and as I was pointing out to the Committee, we have had to purchase over the last ten months 341 tyres which amount to $4,920.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of Order.

Hon. M. E. COX: We have also had to purchase 106—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Has the hon. senior member for St. George risen on a point of Order?

Mr. BARROW: This Chamber has a long and illustrious history of Parliamentary and constitutional Government behind it and I do not think that one should flout all the well established rules of procedure. I am not dealing with the issue involved but I do say it is in your favour to give a ruling on the matter. I think the attempt by the hon. senior member for St. Michael is only one to subvert the well established authority of the Chair.

Mr. Chairman, if you do not feel at this stage competent to give a ruling on the matter, I suggest that you send for Mr. Speaker. It would not be any reflection on your ability but I am submitting that it is a serious matter on which you are questioned and one on which you should give a ruling.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I was saying that we have had to purchase 106 batteries at a cost of $4,770. We have had also to purchase 43 cylinder heads at a cost of $5,160. We have had also to purchase 37—

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman,—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member give me a chance and wait?

Mr. CRAWFORD: It is common courtesy to the Chair, if the Chair is endeavouring to resolve a matter, that both sides of the House keep quiet. The hon. senior member for St. Michael should refrain from proceeding with the matter while the Chair is endeavouring to resolve the matter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Reading Clause 15 of the Transport Act, 1955, it says that the Board may, with the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, borrow by way of loan, overdraft or otherwise, such sums as the Board may require for meeting their obligations or discharging their functions under this Act. I take it that the money which they had was not sufficient and they are asking for a supplementary vote, therefore I rule that this Resolution is in order.

VOICES: No, No.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I was saying

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of Order.

4.25 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I was saying Sir, that we have . . .

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Sir, ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order, I rule the hon. member out of order.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am asking you to enlighten my ignorance on the paragraph you read as follows:—

"The Board may with the approval of the Governor-in-Executive, borrow by way of loan overdraft or otherwise, such sums as the Board may require for meeting the obligations or discharging their functions under this Act."

What have we got before us today to show that the Board is borrowing money?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is a Supplementary Resolution and the Addendum tells you. I am going by the Addendum which is in front of me. This Resolution is to authorise the Supplementary provision included in the Supplementary Estimates. If you are not going to authorise it, you may say so.

Mr. CRAWFORD: May I submit, Sir, that any person in the Government offices can write an Addendum. Any clerk can write an Addendum, and what was done, which is the burden of our actions today, is that the Transport Board Act was sanctioned by the legislature last year.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already made my ruling.

Mr. CRAWFORD: May I submit, Mr. Chairman, that your ruling is a misinterpretation of the Act and I would like to . . .

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I rule the hon. member out of order as far as the explanation is concerned and I am asking the Hon. Minister in charge to continue. The hon. senior member for St. Philip will take his seat.

Hon. M. E. COX: Now, Sir, I was pointing out just now that we had to purchase . . .

Mr. CRAWFORD: May I repectfully submit that the Speaker be called upon to rule one way or another because your interpretation is incorrect.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am ruling the hon. member out of order.

Hon. M. E. COX: I was saying, Sir, that we have had to purchase 106 batteries which cost $4,770, 43 cylinder heads $5,160, 37 clutch discs $814, 32 clutch pressure-plates $1,305, 8 crank shafts $1,200 4 clutch housing $140, 14 oil filters $88, 6 blocks $1,800, differential crown wheels 10 of these — $1,100, nine manifolds — $360, gearboxes complete — $1,500, transmission gears $860, miscellaneous small parts $5,000 that amounts to $64,947. This in a sense may be regarded as capital outlay.

Now, as I pointed out earlier, the deficit on the working of the Board up to the 30th of last month is $95,000; the figures quoted above represent a sum of alone $64,947. Now, we go on further, Mr. Chairman. As regards the wages: as you know from the time Government took over the buses—as a matter of fact before the buses were actually taken over — the Government agreed to an overall increase of wages, and as soon as they were taken over, increased wages were paid. The average wages paid to conductors and drivers when employed by former employers were $4.18 per day. The Government rate is $5.28 per day, an increase of 24%; so, Sir, at the end of last month, the total wages paid to drivers and conductors were $220,800—that is, at the new rate—and that is an increase of what they used to get under former employers of $53,000.

Now, as regards inspectors, they used to get $2.20 per day. The Government pays them $3.20 per day, an increase of approximately 45% and that brings the total of wages paid to inspectors up to last month, to $35,561—an increase of $15,503 over the old rates; so that alone, Mr. Chairman, when you add these increases—and we have also paid mechanics $89,722 up to the end of last month—the increase to drivers and conductors and the increases to inspectors, you will see, Sir, alone represent $68,503; so when you add $68,503 to the $64,947 which I have already mentioned you will see that that represents $133,450. I shall invite any member of this House—or all the members if they so desire—to go over to the Board and check for themselves and see that there are in stock 106 dead batteries which were taken over with these buses, and as I said, all the old parts taken out of the buses. They can go and see them in the store house of no use, tyres included. So although it appears, Mr. Chairman, that the loss is great, you will see from the increase in wages, and as a matter of fact, the increase of wages alone could offset the deficit which here appears; that is, in so far as the $110,000 is concerned. 4.35 p.m.

I should mention that some Firms are eagerly waiting on this money; the position is not as bad as has been represented in some sections of the Press; and when the matter was drawn to the Government's attention, the Government took immediate steps to get money in order to pay off the outstanding accounts

As regards Item No. 2, we have had various correspondence with people who are very well acquainted with the running of Transport. Some time ago, Mr. James from Jamaica who runs the British Electric Traction Company there, came here and discussed the question of the operation of the bus service in this Island, and he told us that the Diesel Motor were very good motors. They seat 44 people and there is standing accommodation for as many as another 40 persons. After we had discussions with Mr. James, another gentleman called Mr. Gibbons, who is the Licensing Authority in Trinidad, also passed through here and gave us a lot of valuable information as to how the bus service is being operated in Trinidad. As hon. members know, the Trinidad transport service used to be run by the Government and they lost over $1 million a year when they were operating their service, whereas this service only shows a deficit of $95,000. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: That is a first-class example.] That service was afterwards given to private Concessionaires, and Mr. Gibbons takes great care to see that the Concessionaires run the buses in an up to date manner, and that the profits made are not, as is usually done in the majority of cases in this Island, put into property but that the profits or quite a considerable part of them are ploughed back into the Transport service, thereby providing for an adequate and up-to-date service. Mr. Gibbons inspects their books, way-bills and everything else, and judging from what he has told us, I can see that there is almost a cast-iron system obtaining in Trinidad today. We have discussed with him the possibility of his coming here and giving us some of his experience, and he has agreed to do so. He is now in the United Kingdom and hopes to pass through here sometime around the 15th of August; if this Resolution is passed, as I have no doubt it will be passed, Mr. Gibbons will be here to assist us in this matter of the re-organisation of the Transport services.

Since the Concessionaires were granted their concessions—I think it was in 1936 or 1939—quite a lot of areas have been built up, and it is time that we should have a re-distribution of the routes to fall in line with providing the necessary Transport facilities in respect of those areas which have been recently built up.

As regards Item No. 3, the amount of $750.00 is required to pay honoraria to some members of the staff of the Highways & Transport Department who worked overtime during this take-over of the buses.

Hon. members will remember that quite a few of these people, even the Stenographer-Typists, worked overtime during this take over, and in the circumstances, it was agreed to pay them honoraria to the tune of $750.00 to these people who did this work during this time.

The other Item under this Head is for the sum of $8,795 in respect of legal expenses. As I have already said the amount of this Item has already been voted by this House, and therefore I need not repeat what was said then. I shall only remind hon. members that the case is expected to commence sometime early next month or rather the middle of next month, and it is necessary to have this money in order to get a Queen's Counsel to appear on behalf of the Government.

Under the Head Capital Expenditure, it is proposed that we purchase a 44 Seater Diesel bus similar to those which are in operation in Trinidad and Jamaica. As I said just now, we were told by Mr. James and Mr. Gibbons that it is a waste of time to run these gasolene motors. We have been told that these Diesel Motor buses are sturdy and strong and they have a good life of at least 10 years, and the cost of one of these buses is $25,000. As soon as this Resolution has been passed, the order for this bus will be placed.

As I have said, of the buses which were taken over, many of them had already passed the ten-year limit; some of them have been in existence since 1939. It is not at all surprising to me that if you read the comments made in the Press, it would appear is if these buses had deteriorated in the last 8 or 10 months more so than they had deteriorated within the last 10 years or so. The buses which were taken over have been twice written off. From the comments made in the Press, for example, quite recently the head lines in the Press showed that the back of a bus had dropped off; well, if the back of the bus dropped off, when the Government took it over, the back was nearly off. [*Laughter*]. We could not have taken over a good bus, and then it deteriorated to that extent in 9 months! The fact is that this particular bus skidded on the wet road in Locust Hall Hill, struck a bridge and a part of the upright at the back of the bus broke and fell; that is what happened. Of course, you will hear any sort of thing now, especially from the hon. junior member for St. Lucy who was hoping to get a debate; his little heart will now come down since the debate on the question of Government policy in relation to these buses has started.

4.45 p.m.

I have a brochure here (which I want to show to hon. members) showing the type of bus to which I have referred and which the Transport Board is hoping to put into operation in a short space of time.

Now, Sir, I come to Item 6. That is for the sum of $75,500 to provide accommodation for these buses. As we read in the newspapers some time ago (although I pay very little attention to what they have to say) we saw that it was suggested that we provide quarters for these buses. That was a suggestion which was made almost from the time we took them over. Sir, if you remember, when the Resolution for $30,000 was before the House, it was pointed out then that the Government was prepared to keep one or two of the routes which were taken over when the final decision was made. It will also be remembered that, while some people said (or will have people to believe) that we were anxious to take over the buses, that was not the case. I think the public ought to know that it was not a question of Government being desirous of taking over the buses but rather that the Government acted in order to keep the cost of living down, especially so for the poorer people of this Island. The Government said then, that it was not prepared to increase the bus fares because it took into consideration the large number of school children who were transported daily from all parts of the country to and from Bridgetown and that being so, if the bus fares were increased at the time, it would cause a great hardship on the parents of those children to keep them in school. As an alternative, which you will remember Mr. Chairman, the Government offered to give a rebate of 15% on gasolene to the concessionaires and as you know, the concessionaires turned down that offer. They said that they wanted 50% and if they were not given that, they were willing that the Government purchase the buses. As a result, the Government was faced with no alternative under the circumstances than to accept the offer of taking over the buses; so the Government took over the buses.

As was pointed out already, and as is pointed out in the questionnaire submitted by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the Government before taking over the buses called for tenders for concessions to operate the various routes, and about eight persons applied. I said then, and I will say again, that it was never the intention of the Government to operate all the routes taken over. That is still the policy of the Government. As I have said already, there are some people who have applied for concessions whose applications still hold good today, but the Government could not release those buses because of the fact that we do not know how much these buses are going to cost. As you know, Sir, nothing has been decided yet; therefore, we cannot take the buses and give them to people without first knowing how much will these buses cost. Neither do I believe anybody would be so stupid as to take them over without knowing what they will cost. That is the reason why no firm agreement has been reached, so far as these buses are concerned.

To all this must be added that we had a hurricane on us almost simultaneously with the taking over of these buses, and it meant that all our forces had to be concentrated on the hurricane. We also had at the time damage done to the buses as a result of the hurricane and we had to send many of those units to the various garages to be repaired; and doubtless, at some of the very garages which were owned by the people from whom we had taken over these buses. Of course, as in all cases where Government is concerned, whenever Government wants anything, it must pay through its teeth for it; and so we had to pay through our teeth for the repairs done to those buses at the various garages.

The question will also be raised again, as I saw it in the Press: why not provide shelters for these buses. I think members of the Opposition, even when we brought down a Resolution for money to finish Government Headquarters and to start the new Bay Street Boy's School, shouted loudly that we should do nothing but concentrate all our forces on the repairs to houses and rehabilitation of the people who suffered in the hurricane. In fact all our efforts were concentrated on that.

We read regularly that even passengers are complaining of the bus service which Government is now running. As long as one refuses to disclose one's name, that can be taken to mean a former concessionaire, or a Broad Street merchant who does not travel in these buses. As long as a *nom de plume* is used, that can be taken to mean anybody. On the question of increasing bus fares, you read that somebody is saying "why will you not increase bus fares? If you increase bus fares all this trouble would cease."

I would not swallow that and the reason why I would not swallow that is because the concessionaires were not talking of increasing their fleet; they were saying that their operational expenses were more than their revenue, and therefore they wanted so much as would square them and give them a little profit. That is what they were saying.

Now, Sir, just to show you when you hear and read certain things that they are not always accurate, I will say this. The Committee knows when we had taken over the buses, that among them were ten buses of the Progressive Bus Company. Two weeks after those buses were taken over, the owner wrote to the Government asking whether it would be good enough to return those buses to him. Of course, the answer was "No". It went on like that for some time, until the owner made representation stating that he was quite happy and contented with what his profits were before the take-over. Of course, I did not believe that and I doubt whether anybody will. He did say that he was making a very good profit and that he was misled by the hon. junior member for St. James; therefore, he found himself in that "going down." He appealed to the Government to allow him to have back his buses.

4.55 p.m.

Well, eventually around May last we decided to return his buses after he made his final plea; and those buses were returned with what would be regarded as a *status quo*. We said, "here they are; you take them back as they are; the Government is freed from any liability present or future;" and these buses were handed back to the Progressive Bus Company with a document sealed and signed; the Government is freed from any liability now or in the future. That was the condition under which the buses were given back to Mr Birch. Not a cent was paid. We handed them back just as they were with the understanding that if you want them back just as they are, and he willingly and gladly took them 12 o'clock in the night, and he was very glad to get them back in his garage, and I know he is happy and he can now smoke his cigar again. Now, if that was so, if these buses were losing all that money, as we were told, I am sure that this gentleman would not have taken back his buses in the condition in which they were after they had been on our possession for over eight months. At least he would have said, "You should give me something, depreciation or something for the months you had them; but that was not the case at all. These buses were taken back as they were from the Government with a signed document, as I said, freeing us from any present or future liability. That, in my opinion, is evidence to prove that it is not true to say that these buses were operating at a loss or at least the majority of them —and again I repeat we find that other concessionaires are still operating their routes. There were fourteen concessionaires; eight gave up their buses and six kept theirs; and the return of the concession above referred to make a total of seven privately run, from whom we have heard no further complaints. Now again, as you will remember, Sir, in the Press, this question of a committee recommending an increase in fares is always looming up , and people are inclined —some people rather—to say that if the increase had been given by the Government, we would not be in what they consider a quandary. But I would like this to be clearly understood; we are in no quandary. The buses we have today—or at least the majority of them—are in far better condition than they were immediately before they were taken over by Government. I now refer a paragraph which was written appears in the report of the very Commissioners appointed to enquire into the bus fares at the time—this was on the 24th June, 1955—and this is what they said:

"In the course of this enquiry we found ourselves at some disadvantage in that adequate statistical information was not available from many concessionaires to enable us to make a proper comparison and reliable estimates. For example, important information such as the number of passengers carried, mileage covered, etc. was lacking in many cases."

And what is the position? They said, however, in as much as these fares were fixed in 1936 or 1939, you should give an increase and also make it incumbent upon them to provide new and better units. That is what the Commissioners said then, and as I was saying, Mr. Chairman, the case put forward by the concessionaires was never formed on the grounds of providing units to increase their existing fleets.

I have quoted the Progressive Co.'s case as an instance to show you that while on the one hand you get people clamouring for an increase and saying if you had only increased the fare by one cent Government would not have making adequate profits; although he was one who protested and joined the others in giving up the buses. The buses are running again under his supervision and as I said he seems to be a happy man. I think, Sir, I have dealt with those points set out in the Resolution, and I repeat I am sure now that hon. members here know the true position, even though they would be quite willing at all times and more particularly on this occasion to attack the Minister of Transport, I am sure that they will see that the picture is far different from what the public was led to believe. They will see, as I said, that while you have an operating deficit of $95,009 to the end of last month, the causes or reasons for that deficit are clear in that the additional wages paid to drivers, conductors and inspectors are approximately $83,000.

5.05 p.m.

These are wages in excess of what these people used to get when they were working with the private employers. As I have already pointed out, we have had to purchase batteries and other accessories which can be regarded as capital, and at least they can last for another 8 months or even a year: the guaranteed life of a battery is a year. As I said a while ago, we have had to supply 106 new batteries; we also had to buy 341 new tyres All these things had to be installed in these buses so as to make them serviceable for the road.

Mr. Chairman, I think I have dealt with all the points which are likely to arise. I do not know if I have answered all that has been asked by the hon. junior member for Christ Church as to the policy of the Government with regard to the Transport service of this Island. The policy of the Government is to dispose of some units which we now own as soon as the necessary arrangements can be made, and to operate the remainder It may be that after a few years a complete taking over of the Transport service by Government will take place. That is the Government's policy.

The hon. member asked how many Concessions were operating on the 10th August, 1955? There were 14; the Government took over 8 of them. One has been returned, which leaves us with 7, and a total of 106 buses. The hon. member went further and asked for what purpose did the Government take over the buses? Well, the purpose is obvious; the buses were taken over for the purpose of carrying on the Transport service of the Island which the former concessionaires told us they were not prepared to carry on after the 22nd August. 1955. As to the question of taking over these buses with a view to giving them to new people, that was not so. I have already an

swered the question about advertising for new Concessionaires; we have received 8 tenders: some of which are still good today. No new concessions were granted; those who carried on outside of the Government, carried on under the old conditions.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of Order. I should like to know under what Act of Parliament is this Resolution authorised.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. junior member for Christ Church asked whether—

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman. I am enquiring under what Act of Parliament is this Resolution authorised.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will find out from the Clerk and let the hon. member know.

Hon. M. E. COX: The answer to the question also asked by the hon. junior member for Christ Church as to whether the Government has been keeping separate accounts in respect of each units which we took over. On the question of what profits profits and or losses were made in respect of each concession retained, is "yes. We have been keeping separate accounts in respect of each lot of units which we took over. On the question of what profits and/or losses were made in respect of each concession retained, the answer has already been given, because I said that there was a deficit of $95,000 up to the middle of last month.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman.—

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of Order. I wanted to know under what Act of Parliament this expenditure of funds from the Public Treasury has been authorised. I think that the Addendum to this Resolution is very misleading, and it has misled you. The Addendum says this:—

"This Resolution is to authorise the Supplementary provision included in the Supplementary Estimates, 1956-57, No. 9."

I should like to say that there is no Supplementary Resolution No. 9 of the 1956-57 Estimates; this Resolution is Resolution No. 9 itself. I think it is most dishonest of the Civil Servants perhaps I should withdraw the words "Civil Servants" because we know who are the hewers of wood and the drawers of water, but it is misleading to draw up the Resolution in this way. There is no such Head in the Appropriation Act as Head XXXVI: once the Appropriation Act has been passed, my submission is that you can only bring in a Supplementary Resolution under what appears as a Head in the Act, to take money out of the Treasury by way of a Resolution. Unless there is something to hang over it, there is nothing to prevent the hon. member from appropriating money to himself.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I strongly object to that statement. The hon. member with his twisted mentality is always giving a bad impression of other people.

Mr. BARROW: Well, there is nothing to prevent him from giving the money to me. then [*Laughter*]. I am saying that there is no Act of Parliament authorising this expenditure at all. This is a very serious business.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Leader of the House is going to move the adjournment of the House at this stage, and at the same time, I will get your point clarified. On re-assembling, I will be able to tell you something about the matter. [MEMBERS: That is alright.]

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

Mrs. BOURNE: I beg to second that.

The motion being put and carried nem. con. the Chairman reported progress and Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reportedly accordingly.
5.15 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: On the motion for the adjournment —

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you seconding that motion?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Yes Sir. Earlier in the debate, which was reported to you by Mr. Chairman I was asked to take my seat when I requested a ruling from the Chairman on the legality of the procedure as to the Resolution before the House. Now, Sir, I am not attempting to question the ruling of the Chair but I am asking Your Honour to be so good as to enlighten the House as to the correctness of the proceedings as regards the Resolution before us for $121,790. The Resolution is divided into two parts — (1) Part I, Current — Head xxxvi (New)— Transport and (2) Part II, Capital A—Loan Funds, Road Transport.

My first point, Mr. Speaker, is that on reference to the Estimates of Expenditure for the current year there is no Head XXXVI; therefore there could not have been any expenditure involved under this Head when we passed the Appropriation Bill. Secondly, Sir, the second part of the Resolution — Part II, Capital — calling for Capital expenditure to be raised from Loan Funds is wanted for the newly created Transport Authority. The House has been told that under Section 15 of the Transport Act, 1955, which sets up a Transport Board that the Board may, with the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee borrow by way of loan, overdraft or otherwise, such sums as the Board may require for meeting their obligations or discharging their functions under this Act.

I would like to say in passing that this Section to which the Committee was referred by the Chair is establishing a local authority under which Government is providing it with money by way of this Resolution. Am I to understand under the Section of the Act giving the Board approval to borrow money that it necessarily can be interpreted to mean that the Government is intitled to come in here and advance money from the Public Treasury to the newly constituted Board without any reference or application by the Board itself for such a loan or without any legal sanction?

I respectfully submit, not merely to enlighten myself but in the interest of maintaining the traditionally correct procedure which this House always upheld and in the interest of the maintenance on the part of Your Honour of the right procedure being in operation at all times, and also or the desire that the Other Place may not regard us as not knowing what we are doing and the House of Assembly to be ridiculed in public, that Your Honour should give (and rather it is your boundened duty to give) a clear ruling to the House on this issue.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member who has just spoken began by saying that he was not attempting to question the ruling of the Chairman. He then concluded by asking me to give a ruling.

Now, I would just like to read from May's Parliamentary Practice on page 235 (fifteenth edition) for the benefit of hon. members who very frequently call for the assistance of Mr. Speaker, when the affairs of the Committee are being conducted

under the Chairman of Committees. That practice is becoming very frequent in this House and there is no validity whatsoever for it. Hon. members must understand that the Chairman of Committees has as much power when he is in the Chair as Mr. Speaker, and there is no question of an appeal from the ruling of the Chairman of Committees to Mr. Speaker.

The passage from page 235 of May's which I want to read to you is as follows:—

"The opinion of the Speaker cannot be sought in the House about any matter arising or likely to arise in a Committee."

If hon. members wanted Mr. Speaker's opinion as to what they may consider as an irregularity or of a happening in Committee, there is another provision in May's whereby they can go to him and get a private opinion. In other words, this is not like a Court of Appeal where you appeal from the Chairman of Committees to the Speaker.

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

On re-assembling,

QUESTION

Mr. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, before you begin the business of the House, I would like to ask the questions which I intended asking earlier.

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

Mr. F. E. MILLER: I beg to give notice of the following questions:—To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works & Housing:—

Will the Hon. Minister consider the necessity of having both the half-hour and hour 'bus service now operating on the Ellerton, Drax Hall route, passing through East Layne, (Blenman's Hill) St. George, (instead of having the hour bus pass through Old Works Hill) so as to improve the transport facilities in the area

2. Will the Minister also consider taking steps to have both the in and out night trips on this particular route extended on Sundays and week days at least an hour or two later?

3. Will the Minister exploit the possibilities of a reduction on the fares of school-children using the said route, as is done on other routes?

To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:—

Will the Hon. Minister consider the installation of standposts in the following districts in St. George:—

(1) Cole Hole
(2) "Cross Roads" South District
(3) "Blenman's Hill" Ellerton

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY C'TD.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of Committees will be a little late; and I am going to move that the hon. senior member for St. Andrew be Chairman of Committees *pro tem.*

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

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

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, before the House resumes Committee, I would like to ask Your Honour whether the Resolution under which we are going to resume Committee is in order. Some time in August last year we passed a vote for $30,000 for the Governor-in-Executive Committee to pay for gasoline, wages and for taking over the buses for a period of two weeks. Since that time no money Resolution under the Act of Parliament has been before this House. Later on, we said the Transport Board should have full power to borrow money or to raise loans as they thought fit, and passed over the buses which the Government had taken over to the Transport Board, which is in the same position, as let us say, a limited liability or any other kind of corporation except one created by Statute. In the Resolution which is before the House, Mr. Speaker, it speaks about the sum of $120,729 to be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1956/57 Part I Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1956/57, No. 9 which forms the schedule to this Resolution; and for Your Honour's information, on the vote which has already probably been drawn to Your Honour's attention, there is no such Supplementary Resolution No. 9 other than the one presently engaging the attention of the House. It would appear as merely carrying out something which we had already voted, whereupon we would be asked to vote this money when not even a token vote was inserted in the Appropriation Bill for this purpose; and although Section 15 of the Transport Board Act does give the Transport Board the power to borrow money, there is no correlative power in the act to advance money from the Treasury. It is very, very important that we should not appropriate money from the Treasury unless authorised by law or by an Amendment made to the Appropriation Act itself, and therefore I would ask Your Honour's ruling as to whether we can rightly resume Committee on a matter which has been brought to the House in the proper way. Now, Sir, I have suggestions to make and probably they will fall on deaf ears, maybe because the understanding of members of the Government is imperfect in financial matters, but there is nothing at all to prevent Government from coming here and asking for a loan to lend the Transport Board and then the Transport Board under Statutory authority and under statutory duty can then spend that money in such a way as they may think fit. There is nothing to prevent them from doing that. Here is a Resolution for money to be taken from under two separate heads, one for Capital from Loan Funds and the other for Current Expenditure, all dealt with under the same Resolution. Mr. Speaker, there is something else to which I would like to draw your attention. The Appropriation Act has been passed. It is now an Act of Parliament, and there is no Head 36 at all. No wonder, therefore, that members will be misled when they see Head 36, Transport, something which was never provided for in the Appropriation Bill, and my submission is, in view of the submission which I have made, that it would be improper at this stage—not to say misleading and completely erroneous—to resume Committee on this matter which has not been brought to the House in a proper way. I would like to make the position clear. We are only asking that the approval of Parliament be sought in a constitutional manner. It was competent for the Government at the time of the Annual Estimates to put in a token vote of one dollar to advance money from time to time out of the Treasury if the Transport Board needed it, and I dare say it would be competent to return to the House from time for an advance to the Transport Board on the Authority of the token Resolution which had been inserted in the Appropriation Act

That I do not question for one moment; but to take money out of your Public Treasury to the tune of $180,000 in this manner would be completely irregular and unconstitutional. I do not know what reasons the Government had during the Estimates for leaving out Head 36 and not even putting in a token Resolution, but I would like to remind Your Honour that when money was voted recently for the Transport Board, it was not yet in existence. It was an emergency. You can say we are going to lend money for this purpose and that. That is the position, Sir, and therefore I would be very glad if Your Honour would give some direction at this stage which is a completely new phase in the debate which the Government now seeks to take.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has asked for a ruling regarding the legality of the Committee committing itself to the expenditure involved in the Resolution. I must point out to the hon. member as I earlier pointed out, to the hon. senior member for St. Philip that the Chairman has already made a ruling. This Chamber is no place for double rulings. In May's Parliamentary Treatise, Fifteenth Edition Chapter 12, Page 235" "The opinion of the Speaker cannot be sought in the House about any matter arising or likely to arise in Committee."

If I happened to have been in the Chair and I gave a ruling which was not pleasing to hon. members, they have it in their power to deal with me on a substantive motion. Similarly, when the Chairman is in his Chair and he happens to give a ruling which is displeasing to the Committee, they can on a substantive motion deal with the Chairman. I do not intend in spite of the elaborate explanation given by the hon. senior member for St. George to give a ruling. All that the hon. member is saying points to the fact that he disagrees with the ruling of the Chairman.

6.15 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of Order

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no point of Order; the hon. member is out of Order to speak at this stage. I am about to put the question.

The question that the hon. senior member for St. Andrew be Chairman of Committees during the absence of the Chairman of Committees was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

Transport Ct'd.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Madame Chairman,—

Hon. M. E. COX: Madam Chairman, I had not finished speaking on the adjournment.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: On the adjournment, the hon. senior member for St. Michael, the Hon. Minister of Communications, was speaking.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Madam Chairman, the position is this: the Chairman of Committees specifically gave an undertaking that during the interim of the adjournment, he would give a Ruling.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member take his seat and allow the hon. senior member for St. Michael to continue speaking?

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of Order. I regard it as being more than an accident that the Chairman of Committees has not resumed the Chair.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Is that a point of Order?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am going on to explain. When the Hon. Leader of the House made the motion for the adjournment, the Chairman of Committees welcomed it and said that he would use the interim of the adjournment to give the House an explanation of the matter then before it. Now that the House has resumed its sitting, the Chairman of Committees is not to be found; he has disappeared.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: I am not entertaining what the hon. member is saying; the hon. senior member for St. Michael may proceed.

Mr. CRAWFORD: These tricks cannot always be successful.

Hon. M. E. COX: On the adjournment, I had got down to the point where the Government had been keeping separate accounts in respect of the various concessions taken over. I pointed out that the answer to that particular question asked by the hon. junior member for Christ Church as to whether the Government had been keeping separate accounts in respect of the various units taken over, was "Yes". I have already said that there was a deficiency of $95,000. That answers the 11th question asked by the hon. member.

I should like at this stage to say that in addition to the matter of the purchasing of this Diesel Motor Bus, quite recently—last week, I should say—I was interviewed by a representative of Faulkner's Company Limited of England who re-condition buses and sell them. They are buses similar to those which were recently imported by the Lincoln Bus Company. Some of these buses are gasolene motors. The representative pointed out that these buses are obtainable for approximately $3,800 each. It has been decided to consult the Crown Agents with a view to finding out whether these buses are of the type which are suitable for this purpose. The reason for that is obvious.

Soon after these buses were taken over—it was about three months after—the Director of Highways and Transport represented that we would need at least 51 new units to improve the Transport service, and recently we have been pressed by the Transport Board for an additional 15 units. As you will see, Madam Chairman, units at $25,000 each will represent a colossal sum, and it is hoped that we would obtain some of these re-conditioned units provided, of course that they are in a first-class condition and have a life of 5 to 7 years. Having regard to our financial commitments, it may be that we could purchase a few of these buses so as to carry on the Transport service. I should like to emphasize that it is not the Government's intention to purchase any more gasolene motors. We have found—that Trinidad is concentrating very seriously on these Diesel motors, and so is the case of Jamaica.

Honourable members are aware of the fact that in Jamaica the British Electric Traction Company controls the Kingston and St. Andrew areas, and that Company is solely responsible for the Transportation service in those areas. I think they have over 80 or 90 of these motors Mr. [E. D. MOTTLEY: That is private enterprise] and the Government subsidises that Company very heavily in that the units are imported duty free; gasolene, tyres, spare parts, everything they get free of duty. You can quite understand to what extent that Company is being subsidised by the Government. All these units are Diesel motors, and as I pointed out earlier, in Trinidad, they are also concentrating on the use of these Diesel motors. I think that we should fall into line with these Colonies in this matter. As you know, quite a number of people who visit these Islands will not be in a position to hire taxis, and they would like to sit in comfortable and modern coaches. It is therefore proposed to concentrate on these Diesel motors and, as I have already said, if these units are good, the Government will at a later stage come to

this House and ask for a sum of money to purchase a certain number of them.

I have a brochure of these re-conditioned "Diesel" motors as well as of the re-conditioned "Bedford" motors which I will pass around to honourable members.

6.25 p.m.

In my closing remarks, I would like to assure honourable members that I have outlined as lucidly as possible the bus transport system as it is today, and I would like to say what we all know and must admit: that the transport services in general in this island are not as up-to-date as we would like. But that has always been the case. It is quite easy for people to criticise the Government and we have quite a few who are always eager to throw mud at the Government whenever the opportunity avails itself.

One would have thought, reading the *Advocate* newspaper sometime ago, that no bus owner ever repaired any buses at all, because in an issue of that newspaper, there were pictures of at least four chassis of buses out of which the engines were taken for repairs. I am sure that the former owners had repaired those engines and in doing so had lifted them out of the chassis and had done other things, but according to the *Advocate*, it appears as only since the Government took over the buses that repairs are effected to them.

From time to time people have spoken of the inconvenience experienced in getting buses on schedule. That complaint has also been made against the former bus owners, and more so in their case. I am sure, Madam Chairman, we are providing today a better service than was formerly provided. For example, of the ten buses which we took over from the Progressive Bus Company, the owner used only four regularly; the others were only used at peak hours and excursions. We ran all ten. I can tell this Committee that people from as far as Martins Bay have come to me and said how much they appreciate the service which the Government is giving them. They have said that in the days before Government took the buses over they could only get a mid-day bus to take them to Martins Bay. I have letters written to me telling me of the improvement in that service and that the people from down there can now get a mid-day bus. I have also information from people in St. Philip as well as from St. Bartholomew to the effect that people from that part of the country had to walk as far down as Oistins on many occasions to get a bus when the former concessionaires were operating on those routes. Nowadays they get at least a half-hourly bus service passing that way. I can speak from my own experience of the Collymore Rock Route. Sometimes you had to wait an hour before you got a bus on that route when the former owners were operating those buses; now, you get one almost every quarter hour. Left and right, Madam Chairman, there have been quite a lot of improvements: but it must be appreciated that never mind how rich a Government or a concessionaire may be, he cannot provide buses in sufficient number to meet the needs of peak hours when those hours arrive. There will always be people waiting to get buses to take them to and from work in the morning between 7 o'clock and 8 o'clock, and in the afternoon between 4 o'clock and 5 o'clock, because it will be uneconomical for one to find sufficient buses to take off the people at those peak hours. As far as I can see, that situation will remain so for a long time.

Madam Chairman, I am sure that the bus service has improved. I think when Messrs Eckstein Bros. used to run buses, they had 39 and of that number they used 20 regularly; the remainder were used for charter bus purposes, and a few were taken out to be used at the peak hours. Nowadays, of that service, we run 30, and only one or two are kept to relieve a bus if it breaks down.

I do know that whenever you get changes you will get opposition. I do know that there has been quite a lot of opposition whipped up against the Government and against the Transport Service by people who do not want to see the Government running that service. The Press and big business no doubt, have been behind this and have been using their influence on this bus business. I want to say that even recently there has been a great all-round improvement. It has been found necessary to reprimand, discipline and in some cases dismiss certain employees of the Transport Board, and I know that some members will raise these questions: but again, I wish to say that in all undertakings such as that, you will no doubt find some "bad eggs" among the crowd, and you will have to weed them out as quickly as possible. I think I am correct in saying that there were some employees of this Board who were dismissed by some former employers who could not be employed by those concessionaires for half a minute. After the Transport Board took over the buses, the names of those persons were submitted to the Board for employment. Well, the reason for that is obvious; therefore, it is necessary to do some cleaning up.

I will assure hon. members that the situation at the Transport Board is nothing like what is represented in the Press, by people who no doubt do not want to see the bus service run by the Government, and by people whose only aim is to throw mud at the Government.

I want to assure this Committee that nothing which has been said against me or this Government can stick anywhere because we are sure that we have been acting in the interest of the people, bearing in mind the cost of living and that we do not want to do anything to increase it. As a matter of fact, we said in the Five Year Plan that we were not going to increase bus fares and we stuck to that.

6.35 p.m.

No amount of criticism, abuse, lies, slander or anything like that will ever change any intention I have about anything. I want that to be known crystal clear. None at all! I am accustomed to slander and it can go on indefinitely; it just rolls off, like water on a duck's back. I pay it no attention at all as long as I am satisfied the thing is right: and in the interest of the community and more particularly in the interest of the poorer class of people especially, I am prepared to support it.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Madam Chairman, if we were attending a Company Meeting instead of this Assembly, and this were the Annual General Meeting, after the display of the Directors which are the Ministers and the Government, they would be called on to resign, each and everyone. In a private company they would have to get out and that is the big difference between nationalised industries and private enterprise companies. For the Minister to get up here for the past two hours or more and even at the very end to say that the bus service today is better than when it was taken over; well, each and every member in this Chamber including the gallery can answer that. Madam Chairman, I realised the nature of this debate and for that reason I furnished the Minister with a series of questions which I told him I would be requiring him to answer today. I gave them to him this morning in writing so that he could prepare them, and I am going to read them

because he has attempted to answer some, but I notice when he got down to No. 12 he stopped.

The first question was: "What is the policy of the Government in connection with the Transport of the island?"

The answer to that is still "they do not know." They have declared today that they have not taken over for the purpose of nationalisation. They just took them over because they said they had to. They did not have to. They took them over because they claimed that the concessionaires were making adequate profits, and they were not prepared to increase the fares of the public, and they were going to show the concessionaires and the public that they can do a better job. Well, have they done a better job?

Question 2 is "how many concessions were there on the 10th August, 1955?"

Mr. Chairman resumed the Chair at this point.

Mr. TUDOR: I rise on a point of Order. When Your Honour was last sitting in that seat, you left us with the promise that you would seek clarification on the issue and that when you returned to your place would give it to us. Are you not in a position to favour this Committee with the ruling you sought?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member wanted to know the reason for Head XXXVI. There was no such Head XXXVI in the Estimates. In this particular Resolution the amount being asked for is a new Head and the Government saw fit to bring it under Head XXXVI because there is nowhere in the Estimates to put it. They had to bring in a Resolution under a Head and it being a new Head they brought it under Head XXXVI.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of Order. What is the senior member for St. Michael doing behind you?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Allow me to speak if you want me to speak. The hon. member must take his seat. Head XXXVI formerly was Transport Board, now merged with the Department of Highways and Transport [A VOICE: In what way?] Don't you know the way? Head XXXVI is new so that is the reason for Head XXXVI that they are referring to.

Mr. BARROW: I do not think you understand the question on which I sought Your Honour's ruling, I did not know you were going to come back and consult the senior member for St. Michael.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have not consulted the member for St. Michael.

Mr. BARROW: I am sorry, I did not know he would gratuitously offer his advice.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to warn you that you should not accuse people of things. That mind of yours you should leave at the bottom of the stairs when you come here.

Mr. BARROW: What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that the estimates you have before you are not for the present financial year because there is no Head for Highways and Transport in the Estimates for this year; but moreover, Your Honour will understand, I do not think I made myself sufficiently clear on the issue I was putting for Your Honour's ruling and it was this: under what authority was this Resolution being set now before the House, not where was Head XXXVI, because I know there was no Head XXXVI? I am asking under what statutory authority you are asking to take money out of the Treasury.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You said there was no Head XXXVI.

Mr. BARROW: I explained to you it could not come under Head XXXVI because there was no Head XXXVI and I want an indication under what statutory authority this money is to be voted. All the money in the Estimates for 1956—57 was voted by this House in the Appropriation Bill which is now the law of the land. That is the point which I was making. I do not think you understand or I did not make myself sufficiently clear.

If there is no Head XXXVI in the Estimates, then there is no law. Therefore, I would like to know under which law we are expecting the Colonial Treasurer to pay out this money.

6.45 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I take it that after we have passed the Estimates and you want to bring down a Resolution for money, you would have to bring it down under a certain Head and this is a new Head. In other words, I would have to say that this is new money. [*Laughter*].

Mr. BARROW: I do not know whether they are going to print this money or not. [*Laughter from the Visitors' Gallery*].

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to say a few words to the visitors in the Gallery. The visitors in the Gallery are not allowed to shout or to laugh when they are there; they must sit quietly and listen to the debates.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the jocular manner in which you answered the question provoked mirth. However, that is by the way. I would like to know what is the legal sanction for this expenditure of public funds out of the Treasury. I am not asking for the Head of the Estimates which they have invented, and you have suggested that they are inventing the money as well; I think I have made myself quite clear. The Appropriation Act authorises money to be taken out of the Treasury for the year, and unless you have a Supplementary Resolution for something which is already in the Act, you cannot create a new Head in this way. I do not think that you should allow yourself to be misled by the blandishments of any of the members on that side of the House; they cannot make the illegal legal.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I think that this farce has gone on quite long enough. I have told the hon. member before that whatever happens in the Law Courts, let him keep out of law when in the House, because whenever he opens his mouth on the law, he is always wrong. What has the hon. member said? He says that once you have passed an Appropriation Act, you cannot spend any more money.

Mr. BARROW: The hon. member is building up a thesis to destroy himself. He is misquoting me; is he giving a Ruling?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The hon. member said that outside the Heads of the Estimates and the Appropriation Act, you cannot spend any money. We will all see what he said when the Report of the debates comes out. [Mr. BARROW: You will have edited the debates by that time.] Anybody who has been called to the Bar should be ashamed to let what the hon. member has said come out of his mouth. The Crown can come to the House and ask for money at any time; you do not pass a law saying that the Crown can ask for money. It is no wonder that we get these guffaws from the hon. senior member for St. Philip and the honourable junior member for St. Lucy. We have passed the Estimates, and we put a sum of money in the Appropriation Act; that money is appropriated to the service of the Crown for the year. On the day after, you may have a disaster, it may be a hurricane or, suddenly, you may make up your mind to set up an Atom Bomb Station or anything you like. If you have not got a Head in the Estimates, must you not create a new Head? The Draughtsman remembered that we used to have a Head in connection with Transport; that Head was wiped out because the Transport Board was amalgamated with the Highways Board. You have a gap

between Head XXXV and Head XXXVII of the Estimates, and what is more appropriate than to create a new Head which would be a Head in respect of Transport? I would guarantee that the average bright child who comes in here, and knows anything as to how money is spent by the Government would be able to answer the question. No such child could possibly say that you need a Statute to enable the Crown to come to the Legislature for money. [Mr. BARROW: For this money.] You do not need any Statute for any money for which you are asking.

If there is no Statute creating a Head, then you ask for a Supplementary vote under a new Head. We come down for a Supplementary Estimate and put in a fresh Head; We can put in the Head "Atom Bomb Research". The honourable member would then ask: "Where is the authority for doing that?" Mr. Chairman, do you think that I feel happy, being a Barrister myself, when I hear a man who has been called to the Bar making such elementary mistakes which a boy attending a Primary school should be ashamed of making, and apparently being taken seriously? I repeat: the Crown can ask for money at any time for anything, and it is up to Parliament to abolish it or grant it. For somebody who, as far as we know has been called to the Bar, to ask for the Statutory authority under which the Crown has asked for money, and complain that in a new Resolution you have not got any Head under which to put it, well, I do not know that anything could be more farcical than that. This tells you that it needs a new Head because no old Head is there. It is time to stop this sort of thing, Election year or no Election year; it is time for anybody to stop displaying such invincible ignorance as the honourable member displays.

Mr. BARROW: The honourable member has made a reference to my legal ability. If I am not displaying that ability, he must be a little patient with me. It did not take me the long number of years which it took him to get through the Bar Finals, because I was a bit more in a hurry than he was. I should like to say that personal abuse is no answer to criticism and the sooner the honourable member learns that, the better it will be for him. He took the longest time to qualify at the Bar; with such depravity coming from that side of the House from a man who has won a Scholarship illegally, well, such a person would not be concerned with the exigencies of Parliamentary procedure at this stage. If the foundation was bad, then the superstructure must be also bad.

For the honourable member to get up and give a ruling for Your Honour is an attempt to subvert the authority of the Chair. Of course, if Your Honour accepts the ruling, well, I will accept it. Let him get up and tell his colleagues and his satellites how much time he took to do his Bar Exams.

6.55 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am appealing to the honourable member.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: For the honourable member's benefit, although it is purely personal, but for his satisfaction let him go and look up the records and he will see that I never began to take my Bar Examinations until my last year. I read law at Oxford University but that has nothing to do with that. Before the honourable member begins to raise his points let him look up the records.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, ———

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable junior member for Christ Church will continue to speak.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am entitled to make a personal explanation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable senior member for St. Philip is out of order.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Am I not entitled to make an explanation?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am saying that you are out of order.

Mr. CRAWFORD: How am I out of order?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am saying that the honourable junior member for Christ Church will continue to speak.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am entitled to make a personal explanation now.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the honourable senior member for St. Philip for the second time to take his seat and to let the honourable junior member for Christ Church continue to speak.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, ———

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am saying ———

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable senior member for St. Philip must take his seat. The honourable junior member for Christ Church gave way for the honourable junior member for St. Lucy. I am saying that the honourable junior member for Christ Church must continue to speak.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Who gave way for the honourable senior member for St. Joseph? He just got up and ran the Chair and everything. I have never heard this thing in Parliament all my life.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: For the third time I am calling on the honourable senior member for St. Philip to take his seat and to allow the honourable junior member for Christ Church to finish his speech. The honourable senior member for St. Philip will have his opportunity to speak later.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, my second question was how many Concessionaires applied on the 10th August, 1955 and in the reply by the Hon. Minister of Communications, he said that there were fourteen.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am entitled to rise on a point of explanation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what is the honourable member speaking?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am speaking on a point of explanation. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph in his fulminations against honourable members referred to the honourable junior member for St. Lucy and myself because we could not agree with his reasoning on the Resolution before us. He went on to say that if the Government wanted to set up and Atom Bomb Research Station they could bring in a new Head and ask for the money to set it up. He is perfectly correct because we have no Atom Bomb Research Station.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is that a point of explanation?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I want to explain to the satisfaction of the House and the Committee as well as the honourable senior member for St. Joseph that it does not mean by one passing his Bar Examination that he has all the sense. If, Mr. Chairman, you had previously created an Atom Bomb Research Authority——— —

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of explanation.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Am I not entitled to explain for the benefit of the Committee? I merely got up to show the waste of time of the village lawyer. I was saying, Sir, that previously in this House when we had a question as regards expenditure of that Transport Board Authority we were told by the Hon. Minister of Communications that he could not answer the question then; he had to wait until he got a statement from the authority. In other words, having once established an authority, in financial matters concerning that authority you must get a statement from that authority itself first.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of Order. I think the honourable member is misleading the Committee. What I said then was that the matter was *sub judice* and that according to the Transport Act, a statement of expenditure must be laid on the Table of the House at the end of the Year's working of the Transport Board. I have never said what the honourable member has just said.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member was asked about the expenditure of the Board.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of explanation. You got up to reply to the remarks about village lawyers.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Well, I am telling you now————

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You got up and said that you wanted to give a personal explanation and I gave you the opportunity.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have not made it yet.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Well make it now.

Mr. CRAWFORD: For the honourable member to come in here and abuse people————

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You got up to make a personal explanation; do make it now.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am suggesting that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has attempted to pull matters of procedure in this House down to the level which one does not associate with this Parliament. When the time comes I will reply to the nonsense he talked about the legality of the Resolution because he knows it is not right. At this stage, Mr. Chairman, I am justified in quoting what he said.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You can speak on that until morning when your turn comes. Allow the honourable junior member for Christ Church to continue.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, the next question — Question 4 — is to the effect as to what purpose the Government took over these concessions. Was it for the purpose of granting new and equivalent concessions? The Hon. Minister replied by saying "no." He said that they did not take them over with that view. I am saying that they did. Some applications were made but they were not entertained.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I did not say anything about they were not entertained. I made it crystal clear that they were not attended to because we did not know how much the buses were worth. I said that the applications still hold good up to today.

7.05 p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: He took them over to prove to the public that they could run them better than the existing concessionaires and at the same time to make a profit. Well, he has failed miserably in both. We have a much worse transport service to-day and it goes back to the type of transport when we had the fly buses. It is tantamount to that, and if his removal to Bay Street has caused him not to realise the hardships on the travelling public in Bridgetown, I would invite him at half past three any afternoon to leave the Ministerial Buildings and come down in his car and watch outside here or opposite Dr. Storey's and see how the public gets home and say whether it is his idea that the twenty-five minutes or hour and a half spent in the morning to catch a bus and another hour and a half to catch a bus back home is deserving of keeping the fares down by half-cent. That is his economics, but I believe each and every person of the travelling public were prepared and are prepared to pay to get a ride home or to work as soon as they come out of their doors as possible, but that does not obtain today. It has got worse: and with this statement that the buses are in better shape than they were with the old concessionaires. I am only going to make this one statement and say how false that is. How many buses have been licensed today. Now, today is the 3rd of July, and in the month of June every vehicle should be licensed and in the former days they were licensed when owned by private individuals and those existing concessionaires today have licensed everyone. Today out of 116 buses which they have—I will admit they have some in the grave yard, and they have some with engines out—I would like to know how many are licensed. I have made enquiries and I will tell him. In St. Michael they have licensed 34. Now, you have 106 buses and may be you have licensed some in the other parishes, but surely with 34 buses licensed today you are doing something and breaking the law that no concessionaire could have done. Under the old practice, concessionaires had to have their buses up to standard in June when they would go to the Parochial Treasurer with their forms from the Transport Board and their Insurance certificates to pay their licences. Todays you have licensed 34 in the parish of St. Michael. Of course, I will allow for some that might be licensed in St. Philip or some other parish. What are the others doing? Are you telling me that the buses are running without licences and that it is a better system than the old one? You may draw your conclusions but the public will draw them differently. That is what is happening today! I do not know if they are licensed and the pedestrians are becoming impatient. That is the type of transport we have today. What are the reasons for Government retaining certain concessions and yet making application for funds for the nationalisation of the island transport service? This is nine months since the taking over of the buses and we have heard for the first time they hope that at the earliest moment they will find someone from somewhere after their operation who will take over those buses and run the service as they direct. Well, they have found someone to take back his buses and the honourable member has proved today that that man is a very happy man who was making money and whose intention it was not to give up his buses. He said the gentleman took them back as they were at the time. Now, I am in a position to state that that is also false. They were directed over at the Transport Board to put these buses in top form, and if necessary to put in new engines; and I understand there were some new engines put in, and I do know they worked on them into the wee hours of the morning and delivered them at 12 o'clock. I do not think they could have delivered all at the same time because they were not in good condition to hand them back. So when the Minister gets up and says that the former proprietor was anxious to get them back and took them as they were, that is contrary to what we know to be the facts. They were worked on and actually a direction went out to the mechanics to put them in top shape and if necessary put in new engines. [A VOICE: From J & R?] You cannot throw any red-herring across my trail; I will continue with this. I know it hurt and it would hurt any Minister who had feelings to have to take what he has to take today, but he has started off wrong, he has continued wrong, and he is still blundering on.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am sorry to interrupt the honourable member but can he tell me since when the Transport Board is a Government Department?

7.15 p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: It is directed as if it were a Government Department. It has gone from bad to worse; it was conceived in spite and nothing will succeed that is taken over like that.

The honourable member made a statement, and he read out that the Commission of Enquiry had

said that they were unable to arrive at adequate conclusions because some of the Concessionaires were unable to furnish adequate figures. However, the honourable member did not say that there was at least one Concessionaire who could have furnished every conceivable figure which they could have wanted and did furnish it; he could have come to conclusions from that Report of Concessionaires, but he neglected to say that. I am pointing out that they have two Reports, one from the Director of Highways and Transport, and one from their appointed Committee, but they went against the express views of the Committee's Report and they said that they were bringing somebody from Trinidad to make a third Report. Where are we going? When this person has finished reporting and he tells you to put the Transport system of this Island on a proper footing — you will have to do that some day—it may cost you $4 million or $5 million, and what are you going to say? Are you going to get rid of the existing conditions under which the Transport system is operated now? Are you going to turn back the Transport service to be run by the former Concessionaires or even new Concessionaires?

The Auditor has made a Report to the end of March and the figures quoted show a loss by this Transport Department of the sum of $170,000. [Hon. M. E. COX: That is not true.] I am surprised to hear the Hon. Minister say that the Board has only lost $95,000, and he went on to explain that most of that money was due to increase wages and salaries of the employees. Some day, we will know the whole story. Twelve months will soon be up; we still have three more months to go. I can only hope that we will have profit and loss accounts properly audited as soon as possible and that will be another imposition even bigger than this one; many of the facts which are being withheld today will be exposed on that occasion.

I asked the Hon. Minister if, when the Transport Board took over these concessions, they operated them individually, and his answer to that question was "Yes". If that is so, then he could have gone on to answer my further questions. These are the important ones which he did not answer; question No. 11 was: "If so, will Government state what profits and or losses were made in respect of each concession retained?" That question has not been answered; perhaps, he will give the information to me up to the end of December or March or to the end of May. From my own deductions, I do not know where they are going. My next question was this: "What is the gross revenue from fares, advertising and other sources?" That would be up to the end of March or June. I would be grateful if these figures were available because we should be in a position to know the other things we are going to have.

The next question was this: "What were the expenses in respect of the following:— (a) Repairs, (b) Licences; (c) Rent, Light, water and telephone, (d) Salaries, (e) Stationery and printing; (f) Insurance (g) Wages; (h) Gasolene and Oil; (i) Tyres and tubes; (j) Legal and accident suits; (k) Depreciation on buses; (l) Depreciation on Machinery; (m) Depreciation on Furniture; (n) Depreciation on Tools."

The Hon. Minister has not furnished one figure in respect of any of these items, yet he told us that they have kept the accounts separately for each concession taken over. I would like to know how they could have kept separate accounts for each concession when I have seen a National bus up in Oistins and in Cave Hill, and indeed as far afield as St. Philip? I do not know if these accounts are kept in respect of each bus or group of buses in respect of each route.

Question No. 14, was this: "Are there any outstanding debts? If so, what is the amount of such debts, and to whom are they owing?" [Hon. M. E. COX: "J & R." is included] [*Laughter*] I am very pleased to know that I am included, but if the hon. member kept accounts like that, even up to the end of March, he would have furnished the information, but he has not done so.

The next question was this (a) "How many of the buses at present retained by Government have passed the annual inspection? (b) How many are in operation to date? (c) How many are unserviceable?"

Do you not think that that would have been helpful information to be given even at 12 o'clock today? Can the hon. member furnish that information even at this late hour?

At this stage it would be interesting to note that under the Transport system of this Island, buses have to be inspected by the Police every quarter. Have the Police inspected any of these buses during the last two quarters prior to this one? It is within my knowledge that this inspection has lapsed, and we are only now having a partial annual inspection of these buses. The danger to the travelling public and to pedestrians is becoming greater, and we have an improved bus service according to the standard of the Hon. Minister of Transport!

The last question I asked the Hon. Minister was this: "By what authority and under what conditions were the Progressive Buses handed back to Mr. Birch?"

Well, I have dealt with that matter already, and, Mr. Chairman, you have heard what the Hon. Minister has said; he has said that the Progressive buses were handed back to Mr. Birch under the same conditions and the same state in which they were when he applied on the last occasion.

7.25 p.m.

Hon M. E. COX: I did not say that.

Mr. GODDARD: You said that they were returned to him and he was so anxious to get them back that he took them as they were. [A VOICE: With new engines.] Yes, with instructions to the mechanics to have them put in top condition even if new engines had to be put in them.

Hon. M. E. COX: Who gave those instructions?

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, the Minister's whole defence of the Transport System has been the type of criticism that the employers in Barbados are the most vicious and scandalous imaginable he has known. He attempts to say that the Transport System as run by the Transport Board has been sabotaged by big business. That has been his whole defence. He attempts to say that they have got into this difficulty because of big business trying to intimidate the employees of the Transport Board so as to see that the conditions over there are unfavourable as can be. Of course he includes the Press. He is trying to throw mud on somebody. It is a most vicious thing to do and if that were the attitude of Governments in the past, not only business in this Island but business in the other neighbouring Islands will be afraid to have dealings with this Government because they will never know what they are going to get. When you are wrong, say that you are wrong.

The gentleman from Trinidad whom they are now asking to come and give them a third report is the Licensing Authority of that colony. Did he not visit here a few months ago (it might be for two days) to give the Government a little idea of what type of transport would be more suitable for this Island? I was very pleased to hear the Hon. Minister say that this gentleman spoke highly of the type of buses we have operating here and the system that is now operated in Trinidad as well as in Jamaica, but the Hon. Minister did not tell us that the

Transport system both in Trinidad and Jamaica is being run privately and not by Government. Those two colonies had a Government Transport system formerly and they both failed; so both of those Governments eventually realised that running a transport service was something for private industry to do; so they turned it over to private enterprise.

At one moment he says that the former concessionaires made money out of the business and will continue to make money under the existing conditions, but after that he comes back and tells us that although Government is running a better service, it is losing money. Is it not that Government cannot run the system?

I will draw to his attention that the Vestry of St. Michael has not got one penny from the Government this year by way of taxation on the transport system. In the past we have been in the happy position of getting trade returns from the concessionaires who operated in St. Michael. When the Vestry of St. Michael was laying its rates this year it expected to get trade tax on something like $30,000 profit from the bus companies. When the Assessor approached the Transport Board for its trade returns and the Vestry was hoping and expecting from the Board a trade return because Government said that they would make money and that was the reason they took them over, the Assessor came back to the Vestry and said that the Board reported a loss [A VOICE: Who said that?] That meant that the Vestry of St. Michael has not received one penny from the bus business this year although all along, from the time Messrs Eckstein Bros. were running the buses, bus companies have paid taxes in St Michael. Now, the first year that Government has taken them over, they have returned a loss, and as a result, they are not paying any taxes. They are using a Government Department, the workshop of the Department of Highways and Transport, they have had already $30,000 which is already gone and they have come now for $110,000 which is an amount that can only buy tyres and all of that, to run the Transport service. Do you not realise that this amount which you have come for is inadequate? You should at least come for a sum to carry you through to the end of the year. Is it your intention to run up bills in order to carry on?

Mr. Chairman, I do not have to say much more on the existing transport system and the types of buses, because apart from the Hon. Minister of Transport, everyone else realises that the buses are not only dirty, filthy and want painting badly but the engines want repairing because they misfire, back-fire, catch afire and stop on the roads daily. It is seldom a morning that I come to work that there is not a bus on the road waiting for something to tow it back into the yard of the Highways and Transport.

If I may get on with the other parts of the Resolution, I see that Government has come down for $25,000 to buy a single diesel bus to show the public what comfort in travelling really means. When you buy that one bus, I hope you will take into account the size of the bus and that you will not have to bring down a Bill to amend the present law to make provision for a wider size bus. Does Government feel satisfied that this type of bus which you are getting down is the right type? You say that you are getting it for the public to see the type of comfort in travelling they will get in the future. Is that a little hold-out to the public so that when the time comes for Government to say that it wants 120 of those buses to put the public transport on a proper system that the people will be in a better mood to ask their representatives to vote the money, and let something else that they have promised in the past to the people wait a little longer?

However, Sir, we will wait for the report of this gentleman who is to come from Trinidad. Government has stated tonight that it is not their intention to nationalise the bus service of this Island and that they are hoping as soon as a settlement as to the payment of these buses is reached that they will find concessionaires who will come forward to take back certain of these bus routes and run them.

7.35 p.m.

But he goes on today and says that Government intends to keep a few. What purpose would that serve if they keep even one? What would be the purpose of that? He did make that statement about keeping one or two! If I am wrong I would like him to clarify that. What are the few they are going to keep and for what purpose? Where do you propose making your bus terminal for this purpose? Where? What size will these sheds be, and how many buses are expected to be housed in these sheds? If it is possible to furnish that information we would be grateful. As regards the honoraria of $750 there were many persons who in the take over had quite a lot of arduos duties to perform at odd hours, day and night, and I see that the sum of $750 is to recompense these persons. Would it be possible for you to say how many persons you intend to recompense because the question was once asked by some member of this House—I forget who it was—whether it was the intention of the Government to recompense the Director of Highways and Transport for the amount of work he had to put into the initial stages and a reply came that that was part of his duties and no recompense to him was contemplated. There may be junior staff; and if it can be said how many there are, we, on this side of the Table would be very grateful for that information. The amount for legal expenses is a revote and that is really outside of the questions I have asked, and I do not intend to go into that. But as regards accommodation for these buses I would like that information if he has got the questions clearly which I have stated: the size, where you intend to put it, for how many buses, and whether in one or other places, because it seems that until you can tell me how many buses you are going to house I will be content with that. Again, I regret I cannot share the Minister's happy views about the type of public transport that exist today, and I know that when the concessionaires ran these buses they had to conform to a standard that was so much higher than exist today that if one bus misfired twice, the road inspectors were asked to take that bus off. Not only do they misfire today but I think they catch afire, and the buses are still put back on the road next day to take people out.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, because of my conviction that it is in the interest of this community that the public passenger transport system should be nationalised, Government is entitled to be entirely optimistic in respect to my support on this measure in the Resolution which is before us; but Sir, I must say that I was greatly perturbed to hear the Hon. Minister who is in charge of this make certain remarks this afternoon, because one felt that because it is the policy of a Socialist Government in the interest of the people to nationalise every essential commodity—One took it for granted—and particularly having heard the answers which were given to my questions earlier last year in connection with the nationalisation of public passenger transport, Government even if temporarily or lukewarmedly, halfheartedly were embarking upon complete nationalisation of the public passenger transport system of this colony: but the remark, Sir, of the

Minister which has caused me so much perturbation included this: that there is no question of Government being desirious of taking over the buses but simply a question of Government doing its best to keep down the cost of living; so Sir, let us consider that for a moment. "There was no question of Government desirious of taking over the buses." Well, Sir, either the Government is in favour of nationalisation or they are not in favour of nationalising essential utilities and when it was said by the Hon. Minister that there was no question of Government taking over the buses but that Government was doing his best to keep down the cost of living, it is an indication that the Minister does not appreciate the best means of keeping it down is by nationalisation of essential commodities; but of course, there is taking over and taking on and there are two important elements in respect of taking over. One is like taking over stock and barrel, and then you buy everything at wholesale price at a much cheaper rate than would obtain when you buy only the number which you require for the concessions which have been taken over. Again, of course, if Government is running a business, it does not have to make a profit. You want to run a business, it does not have to make a profit. You want to run a business efficiently and while they do not want to make a loss, undoubtedly you would not want, as would any of the big firms or even the small firms of this island insist on being able to show a profit. What you must insist on being able to show is that you have a satisfied contented public as a result of the units being run. But another aspect of it which is discouraging, Sir, is that from the very take over—and they had notice of it, it did not happen overnight; the matter of some weeks when the former concessionaires were asked to give up the buses and later to hold on for a sufficiently number of weeks while the frame work of a proper organisation would be constructed so that in the taking over they would run with efficiency and proper administration. To take over a series of concessions or concessionaires in respect of which each formerly had its own manager and to take the whole lot over without a manager at all! As you know this system started in September and it was only in mid-February that we heard of a manager being advertised for and appointed. Well, no bus service could ever be expected to run itself with everybody as a manager and everybody as a boss. The public should not be given the impression that this matter was being so managed or mismanaged as to get the public afraid of nationalisation and be made to believe that nationalisation is bound to be a failure.

7.45 p.m.

My contention is the reverse; there must be proper and adequate management in all spheres of business.

The other remark which the Hon. Minister made and which has caused me great concern, was that the Government always intended to get rid of some of these buses. That does not go to show that this question of real Socialist nationalisation finds very much favour either with the Hon. Minister himself or with the Government as a whole. That phrase is very direct and provocative. That is a point which goes very much against the Hon. Minister, because on the one hand he has told us that Mr. Birch so much welcomed back his buses, that he came for them, or that he sent for them in the dead of night; and that he used only 4 buses in the past, whereas the Government used 10. If Mr. Birch would use only 4 of his buses and keep the others in the garage, and the Government used each and every one of the 10 buses, you would have thought that they would not be justified in giving back Mr. Birch these buses unless there was an undertaking given to run all 10 of these buses. Of course, on the other hand, Mr. Birch has only one route on which to run these 10 buses and they must be usefully employed on this route. Now that the Government's fleet of buses have been depleted, I am forced to ask: what happens now? Does he keep 4 or 5 or 6 of these buses in constant use? We must be suffering as the public, if we are assured that no longer are the routes of this Island serving the travelling public of Barbados.

Under Part 1 of this Resolution, at paragraph 1 of the Transport Board up to 30th June, 1956, will amount to approximately $110,000. It has not been possible to calculate the amounts which will have to be provided for renewals and replacements."

I am wondering if 150 new tyres are all that are required to fit the Government's buses with tyres, because these tyres on the Government's buses are in a poor condition; that is to be regretted particularly now that the rainy season has set in. I have never seen such billiard-table tyres as I have seen on the Government's buses; I remember only a few weeks ago being called to Crumpton Street which was the scene of an accident between a bus running on the My Lord's Hill route, and one of General Traders' lorries. I went to the scene of the accident in my professional capacity; I happened to look at the tyres on that particular bus, and I have not seen tyres as absolutely bereft of threads as I saw on the bus. The public who travel on that route, and indeed the rest of the public should be protected against buses being run with thread-bare tyres of that sort. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that you will be able to help the Government with the adequate number of tyres of which they so obviously stand in need. I cannot see that 150 new tyres could be adequate to have the 106 units remaining under Government control properly fitted.

Paragraph 2 which deals with advice on re-organisation of the Transport system, refers to the sum of $2,245. I am not quite clear as to the length of time that this gentleman will be here, but one gets the impression that it might be rather long because the note refers to our contribution for his salary and pension. This is what is stated in the note:—

"It will also be necessary to provide for his salary and pension contribution or an honorarium whichever is preferred by the Government of Trinidad."

Anyhow the amount is in the vicinity of £500 and therefore, it does not call for any special comment.

Paragraph 3 of these notes says this:—

"There were certain members of the staff of the Department of Highways and Transport who were called on to work long and continuous hours in connection with the taking over of the buses. It is proposed to pay honoraria to these persons and for this purpose there is needed a total of $750.

That amount seems to be very small; it is only $750. I wonder if when the Hon. Minister rises again in this debate—I have no doubt that he will rise many times again—he will supply us with the breakdown of this amount. When we come to paragraph 4 of these notes, there is a re-vote in connection with the services of a Queen's Counsel to appear on behalf of the Government in any proceedings which may arise out of the taking over of the buses. I do think that the Government should be congratulated on having secured the services of such a distinguished Caribbean Queen's Counsel as Mr. Wooding for the reasonable fee of 1,000 guineas. I think that the Government is very fortunate in this respect; we all know the ability of Mr. Wooding as against our

Acting Attorney General. You will agree with me, Mr. Chairman, that this is money which will be well spent. Since the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has retired from the Bar, it is surprising for what a reasonable fee one can get a really good Counsel.

Under Capital Expenditure, we have the proposal to purchase this Diesel bus which will have a life of 10 years. This is the most intriguing part of this Resolution; if this 44 Seater Diesel bus becomes so popular with the public as the hon. member in charge of this Resolution anticipates, it is proposed that all the Government-operated buses should be 44 Seater Diesel buses until something better is evolved? Should we have selected routes—and in that case, knowing the Hon. Minister as I do, these Diesel buses would be in St. Michael—or it is proposed to have 44 Seater buses operating throughout the Island for these 5,000 guineas apiece? If that is accepted as the standard unit for the Transport system of this Island, then the private concessionaires will also be required to invest in these comfortable and commodious units. Obviously, that should be the case and if they decide that they cannot afford to do that, then it would be quite a simple matter for these concessionaires to hand over their buses to the Hon. Minister and let us achieve this full-blooded nationalisation of the Transport system. That is the only way in which the Transport service will be made to pay; the Government will be able to control all the routes and have efficient people employed in the running of the service.

7.55 p.m.

Let the Hon. Minister understand this: the best people to run any concern are the people who are the most fitted to do it. Those people may or may not be personal friends of the Minister or for that matter anybody else. Friendship should not count here as efficiency; the only test and criterion if you want the system to be a success and you do not want it to be a failure is efficiency.

Now, Sir, as regards the $75,500 for accommodation for omnibuses and workshops I have no quarrel about that, although I certainly, like the hon. member who preceded me on the floor of the House, lack information on the matter. We certainly should have been given detailed information on the $75,500 which is to be voted for this expenditure. The Hon. Minister should give us information as to how many buses are supposed to be housed and where it is intended that this building and the workshop should be situated.

Now, Sir, I will refer to what I consider is an important matter, one to which the Hon. Minister referred in one of his speeches on this matter. He said that it is necessary to reprimand, discipline and even dismiss employees. No one will disagree that at times it is necessary to reprimand, discipline and even dismiss employees. That is nothing to deplore but when the apparent necessity arises, Government should see to it that all steps are taken in order to safeguard the employee and to ensure that his case is properly put before the Board. They should never attempt to consider a case of this kind unless there is present throughout the entire hearing of it a representative of the Trade Union to which the employee belongs. I am told that always happens. In every case the employee's interest should be safeguarded.

As you know, when one is working with the Government, one does not expect to be dismissed or to have one's job sacrificed unless one is proven guilty of something very serious. Only last week, a letter was received by an employee of the Transport Board that his services were terminated on the ground of general inefficiency? I have seen that actually in writing and I must confess I cannot understand it. One would like to see them if legal proceedings were taken out against them, attempting to justify this vague, general charge of inefficiency. It should be something specific to pin down on the employee Even so, before sending in a written notice of general inefficiency, there should be a proper opportunity for the employee to answer in writing such charges as there may be which constitute the alleged general inefficiency in writing after he has had the opportunity to study them and that record of his should be placed among the archives of the Transport Board.

Even though I see the necessity at times to reprimand, discipline and dismiss an employee, it is not good when an employee arrives for his pay packet on pay day to be handed a letter saying: "You are hereby dismissed and you need not return to work again." That is not good enough. The first time that an employee knew that he was regarded as generally inefficient was when he received a letter from the Board with a statement to that effect.

Sir, I will warn the Hon. Minister of Communications that although this Transport Board is a separate entity he should, without appearing to take in hand any running of this Board to let it be known, perhaps by circular from Government, that all the proper steps must be taken in order to ensure that every employee, from the humblest to the greatest, is given the opportunity to state his case and to answer all the charges which they might put against him.

This may be a small point, but it is only now that either they do not have the right sign up as since these buses have been run by Government to the direction in which they are going, or that it is upside down or inside out, or in respect of a different route so that which the bus is actually going. It is a most outstanding thing one notices on the road. They may appear to be rather minor things but they should be looked into.

What I do suggest about the new Diesel bus which they propose to get is that one is not enough for a start. Mr. Chairman, you do know that although every new car is expected to be good, (perhaps the Fords are better than the rest) yet it does happen occasionally even with the new run of cars that among them you will buy one in which there is something wrong and as a result you have to return it and get another new one in its place. That is my objection to this proposition of yours for buying only one 44-seater Diesel bus to be used to demonstrate the many advantages of such a vehicle for the public transport system I think Sir, I have made sufficient comment on this Resolution which as I said I am supporting with the misgivings which I have uttered and with the constructive criticism to which I trust the Minister has listened and which I hope he will readily act upon. I do not propose to say anything more about this, Sir, but I wonder if before I resume my seat, you would like me at this stage—I see, Sir, you appear somewhat tired and perhaps ready to perform another very necessary function, and I would move that you do now report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the House do now adjourn for three quarters of an hour.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

8.05 p.m.

On Resumption

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY CT'D.

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

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask leave of the House to proceed with the Address of which I gave notice earlier today.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I object to that. We want to get through with the Government business.

The question that leave be granted the hon. member was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: MR. TUDOR, MR. CRAWFORD, MR. HAYNES, MR. GODDARD—4

Noes: MR. SMITH, HON. DR. CUMMINS; HON. M. E. COX; MR. HOLDER; MR. BRYAN; HON. R. G. MAPP, MR. VAUGHAN; MR. MILLER; and J. C. MOTTLEY—9.

Transport C'td.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, in a matter of this sort, to judge from the exhibition made by the Government, it is not very easy to decide how one should approach it. I will give examples of what I mean. The Minister right blankly said that they are not making any profit on the operation of these buses, but then said he never promised he would make any profit. Well now, there are two basic factors underlying the nationalisation of any industry or service by Government. The first is that the Government should feel that the service or industry is essentially a public service and therefore must be controlled by the state; the second is that since this service is essential, it has to be carried on and has to be utilised and since no private concern would carry on without making a profit, if and when Government assumes responsibility for control and operation, the normal profits which it would make would improve the service that Government would provide for the country. Well now, if the Government starts off by saying we are not making a profit and did not promise to make any profit, then you are forced to ask what are the basic reasons for taking over the service, and when one hears that in respect of many of these nationalised services, the Government obtained taxes from the operation, it is even more difficult to understand the position. The bus companies and other bigger concerns pay approximately $4,000 a year as Trade tax to the St. Michael Vestry. They pay their Trade tax on a return of between $30,000 and $40,000 a year.

They also paid Income Tax, so that with one swoop the Government has been deprived of the taxation paid by these bus companies; and one has to add this loss of taxation to the overall running of the service by the Government. You have to wonder what is the approach of a responsible Government in a serious matter of this sort; one is forced to come to the conclusion that if they are going to approach a serious matter in this way, then little children and fools have no right with sharp-edged tools.

To quote another example of the ineptitude of the Government in dealing with this matter, the Hon. Minister said that the Government was minded not to permit an increase of one cent in the basic bus fares because, apart from adding to the cost of living, there was this question of the school children who live in the rural areas having to come to the City to school, and the increased cost would fall heavily on the parents. How seriously should we consider this statement? If the Government were so concerned with minimising the Transportation cost of these children in getting to the schools in the City, certainly they would consider constructing more secondary schools in the rural areas. That would be the necessary answer to that question. In St. Philip, there is a new glorified school called the Princess Margaret School; the Government has persisted in running it as an elementary school so that the children have to go to the Secondary schools in the City. You have been amazed, Mr. Chairman, at the enormous number of applicants who try to get into Secondary schools every year; you have 800 applicants at Harrison College, you have a similar number at St. Michael's Girls' School and over 900 at the Modern High School. The answer to this problem is not to sink money in a service which you cannot operate, but to provide more Secondary schools for the children.

A third example which had me so befogged that I did not know how to take part in this debate, is in respect of the bus service in Jamaica. The Hon Minister went on to tell the Committee that the Government is subsidising this bus service. Are we to understand that this Government wants to throw away money in subsidising the buses? The Hon. Minister told the Committee that people who are operating these buses in Jamaica are allowed to bring in their rolling stock and so on free of duty Apart from that, the Government of Jamaica has had to give a rebate on the gasolene tax in order to help them equate running costs with revenue. The Hon. Minister might have told the Committee that the bus fares in Jamaica are very much higher than they are in Barbados. [Hon. M. E. COX: So is the gasolene] In Jamaica, you pay something like 6c. for two miles which means that a comparable distance in this Island, from Bridgetown to Top Rock would cost a little over 12c., and to go to Oistins would cost something like 20c. in Jamaica. Here it costs you only 10c; but the Hon. Minister is much enthused over the matter of having buses like those in Jamaica and then heavily subsidising them. I am reminded of the saying that a fool and his money is soon parted, and the Government has demonstrated itself as a fool. and is throwing away the money as fast as it can.

The argument advanced today is that we have money in the Treasury, and you have to provide a Transport service for the public; therefore the Government can afford to dip heavily into its coffers and throw away the money. That is not my conception of how a business should be run, whether it be a State controlled or a privately-run business. I refuse to make any reference to the Hon. Minister's statement that the bus service is being operated better than it was operated before. If out of the 116 buses which they took over, only about 50 are licenced on the road, 34 are in the metropolitan area and 16 outside, then you have 66 which are not in operation at all. When the buses were in operation, the service was not enough to satisfy the needs of the travelling public, because the Government themselves called upon the concessionaires to increase the number of buses. Now the Hon. Minister has the effrontery to get up in here and say that they have a better Transportation service than before.

I have never seen more bus waggons carrying people about the road; people are buying these small waggons and using them in transporting the people. You cannot have the service improved with less buses; I have marvelled from time to time to see the small number of buses which are on the various routes, and I have been amazed at hearing complaints all over the Island, as to how long people have to wait for buses to transport them. Yet we are told that the service has been improved! Improved where? If, in my opinion, the Government were minded to nationalise the Transport service of the Colony, and if we had the money to do it effectively and efficiently, one could understand that. If the Government were actually and really concerned with nationalization as a political principle, we would today have been owning a large number of shares in the Electric Company; and to be responsible for the acquisition of capital by the company, and the Government itself to control the relevant number of shares in the Company; but we did nothing of the kind. We have allowed the Government's financial position to be used as an endorsement by the Electric Company to the share capital it needed and today we do not own one single share in the Company, and that is a concern out of which we could have made money. We would have ensured that this Company would be run efficiently under proper management and the shareholders would be getting some return on their investment, and therefore any investment which the Government had in the Company would show some profit. Motivated by reasons which I cannot characterise in parliamentary language, the Government has put itself in a position in which it has to acquire the bus service; it talks glibly about nationalising Transport on the one hand, and on the other we are told here tonight that Government does not intend to keep the concessions which it has acquired; it may keep one or two of them.

9 20 p.m.

He said that eight applications were made for these concessions but that nothing can be finalised until such time as can be settled the purchase price of the units. In other words, the Government intends as long as conveniently possible to permit private enterprise to operate the majority of the concessions which Government has under its control. If that be the case, why not make a clean breast of the matter?Why do they not let the taxpayers know of what they are doing now, and what they intend to do? Are you going to do it this year or next year after the General Elections? They know that they cannot run them; they know that they cannot operate them; they do not intend to operate them themselves; therefore, why merely set up a gesture in order to make the public feel that there are at present some improvements just to hold out until after the General Elections, when they know that the position is not what they put up? The Hon. Minister says that the financial loss is $110,000. The hon. junior member for Christ Church has claimed that the Auditor for the St. Michael's Vestry who investigated the finances of the Board—

Hon. M. E. COX: When did he investigate them?

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. junior member for Christ Church stated that the financial loss of the Board up to the end of March was $175,000.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of explanation. It was not the Auditor of the Vestry, it was the Auditor of the Transport Board who made that statement. [A VOICE: Who is the Auditor?]

Mr. CRAWFORD: He simply said an Auditor and I assumed he meant the Auditor of the St. Michael's Vestry because I knew that the St. Michael's Vestry had instituted an enquiry in order to know whether the Board could pay taxes. The fact remains that a highly qualified Auditor assessed that Board up to the end of March this year and found out that the losses were $175,000. Of course what the Minister told the House was that it estimated that the operating losses would amount to approximately $110,000 — $95,000 operational loss and $15,000 otherwise.

The Addendum says that it is estimated that the operational deficiency of the Transport Board up to 30 June, 1956 will amount to approximately $110,000. It further says that it has not been possible to calculate the amounts which will have to be provided for renewals and replacements. In other words, the Ministry and the Transport Board are either incapable or undesirous of putting the true position before the public. They are telling you that it is not possible to calculate the amounts which will have to be provided for renewals and replacements. Why not?

Now, Sir let us look at the picture before the House for a moment. The Hon. Minister claims that the losses are $110,000. Mr. Mc Dermott, the Auditor, said that up to the end of March it was $175,000.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, it is more or less unfair to that Auditor when the hon. member makes that statement. He said just now that the Auditor of the St. Michael's Vestry made $175,000 and then the hon. junior member for Christ Church corrected him. The hon. senior member for St. Philip then got up and said that he was under the impression that the hon. junior member for Christ Church meant the Auditor for the St. Michael's Vestry. Now, he accuses Mr. McDermott for saying that. I am sayng that no Auditor ever told him that. None could have said that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I said that the Auditor said losses were $175,000 and the hon junior member for Christ Church and the hon. senior member for the City both said that the Auditor was Mr. Mc.Dermott. I prefer to err with them because they know what they are talking about.

Hon. M .E. COX: The Auditor of the Transport Board is Fitz Patrick Graham. [*Laughter*]

A VOICE: Mr. Mc.Dermott is of the firm of Messrs Fitz Patrick Graham and Co., Accountants.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, we have had so many demonstrations of colossal ignorance by the Hon. Minister of Communications that it is unnecessary (I would say cruel) to accuse him of urther ignorance today. Everybody in Barbados except him knows that Fitz Patrick Graham is the trade name and that the firm of Accountants belongs to Mr. Mc.Dermott. This Auditor said that the operational losses was $175,000 to the end of March, therefore to the end of June you can be sure that the financial losses would total over $200,000.

Now, the Hon. Minister himself said that those people who were running the buses are given the right to write off annually 20% for depreciation. Let us assume that the 116 buses which the Government acquired represent a capital cost of $300,000. Of course, that is a conservative estimate. If you assume that the capital cost of those buses which Government acquired is $300.000, well then 20% depreciation would be $60,000 which you would have to add to your operational deficit. On top of that, you have to add the interest for the bus owners which is at

the rate of 5%. As you will remember, Government promised to pay them 5% on the capital value of the buses from the time they acquired them until Government settled the account. Therefore, 5% on $300,000 will be roughly another $15,000.

Now, Sir, sooner or later those buses will have to be paid for, and in any industrial concern your business represents a certain amount of capital investment: and any business undertaking, apart from its interest and depreciation every year, must make some addition to its capital undertaking; so on the $300,000 which I have assumed represents the capital investment on the buses which Government has acquired, we must presume that the Auditors will make some payment towards the capital cost. I will put that figure to the conservative estimate of about $25,000. Mr. Chairman, all that is without any reference at all to renewals and replacements. Government has come in here and told the public that $95,000 represents the financial operational loss for a year without any reference to the interest due to the concessionaires, without any reference to depreciation and without any reference to renewals and replacements. That is either completely hiding the true picture of the situation from the public or that they are presenting a most false picture to the public, or that members of the Government are so stupid that they do not know what they are doing or that they are deliberately attempting to fool the public.

I can conceive that nationalisation of public transport is a desirable principle to be followed by any socialist Government [VOICES: No! No!] [ANOTHER SET OF VOICES: Hear! Hear!] 9.30 p.m.

I believe that transport is an essential public service. It has to be provided for the public and therefore it should be run by the state; and I believe that the state should make something out of it beyond a small operational cost and the profit used in expanding the service and make it more efficient for the benefit of the country. But Mr. Chairman, this is an undeveloped, semi-illiterate colony in which the Government cannot provide a quarter of the essential services of public needs. We have about twenty thousand children of school age, and because of no compulsory education in Barbados and because the parents are neglectful and unmindful of their responsibility, and this money we are going to squander on the transport service could provide compulsory education. It is all right to talk about Great Britain's nationalisation of transport. It is the most industrialised country in the world; they have got free secondary education, hot midday meals for children, national insurance schemes; twenty to thirty thousand leaving Universities, most of them come out not having contributed one cent towards the University education; even higher education is partially free, so they can get down to nationalising coal, steel and transport although you will remember that the Labourites nationalised steel, then the Tories came into power and there has been no talk by the Tories of denationalising it — but I would prefer to see this money put into an industrial corporation to start new industries in Barbados. As a matter of fact, the Government is employing less people than the concessionaires used to employ by throwing away this amount of money annually and I put it at $30,000 which is entirely irrespective of replacements and I say you are going to spend this large amount of money annually, and you are not going to give employment to another person in the island and you cannot provide the services which the country requires. Do you think, Sir, the average taxpayer feels he will save one cent bus fare? Do you think he is so ignorant not to know that if he does not pay it here, he has to pay for it somewhere else? It may well be true that the Government refuses to provide free education or to provide more secondary schools because they want people kept ignorant but there are not as ignorant as they think. Do you think it is right, Mr. Chairman, that this Government approaching Dominion Status, complete responsibility for all our affairs, should have this mass ignorance in Barbados still instead of providing more secondary school accommodation? Do not think you can run a country merely by teaching people a little arithmetic and elementary English. Every time you want something done more than ordinarily above the usual pursuit of Government you have to bring an expert from outside; you are bringing a Q.C. for the Transport, a valuer of valuing authority. The people here are ignorant, and you are not providing any facilities for more advanced education. All they are doing is squandering every cent they can collect and doing it shamelessly and ignorantly. I would be willing tonight under the circumstances to spend money to make the running of the service more efficient, and if the Government wants to demonstrate it is capable of conducting public affairs in the highest possible manner it is inescapable to begin with the transport service and put it on a firm foundation. It is no credit to Government to accuse people of sabotaging; it is not true. The people working there have been screened and you cannot get a job. No unauthorised person can get in there easily. To get in there, you have to get in with people you should not be mixing with and when they see the fruits of their maladministration [A VOICE: What about the letters you wrote recommending people for jobs there?]—it is my duty to provide employment in the public service wherever I can for my constituents; and if they come to me and ask to recommend them and I send them, that is my business. If the Minister were concerned with the job as Minister he would not be maliciously pushing his nose in the affairs of the Board and telling them whom to employ and whom not to employ. The point is, Sir, that the Minister is supposed, if he knows what he is about, to formulate a policy and to see that the policy is carried out; but merely to be concerned with intrigue and trickery and what not is not what is expected of him. I know, Sir, I am fully aware that the Government knows that they cannot run the Transport service; they cannot even run one concession. If they say they want 50 more units and they are recommending these $25,000 diesel jobs so strongly, 50 units at $25,000 is over $1 million. Where are you going to get the money from? Then he tells us something about reconditioning buses which are in the yard. Now, do you really believe Mr. Chairman, with your experience of reconditioned machinery of any kind that the Government has any right buying reconditioned buses to put in the transport service? 9 40 p.m.

That is like putting new wine in old bottles From the design of these buses, you can see that they are antiquated; they are nothing which should be put on the roads in Barbados to-day. The honourable learned and gallant senior member for St. George some time ago told the House that the tendency in big Cities in Europe to-day is to utilise small buses, not the big omnibuses which they want to foist on the public. In Europe, the tendency is to use small units which can be easily manoeuvred and which can take passengers with the minimum of ease and operational expense; but they want to commit us in Barbados in 1956 into enjoying the use of buses which are out of date in other parts of the world, and con-

demned: and which are re-conditioned for the backward areas by the English manufacturers. We do not want any re-conditioned units, because they are antiquated and must be expensive to run; and, in addition to that, they are too big. We cannot afford these $25,000 buses; the experience in Trinidad and Jamaica is that the Government has heavily to finance their operation. Is the Hon. Minister committing us to a similar policy in Barbados in the future?

There were one or two other points which the Hon. Minister made and to which some reference should be made; but what I am concerned with is whether we really want to be honest with the people from whom we are buying these buses. I think that we should put our cards on the table now and say: "We cannot operate these buses as we thought we could do; we have found that the position is not what we thought it was, and we are willing to arrive at some amicable settlement in this matter." Instead of doing that, in spite of their own practical experience in the matter, they are carrying on this regrettable state of affairs; they are holding the eight applications they had, and then, a little later on, some of these applicants will be given the opportunity of acquiring these concessions on God knows what terms. As a matter of fact, two different applicants have been recently told that they can have concessions provided they will pay cash for them, and provided that they will pay the value agreed on by the assessors. They themselves should advance something by now, as to whether or not it is possible to maintain the existing services and to improve and extend them on the current operational revenue.

What the Hon. Minister should have done is this. he should have come to the House with facts and figures to show what are the costs of operation on any given routes in respect of the concessions which they are now running. They should take any of the concessions which they operate and give us the maximum figures for the period under review; they should give us the figures for three months in respect of any route. They should tell us that the cost was so much and it is likely that we will lose so much on the particular route. They should let the House and the Country know what are the prospects for the future operation of the Transport service, but do not ask us to agree to this expenditure of $110,000 and tell us that in the near future we will be asked to vote money in order to purchase either these $25,000 units or second-hand rebuilt buses. I cannot agree with that; there are too many things to be done for us to agree to squander this money to-day. They are experiencing difficulty in getting the money for financing the Deep Water Harbour, and yet they expect us willingly to support what they propose here. I am not voting for this Resolution; I cannot see any justification for supporting it.

9.50 p.m.

It is not what they are presenting here. Are we going to get a true statement of the losses after the Elections? It is not fair to the country that the people's taxes should be squandered in this matter when there are so many things to be done. It cannot possibly be fair. Let us assume that the employees of the Transport Board are now being paid better wages. By all means the best possible wages should be paid to them, but they are paid better wages at the expense of the Treasury. They should not be paid better wages out of the Treasury; they should be paying better wages out of the increase in bus fares.

Why subsidise public transport? Let us subsidise flour instead. We took off the subsidy from flour, and immediately after that the price went up by one cent per pound. I believe the people will prefer to get cheaper flour than to think that the public is so heavily subsidising the part of the transportation system which Government is running. Government is only running a few routes. They are several concessionaires who are still running their own service and they are not getting any subsidy. We are spending this money on only eight routes: which means, Mr. Chairman, that the taxes of the people in St. Joseph, the constituency which you represent are being used to enable people from other districts to travel. That is discrimination against certain sections of the travelling public. That is what it means and the irony of it is that the Government is incapable of assessing adequately and correctly what the true position is.

I would not be mindful of the best interest of the colony if I allow this tragedy to continue. Mr. Chairman, I am not supporting this Resolution and I am sure and have every confidence that when the facts of the case are fully put to the public that the people would support the few of us who cry out about this wanton expenditure by the Government.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, it is not enough for the Hon. Minister of Communications to be right; he must be clearly and immaculately right. I will quote the "Beacon" of the 29th June, 1955: The only member of this community who says that the Transport system of this colony as controlled by the Government is better run now than ever is the Hon. Minister of Communications. If there were an absence of arrogance on the part of the Minister. and there was a consciousness to the expenses by the minions in the Party who would guarantee the passing of a Resolution of this sort, the Hon. Minister of Communications and the Government would certainly give to the broad public of Barbados the feeling that they are willing to respect the people's opinions and that they would do the thing which the public clamours to be done.

What I am trying to do, Mr. Chairman, to-night is not to make an appeal to the Government in this respect because the Government is so oblivious to constructive suggestions and the public demands that it would be a waste of time to make any appeal to them What we on this side of the Table should do is to make an appeal to public opinion and we should do more than that because public opinion in this colony unfortunately has shown such a weakening of character and determination when it comes to standing up for the rights. We should carry the matter further by taking the matter in our hands and putting it before the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

The Hon. Minister of Communications, irresponsible and inefficient as he is, ignorant of his responsible position, may sneer at me but I regret very much that we have to tolerate such ill behaviour on his part. I am not speaking for myself, Mr. Chairman, I am speaking for Barbados with its thousands who have been told (not that they wanted it) that they could not pay a cent more for bus fare; and bear in mind, in the Report of the Committee which enquired into the matter of bus fares, the recommendation on some routes was as low as half cent. I am not saying whether the travelling public was able or unable to pay the increase in bus fare; what I am saying is that the Government which should have taken its courage in its hands; this Government which boasts of having the respect and admiration of the people in this colony should be honest enough not to fool them. But this Government has fooled them in this respect. This Government has told them that they cannot pay a half cent per trip for bus fare directly out of their pockets but is calling upon them to pay millions an-

nually to replace and operate the buses. It is calling upon the people to replace those sums which conductors and others will unavoidably extract illegally. In other words, this Government is saying that the people will have to pay out of their pockets by way of taxation that which garage operators will overcharge them.

That is dishonest leadership; that is dishonest politics. It is better, Mr. Chairman, if your child calls for honey, and you think it is better to give it castor oil, to give it the castor oil. The child will thank you in the long run. Gone are the days when a Government such as this should resort to cheap politics.

I regret, Mr. Chairman, that such a hard blow has been dealt nationalisation; socialistic as I am and as they claim to be. I have read a lot about nationalisation of certain industries. I believe in it. There were days when I walked the streets without a penny to buy biscuits, and so I was forced to believe that if the State owned the wealth of the country I would be able to buy biscuits. The Socialist Government which we were proud to support when it first came into power, I regret, has forced me to think differently of it.

Now, Sir, the Government has taken over the only industry which was built up by people who were chauffeurs themselves, by people who started from owning a lorry and putting a tarpaulin on the top of it to carry people and who carried on in such a way until they were able to buy a bus. Indeed, some have been able to buy a dozen and some two dozen buses. 10.00 p.m.

The transport system in this colony was owned by three-quarters of the people who sprung from the gutter-hole and I think that if it were not owned by such persons there would have been no suggestion of taking them over. I would swear, Mr. Chairman, that if Musson and Company, Wilkinson and Haynes, K. R. Hunte and others [A VOICE: What about Eckstein?]—do not mind Eckstein that was only one ownership—but the bulk were owned by men like Trotman whose mother worked farm ground; and Stewart who drove a bus as a driver in the employ of somebody; and Jones; men of that sort, and Miss Rock in St. Andrew, a shop attendant. I want to draw the public's attention to the false idea of socialism which is practised by the Government opposite me. Anything that can be run easily but which is owned by English people, by the big financiers of this colony and which would give greater and more ready returns, Government would never think of taking them over. The Telephone Company raised their rates every other week: [*Cheers*] the Electric Company makes you pay more when they like and they cut you off when you do not reach their demands. Not a word is said: and I am sure, Sir, that returns from these companies would have been greater than they would ever hope to get from buses. Results have shown us the truth, but you know what happened? The Directors of the Electric and Telephone Companies and other companies have their representatives placed in the Executive Committee and the Executive Council. The present so-called socialist group, some of whose members sit on the Executive Committee, come down here not with their policy but a policy diluted by the representatives of big businesses whom they allow to sit on the Executive Committee, notwithstanding the boast of having the most wonderful constitution in the British Empire; and here we are saddled now. I am wondering if the previous speakers fully realise the immensity of this situation. The antics of our Minister of Communications would give one the impression that he is too small to rise to the occasion. He does not realise what an important Resolution we are handling tonight. His laughter, his sneers and his stupidity definitely betray his ability, if ever there was ability in the Hon. Minister. [*Cheers*] What I am stating Mr. Chairman, is this: here it is, within a couple or months this small colony of ours shall be saddled with the overburdening expenditure of the Federal setup. Nobody knows the tune of the amount which we will have to bear. Here it is, the community has been clamouring for a T.B. Sanitorium for some time The Government has gone so far as to make it possible for me to attend a function at which the consideration of such a T.B. Sanatorium would be set up. Nothing has happened in this respect yet, Mr. Chairman. At the Hospital, every now and again they are changing plans—and will continue to change the plans—until not one cent remains in the Treasury. Here it is, you have three or four distinguished foreigners being taken around this colony and shown its amenities, its superior amenities over those which obtain in the other colonies, for the purpose of influencing them to give Barbados the only salvage which it hopes to obtain from the Federal structure; and what do you find during the presence of these worthy gentlemen? There were examinations for entry in our secondary schools and you found eight hundred persons applying for less than one hundred places. That shows the stark need of secondary school accommodation Should we give it to them or should we not? We should: because most of us here could only see for tunate people going into the portals of such institutions, and to-day we are in power to give it to those who would be more fortunate than we were, but instead of doing that, what are we doing? They are prejudiced through pettiness, through cheap politics, and they are pushing such possibilities further and further from the realms of achievement. [*Cheers*] I want the Hon. Premier on whom we look over all the years when I first entered politics for constructive leadership, to ignore the pettiness of his henchmen and other Ministers. I want him to realise you do not have to practise cheap politics because this is election year. His Government should be destroyed for having resorted to it. The only reason why Government has talked about nationalising the buses is because this is election year. The only reason why he said bus fares must not go up, "they shall not go up over my dead body," is because this is election year, because the hon. member, the leader of the Government has carried up every possible charge in Government within the past two or three years—increased court fees, increased cost of stamps, increased duties on rum, increased duties on vehicles, on cigarettes; they wanted to carry up fares on hawkers but we on this side were too voluble in the matter.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable senior member for the City must not interrupt.

Mr. ALLDER: The Government, you must remember, increased water rates; everything that the Government supplies has been carried up within the last two or three years; these years were not election years and now it comes to election year they are playing cheap politics. I am alone, lonely and weak and I would like the Premier not to resort to that cheapness in politics as a Leader. I would tell my people, 'Get it straight: if it means you must pay half cent or one cent, pay it; because if I take it over, it will cost you more indirectly." That is what they should have told them. But here it is: the argument being put by the

Premier is of a bus owner owning six or eight bungalows! You cannot legislate on such cheap political lines. You do not know if somebody gave them to him; because you may see him with a house or two, are you going to legislate because of your prejudice against him?

10.10 p.m.

This is what the people would appreciate; a man is great and strong when he realises that he has made a mistake and is big enough to say: "I have attempted to do good, and I have made a mistake; no being infallible, I am willing to remedy it." The only way in which they can remedy this situation is to say boldly that they have not got any direct control over the dozens whom they have employed to run the service. You cannot put an Inspector to watch another Inspector, because the cost of doing that will be too great. They should say: "We are not going to continue to run the Transport service in this Colony," and you would be surprised to know how many people, even your enemies, would appreciate your stand. Not even your supporters would feel that a Resolution of this sort, calling for further expenditure in this respect, should be dealt with tonight; not even your supporters would feel so, furthermore your opponents.

As a member of this House, I cannot avoid the public meeting me and saying some people are accusing the Hon. Minister for the breakdown in the Transport service. I have said that you cannot blame him, the Opposition is not strong with members and I can only console myself with the hope that the Government would not worry to keep these buses. You cannot tell the intelligent public such as we have in Barbados, that the Transport system is being run better than it has ever been run: You cannot cause me to feel so, if a domestic has to wait at a stop pole for an hour on mornings before she can get to work. It is ignorance and stupidity in any minister who thinks that he will cause a man who is suffering from a pain in his wrist to feel that he does not have that pain.

The Government took over the service with such arrogance and pettiness that they allowed the slogan. "This is we buses," to be used by all and sundry, and therefore the Transport workers felt that the buses were theirs, and the money went straight into their pockets and not to the Clerks; the only persons who did not know that were the Hon. Minister of Communications and the Hon. Premier. If the Hon. Premier does not want the Transport service to be continued in the Government's hands, then it cannot be continued in their hands. I have known cases in which conductors felt that inasmuch as "This is we buses" they must take the takings. [*Laughter.*] That has been going on from the second week after the buses were taken over and it took 9+ months for the Government to discover that. Because a Resolution of this sort was going to be put before the House, they dismissed Inspectors by the dozens, Conductors by the two dozens and jailed some of them. I believe that these steps were taken because of this Resolution which is before us tonight. Last week and the week before, they wrote off and jailed people; and before then, there were flagrant cases taking place. What happened was that every misdemeanour was kept under cover for fear of the public knowing what has happened; but there are some of us to whom things are brought as readily as or more readily than they are carried to the Government or a Minister.

What is more, if Ministerial Status will bring us to a state of affairs such as this, then I regret having given Ministerial Status my blessing. Some of the Government's supporters were prejudiced against their having this Status, and I stood up and expressed the hope that hon. members will live up to their expectations. If there was a single man who has done Barbados any harm, (the harm is greater because of the position in which the Hon. Minister has been placed) that man is the Hon. Minister of Communications. The greatest blow which can be struck at a Country is in its economics, because when its economics are squandered on the most unworthy, both rich and poor will suffer. That is why I feel that because of his pettiness the Hon. Minister is ignorant of proper administration of business. What has the Hon. Minister been doing? All you have to do is to sit in the Gallery of this Chamber and when the Hon. Minister is passing through the Lobby, go and pat him on the back, and say "Those fellows were wrong, you were right," and he is regarded as a god. The Hon. Minister has recommended appointments, not because of ability, but because of friendship and servitude. If the Hon. Minister had realised the responsible position which he holds—

Hon. M. E. COX: I do not mind the abuse, Mr Chairman, but I would ask the hon. member to call the names of people whom I have recommended for positions.

Mr. ALLDER: I cannot do that. The Hon. Minister disregards rectitude and morality; he will call your name even if you beg him not to do so. Every member of the public knows whom he has recommended for the appointment to the Department of Highways and Transport and the Housing Board

10.20 p.m.

I am not criticising the membership of the Board, but it is us who have the public purse to protect. We do not expect the Minister to be able to administrate all these Boards himself but according to the constitutional set up of this colony, as is always drawn to our notice by the Hon. Premier, we know the Minister has to recommend membership to that Board. Everybody knows that there was dissatisfaction the day after the appointments were made to those two Boards; and if the Hon. Minister was not up in the skies and was walking like a human being on the earth, he would be able to hear the likes and dislikes of the travelling public who are in the majority the taxpayers of this colony. Certainly, if I were the Minister, I would not like to do something which 99% of the taxpayers dislike because I would always be reminded that they have to fill the Treasury owing to this state of squandermania.

What has happened, Mr. Chairman, is that the Hon. Premier has introduced to this Hon. Chamber within recent years something which prevents members of this Chamber from being appointed to these administrative posts. All the twenty years that the Hon. Premier was in this Chamber, and the other people dominated the political scene of this colony, they always saw to it that the best kind of persons to put on administrative and statutory Boards should be members of the House of Assembly. The Hon. Minister of Communications in his ignorance will sneer at what I am saying now, but it is a fact that when you have politicians on these Boards they always bring to those Boards the experience which helped them to become a member of this Hon. Chamber; and along with that, most of them have had experience in business and administrative matters. Therefore you start off with a certain amount of administrative experience; but when you go and get nondescript people whom you see walking the streets of Bridgetown year after year because of their lack of business acumen, and as a result no-

'ody gives them employment, and you make such people even Chairman of an important Board like that, you can expect anything to happen.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not relevant to what we are discussing.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, it is relevant. I am discussing the membership of the Transport Board. I am only sorry that after hon. members like myself have finished fighting relentlessly in the public interest this Resolution will still pass. It is to be regretted that after we have fought—the few but yet strong voices in the fight for liberty, freedom and morality—we will still have to sit and see those hon. members opposite to us voting for the draining of the public purse. I view the public purse as a large bag held over an abyss by the five Ministers and the Hon. Minister of Communications in this particular instance has a big sword cutting the bottom of it. [*Laughter*].

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Again I must speak to the hon. senior member for the City. I hope you will behave yourself sometimes. This is the second time that I am going to make an appeal to visitors in the gallery of this House to behave themselves and not to laugh and shout. If they carry on in that way I am going to ask the Police Officer to put them out [A VOICE: Oh no, you cannot do that.]

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I was saying that when I sat here and listened to what the Hon. Minister of Communications had to say it was not even considered a good trade. It is not capable of any such term. I sat and said to myself: what a woeful mess has politics in Barbados entered. A thing of this sort does not call for personal abuse of those whom the Hon. Minister feels would abuse the Resolution. All that he needs to do is to convince the public that what he is doing is right and he has not done that. He has with innuendoes abused the unabused with the feeling that whatever happens the Resolution will still pass. As one of the stooges of the Government has said: "man, we were over there and we know things are bad but whenever the Opposition finishes braying, we know the Resolution will pass." A ridiculous state of affairs like this can only happen in Barbados. If a failure of the Ministry of the Transport Service had taken place, even as some members of the other side term it, in corrupt Trinidad, the Minister will have to resign. Realising that he has failed miserably, he would resign I am not suggesting that because I want to fill the Minister's boots.

Hon. M. E. COX: You are not capable.

10.30 p.m.

Mr. ALLDER: It does not take anything much to suggest that another hon.member in this Chamber is not capable.

It is because the Hon. Minister is not capable that he can tell me now that I am not capable, because if he had run the bus service as efficiently as I feel he should have been able to do, we could not have been here passing this Resolution: because he does know that when he handles anything correctly I always give my support as a member of this House, not as an individual, to the thing which he is doing. What I want to suggest now, Mr. Chairman, is this: it is not the $200,000 we are voting which would put back our transport service in order; this is only the initial expense which we are being asked to agree to tonight. What I am fearful of is this: in the Resolution there is provision for $25,000 for the acquirement of a bus.

Mr. Chairman, you do know, because most of these buses stop at your service station, that they cannot last in proper service for another year without replacements. Every member of the public.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not think it is fair to the Chair to be saying that buses stop at my station. It is not true and you should not be lying like that.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman. I really cannot object to your remarks in view of the fact that the Chair is supreme in Committee, but you do know I have been present when buses parked at your place when you and I were talking. I am not going to be so small as to object to your telling me I am lying, because I know members of the public have seen buses taking gasolene from your station. I do not mean to suggest anything wrong, but it is true nevertheless. You know that too. I do not mean to suggest any motives or bring anything against you .

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But you must not say things that are not true.

Mr. ALLDER: I was not implying any ill motives, but it depends on your attitude of mind. What I was trying to suggest is that you know the condition of these buses, and most of the public do know it too, because daily we see one pulling the other along the road. Most of us do see that and were never accustomed to seeing them in such large numbers being towed in service on the road; and that is why I am saying that the condition of these buses compels the Government to replace every possible one within a year. Now, let us start off fresh. We want this $200,000 odd. Let us leave that out entirely. Let us get down to replacements within a year. If you have 116 buses — and this is one time the Government must understand if they intend keeping these buses it is no use keeping second hand rebored jobs from England, Trinidad, Jamaica, or Canada, because the only reason I purchase a second hand car is because I cannot afford $3,000 odd and therefore having no Government funds at my disposal—[*Laughter*] I am not suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that anybody who has Government funds at his disposal can go and buy a car; what I mean is, Government can go and buy a $75,000 bus to attach to the Highways and Transport Department without thinking. I do not want the implication to go over in a wrong manner, but what I am saying is this: the only reason why I buy a second hand car is because I cannot afford a new one right now; and transport is a continuous grind of engines; and in view of the fact that you cannot run them this year and next year, you should not consider the acquirement of second hand buses which have been discarded by the Transport Authority in these countries. Therefore, having that in view—and you have to know this business to appreciate what I am saying — if you have to run the transport service continually in the future, you have to buy new buses: and each new bus as proposed in the Resolution would cost the taxpayers $25,000. I therefore envisage $2,500,000 being spent to purchase new buses to replace the existing ones. Now the question is having a group of concessionaires, old and new, who are willing to take over the troubles of transport in Barbados; should we ignore such an opportunity and commit the economy of the colony to that unnecessary expenditure? That is clear, especially and in view of the numbers of other social commitments which the Government has already. These are things which the Hon. Minister must sit back and think out. I am saying this: if you were to take a plebiscite in this colony of ours, you will find the majority would be against the continuation of their possession of the bus service. It is all right for a few friends to meet the Minister and say "we are running the buses" because being the Minister's friends you can get a job; and can you imagine, Mr. Chairman, you have dozens of people employed to run the transport service? In some cases I have attempted

to sympathise with the Government because the Government cannot be here, there and everywhere; but what I get vexed with the Government for is that they are not courageous and honest enough when they make a mistake to remedy it in a bold manner. Do you expect the transport service to work when you get employees like the efficient chief motor mechanic whom every possible person in this colony knows is a responsible person—the man Applewhaite —and you tell me a lot of youngsters can go there and because the man is a disciplinarian—and this is the type of man the Government wants—and because he tries to inject a measure of respect in the service, those who are under him can say "we are not working with him?" It is barely a hair's breath that that man, efficient as he has always been, has not got himself fired. What a set-up is this? The Premier said they are not putting members of the Government on the Board because too much pressure would be applied. What happens is that unless you are friendly with the Minister you cannot get a job. 10.40 p.m.

If I were to go over there as a friend of the Hon. Minister, dare any man to fly in my face and tell me to go and do the people's work! And if I got a dozen people to agree with me, we could start a chorus. A man with a sense of responsibility to the public would have to get uneasy when such threats are made against him. I do not know if the Hon. Minister has heard the current rumours; if you were able to get a Harbour Police boat and comb the river, you would find a lot of bus parts in it. In such a case, are you going to allow the Government to destroy further the economy of this community by doing something about which you hear dissatisfaction on the part of every member of the service? I head about saboteurs; the only saboteurs in this case are the Ministers of the Government. They talk about nationalising the buses; they have not taken the opportunity to see that they must get workshops and that the accessories and gasolene etc. are obtained outside the local people. They should negotiate overseas and see that their gasolene is delivered in the Government tanks and controlled by Government employees; they should also import their tyres, tubes and spare parts, and they should comb the garages and get proper and respectable personnel to take charge of the repair of their buses.

They should not act on cheap politics; they take over buses at 12 o'clock, and at five past 12 or on the next day they have to revert to the people who ran them. People are made to feel that wretched life is paradise and Heaven is Hell. Hon. members are prevented from saying what they really and truly feel in this matter. I am told that with respect to this amount for which the Hon. Minister has come, it is far from the real amount of the Government's commitments to private concerns. I would like the Hon. Minister to say if the Courtesy Garage's bill is over $40,000 or not. Sometimes it is good to help the Government to put a rope around its neck. [Hon. G. H.. ADAMS: You took a long time to think that out.] That is not a long time; a few of us around here make it possible for the Government to go in a channel which makes people believe that it is a wonderful Government, but sometimes things are so bad that you cannot keep silent. The Hon. Premier knows that secretly.

Now there have been conflicting statements made by the Hon. Minister of Communications. At one time, he said that he had received tenders for concessions, I think he said that they were eight of them; and that that number is still good for them to be considered. If he feels that they are still good, if he knows that that is a fact, what is the good of asking this House to vote this $75,000 for the purpose of building sheds? That is just like the action of the Government in respect of the Lancaster Factory when it was to be constructed; they spent a lot of money to bring down a man from England to teach us how to make clay bricks, then they abandoned the project and private enterprise took it over. I ask: if you have the concessions for the eight tenderers, why are you asking for this $75,000 for the purpose of building sheds for these buses? They are talking about buying a new bus for $25,000; would a private investor commit himself to doing such nonsense? Why do they not get an Adviser? Some of us have not been able to get any experience in business, but surely we have had to start from scratch and build ourselves up, even if it is no more than selling a snap of rum for 12c; that gives experience in business too. They are only running helter-shelter in this matter.

I would really like to have a peep in at the discussions in Executive Committee, because I believe that the Ministers are laughed at. I believe that the Hon. Premier says: "Never mind we have other people on the Executive Committee, what we say goes." There are other people who know when they are hanging themselves but they just sit back and do not put them right, or put them in their favour I repeat, if you feel that you are going to give the buses to concessionaires, then do not let us spend so much money to provide accommodation for these buses.

10.50 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I think I have said enough and I wish to conclude by saying that, regardless of how employer and wherever there is an impersonal much money you spend or how much you may ignore constructive suggestions during the passing of this Resolution, if you do not relieve yourself of these buses now, the public in the future will hate you for having kept them. I say that because I know that the buses will continue to cost you more than what they will cost private concessionaires to run because the State is considered to be an impersonal employer the employee is never encouraged to give of his best because there is no one to pat him on the shoulder and tell him that he is giving of his best. That is what happened in the coal mines in England. Regardless of what you pay inspectors you will not be able to run them as properly as private concessionaires. The last thing you have done is to sack the inspectors, therefore you leave the conductors to do as they like. Your maxim is if two fellows have to benefit and you get rid of one you save on the other. The question is: do you want as a Government which depends on the support of the same people whom you employ to put yourself in the position where every day you have to create another enemy? If you keep these buses, every couple of days you will be adding to the number of your opponents because you will have to criticise them, you will have to lay them off, you will have to fire them momentarily, and every man you fire will become your perpetual enemy. As a Government, you should adopt safer safeguards because if you have 1,000 supporters and everyday you lose one you will soon not have any. [*Laughter*]

Sir, I can only do what lies at my disposal in defending the interests of the taxpayer and Barbados. Having done that I am hoping that the future of the bus service in this Island will not be as shaky as it has been over the past nine or ten months. [*Cheers*].

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am having very little to say. I am not trying to interrupt hon. members from speaking but I must say at this stage that in my twenty years in this Chamber I have never listened to a more irresponsible and irrelevant harangue than what we listened to from the hon. senior member for St. John tonight. I did not interrupt the hon. junior member for Christ Church when he was speaking, but as all hon. members know, a Minister is responsible for the running of the Government Departments under his portfolio and he is only here to answer when you have a matter which is run by a public corporation. You cannot attach any blame to a Minister for the running of a statutory corporation. If you do that, it is just that you have no knowledge of what Government means. Every single member of this House has a perfect right to criticise the spending of Government money, whether through a Government Department or through a corporation because it is the taxpayers' money; but over and over again to say that the Minister does this or that is to show a perfect lack of knowledge of the most elementary procedure of the running of Government.

Nobody stopped the hon. member when he was speaking. He got the cheers and the thunderings of his colleagues, but he made one of the most useless speeches on this matter. If a Minister has a Secretary or Assistant Secretary who is in charge of the Departments under his concern and he allows things to go wrong, certainly he should resign. Under the present set up we have here — [A VOICE: Who appoints the Boards?] The Boards are a vastly different matter from a Government Department.

Mr. Chairman, I am merely putting on the record the actual position. It is immaterial to me and to the Government (and that is not just words) how often we are abused. I have been hearing that for 20 years especially from the hon. senior member for St. Philip who is only too eager to find the shelter of another Party. It does not make any difference to me personally. I do wish to say this: we have a Ministerial System but we are not even as far advanced on the question of Civil Servants as there is in Great Britain. It is hard lines that a Minister should have to resign because a Civil Servant under him does something wrong when the Minister himself has not the power of moving the particular Civil Servant out of his Ministry; but he has to resign. Therefore, you will see that a Minister who himself might not have given instructions to do something will have to resign because something has gone wrong in his Ministry. Obviously, if he has no means of controlling Civil Servants, it is hard for him to resign because a member in the Civil Service for whose appointment or dismissal or transfer he has no control does something wrong. It is unjust. In England, a Minister has that power, therefore anything which goes wrong in his Ministry, in the last analysis he can be held responsible by his retaining in his department a particular Civil Servant. How can you pin a Government corporation on to a Ministry? Hon. members have in front of them the Act dealing with the Transport Board. I saw somebody throwing it about over there. It is the Governor-in Executive Committee which creates a public corporation and the only duty of the Executive is to say — [A VOICE: What is it that he is saying?] I am only putting it on the record for the benefit of the public.

11.00 p.m.

When you come to a public corporation made under an Act and it is not efficiently run, it may then become a question whether Government should not repeal the Act and make the particular institution a Government Department; but you get here and attack the Minister sentence after sentence as though he is responsible. It is not a Government Department. You appoint a Board to the best of your ability and hope it works well. When the shouting is over, I will still say what I have to say. We have in this Island a Natural Gas Corporation and as far as we know we could not have improved the personnel of the Board. I have already mentioned to members that at least two Canadian Senators have told me that the present Head knows more about natural gas than anybody else in the whole Dominion of Canada. That was our good luck. If however, we pass an Act, Mr. Chairman — I am answering the hon. member, it is immaterial to me if they laugh or shout, I am repeating it to the public and it will appear in the *Official Gazette*. You appoint a Housing Board — the hon. senior member for the City was a member — so let him ask himself if he would have tolerated in that position any interference from a Minister or a member from the Executive Committee. The hon. senior member for the City happens to know something, it is said, about housing, and therefore he was a good member of the Housing Board, but if he were a bad member of the Housing Board, would you blame a member of the Executive.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. That was a Board appointed by Statute. This is a public corporation and the hon. senior member for St. John was saying the Minister appointed the personnel of the Board. If you pass an Act and say this is a public corporation, it can only be successful or unsuccessful if the personnel appointed by the Minister prove competent or incompetent. Who can account for it but the Minister?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The hon. members on the Other Side were not attacking the personnel of the Board. The whole of their speech for the benefit of the crowd was talk about election year. Who is doing more electioneering in this island at this moment than the hon. members who face me? The argument is if you have a weak Board, change it. That is not the approach, which would be the only reasonable approach if they had the facts to support the allegations that the Board was ineffective, but it was too good an occasion to miss with this House so full of visitors as we have never seen it before.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman: is the member for St. Joseph calling Your Honour's attention to strangers in the gallery? He seems to be by the remarks used to the hon. senior member for St. John. Is the member for St. Joseph calling the attention of the Chair to strangers? Do not let us talk about electioneering and that sort of thing.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: As I was saying, the opportunity was too good to miss. They criticise the Government over the running of the transport; and any amount of untrue statements which the member for St. Lucy comes out with makes it look as if the buses go along and drop to pieces! All these half-truths and complete untrue statements are used to bolster up an attack on the Government! The setting is suitable, and the hon. senior member for St. John whom we have learnt to know as a person who (all to his credit) spends hours and hours preparing his speeches has in the interim departed from the text of his speech to put in morality and immorality every now and then for good measure.

Mr. ALLDER: On a point of explanation, I should like to inform the Hon. Premier that I do not study a speech or enlarge it. I get up impromptu and speak according to my personal feelings on the ignorance displayed by the Government Bench.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I was trying to commend him for spending the time preparing his speech; but he wants to put it the other way! If he prepares his speech and gets the facts right he would not make such mistatements as he has made He has asked what is the sense of asking for $75,000 to construct work-shops. As to the clay scheme, can there be a more glaring instance of a reckless mis-statement? This House passed a first-class Bill, a Resolution for money to get it going; the Other Place threw it out and yet he talked about our starting a scheme and then discarding it. That is his disregard for speaking the truth.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I do not like to object to anything said against me in this Chamber because I know such statements do not make me what I am not. I would not worry to ask the member to withdraw that statement, but the hon. member cannot refute that the Government did spend large sums bringing Mr. Brannam here, and although the Other Place did not go favourably with the Resolution, the hon. member knows he has a weapon whereby he could have Mr. Brannam brought here again for the factory set-up; but the hon. member did not want such a knowledge to be possessed in the island, at least in the position of Government and he allowed it to die. If the Other Place turns down anything this Chamber sends up, he knows better than I do the weapon at his disposal to use to override them. He did not use it then.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I would not honour the member by replying to that, but let me assure him that the Other Place would have thrown it out a second time. [A VOICE: What about a third time?] It is absolutely immaterial what opinion hon. members have of me and if I live to be as old as Methuselah I would always be like that. Utterly and absolutely indifferent! But what I do say Sir, is this: when the hon. member reads his speech again he will see it is one long slinging attack on the Hon. Minister for which he has no right. You appoint a Board and hope it does well. The personnel of the Board has been changed and I am not exchanging any secret over the fact that new members have been appointed to the Board, but I will say this again: When it comes to a public corporation you choose what in your judgment you consider to be men who will run it effectively. If you discover you cannot find the best people or the people do not give you satisfaction, it is a matter for your consideration as Government whether we should not make it a Government Department, in which case you are responsible for running it. But to get here tonight sentence after sentence attacking the Minister! The Transport Board is not the Waterworks; if it were the Waterworks Department, he deserves every word said against him if it can be proven. I hope that hon. members have read the statement "one swallow does not make a summer", and you assume because one bus hit a post or bridge and was damaged that therefore all will fall to pieces. The Government from the first moment appointed a Commissioner to investigate. The Government cannot go further than that. I do ask hon. members to ask themselves whether the personnel of the Board has always been the same.

11.10 p.m.

When it comes to the question of a public Corporation, it is a matter for the Government to consider whether the establishment of a public Corporation is the answer to this or any particular problem. Ours is a corporate responsibility. I deprecate strongly, and I would be failing in my duty if I did not mention it, this pandering to the popular delight of hearing evil of other people. You throw mud on a man and every little drop of mud induces laughter; but if you say what a fine fellow he is, people will wonder if it is really true. Especially faced with the problem of not knowing when there will be a General Election, and fearing that when the Election comes he may not be successful, I can well understand the attitude of the hon. senior member for St. John.

Mr. Chairman, I have nearly finished; I deplore the fact that not one single hon. member, when attacking the Hon. Minister, has given the Government any credit for having appointed a strong committee to investigate every single reported act of conduct on the part of the Staff of the Transport Board since it has started. In addition to bringing down Mr. Gibbons from the point of view of running the service, the Government has appointed a Committee composed of Mr. Osborne of the Income Tax Department, Parfitt of the Water Works Department, and Mr. Herbert Williams to enquire into the complete working of the Transport Board from its inception, including every reported case of conduct on the part of the staff. We have not been given any credit for trying our best all the time; instead of that, the hon. senior member for St. John talked about petty politics. The word "petty" is too big a word for the hon. member's harangue tonight; all he thought was that this is a first-class opportunity for him and he may get a few pats on his back when he goes down the stairs tonight.

Mr. VAUGHAN: The Hon. Premier has made one-half of the speech which I intended to make. I have a note here to this effect: "If the Government were responsible for the running of the Transport Board, the things which have gone wrong there could not have gone wrong, because Government Departments are always debated in this House." I repeat: "If the Transport Board were a Government Department, what happened there could not have happened." The Government did not create the Transport Board as a wish of theirs or as a declared policy of theirs; they created the Transport Board to run the bus service of this Colony, to carry people to and fro, because an emergency had been forced upon them. The concessionaires put up an ultimatum to the Government saying: "Let us charge more; we must get more fares, or we do not run our buses." What was the Government to do? Was the Government to allow the people to be left stranded on the Government? There was no choice about the matter. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: That is not true.] For months negotiations were going on with the concessionaires, and the Government offered them a rebate of 15% on the gasolene as a substitute *in lieu* of the raising of bus fares, that 15% representing $65,000. Afer the concessionaires were offered that subsidy of $65,000, they refused it and they wanted a 50% rebate on the gasolene which would have amounted to $217,000. If the Government had acceded to the request of the concessionaires, there would have been a deficit of not $95,000, but a deficit of $217,000.

11.20. p.m.

Sentiment, or passion, or abuse is one thing; but the cold figures preach another thing. These are the facts which I have stated. I have even in my notes here an example of the running of the Natural Gas Corporation. Let me repeat, it was not a question of choice, it was not a question of doctrine, it was not a question of socialist ideology, it was a question of absolute necessity. The concessionaires refused after a certain date to run their buses. What was the Government to do? It was forced upon them. If Government had failed to take over the buses, they would have failed in their prime duty to the

citizens of this country. I commended them then, and I commend them now.

Whatever is wrong with the Transport Board (and admittedly a lot is wrong with it) let us change the membership of it and if Government cannot get a proper Transport Board, make it an arm of the Government — a Civil Department — and run it. It is very well for some hon. members to talk about Government increasing the wages of the drivers and conductors, and the same drivers and conductors who regard this as their Government have operated against it. Do you think they have done that of their own free will? They have been influenced to do so by interested persons who are determined to see that this Government corporation does not succeed. There are interests in this colony who would do anything to prove that anything which Government sponsors must fail and the success of the Transport Board would be a defeat to such interests. The happenings were near enough to allow those interested to operate, and it is my conviction that those interest have operated in influencing people who regard this Government as theirs to commit certain sabotage againt the public transport.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the last hon. member who spoke has changed the tenure of this whole debate. All the other hon. members' argument was to the effect that this Government wilfully, maliciously and vindictively grasped the transport system from the Bus Concessionaires and utilised it to their own purpose. The hon. member who spoke before the last, knows that the Government was forced into this position. When conditions like this arise, they call for sober reflection on the part of hon. members so as to be able to arrive at a satisfactory solution in resolving the question.

Sir, all the hon. members have painted a woeful picture on this matter of public transport, and I want to say that it is really in a bad and deplorable condition; but the Government started out with good intentions, and as you know, good intentions do not always get good results. When this Government was forced into this position, it did not have the nerve to do the right thing. The right thing to do was to look at this situation squarely in the face and see that the situation demanded a rise in bus fares. If that were done, we would not be in this position today but we are in this position and we must find a way out, come what may.

Mr. Chairman, if the travelling public or the conductors and drivers have the interest of the public at heart, as regards this public transport service these conditions with which we are confronted today would not be in existence; but everybody who knows something about it, knows that there is some sinister influence at work to prevent the successful operation of this bus service by Government.

Sir, on my way from home in St. Philip to the City on these buses, many times I have to argue about the way these buses are operated by the conductors and drivers. If these people had maintained these buses up to the standard which obtained when the private concessionaries had them in hand we would not have had the trouble we are having today and it is those conductors and drivers who have got better wages. Have they given better service? That is a question which hon. members should answer.

My colleague made some statements with which I really do not agree but the time will come when I will reiterate them. There were statements which he never used to make when I sent him to this House of Assembly.

I do not know if the Government in coming down with this Resolution for this money is doing the right thing. I think the right thing for this Government to do is to get rid of these buses as quickly as they can. Give them back to the concessionaires and get new ones. However, in the mean time they have to carry on, therefore you must give them the money to carry on.

11.30 p.m.

That is what I feel but in the mean time they have to carry on so we have to give them some money to carry on with. Get them off your hands because the general public does not seem to be with you, so therefore get rid of them as soon as possible. I say they have got to carry on so we have to give them money. I do not know about finding sheds. I think you can cut out that, if possible. We have got to find the solution and find it quickly because this, Sir, is one of those conditions that need immediate remedy. I would not say the Government was entirely right in taking over the buses but they were forced into this position out of a clear sky by the concessionaires with "either you meet my demands or you take them and run them" and the Government was bewildered and had to ask them to carry on a week longer until they could take them over, and the Government thought with the co-operation of all and sundry they would make a success of the operation of these buses, but they failed. Whether this is election year or not, you have got to face the facts that you failed in this enterprise and should get it off your hands as quickly as possible, and I believe the public will be with you in the election and bring you back here. [A VOICE: Do you really think so?] Do you think they are going to bring the D.L.P.? That has a doubtful father and a doubtful mother, and the general public will do well to examine who was the father of that party. I know the father and mother and I have no dealings with them. This new omnibus might be necessary for experimental purposes, Sir, but I think it is a lot of money to experiment with. These last two Items Nos. 13 and 14, I think we can do without if we are disposing with these buses. We do not need them and I would advise the Government to examine the utilisation of this money in that respect. Get rid of these buses; this nationalisation is something we cannot stand in this island. We have not the talent or the ability to operate a nationalised utility successfully [*Cheers*] I want to assure Government that I am in hearty sympathy with their dilemma and they can rely on my support because I was sent here by men and women of the suffering public, and when they sent me here they told me "Mottley, I know you and your colleague cannot do much, but whatever measure Government brings to the benefit of the people support it", and no electors can say I am not doing that. If I had to face the electors to come back here, one could not stop me on that because they cannot say I am not supporting Government with measures for the benefit of the improvement of my people. There are a lot of ideas going on that my people forget the position they were in eight or ten years ago. Remember who was the direct cause of the amenities they are enjoying now. [A VOICE: Who?] Not you, Sir! From morning I get up arguing for the improvement of my people to now. My colleague and I are not seeing eye to eye. He has deviated from that course we have followed seven years ago and I do not approve of his deviation. He has not told the

people in St. Philip yet. [A VOICE: You do not come to the meetings!] It is all right. I am fighting for the poor and the under-dog.

Mr. Chairman, with these few remarks, Sir I am appealing to the Government to use their best ingenuity to solve this bus problem. There are some things that we will never succeed in as long as you hold them in hand.

Mr. ALLDER: No remarks could be more heartening than those coming from the hon. junior member for St. Philip who is a permanent supporter of the Government, and when he makes a suggestion like that it is sufficient to have some effect on the Government's decision to keep these buses. I was definitely and deeply surprised to hear the hon. junior member for St. Philip. In respect of my colleague I cannot say I appreciate very much the points which he made and as a matter of fact it appears as if he were not sufficiently convinced of his statement and it caused an apparent burst of his lungs. What I would say is this, Mr. Chairman, everybody knows that the hon. member has corrupted what would otherwise have been a wonderful political career. [A VOICE: Who?] My colleague.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You must get on with the Resolution.

Mr. ALLDER: I am getting to Resolution. The hon. member insinuated that wrong charges were being made against the Minister and against the Government in respect of the running of the bus service. What the hon. member does not know and what he pretends to be ignorant about now is that whatever happens over there at the public Transport Department, the Hon. Minister has got to give his sanction before any Board can attempt to put it into practice. Everybody knows that. The only person who does not know that is my vacillating friend. [A VOICE: Are you really serious?] I am serious and more than that. Who created the Board? The Government. Who is put responsible for the Executive running of the Department? The Minister of Highways and Transport. Who recommended the appointments to the Board? The Minister for Highways and Transport. It is he who is handling the Resolution. He is responsible for the running of the Department and we could not come and attack the Board and accuse it for any wrong running of the Department. It is the Minister who comes to us to get our approval for the continual running of the Department and it is he who is responsible, and what is more the Board did not bring this Resolution here; it is the Minister for Highways and Transport and it is Goverment policy.

11.40 p.m.

That is the Government's policy. Does my colleague want to tell me or the Committee that the Board decided that they must have a bus for $25,000 as an expedient? That is the policy of the Government and the policy of the Hon. Minister. Does he want to say that the Board constituted as it is, wanted to erect accommodation costing $75,000 to house buses which the Hon. Minister has said they are about to give to the new concessionaires? Let my colleague change his path; do not let him play the game of a lawyer, that is to say, if I get there first then I am right.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I am not at all flattered; if I am playing the role of a lawyer, other people besides me feel that I would have made a good one. As far as vacillation is concerned, I do not think that the pot should laugh at the kettle. I began my political career as a member of this Party; I have returned to it, and I have no apologies to make to anybody. I shall never fail in defending this Party when it should be defended; I have told my colleague before, I told him during the consideration of the vote in respect of the visit of Princess Margaret, that the people of St. John have sent me here, and it is on them that I have to depend. I have lived to see the Government ———

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member must keep to this Resolution, because other honourable members must do the same thing.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I am keeping to the Resolution. This is a quotation from the speech of the honourable senior member for St. John when the Government created the Transport Board. This is what he said:

"Sir, I am going to vote for the passing of this Resolution because I feel out of a sense of responsibility I should not do anything to tie the hands of the Government but I hope they will" ———

Mr. ALLDER: The honourable member is reading from a slip of paper something which purports to be a part of my speech, and I do not remember having made any such remarks. If the honourable member is permitted to present a slip of paper and read something which purports to represent a part of my speech, I do not think that that should be done. The proper thing to do would be to get the report of the debates handled by the Clerk of this House. I must object to the honourable member quoting from my speech remarks which I do not remember making.

Mr. VAUGHAN: This is nothing against the honourable member.

Mr. ALLDER: I object to the quotation to which the honourable member has referred as representing a part of my speech.

Mr. VAUGHAN: At page 1414 of the *Official Gazette* the honourable member's speech appears. This is what he said:

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

Mr. ALLDER: I have heard the honourable member criticise the speeches reported in this House. I am not hiding under that; I do not say anything to-day which I cannot repeat to-morrow. I did not ask the Government to reciprocate anything; I said: "It does appear to me that this amount of $30,000 is only a drop of the amount which we will have to spend on this issue; and I am appealing to the Hon. Premier, not the Hon. Minister of Communications, who I feel should be more responsible, to see that if it takes five days or five years to negotiate with the present concessionaires to continue to do so; do not close your doors. [*Cheers.*]

My attitude was this: having been injected with the virus of nationalisation by the Hon. Premier, I felt that if this Government were as Socialist as it pretends to be, it was attempting the first phase of the principle of nationalisation, and therefore I would not stand in its way, although my support did not go without caution. That caution was correct, because we see now where this matter has cost us more than it should have cost us. That is the position. I do not see why the honourable member should cheer; it all proves that they did not take any heed to my caution, otherwise my speech, instead of being what it has been, would have been singing their praise for having embarked on the first stage of the nationalisation of the Transport system of this Island.

11.50 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, there are just two points I want to make and the first is this: an attempt has been made to throw a smoke screen in the eyes of the public on this matter There has been a red herring thrown across the trail as regards the responsibility of the Hon. Minister of Communications and the Transport Board I want to say for the explanation of the public that we on this side of the Table criticised, not what the Board has done or fail to do, but the policy of the Government itself as demonstrated in the Resolution before the House. What has been done is merely an attempt to draw a red herring across the trail. It is merely an attempt to becloud the issue for the Government to say tonight that the Minister of Communications has no direct responsibility for the actions of the Transport Board when the Board is not responsible for the Resolution before the House.

Mr. Chairman, the Board does not want to buy a new diesel bus for $25,000, nor has the Board said it wants $75,000 to accommodate buses. Those things are aspects of the Government policy, therefore we are justified in criticising the Government and the Hon. Minister of Communications on those grants.

The final point is this: my colleague, the hon. junior member for St. Philip, has seen fit to express opposition to certain views put forward by me. It is his right to do so if he feels that they conflict with his views, but I object more strenuously and emphatically to his implying that I am not fulfilling the pledges which I came to this House to fulfil. He himself has told me that his reasons for supporting the Government Party are twofold. The first is that the hon. member does not want the session to come to an end before the five years he was elected and the second is that he is not certain —

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr: Chairman, I rise on a point of Order. I think you said that members should stick to the Resolution.

Mr. VAUGHAN: You ruled that in my case, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I did rule that members should keep to the Resolution but the hon. senior member for St. Philip is replying to something which has been said by the hon. junior member for St. Philip. As soon as he strays, I will stop him.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, if I am forced to state what those inducements were, I will state them. However, Sir,—(To Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: you are elected for five years. If you fail to continue, that is a matter for you) but I am prepared to vote for what I think is in the best interest of the people. As regards the offering of inducements, it is not the first time that people whom I brought in here have succumbed to the blandishments of the members on the opposite side of the Table and have done it to satisfy their own personal interest at the expense of the interest of the public. As regards the hon. junior member for St. Philip, I warned him that those inducements will never materialise. It is true that they might materialise now, but they have been hanging over for a very long time now.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I do not think any useful purpose will be served in my replying now to the hon. member.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am merely rising to say this: I have never ever, in spite of what any person may say, offered any inducement to anybody to join or rejoin the Labour Party. Never ever have I done that. I do not believe a word which the hon. senior member for St. Philip has said because it is utterly impossible for the hon. junior member for St. Philip to have told him that. I have never told any hon. member that I will put him on the Executive or anything of that sort. I have never held out any inducements whatsoever to any member or anybody to join or rejoin the Labour Party. I will go on oath in saying that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not surprised that he will go on oath with that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is the end of that matter. I am not entertaining any more of it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What about Mr. Talma and Mr. Blackman on the Executive and every one of them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is breaking the Rules of this House. The honourable member is calling honourable members by their names.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of Order. I want to bring to the attention of the hon. senior member for St. Philip, it is entirely this House and the Island as a whole that at no time have any inducements been held out by the Hon. Premier to me. In so far as the statement made by the hon. senior member for St. Philip it is entirely untrue and unfounded and deserved no recognition by any right thinking member of the Community.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I promised myself that I will generate no heat in this debate. As a matter of fact, Sir, I have heard on more than one occasion that it is because of the remarks made by the hon. junior member for St. Peter and myself on one occasion in this House that the Government has found itself taken up with this matter of bus transport. Well I hope that is not true. As you know, Sir, long before this matter of bus concessionaires and the question of the public transport system came before this House, I as a member of the St. Michael's Vestry had to fight with certain concessionaires, (or at least the Vestry had to do so) and I think that when that fight was going on, the Hon. Premier who was then practising at the Bar had the opportunity of defending one or two of the bus concessionaires who had refused to pay parochial taxes. At that time I felt very strongly in the matter; and if you will recall, Mr. Chairman, on the first occasion that this matter was discussed in this House I took a particular stand and I am going to take that stand again tonight.

As far as I am concerned, the sixteen questions asked by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition were discussed by my party and we felt that in fairness to the general public these questions should be answered by the Hon. Minister of Communications. You will observe, Sir, that the first question asked is what is the policy of the Government in connection with the Transport of the Island. That is the first question and upon that hinges the entire criticism which we are offering.

If I head right, Sir, the Hon. Minister said that the decision of the Government relative to the Transport of the Island . . .

12.01 a.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. senior member for the City continue?

If I heard right, Sir, the Hon. Minister said that which we asked in respect of the Government policy on the transport of the island—I want to take this along logical lines because when I am through I can justify my position for not voting for this at all. In other words, I am not going to vote for this but I must justify it logically. The Government's reply to the Leader of the Opposition to question one is that their policy is the same when they took over the buses; and they are trying to carry on this transport system, and at present they have eight applications and the applications remain the same. In other words, they have said today that while as a socialist party they believe in nationalisation, it is not their policy to nationalise the transport system of the

island. [A VOICE: Who said so?] If the hon. member wants to correct it, please say now that they do not intend to nationalise it. They have said at this stage that they do not intend to nationalise it. The hon. member said so here today and if the Premier is going to contradict that, would he please say so now. I am trying to argue this as logically as possible. They do not intend to nationalise. I for one am very glad to hear that. The records will show how I on the last occasion voted because I felt myself it was a question of Hobson's choice put to this House. The Government negotiated with the concessionaires and after some negotiation they reached a final day on which concessionaires said they would give up and continue to run no more. That is the reason why I voted for the sum of money to operate the transport service until they got some settlement, and the settlement were given then was that they would advertise for new concessionaires offering them the concessions and they would at least have it run again by concessionaires with different conditions Now, I take it from what the Minister said in reply to the Leader of the Opposition that the position remains the same. We went on to ask, Sir, among other things, how many concessions Government did take over. The Hon. Minister said they took over eight and that they have since given back one. In other words, they are fourteen now in the island; seven are being run by private enterprise and seven presently run by the Government. But let us allow for the shortcomings and the unfortunate position, I say unfortunate, the Government found themselves in at the time in August 1955; that is, that they had to take them over because they had to continue some sort of service. Now, I want to know what has not been answered to the satisfaction of the Opposition; having advertised and having eight applicants, why they have not given out the concessions to these eight people? I heard in a *sotto voce* voice for the first time something about the price, but we have the notes made here, and the Minister may have imagined he may have said that, but we are asking what price was asked. Let me accept the answer given now by the Premier—the question of price.—I do not know what he means by price. If it a fact, have operating all over the island are still making money—and I would like to say here and now that that statement cannot be disputed because these concessionaires have been returning, not only in this parish, but in the other parishes where they operate, trade tax and I think I am in a position to say with authority they have also been returning income tax. If therefore the seven that is being run by private enterprise are now returning a trade profit, it is difficult to understand how you have been able to throw so much money away in so short a space of time. It is true to say the representation which has been made to Government when they set up to investigate the question of increased bus-fares—they recommended taking an overall picture of the income, that they were not making sufficient revenue and as a result an ultimatum has been given and I say Government took over temporarily, and established authority for the formation of a Board and the Board was set up. I want to draw this to the Government's attention. Let us forget anything about nationalisation, just let us look at it this way. The Government set up a Committee as a result of representation made to us to increase bus fares and that report has been rightly read by the Minister who said "We could not get the necessary data of the number of passengers carried and so on and we will not recommend an increase." It is strikingly strange that Government on immediately setting up or taking over the concessions which they took over, before having, (at least I am hoping this is so) any information to the contrary, went about it and the first thing they did was to say we could not find books or sufficient data to tell us how many passengers they were carrying for the recommendation of an increase. Government said and I agreed then and now they were not going to increase the fares, but the Board which was appointed by Government—and let them deny this—Who was the Board? Mr. Chase, who held every other job in the island. I remember well what I said: with all of the slanderous remarks about this gentleman and what not that this Board was doomed to failure, Chase failed in everything he went into and he failed the next morning he was appointed, and he was at that time also employed with the Gulf Oil Company.

12.10 a.m.

I am trying not to generate any heat; I am trying to put the true position clearly. The Government were told that this business did not pay, but they appointed a Board and on the next morning, the Board increased everybody's salaries, and paid to a number of men more than what the Companies had paid. You took over 8 concessions from these concessionaires who employed 100 men; instead of working for some time, for a month or two, you decided that you wanted five times as many Inspectors as were formerly employed. I should like to say this: if you want the praise, then you must accept the blame. The Hon. Minister tried to impress upon this House how the deficit was made up; the Government paid more salaries. which amounted to $55,000 You wanted the praise for saying that you took over the Transportation service, and you started off and paid more money, without seeing how the business would work. Who else would have done that except they were told to do so by the Minister of Transport? Must the Hon. Minister not accept any criticism for the action of the Board? The Board under the Chairmanship of Mr. Chase, told you next morning—I am presuming that the recommendations must come from the Board—"We cannot see how we can run without 100 more men, and without putting on 25% of this expenditure"

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If the hon. member reads the Transport Board Act, he will see that the Board may employ servants at such salaries as the Governor-in-Executive Committee may approve. We do not appoint chauffeurs, conductors, inspectors or anybody else; the Board must make recommendations to the Executive Committee and the Executive Committee approves. We approved increases in salaries to employees.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: You accept that criticism, but you do not accept the responsibility. Who else but the Government would say: "We take over this business today; we do not know what profit you made, but the first thing we will do, is to increase salaries?" [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: We paid a decent wage.]

The criticisms offered by the hon. senior member for St. John are perfectly in order. The Hon. Premier could hardly get out of this; who else would have done this? Are you going to pay a "spy" more than you pay a conductor or driver? [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: All over the world inspectors get more than drivers.] Do not talk nonsense; Mr. Chase recommended that an inspector was worth more money than a driver and therefore they paid the inspectors more than the drivers and conductors. That is one phase of the matter in respect of which I do not see how the Government could expect not to accept any criticism.

The Hon. Minister of Communications must plead ignorance of any knowledge of Transport. If the hon. member had been in the Taxi business still, and he had been running his car, do you think he would have decided to pay his drivers more money immediately until he knew what the income of the business was? How can you ask this Committee to level its criticism purely on the Board as a Board? The Minister who is responsible must accept the criticism.

As far as I am concerned, I say this: if it is true that you have no intention of nationalising your bus service. in all seriousness, then tell us so, but do not—

Hon. M. E. COX: I do not know where the hon. member was when I said that. What I said was that certain people had applied for concessions; these tenders remain good, but it is the Government's intention to continue the running of this service with the ultimate aim of running the Island's Transport service.

12.20 a.m.

Mr. GODDARD: The honourable member has now said that for the first time to-night. He said that it was the intention of the Government to keep one or two of these concessions. I asked what are the reasons for the Government retaining these Concessions but the Hon. Minister did not answer.

Mr. Chairman, he said that now for the first time. He said today that it was the intention of the Government to keep one or two of the concessions and I asked him: "for what purpose?" The question was never answered. Mr. Chairman, I hope when the debate is recorded that the Hon. Minister will come back here as a man and say that he agrees with the record.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: It was the first question and I pressed upon the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to ask it again. This is the first time that the Hon. Minister of Communications has said anything about that. The Hon. Minister said that he told the Committee that they would keep one or two of the buses and I asked the Hon. Minister to repeat that.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I just want to say that the Government has never made any secret of its intentions as regards nationalisation but the Government wanted experience.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The Government started off with nationalisation. I said to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that when they come to find out what is the overall cost of the Transport system and they insist about nationalisation it would be infinitely better to nationalise the Electric Company. It is not any new thing for the Hon. Premier to say that he has not abandoned nationalisation. I think after their final analysis of the bus situation that they would be infinitely better to let private enterprise carry on with it.

The hon. senior member for St. John said that the $75,500 with which you propose to build sheds to house the buses seems to him a waste of money. I am also of that opinion. As a matter of fact, the Hon. Minister has not told the Leader of the Opposition where it is proposed that those sheds should be put up, therefore, we want to know something about that. As regards the $25,000 for the 44-seater diesel omnibus, all I would say is that it will be good at times if some of us would travel by buses. What I wonder is this: Does the Hon. Minister think that that bus is the one which we need in Barbados taking into consideration our narrow roads and our transport system? It has been drawn to our attention that the Directors of Transport in England and America have had to reduce the size of their buses and put into operation a bus of a smaller size. I regret very much that under the circumstances I cannot support the purchase of that bus.

As to the idea of the Hon. Minister speaking of graveyard buses, it is a fact that that type of bus is known as a graveyard bus. As soon as those buses have done anything in the vicinity of 150,000 miles they are put in what is called the graveyard and they are remodelled and then reshipped to places which want them. People like Colonel Julien are famous for obtaining them and then shipping them to other places. If you travel to big countries you will find that some of those buses are just like the ambulances which Colonel Julien gave you. Of course, the Hon. Minister said that they are going to consult the Crown Agents on the matter. I do not know, but they must know whether it is well that they should consult Crown Agents. Nothing we can do will persuade them not to invest in such buses or not to invest in this new 44-seater diesel bus. I would only say, speaking for myself, that it is most regrettable that the Government has not seen fit as yet to settle the matter as regards these applications for concessions. The Government should get that matter settled once and for all, because on the face of it, you have divided your island transport system into 14 sections and you have not heard one of the seven concessionaires who are running their buses privately saying that it is not paying them. They are perfectly willing to carry on. May I ask you this question? Here it is you have seven concessionaires who have been carrying on. Have you as yet suggested to any of those applicants for new concessions that you will take A, B. C. or D? I would like to know what is keeping back the Government from awarding those concessions to the eight applicants or so which you have.

12.30 a.m.

I heard something about price but let me ask this again. There is no possibility of having the names and going into it and asking if they will take over these buses which you have. Now, everybody knows and I am putting this to the Government — you had to take over at a time to fill the breach because of the dead-lock. No one could be annoyed if during the period when it started to run and you found you were going down the hill and you found you could not carry on this as a system you decide to approach the eight concessionaires and the Government sued the proprietors for part of the expense. It would be better to do it that way. There is no two ways about it. For you to carry on the transport system of this island, it would cost between two or three million dollars and I cannot imagine any Government outside the Mental Hospital wanting to carry on transport system as it is now. What I am saying now, is this: you have wasted a lot of money in the appraisals for the various companies. We realise we had to give in, we had no proper management, no proper sheds, and we have got to account for a certain amount of depreciation. Could we not see it is better to drop $30,000 now than to go on as you are doing? That is a business-like approach to this question. But let me say while I put the suggestion it might fall on deaf ears. You come here for $75,000 to build a garage. Would it cost you more than $75,000 between what the ex-concessionaires are asking and what the new ones are asking? And this House would be more than unreasonable if they did not appreciate that because you did not have the wherewithal; and anyhow it is a great thing you had to fall back on Chase. God help you! Chase was Chairman. [A VOICE: He was not Chairman] Anyhow he was a member of the Board. I am coming

down so that, I am suggesting here to you tonight that it would be infinitely better, and I still share the views that it should be impossible for you to have seven and say you are making money and give the other more. Therefore, mind you this, Mr. Chairman, this is diametrically based on nationalisation and I would have no objection if Government came with a policy and said we are going to nationalise. They cannot face that because the Premier agrees we would have to spend much money on a new Hospital first. We share your view about the Hospital, therefore, you should allow private enterprise to carry on the transport service and you should come and face it clearly. Do not come and ask for $75,000 to build a shed and what not and still know you have to have these things. If you are going to nationalise, come straight out and do that. I expect this House would have to accept the valuation put upon these buses, but we do not have the wherewithal, the depreciation, because the seven are making money and paying income tax and trade tax. You are silently awarding concessions and drawing your 40% of the profit without paying out one red cent so why pay out a lot of money here, and you have got to admit this. I think the only person who would not admit this would be the Minister for Communications who has said that the transport service of Barbados has been run better now they are run by Government than when they were owned and run by private enterprise. It is only when you have great antipathy to the truth that you can say things like that. No one can expect that the Minister has not really heard criticism from every possible angle. The Premier would be shocked because the transport service has become shocking. You have got to admit it is absolutely shocking. This is what I have to say; if you are going to nationalise now and you agree you have more essential services, call a spade a spade. Do not come and build sheds for these buses. Come and say we have got this amount of money and finish. Get rid of it one time, I would not vote one red cent to buy a bus for $25,000. Are you satisfied with the seven concessionaires who run the seven concessions to the other parts of the islands? Are you satisfied the public is given good service? If not, it is your duty to do so, or if you can say the seven will give good service or you believe they will give us good service, it is your duty to award it to them. We have had in applicants, so we cannot allow the people to suffer even if you must drop money every month for the transport bus when travelling. I remember following an ex-service. What I say now is what happened with a cursion since Government took over. They had a flat tyre and had to wait two and a half hours to get a tyre. If you, Mr. Chairman, or any other Minister were running those chartered buses to the excursion to any part of the island, you would see it had a spare tyre. Do not let anybody fool you. There are so many people to look after that you must face the facts. You know you have other essential services, so on the other hand what happens. You appoint a St. John talk about sabotage. There is a feeling that Board and I heard the Minister and the member for a black man in this country, unless you are the type of man who is prepared to go on with Government and so on, will sabotage anything. I have had this experience and I believe the Premier should have this experience.

12.40 a.m.

You have people who are strong supporters of the Government, and I know that they are people who were willing to offer their services to the Government, but they are not "yes-men." If I happened to be in the Government or close to the Government, and I had to look for people to put on the Transport Board, I would look for people who had some experience in dealing with transport business of some sort, even if it is hauling molasses or anything like that. If you are running a business and you succeed with it, it will be said that you are a smart fellow; but if you should fail, it will be said that you are a fool.

They would rather bring down somebody from England who would know nothing about this business and take his advice. You have a man like Mr. Evelyn who had been running Lancaster and who knew when the engine was not working well; but I ask; who is responsible for appointing these people to the Board? Mr. Roy Gill or Mr. Evelyn could not have made the recommendation to the Government to take over these buses and appoint these 25 Inspectors. Do you think that either of them would recommend that you appoint these Inspectors and pay them more money than you are paying the drivers? That is wrong. Mr. Chairman, if they had asked you anything, would you have said, "I would pay these Inspectors more than I would pay a driver?" In other places you have an Inspector who comes along and you never know where he is; you have a conductor, you just have a driver, but here you have a man who is working all the time and another man just sits under a tree and waits until the buses come along. What then do you expect?

When the hon. junior member for St. John says that the people of this Country have been sabotaged, does he mean the bus concessionaires? I should like to say that is felt that if you have a Socialist Government advertise for loans from whom do they have to get them? People will lend you money when you advertise for it, and therefore it is reckless dishonesty to talk about sabotage. What the hon. senior member St. John has said is quite true; you want to make some small-time people believe that you are a god on wheels going around. I will not be contributing to anything of that sort.

You may be a classical man, you may be learning the humanities, but you are not a business man. When I first met Mr. Manley, I said: "I know you have been professing to be a Solcialist, but I have the greatest respect for you, because immediately as you got into power, you decided that even the most rabid Socialist, if he must meet any success, he must have an economic adviser." When anybody says that you are ignorant as to business conditions, do not take umbrage at that, because there is no point in taking umbrage if you do not know anything about these matters. I tell you quite candidly that what you really want is an adviser in these matters.

I was surprised to hear the hon. junior member for St. Philip make the speech which he made. He has told you what the position really is; there is great dissatisfaction, and therefore let us face the facts. You are asking a man to come here from Trinidad to tell you about the Transport system; well, I am going to say something which, if you were in business for 20 odd years, you would appreciate. I suppose that when this is all recorded, somebody will curse me. The Hon. Minister has said that this gentleman came in and discussed the question of buses and what not. I am just asking them to be careful.

I asked that question just to be sure. You saw you are going to try out this 44-seater diesel bus. The Hon. Minister has rightly told us what has happened in Trinidad and Jamaica as regards that type of bus. He said that they have tried them out and

they have failed. If I were you I would not make that blunder. You should use that money for other services. I will put it to the Minister: do not vote this money, come back and say to this House that you have erred. That is human. Do not fool yourself I need not speak in this strain because I represent the City of Bridgetown where it does not matter whether bus fares go up or not but I am speaking from the depths of my heart despite what any Minister or Government might feel. This Government is headed by the Hon. Premier who is frightfully ignorant of the real business situation when it comes to running the buses. Let me suggest this to you. Before you bring anybody to tell you how to run your Transport system, you must give them a brief before they are going to tell you how it should be run and the next thing that will happen is that you will find yourself buying buses which that person want to sell to you. Bear in mind that a man does not come out to advise you on these matters unless he is interested in this sort of thing. He has all sorts of offers before he comes here. I am telling you that the next thing you will know is that you will be like Trinidad or Jamaica as regards this bus situation. Even if you nationalise it, you are going to find yourself in the same position. Do you know the reason why? To make a success out of running buses, the concessionaires have to put in a tremendous lot of work and have to be up early in the morning and all through the day looking after the running of their concession. You must have known by now that as soon as somebody is employed by Government he says that it does not matter.

Let me say this: When I caused the Vestry of St. Michael to investigate into the accounts of the National Bus Company, that Company had the best bus service running in the Island. I have been in those buses then and recently and I can say that they are in a terrible condition now. Let me say that they are nasty and stink now. I am telling you that no attention is paid to them. What do you find? We are told that the Government is not responsible, or that the Minister is not responsible, but that they appoint a Board to run the transport. They choose the people to run it. I am not suggesting for a minute that they should select to any of those Boards people from one particular walk of life. I am saying that you should not pick people to place on Boards just because they make you a little god on the earth. You must do things which will benefit all the people of the Island.

Mr. Chairman, I promised myself that I will not generate any heat on this matter. I am going to ask this question: have you done anything to merit your nationalisation of the Transport system? Now, you cannot say when will you nationalise it, nor can you say that that is your intention. If you share our views or we share your views, there are other essentials which should come first. I will say this to you now. Get this Transport out of your hands as quickly as possible. As long as you are satisfied with the persons who have applied for the concessions you should grant them their request. Am I to say that I understand rightly, Mr. Chairman, that while you have given back one concession to a former concessionaire (Mr. Birch) that one of the applicants for a concession has been written a letter offering him the Yonkers Bus Service?

Hon. M. E. COX: You will always hear that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Minister says that I will always hear that. I understood from a reliable source that you offered the Yonkers Bus service to Mr. Alleyne but he said that you will have to pay the cash money which the man charged the Government. He has received a letter telling him that he will have the Yonkers. Mr. Chariman, I am telling the Hon. Minister of Communications what I have heard. I understand that the price is $35,000 as has been fixed by the valuers. I understood you told him to pay $35,000, but that there seems to be some difference of opinion on the matter. Why should you bring somebody from England to tell you what the buses cost when you took them over? That is nonsense. Mr. Chairman, I am addressing these remarks to the Head of the Government. If the valuers have valued them at $35,000 and there is a difference of opinion on that, the thing to do in my opinion is to get back in your valuers and let them know that the $35,000 is what he agrees to accept as the valuation at that time but during the ten months they have depreciated by $5,000 or a figure like that, and that seems to be a reasonable sum to pay for them now. Why not get them off your hand now? Not only would you get them off your hand when you accept that amount but you will be getting the service run.

You talk about these reconditioned buses. Let me put this to you: do you know that I have heard from tourists that while the buses which you will bring from outside are very comfortable that the buses which you have now suit local conditions better than those because they are airy? Do you know that the type of buses which you have is first class for the colonies? Do not let anybody fool you. They can be reconditioned to look as new. It is the engine that goes. Put in a new engine and put the new tyres, paint up the body and you have a new unit. 1.00 a.m.

What do you think they are doing? They have a chassis and as long as they get it painted up and put on tyres and put in a new engine they have a new bus working. They are getting down new engines and putting them on the old chassis and that is what has been happening. I make this statement. I know there has been a man, who incidentally is a Barbadian, and who is connected with the parish the Hon. Premier represents, and he can get second hand buses like Julian put on the people down here. Let me speak no ill of the dead. One time you had a Director of Public Works, he was a Civil Servant—the hon. member can sneer. Happily for me I do not depend on such people to put me here. He was a Civil Servant and you reached a stage at one time that no kind of toilet bowl could not be put in anybody's house—unless it was a Tyford. This is not speaking ill of anybody; this is merely saying when you come to business you see this. I smile at this type of diesel, and you have other types with the engine in front. What I am worried about is this. Have you taken into consideration that the length would be difficult to get around certain corners? Have you taken that into consideration? Have you taken into consideration the question of having it swag around? I say it would be a sensible approach and I would back it one hundred per cent if you withdrew this and ask for a certain amount of money to pay off these debts and be satisfied that you have good bonds and let the people run them and everything would be all right. Of course I would not be surprised to hear somebody say I have friends who applied for them. Mr. Chairman, I think I have given my views to the Government. I think I have been perfectly mild indeed; I have outlined the question of the transport system and I would like to say this: you know a tremendous lot more can be said because as the Leader of the Opposition told you, you have 106 buses and have only licensed 34. Who else in Barbados on this third day of July could be running a set of buses not licensed and possibly not

insured to the danger of the public? You have already said this is a Board and you know they have not been licensed, the reason being they cannot present insurance papers to the Treasury. Today is the 4th of the month and they are running, and do you realise if anything happens tomorrow you would be backing the Board; and what I am telling you is that Government has to back the Board in case of damages. Look at it squarely in the face; you are responsible for the damages. Mind you, I see your feeling is that this is something where revenue can be made for the Government and you have a right to satisfy yourself. You cannot say you are doing like Jamaica or Trinidad or of course London and New York where they subsidise quite heavily and give out concessions on account of the density of the population to move off in certain cities at certain peak hours. If you take a route like Black Rock where you have five buses running, the Hon. Minister of Social Services will see all five going in at one time and you will have to wait until they go to town and come back up. What the hon. junior member for St. Philip told you was correct.The people are not with you with it; get it out of your hands. You are absolutely wrong and I suggest to you to get them out your hands. I do not think I can do any more under the circumstances. We have asked for a lot of information and you have given us very little. There is just one more point which I want to make. I have heard that buses had gone to garages and they were over-charged. I made discreet investigations. Now you know I am one of those people who as Chairman am in charge of a fleet of trucks belonging to the Sanitary Commissioners. Do not fool yourself that I do not send them around. I give everybody some and I was shocked to find a bill for general repairs and overhaul for around $900. I made investigations. We have had very strong men on the Board who made very strong investigations into the question of parts and what they paid and then I made investigation into what was paid by the Government. Personally, I am in a position to say here and now that if they over-charge you, they have doubly overcharged us. I was shocked to see the price of the rebored jobs. The jobs were in the vicinity of $700. That is the price which they charge today and I suggest strongly that this talk about sabotage is not fair to the people who if they wanted to sabotage it would be the easiest thing for any firm of leading solicitors in Bridgetown to say if the Government wants loans do not lend them a cent. But they have so much confidence in you that they put up all the money; so how can you in the same breath say that there is sabotage, Sir, I finally say I cannot vote for this. Take the money you are going to build sheds and stand the difference between the depreciation and what the prices would be and let them give back the buses—I am not talking about giving back—there are certain people who do not want them back, but there are others who have applied for these buses and these applications still hold; or you might be able to do what the Hospital or the Government decided to do with the ambulances.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is —

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I should just like to say that there has been no doubt quite a lot of abuse and slander and nastiness which has come forth from supposedly hon. members, more particularly, the hon. senior member for St. John. There is no doubt —

Mr. ALLDER: The hon. member should know by now that he cannot say that any hon. member has resorted to the use of slander, nastiness and that sort of thing. I would please ask him to withdraw those remarks.

Hon. M. E. COX: I withdraw them. From the speech which the hon. member has made, everyone who has listened to him, will agree that he came here for the expressed purpose of attacking me. I promise never to sink to that level.

The hon. junior member for Christ Church contradicted at length this question of losses, and he went so far as to say that I was misleading the Committee in connection with the Report of the losses. From the Auditor's Report, it will be seen that at the end of the 31st December, 1955, there was a loss of $58,000. The figures as follows:—

Fares Collected ..	$261,358.68	
School Tickets ..	6,337.31	
Charters	1,234.50	$268,930.49
Less Expenses		
Salaries and Wages	$134,800.84	
Gasoline and Oil	108,390.15	
Repairs and Replacements	62,813.61	
Insurances ..	11,655.82	
Tickets ..	3,727.12	
Printing and Stationery	2,445.35	
Licences ..	527.60	
Lights and Telephone	496.05	
Miscellaneous ..	89.81	$327,740.75
Loss Carried to Schedule of Balance		$ 58,810.26

Since then we have had a statement from the Auditor from the 1st. January to 31st. March, 1956. The figures are as follows: Fares collected, $198,002.20, School Tickets $7,939.85; Charters, $3,141.04, total $209,083.09. Expenses amounted to $249,849.55 leaving a deficit of $40,766.46. It is estimated that up to the 10th June the amount in sundry credits would be $135,000 and with stock together with bank balances amounting to $40,000, there would be a deficit of $95,000. That, Mr. Chairman, is the position as it stands up to the 16th June this year. If the hon. junior member for Christ Church wants to see that with his own eyes, he will have the opportunity to come around here and look at the statement. If he doubts the propriety or otherwise of the Auditors, that is a matter for him. I can only put forward what has been reported by the Auditor.

The question was asked. Mr. Chairman, where those buses will be housed. We have not yet decided on the correct site but we are hoping to site them somewhere on Government lands. The provision is made for a shed and the Director of Public Works has submitted an estimate as follows:—

Roofing	$35.000	
Fencing	6,000	
Contingencies ..	4,000	$45,000
Hoist	7,000	
6 Workbenches ..	800	
1 Compressor ..	1,500	
Water Supply ..	500	
9 Ramps	4,700	
Surfacing Yard and Approach		
Total		$75,500

We are hoping to site them either at Combermere or behind the old shed which was once occupied by Mr. John Beckles. [A VOICE: That can-

not hold them.] We are not providing for 100 buses; we are providing for a maximum of 66 buses.

I need not refer to the statement made by the hon. senior member for St. John, because the debates have already shown that the hon. member supported the Resolution and indeed all the other hon. members present at the time supported the Resolution. None had the courage to get up and say that we should increase bus fares. They all supported the Resolution and it was unanimously passed. [A VOICE: That is not true.]

Mr. HAYNES: I would like to be emphatic on this matter. I am entirely in favour of the concessionaires being given another chance. The Hon. Premier made an aside saying that it was too late to negotiate. I object that it is too late.

I made reference to the fact that you are now doing something which Jamaica has rid itself of as well as Trinidad.

Hon. M. E. COX: Madam Chairman, every one would agree that the bus service which we have in Barbados today is inadequate. The travelling public is looking forward to a better service whether it is by the Government or by the concessionaires who decided to continue. All through the trend of speeches made by hon. members, it was brought out that the money which we came for at first was insufficient, and we would have to come back for additional money to carry on the Transport system. That is in the debates. As a matter of fact, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy went as far as to suggest that we should use money from the Price Stabilisation Fund which was at the time $6 million. He said that a considerable sum of that money should be earmarked as a loan to the Transport Board to finance the operation of those buses, because he opined that it would cost something like $300,000 odd to have the service run properly.

Madam Chairman, I realise that it is very late or early in the morning of another day and I am not prepared unless it is necessary to go all over the ground I have covered, to reply to the speeches made by hon. members. There is one thing which I would like to state quite frankly. The hon. senior member for the City raised the point about our offering back the Yonkers man his buses.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I have never said such a thing. What I said was that the Yonkers buses had been offered to Mr. Alleyne of Bank Hall and not to Mr. Jones and that they were offered for the price for which they were valued. I was suggesting that he should pay a sum between what is the depreciation for the time the Government had them in hand and that it will be infinitely better for the Government to stand that expense and that the Government should act similarly with the other concessions which they have. I was suggesting that Government should call the whole thing a day, give up the buses and they would be better off. I never suggested that Mr. Jones should be offered back his buses.

1.30 a.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: I do not know where the honourable member got that information from, but I am sure that if that were so it would have to have passed through the Ministry first for a decision to be made by Government. That decision has not been made.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Is the honourable member saying this man has not been offered the Yonkers Bus Company? That is the information which I have had. He has been told that is the position and what he has to pay for it and that it should be paid in cash and the argument is that he would not pay that for it. What I am saying is if there is any disagreement on the price to be paid to Government, make right the deficit and depreciation for the time they had them and call it a day. I will support that 100%.

Hon. M. E. COX: I said in introducing the Resolution that Government have not sold out these buses because we did not know at what price we would have to sell these buses. I went further and said that there was no possibility of getting them to take these buses; they would not be so stupid to take them without knowing what they would have to pay for them. But as I said the Government could not have asked him to pay 'X' dollars until the matter had been decided by Court or by arbitration as the case may be.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: On a point of further explanation. Not for "X" dollars but for the price which the Government put to him. And I go further and say instead of spending money in putting up these sheds, you should pay the difference in depreciation. You cannot expect people to pay for them what they charged Government ten months ago.

Hon. M. E. COX: The honourable member has said that the Board did not ask for any buses or for any sheds for the buses. I would like to assure this House that the present Board was appointed on the 1st April and from the time this Board was appointed they made recommendations to the Ministry to have 15 new buses as soon as possible; and to say they have not asked for buses is not correct because before the Board was appointed, as I pointed out in introducing the Resolution, about two or three months after we took over the buses the Director of Highways and Transport who was then Chairman, made representation to us that we needed 51 new units. Now there is one thing I would like to clear up at this stage although it has not crept into the debate to-night, but some time ago, Mr. Chairman, it was raised in this House by the junior member for St. Lucy about my approaching the owner of the Yonkers Buses asking him to take back the buses now. [A VOICE: Your friend told me so in your presence.] The position is as I pointed out long ago that it would be absolutely no question of my approaching Jones or anybody about taking back their buses because as I said Government had never decided on that: and indeed I would be the last person in the world to put myself in that position where if it were decided not to sell buses to people like those, then the individual could get up on a platform and pass it on to the senior member for the City and to the public.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I was present when his bosom friend, Mr. H. A. Tudor, told him so, and Mr. Tudor said he telephoned him at 4 o'clock in the afternoon and told him so; so why raise the question and bring me into it. All I said was, that I was present when your bosom friend told you about it.

Hon. M. E. COX: I would say briefly what happened. A few Saturdays ago I went to the Public Market and I met Mr. Tudor who told me about this telephone call. I took him to Mr. Jones' house and after discussing the matter, Mr. Jones assured me that he was satisfied that it was a trick, and he told me he would immediately telephone his counsel Mr. E. K. Walcott whom he had previously informed about the matter. I have every reason to believe Mr. Jones did it.

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

Ayes: Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA,

Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. BRYAN, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. VAUGHAN, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY—10.

Noes: Mr. GODDARD, Mr. BARROW, Mr. TUDOR, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. HAYNES, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, Mr. CRAWFORD—7.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

PRIVATE BUSINESS

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, before the Order Paper is fixed, I am asking the leave of the House to move the passing of the Address of which I gave notice earlier in the day. The Address reads as follows:—

The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Governor

The House of Assembly is of the opinion that some record should be made of the signing of the Order-in-Council setting up the British Caribbean Federation.

2. The House therefore respectfully requests Your Excellency to consult the Governments of the participating territories with a view to securing their approval of an entreaty of Her Majesty the Queen, that Her Majesty be graciously pleased to permit a departure from custom by allowing a photographic record to be made of the signing of the Order-in-Council.

3. The House makes this request feeling certain that the citizens of the future Dominion should be able to follow with pride the unfolding chapter of their history and affectionately associate Her Majesty with it.

4. The House further suggests that, if the Governments agree, the Commissioner for the preparation of the Federal Organisation be asked to take the necessary steps to have the request laid with his humble duty, before Her Majesty at an early opportunity.

Hon. M. E. COX: I object to leave being granted the honourable member to proceed with this Address.

The question that leave be granted the honourable member to proceed with the Address, was put and resolved in the negative.

A division was taken as follows:

Ayes: Messrs. J. C. MOTTLEY, BARROW, TUDOR, CRAWFORD, ALLDER, HAYNES, GODDARD and E. D. MOTTLEY.—8.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day week, Tuesday, 10th July, 1956, at 3 o'clock p.m.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until this day week, Tuesday, 10th July, 1956, at 3 o'clock p.m., was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

1.50 a.m.