THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1959

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Friday, 13th March, 1959.

Pursuant to the adjournment the House of Assembly met at 12 noon today.

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS *(Speaker);* Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, *(Leader of the Opposition);* Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., *(Premier);* His Honour Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; *(Deputy Speaker);* Hon. R. G. MAPP, *(Minister of Communications, Works and Housing);* Hon. F. E. MILLER, *(Minister of Social Services);* Hon. D. D. GARNER, *(Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries);* Mr. H. A. DOWDING, M.B.E.; Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Hon. L. ST.A. THORNE, *(Minister of Education);* and Mr. G. E. S. STRAUGHN.

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 circulation.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, before you call the first Order of the Day, I crave Your Honour's indulgence and that of the House to say a few words on the matter of privilege on which I spoke on the last occasion.

Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a copy of the important speech made by the Hon. Premier on the last occasion of our meeting. I think, Sir, that it should be recorded in the annals of this House that this, according to my knowledge, is the first occasion on which this has ever occurred.

I should like recorded the thanks of myself and I feel of all hon. members who sit around this Table to Your Honour in the first place for your co-operation in ascertaining that members are allowed the privilege of doing their work assiduously. I do feel, Sir, that Your Honour is to be complimented, and I hope that this is only the beginning of an era in the business of this House which history will record at some future date as being the start of really getting down to proper procedure and proper business in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I feel certain that without the co-operaoperation of the Premier this matter would also have been impossible. I would like to compliment him on his efforts, and it is noticeable in his regime the difference in the co-operation he gives in order that the Opposition may have a say in matters. I, Sir, am one that believes strongly that without a strong Opposition, any democracy must fail. I feel that our thanks should also be recorded to the Premier.

Mr. Speaker, not least, because there are others, but certainly the efforts of our Clerk must also be recorded. Our Clerk, Sir, is a man that puts - as he has just said in the Lobby of this House - his best foot forward in the interest of the business of this House. Sir, he is to be complimented from all sides, and I am sure he will be, after taking this extra work and achieving on this occasion this particular momentous bit of history. I know that Your Honour will want me to say that he should not only be commended, but that Your Honour should at any time with the permission of this House - I do not know exactly what my grounds on that may be - ascertain that such an assiduous Clerk, such a helpful Clerk and one who does not go out of his way to ask for more recompense but one who does his job ably, should be recompensed if there is need for recompense, and I feel that Your Honour will ascertain that that is done.

12.25 p.m.

I would also like to thank those persons who burnt the mid-night oil in achieving this. Your staff must be commended. I feel strongly that this is a great thing for the future of this Hon. House and I do say on my behalf thanks sincerely and I look forward to a new era in the future.

LEAVE TO TAKE ORDER NO.7

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I am asking leave, Sir, that Order No. 7 which is a very simple Bill to continue various Expiring Laws be taken first.

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

THE EXPIRING LAWS BILL, 1959

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple Bill. It is a Bill which I have been seeing annually ever since I have been in this House and it does not need me to say much about it. The Schedule shows the laws which will be affected if this is not passed by the 31st March. Without saying anything more, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. junior member for St. James be Chairman during the absence of the Chairman.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

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

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SEARLES in the Chair.

The Preamble was postponed.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

The Preamble was then called and passed.

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. L. ST.A. THORNE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded By Hon. L. ST.A. THORNE in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

LEAVE TO TAKE ORDER NO.3

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I am asking leave of the House to take Order No. 3 as the next Order of the Day.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. M. E.COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

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

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to postpone the Resolution for $8,460,987.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1958-59 No.50 DEFICIENCY ON OPERATION OF TRANSPORT SERVICES

12.35 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: As hon. members will see, this is a Resolution for the sum of $259,662 to be granted under Head XXXVI of the current Estimates to meet the deficiency on the operation of the Transport Services of this island. The Addendum to the Resolution points out that the Audited Statement of Accounts of the Transport Board at the 31st December, 1958, shows that the amount of $259,661.46 was due to local creditors for gasolene, oils, parts and services rendered. There is no hope of the Board settling these accounts and this Resolution has therefore become necessary. As I said on Tuesday last, the reason for the delay of this Resolution was due to the fact that I wanted to get the Audited Statement of Accounts as well as the Annual Report of the Board laid before this House so that hon. members could see the Report of the Board for themselves.

It is true that the Addendum points out the deficiency or the amounts due to local creditors to the 31st December, 1958, but hon. members will see from the Audited Statement that in the year which ends on the 30th September, 1958, the net loss was $236,015.02 and that the operating loss of the Board for the year ended 30th September, 1958, was $216,072.12. In the Board's Report, which hon. members have before them, I should just like to call attention to certain features of it. Hon. members will see, for instance, that in order to improve the office and the workshop and to correct the state of congestion and the poor facilities under which the staff has been working, the Board had to provide adequate accommodation for the Administrative and Executive staff, the new Costing Department and additional storeroom and lunch-room accommodation for the staff at a total cost of $5,900. The Board also had to provide Furniture and Fittings, Accounting Machines, general Equipment, Offices and Workshop, Lunch Room and Recreation Hall and to effect repairs to septic tanks at a cost of $49,000. Other necessary Capital Expenditure during the year included the surfacing of a section of the yard, the provision of Workshop and Office Equipment, and Training Expenses in the United Kingdom. Hon. members will recall that the Chief Mechanic took a course of training in the maintenance and repair of Diesel engines in the United Kingdom. Then, as a result of the prolonged digging up of highways along certain routes, tyres and springs were subjected to excessive strain. The Board estimated that overall replacements during the year would amount to $39,000 as compared with $29,000 during the previous year, an additional amount of $10,000. Then there were additional instalment payments on account of the purchase price of the new diesel buses paid by the Board since January, 1958, amounting to $79,400 making a total amount of $180,200.00.

I must point out to hon. members in all fairness to the Board that in respect of the year in which this deficit was incurred, bus fares increased in the third quarter, which is the April quarter. I know that hon. members will ask themselves why is it that in spite of increased bus fares this deficit should be so large. Well, in going into the factors which account for this undoubtedly large deficit, I should like to remind hon. members that bus fares were increased in April whereas the year goes back to October, 1957. The year ended 30th September, 1958, is the year to which we are referring.

As hon. members will see from the Report, as a result of the new rates, the increased fares, the Board estimates that the weekly revenue has increased by about 22%. Then the revenue from fares, school tickets, charters and so on, is set out. As against that increase from fares, as against that increase in revenue, hon. members will see from the Report and the Audited Statement that the expenditure on repairs and replacements, salaries and wages also rose very much. Hon. members will see from page three of the Report that salaries and wages for the year amounted to $404,783 as against $331,281 for the corresponding period, an increase of $73,502. Wages of drivers and conductors were increased twice during 1958, and additional staff was required for the new Costing Department.

Mr. Acting Chairman, no doubt the minds of hon. members will be as worried as the minds of the Government are, by any drain on our resources which might be caused by a continuous deficit; however, in so far as this Government is concerned, we appreciate the difficulties under which the Board operates. A Government concern cannot, like a private concern, ignore justifiable claims for better conditions of work and better conditions of pay. The employees at the Transport Board, at least the majority of them, are members of the Trade Union and even before we were tied to an agreement with the Union, the security of tenure which employees of the Board enjoy is certainly not enjoyed by any other employees of any concessionaire in this island. I have had numerous people coming to me as Minister saying how private concessionaires demand that they bring in so much money per week, and it means that they have to keep the buses up to certain loads in order to carry in those returns. They have to run with certain loads, otherwise they will be dismissed.

12.45 p.m.

They have to make up for a low load at one period with a heavy load on another, and it often happens that they are caught by the Police and fined by the Court. Well, Sir, the Transport Board cannot employ these methods; so let us face facts. We cannot tell a driver or conductor—and when I say "we" I mean the Board, because the Board is a nationalised concern and I as Minister have followed the policy of allowing the Board to run its own concern without any direct interference by me, and when I say "direct interference", I have never adopted the policy or was never in favour of going there and running it or interfering with its operations as if it were a Department. Even in a Department of Government I am not supposed to do that; so I hope members will bear that in mind; that is the only way a nationalised concern can run. It must be run, especially if you are running a concern such as this or a concern like the Natural Gas Corporation, on its own. You advance money so that they can pay proper people to run it, and we have a very efficient Managing Director there now who, I am sure, will bring things up to a much better level by seeing that it is properly staffed; but any interference means disaster.

As I was saying before I branched off, the Board faces this drawback as compared with private concessionaires, because I know that members are going to compare

it with what happens with private enterprise. As compared with private enterprise, they cannot adopt the harsh methods which private concessionaires adopt, even although they might be more effective. The Board cannot adopt those methods and we certainly would not adopt any harsh methods with employees. The Board cannot tell a conductor that he must bring in so much a week or else he will find himself fired, or send off an employee for every suspected infringement. A case has to be proven against an employee; otherwise, as members will appreciate, the Union right away would be breathing down the necks of the Management of the Board.

I know, Sir, that even members of the public have had cause to complain. I myself have reported instances to the Board and where the case is proven, the Board has taken considerable measures to discipline members of this staff. It is true that where a case is proven of indiscipline by a member of the staff or of any ill conduct in any way in his relation to the public, the Board disciplines conductors and drivers or any other member of the staff. I must state again that we cannot operate on the same basis as any private concessionaire and where a case is made out for a reasonable increase in wages, the Transport Board cannot ignore these claims, so that in spite of the 22% increase in fares the Board has been faced with this increase in wages and salaries amounting to $73,502 over the previous year.

Members will see too the amount for depreciation. Depreciation on the new buses, as hon. members will know, will be at a higher rate than on the petrol driven buses, and they will see that depreciation on the buses for the year is $90,943 as against $62,193 in the corresponding period for 1957. All these are accounting figures which helped to boost the deficit, but it does not actually mean that things are that worse or as bad as members imagine.

Now, Sir, as members will see from the Report, the Board has pointed out that much of the losses have been caused by the fact that the out-dated and uneconomical petrol driven buses which they have to operate have incurred increasing repairs and replacement of parts to an amount of $157,347.57 as against $136,572, for the preceding year. Members may wonder why, if this is so, the Government did not assist the Board in replacing these buses by buying new ones. Well, Sir, I will tell this Committee that the facts reveal that some of the diesel buses have not been giving satisfaction. Members will see from the Report of the Board that for April, May and June the profit on the operation of 32 new diesel buses was $6,548 while the loss on operation of 40 old gasolene buses was $42,142. We put the ratio of 32 buses to 40 because the carrying capacity of 32 new buses would be equivalent to that of 40 old ones. If members will look at the audited statement, they will see that while in that quarter the operating loss is $35,591 which was 30% less than the previous year, in the fall, that is, in the quarter for July, August and September, the operating loss was jumped up to $69,568.78, which is a considerable increase.
12.55 p.m.

Much today is due to the fact that some of these diesel buses gave a considerable degree of trouble in operation. You could not get parts for them and some were laid up in the Transport yard for a long time. In the audited Reports, there were marked off as giving nothing. But, Sir, the other type of diesel buses is not suited for the short distances as what we have here, so I decided to wait until the new Managing Director arrived before coming to any decision at all on bringing in any more diesel buses and the replacing of the old gasolene buses with more diesel buses. I have called, for instance, for a Report on the position and I have been shown that the losses which have been incurred during that quarter when the deficit was so high was incurred on those Mercedes Benz buses. I considered that it would be a pure waste of public funds to import any more before getting the advice of the expert and I therefore waited until the Managing Director came and I asked his advice and that he give a report on the matter. I have here, Sir, the figures set out of the Profit and Loss Account of each bus and if it is necessary I can give to the House what these figures are. As I have said, that is my policy and that is the reason why we did not replace those buses at the time.

Now, Sir, I am satisfied and the Government is satisfied that since the new Managing Director has arrived he has been doing a good job there. He has introduced better methods of administration, more efficient methods and he knows his stuff. Hon. members will see from the Report that after carrying out a survey of the island's bus services he has submitted a report and has made recommendtations for re-organising the entire service. That is his recommendation and these recommendations have been approved by the Board. It is stated that if they are implemented it should eventually be possible to transform the service into a self-supporting unit.

That Report is before the Government and I may say that it involves serious financial considerations; therefore it will take us some time to arrive at a decision on the Report. However, I am satisfied that if there is anybody to make this service run in such a way as to operate without a loss it would be the new Manager whom we have there. Government has been very impressed with his statement. He has only been there from August and from the time he was there he has given us the impression that he is an expert in this line and that he knows his job: but, as I have said before, his proposals call for serious consideration because they call for fundamental changes in policy as well as the incurring of some expenditure. I had asked the Board for a Report on some of the work and it certainly shows that since this new Managing Director has been there he has instituted new Time Tables, new Schedules and such things and that the travelling public is given a better service than before. He has only taken up his duties at the beginning of August; therefore he must be given a chance. I do not think Government should expect him to work a miracle in three or four months. The Managing Director had to look at the service as a whole and to examine every detail. He also had to do a lot of spade work, but as I have said already, he has put up very good and sound suggestions to the Board and I am convinced that these suggestions can work.

I am not, Sir, one to run away, and I do not think this Government is one to run away, from facing up to difficulties. There are difficulties in operating any concern like this. We took over all those old decrepit buses which have been causing trouble from the start and we were also faced with personnel difficulties; but I am convinced that what was required was someone at the top who knew his job and we have him now. If this Managing Director cannot make it work, nobody else can. God help this island if we return to the old chaotic conditions of the past.

I realise that hon. members will talk and that we will only think in terms of finance. Obviously, the Government cannot do as certain concessionaires do: that is to say, run the buses whenever they like and dismiss people whenever they like. I know of a case like that and I have referred it to the Director of Highways and Transport. Obviously, we must ensure that an amount of service is carried out even by private concessionaires; but in a Government concern, we must take as our first consideration the service to the public. We cannot shirk it as private concessionaires can and get away with it. We have continuous complaints about the service in St. Andrew and the people in St. Andrew and in other areas are clamouring that Government should run the bus service in those areas; so, Sir, finance cannot be the first consideration of the Government; service must be the first consideration.

I know of cases where school children are left by some private concessionaires in St. James and they have to come down and catch a Government bus in order to get to school. As I have said already, unlike private concessionaires, we cannot get away with that and we do not intend to try to get away with any inefficient service. Our first consideration is efficiency and a proper service to the public at a reasonable cost.

I am satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that we have an efficient man in charge of that concern and I am satisfied if he is given a trial that he will make it work and operate at no loss. I think in fairness to him that Government can only give him a chance to put his recommendations into effect and see what happens in a year or two years' time. The Board is fortunate to have the memorandum of certain changes he has made on certain routes and it shows that he is a man who knows his job.

1.05 p.m.

I do not think that there is anything more that I can say on this Resolution. Hon. members will have the Report of the Board before them and also the Audited Statement of Accounts, and if there are any more details which hon. members require I shall be only too pleased to supply them with those details.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Acting Chairman, although Government intimated that they proposed to deal with this matter today even if they had to ride rough-shod over the feelings and wishes of the members on this side of the House, yet I never thought seriously that they would.....

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I would like to know where the Hon. Leader of the Opposition got that information from, the information that we, on this side, were prepared to ride rough-shod over the feelings and wishes of members on that side of the House.

Mr. BRANCKER: Hon. member may well recall the statement which was made last Tuesday and which evoked a certain amount of critical comment from this side of the House, when the hon. member said that the Resolution would be dealt with on Friday at all costs. That was the effect of what was said.

Hon. M. E. COX: I never intended that at all and, knowing the hon. senior member for St. Peter as I do, he would have objected to anything I said and twist it around to suit himself. I am sorry that the hon. member is not here. I made it clear that inasmuch as this money is to be paid out before the end of the year, we would try to get the Resolution passed by Friday, during which time I thought that hon. members would have had the opportunity of reading this Report; I never said that we were prepared to ride rough-shod over other hon. members in order to get this Resolution through.

Mr. DOWDING: The words used were "rush it through"

Mr. BRANCKER: I take it, Mr. Acting Chairman, that I am addressing you. Whatever the words used were, I never expected that, as we had the Estimates to deal with today, this matter would have been given preference over the Estimates. That is why we have met now; but many of us, certainly on this side of the House, have not had the opportunity of fully digesting this third Annual Report of the Transport Board which was laid on Tuesday, because we were concentrating on the literature which we received yesterday - the Budget Speech and other matters pertaining to the Budget. Be that as it may, I would just like to make a general comment or two in respect of this $1/4 million Resolution.

Reference has been made to the efficiency, almost to the genius, of the General Manager of this Board. I wonder if the General Manager is satisfied that we should have this present dual system of public passenger transport, that we should have a certain number of buses run by a Board and a certain number run by private enterprise. I submit that nothing could be more unsatisfactory and nothing could be more likely to yield unsatisfactory and unsatisfying results than the present system. If we are going to nationalise public passenger transport, no matter who is a friend of the private concessionaire, no matter if he has friends in high places, it is our duty to see that every bus which is transporting passengers in this island is being run by the Transport Board for one very obvious reason. It is not good enough to have certain buses run by private concessionaires - I do not know if all of them have their concessions now because I have been informed that up to a certain time one concessionaire did not have his concession. If all the buses were run by the Board, it must be cheaper as regards the general maintenance. Instead of having a Board with its workshop and each of the private companies having their workshops - it must be realised that if you are buying units for the entire island at a wholesale rate, you must be able to purchase them more economically than if you are buying a limited number which the Transport Board controls. Can the new Manager tell us of any other place in the Commonwealth which has the sort of dual bus service which we are running now - private enterprise plus public transport? This is a matter which should be under public control, and no Socialist should be satisfied with the present system. One rather gets the feeling that the Government is somewhat timid about running this transport and would be more than glad, even at this late stage, if some of the former owners of concessions would ask to have them back and so relieve the Government of its present responsibility. I remember the meed of gratitude which was rendered to Mrs. Weatherhead when she decided to continue to run her concession.

In this third Annual Report of the Transport Board, I notice that a recommendation has been made that all of the worn out petrol driven buses be replaced by modern diesel buses so as to provide the public with a safer, more dependable and up-to-date service. I would like more information as to when this recommendation is likely to be implemented, because I still see that, on our roads, these worn out buses have to be convoyed by some sort of transport or by some unit of the Transport Board in order to get them back to the workshop. The Board must come to a decision as to when a vehicle has passed its useful stage of life and not continue to put it on the road to the inconvenience of the people who are inconvenienced when these buses break down. In the suburban districts you have to wait for half an hour - and in the rural districts you have to wait for an hour or so - before you can get the service of another unit. It is not good enough to have these worn out buses on the road.

1.15 p.m.

Now, I was interested to note on page 3 of the Third Annual Report their comment that as a result of the prolonged digging up of Highways 1 and 7 tyres and springs were subjected to excessive strain and that the overall replacements during the year amounted to $39,000 as compared with $29,000 the previous year.

Mr. Chairman, I would be very glad if the Department concerned would appreciate that not only in respect of the Transport Board whose tyres and springs are subjected to excessive strain, but the owners of private vehicles, because as you know, Sir, as regards Highway 1 there is never a time when that is not being dug up, and Highway 7 seems to be keen and intent on rivalling Highway 1; and just as the Transport Board is concerned about the excessive strain to which these tyres and springs are subjected, I wish they would also realise a considerable section of the public is subjected to the same difficulty and tribulation in respect of their units and try and reduce this digging up to a minimum. Sometimes one wonders whether it is being regarded purely as an employment scheme which, of course, would have all my sympathy, or if it is really necessary to be continually digging up these roads with the result that not only the traffic is very severely handicapped because of digging up the streets as I mentioned in the House a few weeks ago - and the Premier said that he mentioned it to the proper Government authority as he agreed that sometimes long stretches are dug up which make traffic almost impossible without serious handicaps and tremendous inconvenience.

Now an important thing, Mr. Chairman, is for Government to come to a decision and to make a bold decision as to whether it is going to allow the present state of affairs to continue with this duality of transport or whether it has notified the present private concessionaires not to replace their units because Government is going to take over and did not intend renewing their licences, that they have had experience in running a bus system and have decided after such experience that they are going to run

the entire public passenger transport service in this island. It should be understood by the people who are responsible for the running of the service that in the past if a concessionaire was faulty, the old Transport Board would call him up and point out what is going wrong, that his buses are leaving ahead of time or missing a service or his buses are running late. There may be a feeling in many cases with the Transport Board that nobody can take away their concession and many instances have been brought to my attention which I have brought to the attention of the officials of the Board that the service is not being maintained in accordance with the Schedule. There have been occasions when a service has been changed and the people not notified before hand, and as a result there has been grave inconvenience to the people in the country districts to find that all of a sudden without warning a bus which would normally go into a village on a particular morning did not go there, and people were waiting at the usual place for the Transport Board bus which never turned up. When I report it to the Chairman of the Board, there has been that characteristic courtesy of the Hon. Mr. Symmonds and he promises to have the matter looked into right away and it has been done, but some of the people between the Chairman and the Board do not seem to think very much of it. If they have a particular idea in their heads, an experiment which may be good to try, they do not put themselves to the trouble of forewarning people in the district of an experiment which is about to take place and people are caught off guard and seriously affected in respect of their work.

I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister to pass on to the proper source that in the country districts there is more supervision needed in respect of the arrivals and departures on mornings of the buses to take people to work and to take children to school; often the buses either leave ahead of time or considerably after the time. There should be various country district terminuses for incoming buses where officials of the Board might pay unexpected visits to ensure that the six o'clock bus actually leaves at 6 o'clock and not at ten minutes to six or a quarter past six. I have had many complaints about unpunctuality; sometimes they are early, but if you are planning to catch the 6 o'clock bus and it leaves at ten minutes to six, you are not there. I have heard it mentioned about a private concessionaire in the parish of St. James, but I would like to suggest to the Minister that he should take steps to ensure that there is a Transport Board bus to take the children from Institutions such as the Coleridge and Parry Schools and the Alexandra School up Trents Hill or Orange Hill and right away up to Apes Hill, if necessary, instead of these children having to depend on a not too safe looking pickup, or having to walk up that hill on afternoons after a long day at school, or walk up that hill on mornings to catch a bus on Highway 1. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that you will sound your powerful voice in supporting my appeal for a school children's bus service from Orange Hill and Trents Hill so that the children would not have either to walk down or up that hill, going to or from school.

As you know, what some people living on that road and who have to use that bus service have to do is to take a bus from their district to Bridgetown, then catch a bus from Bridgetown to Alexandra or to Coleridge and Parry; that is not good enough. I am sorry that you are at the moment in the Chair because I am sure that you would add your voice in no uncertain terms to point out to the Minister this unsatisfactory state of affairs, because there is no reason why a Transport Board bus should not be released in order to provide that transport to those two Government-aided Secondary Schools. I was told that at the moment the attention of the Ministry and the Board is directed to the urgent necessity for coming to a decision and getting rid of this present duality of transport, because at the moment transport is being run both by the Board and by several private concessionaires.

1.25 p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, for how many more years are we to be inflicted with the state of affairs as is before us today? Government took over the operation of the bus transport service, or rather a portion of it, in August, 1955. They were told then that they were doing wrong, and not only were they told so by members of the House but by two Commissions which had been appointed to go into the matter. Their own Commissions on public transport told them so. Government said that the owners of these buses were making fortunes out of them, that they were building bungalows and taking trips out of them and were running their buses inefficiently and , therefore, they were not prepared to accept what the Commission had told them, that is, that the fares needed to be adjusted upwards. Of course, all along the Government was stubborn, just as stubborn as they are today about other things. I am one who told them that they would regret what they did in a few years: but it was not in a few years, it was a matter of months when they came back to the House to ask for money to meet the deficiency. Since then, it has been an annual recurrence and today the statement of affairs of the Transport Board shows that it is in such a hopeless condition that the only way which the Hon. Minister of Trade could get up and justify it was to make a comparison of the Board with the private concessionaires when he said that they could not treat their staff as harshly as is done by those private concessionaires.

I want to ask him this. Is he also Minister of Labour? I am sure the Labour Department can redress any such thing. I cannot see how you can dismiss an employee as a bus conductor or driver on the grounds that he has not brought in enough money. There is the Labour Department and it is the duty of the Labour Commissioner to take consideration of all those things. Of course the Hon. Minister only said so to throw from our eyes the mist on the Transport Board. Today, three years since the Government has taken over this service, it has cost the taxpayers $826,283.31 on paper and if the Government had acceded to the request of the concessionaires and given them the modest increase of half cent a fare, it would have saved the Government from this loss and the huge capital expenditure which they are being called upon to bear.

I will say today, as I said on the last occasion, that it will be many years before the Government puts this thing right. The Hon. Minister has stated that the Managing Director has made recommendations which they have accepted and which will correct all these things.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member should quote me correctly. I have not said that. I said that the recommendations which the Managing Director had put out were good recommendations but that they involved financial consideration and we are still discussing them. We have not reached a decision yet on them.

Mr. GODDARD: He said that the Managing Director made recommendations many of which were accepted. I would like to ask the Hon. Minister who said that the Managing Director had made many recommendations if it is not a fact that one of them is for a further increase of bus fares. The Hon. Minister can answer that question later on.

As I have said just now, it has cost us $826,283.31 for the three years running of the transport service and, as a matter of fact, it has cost us more than that because we have had to capitalise to something over $1 million and it is a drain and a recurrent drain on us.

The hon. junior member for St. Lucy who spoke just now said that it is time that the Government take over this whole thing. I do not know where his sense of responsibility is when he says that, because to take over the other buses and add to the worry of the Transport Board as well as more losses would be an added burden on the taxpayers. The hon. member has not stated the name of one private concessionaire who is running buses at the same fares and is making or losing money but the Commissioner of Inland Revenue can enlighten us on that question. From what I know they have not appealed for a further increase in the rate of fares, but the losses of the Transport Board have continued although the rate of fares has been put up. As I can see it, there is now

no hope for them and the service will continue to run like that at a loss.

They have new buses and, as you know, new buses during their first year of operation do not require the repairs and maintenance as when they get old. One can be sure that as soon as these buses get older, they will call for heavy repairs and maintenance; therefore, I only hope that that $90,000 as depreciation will be marked off for depreciation and the day that you have to get new buses you will have it there for that purpose because the time will come when you will have to buy new buses and that is what depreciation is meant for. Do not deduct that from your list and then come and say we want new buses; we want new capital. I can tell you that when the public of Barbados read about this thing last night in the *Advocate*, they were appalled at the figures because they were told by the previous Minister whose portfolio this was that they were going to make money: but they have lost more last year than they have lost in the year before.

I am going to quote something from this Report but let me say before I begin that what is written here is a Report of the Directors, and as this is a hopeless case they are trying to put it the very best way for the public to receive: but it you actually read through this Report and scrutinise it carefully you will realise that it is even much worse than it appears on paper. As far as the Report shows, the revenue from bus fares has increased over the previous year by something like $120,000 but the running expenses over the same period have increased by $130,000. In other words, what was a hopeless loss before continues to be a worse loss. The expenses have gone up and they have gone ahead with new buses that they are running and it is worse than when they had those old decrepit buses which have now been scrapped. What is going to happen next year and the following year when these new buses will be costing more for maintenance and repairs?

In the Annual Estimates for 1959-60 which we are now considering, we have a new Head of Expenditure. It is on page 114. We have never had before the Head - Transport Services - and this is how the note to the Item under it reads: "it is estimated that the operation deficiencies of the Transport Board will be $50,000." That is what is creeping in our Estimates now. We are having a vote of deficiencies for things which were a profit to private concessionaires. These things are now a drain on the Treasury. That is where nationalisation is leading this country. They were not yet fit to take over this service but yet they took it over and they continue to talk of nationalisation of industries that have been making a profit only to take them over and run them at a loss.

1.35 p.m.

It is doing more than that. I hope that no matter who owns or who may be mixed up in Private Transport concessions today, they will be allowed to remain and so save the taxpayers from some of the burden which will be added if the Government attempts to take over any more of the transport of Barbados. If they do that, everything ends; if the concessionaires are doing things badly, you can call them up. You have Inspectors and it is not only in the case of the private buses, but there are many of the Government buses which do not run to time. I take up people who ask "What is wrong with the buses this morning?" You do not get any complaint about the public buses, but only against the private ones because you want to minimise your trouble; that is unfair to the private people, but the public knows what is happening; the public realise that they are footing the bill today.

In the Estimates you have another $50,000 but you have underestimated your losses. In the year before the amount was something like $208,000 this year it is $216,000 and I do not know how much it will be next year. Let them please explain the position to us; let us know it so that we can tell the public. They are going to ask what is the answer to all of this. They take over and nationalise the public transport just at the very time when Jamaica and Trinidad were selling out to private enterprise, and they were told that; it was stubbornness at the time which has led up to this state of affairs. We cannot replace money in Barbados as it is done in Trinidad and Jamaica which have natural resources; we thought we had oil but the Gulf Oil Company is pulling out of the island with their machinery; we cannot afford the losses even if Trinidad and Jamaica can do it. They have seen the light: and our Government with all of that facing them, have put us in this mess in which we now are today with $216,000 out and more to come. The members of the Government have a lot for which to answer; let them answer it.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Acting Chairman, the sum of $826,283.31 is a lot of money for the taxpayers of this island to pay so as to keep one man alive. Mr. Acting Chairman, "not even over my dead body;" the body is still living. The taxpayers have to pay $800,000 and also increased fares and they will have to pay more too. It is really remarkable how the stubbornness of certain people can be allowed to militate against the interest of the whole island. Mr. Acting Chairman, I think you will appreciate how many better things could be done in this Island for the people of this Island with this $800,000 than subsidising a 'dead body' which is the present Government set up for running the buses. The experts know it and everybody else knows it. The Ministers made a trip out to Germany in connection with these Mercedes-Benz buses; some of them have gone and we are going to be told - before I say this I want to say that I have no doubt that the new Managing Director is an able man; I have no reason to suppose that he does not know how to run the bus service, but we in Barbados have been running the buses for years and years and years and nobody in Barbados up to now has been able to make a success of this new 'dead body' venture; but as is usually the opinion of the Government, an importee will be able to make a success of it. When it comes to the facts and figures of running the 'dead body, which we have at our disposal and the public will have at its disposal, I must say that even the Minister of Communications has been unable to make out in his speech any more than a very lame plea for the retention of this service. We must give him credit; I always believe in giving credit where credit is due. I give him credit for the fact that he says, and I hope it is true, that this service is run without any interference by him. One must give the Hon. Minister credit for that, but when he attempts to use the argument that private concessionaires can harshly treat their employees in one way or another, by dismissal or otherwise, to prove his case over the takings of this dead body' organisation, it is there where he fails miserably

As the hon. junior member for Christ Church has said, I find it hard to believe that the existence in this island today of a strong accredited Trade Union Movement and a Government that claims to be a Socialist Government with a Labour Office (Hon. M. E. COX: Not claims to be a Socialist Government). I said that it claims to be a Socialist Government. I know that one Minister said that he saw a statement on Socialism but he did not say that he practiced Socialism; he said he just followed it.

1.45 p.m.

In these days no one would believe that a conductor or driver or employee in any part of this island in any business can be dismissed so easily. This is a case which the Hon. Minister is trying to use in favour of the 'dead-body thing they have now because they do not bring in so much money when the week comes. Well, Sir, that is a sad state of affairs which the Ministry of Labour should look into at once, and the Trade Union as well.

Now, Sir, we have been told that some of these diesel buses are even more decrepit than the old decrepit gasolene buses because they are costing more money and will have to be scrapped.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, that is a statement I should correct. I do not know who said that but I certainly never did. I never said that they are more decrepit than the old gasolene buses. The hon. member is only making a statement because he cannot quote me as saying that.

Mr. DOWDING: I was not quoting the hon. member but if he wants me to quote him I will endeavour to do so.

Facts reveal that some of these diesel buses are not giving satisfaction but the old gasolene buses are doing better!

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Again, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is not quoting me when he says that these old gasolene buses are doing better. I never said that, and if he looks at the Report he will see what it says. I quoted from the Report to show what losses the decrepit buses incurred in replacements.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, if a new brand diesel bus comes here and burns up its engine in a short time, is it not doing worse than an old gasolene bus? It was particularly pointed out by the Minister that some of these buses - and he mentioned the Mercedes - are not doing what they had expected of them. I regret that we were not circulated with the running cost of each one of these buses, and I am sorry that I have had to give my time to the consideration of the Budget and have been unable to produce figures - it is the right of every hon. member of this House to be given such figures and be able to study for himself how the taxpayers' money is being spent. I know what it costs per mile to run a bus. I know and have records: and that is where they would have the idea of every single bus which was once under my control. I would like the figures which I asked for today to be handed to all members in order that these figures could be compared with facts that existed when private enterprise ran this service in the past. This, Sir, is a lamentable case, and the hon. member's speech in an effort to substantiate the furtherance of this tragedy on the people of this island was just as lamentable. He has nothing to work on and you cannot build a speech with nothing to work on. Any Auditor, any businessman or any layman will see that this does not need investigation; the facts are clear.

In their stubbornness the Government decided to nationalise and take over the buses for the sake of half cent; that was the first step. When they took over they found that they had to increase the fares; so that countered the first step. Now they are finding and the Report indicates that it will cost more money in fares and it will cost more money to buy more buses just now. I would not be surprised if there is a condemned diesel engine or two lying somewhere or sold for junk in this island. Somewhere in this Report, Sir, mention was made about fares, and I challenge them now that they cannot get up here and say today that they will not further increase bus fares in the near future. Somewhere also comparison has been made with existing fares in other islands to try to substantiate this evil which is being perpetuated by the Government. Why, Sir, in a matter of this sort should we crow over the fact that by comparison with Trinidad where the minimum fare was 6¢ and the price of gasolene 4.8¢ per pint, the average minimum stage fare in Barbados was 3¢ and in some cases as low as one penny. Of course, any businessman would have added to that paragraph "plus so many thousand dollars and cents lost," or he would have said that the buses in Trinidad are operating at so many thousand dollars profit.

1.55 p.m.

All that we have said, while the buses in Trinidad are operating at so many thousand dollars of profit - whatever the case was, no effort was made to substantiate this - it can be easily seen by any child in the third form that these facts can be pulled to pieces and cannot be in any way substantiated.

One must commend the Government on the fact that they have got this gentleman, Mr. Bowen, to put in a Report. One can only hope that his Report will be such as to, first of all, have the full consideration of this Hon. House after it has been discussed by the various Cabinets and so forth. However, one must remember this gentleman's position. I will not say anything more of the Managing Director until I see that Report because I feel he should be given every opportunity. I feel that this gentleman has the ability, is a good man and that he should be given every possible opportunity to let this Government tie a noose around their necks for the next elections. I want to repeat that I would be very grateful if hon. members can be circulated with the profit and loss figures on each bus because I think it would be a very interesting matter to investigate and compare them.

Sir, the Hon. Minister said "God help this Island if it returns to the old chaotic conditions of the past." Well, Sir, I wonder if these new conditions are not even more chaotic when one considers, and rightly so, the financial aspect of the Transport Board. Do not let him or anyone else fool themselves. The Government cannot be run without money, the bus companies cannot be run without money, you cannot run your own business without money, I cannot run my own business without money, and nothing can be run without money; and if the financial aspects of a matter are not considered, it is a failure.

(Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.)

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2 o'clock, the sitting of this House now stands suspended until 2.30 o'clock p.m. 2.00 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPEAKER called Questions and Private Members' Business but there were none.

Mr. SPEAKER: At the suspension of the House, the House was in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply Mr. SEARLES in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for St. George was addressing the Committee on the last occasion.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, first of all, I must apologise for the volume of my voice caused by the microphone and I hope if it is affecting you that they will turn the microphone down. As I was saying, Sir, it takes finance to run your business, the Government's business, my business, the buses or anything; so, obviously, Government has to pay attention to the financial situation. The financial situation is in my humble opinion indeed the most important one. There is no doubt that by putting on the routes these new buses a certain amount of better service has been achieved. That is obvious; but that does not substantiate the argument in continuing this debacle in any way whatsoever. It is good to remember the attitude of a lot of people who expressed their feelings immediately after these buses were taken over by the Government and they have repeated it on many occasions. I was told quite frankly by people: "These are our buses now; we can do as we like with them.' Well, Sir, that was their attitude and I think it still prevails because, as I have said in this House before, I know of a case when a bus left Combermere yard and was parked in Rickett Street, on its first trip out the gasolene tank which had been filled before was empty. Well, Sir, that is a case of our gasolene! That attitude must be stringently dealt with and we cannot allow the taxpayers' money to be spent on new ventures such as this in a manner not beneficial to the taxpayers and the people of this island as a whole. I do repeat that I have the fullest confidence in the present Managing Director and there is no alternative but for this House to agree so long as Government intends to throw away money in this particular venture.

Sir, it is even noticeable in all the explanations and excuses you have got today. It is for that reason I would like to be given the figures on the running cost of each bus. I can tell hon. members that I have under my control the same model of engine that is in the old petrol buses and it is working efficiently. To make a scapegoat of the old gasolene buses and to go further and to compare private enterprise with Government in the conditions of service that you are giving now cannot make sense because I fail to see - and this is what the Hon. Minister has said, "that the Gov- should ignore the justifiable claims for better conditions of work and pay."

2.35 p.m.

I fail to see any private enterprise, apart from the conditions obtaining in this island, taking advantage of the people as suggested by the Hon. Minister, and dismissing them because they do not bring in enough money at the end of the week. I should like to ask him this: How many persons have been dismissed by the same dead-body set-up? I am certain that a number of persons have also been dismissed from that institution.

On page 2 paragraph (D) of this Report this is what is stated:-

"The new diesel buses had been in great demand for charters and sight-seeing tours and had considerably lessened the incidence of torn clothing and other inconveniences suffered by the public when travelling in the old gasolene buses."

Mr. Acting Chairman, they are certainly trying their best to make out a case. Of course, one would expect that the new diesel buses would lessen the incidence of torn clothing and other inconveniences suffered by the public when travelling in the old gasolene buses. May I remind the Government that at the time that the half-cent increase in fares was refused 'over the dead body', negotiations were taking place by private enterprise to bring in new diesel buses? In fact, I believe there was one in existence then, but due to the fact that the particular concessionaire could not get the laws changed so as to suit the regulations - of course the Government have got all of these concessions passed now and they can operate buses of any size they want to operate. On the other hand, the private concessionaires have been writing all over the world in order to get the particular buses to suit the particular regulations.

It is noticeable that all the incidence of torn clothing and other inconveniences suffered by the public have been reduced. Then they have claims; I do not know for what are these claims. For 1957 these claims amounted to $1,356 and for 1958 they amount to $1,867.03; therefore, in spite of having these new buses reducing the incidence of torn clothing and other inconveniences, the amount in respect of these claims has still been increased. I say that it is a great pity - but perhaps whatever happens, happens - that the claims of the dead body should claim my attention at this juncture and I have not got sufficient facts and figures in connection with them. What I have before me is only a balance sheet which does not give any breakdown as to what the situation is and that has caused me to be unable to offer more constructive criticism on this particular venture I do hope that this particular Government in the near future will be satisfied to see that the dead body is still living; let bygones be bygones and let us stop this waste of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Acting Chairman, this is a considerable amount of money which we are being asked to vote. I did not hear the Hon. Minister's speech; when I came into the House I heard the hon. junior member for Christ Church speaking, and what was very evident to me is that this Government is giving the hon. member, who is not a believer in public ownership, the opportunity to criticise public ownership with such vehemence that the Government of Barbados could not in the foreseeable future ever attempt to say that they are going to own something and run it on the show which they have made with this business. I do not want to go into the history of this matter because it is known that spite is responsible for this state of affairs; and whatever you are working by spite and not by commonsense, you usually end up in this way.

I have been reading this Report and I heard some passing reference by the Government and even by backbenchers in respect of the Trade Union. They should run their affairs as we are running the Trade Union; they can go to Fairchild Street and they will see positive proof there, because when you are running something properly you increase and you build. The Hon. Minister did not have the slightest responsibility for what he was putting us into; an amount of $1/4 million is a lot of money, but I am not worried about that; if you are running an efficient service you may say that it is impossible to make a profit if you are maintaining it at this standard. I believe that the point made by the hon. junior member for Christ Church is fresh in the minds of the people, that is to say, it is going to cost the public so much money now that you had better allowed the fares to be increased, because you are reducing the amount of money which is available to be spent, and therefore you must reduce the standard of the people in this community by some means or other. The amount of money which you had to use in respect of other things cannot be so used now because you have to spend the money in this direction. You did not have this deficit five years ago and it means that your charges have been increased for improving the service to the community. That is a general statement; when we call for money in another direction, we will be asked: "Where is the money coming from?" This matter has given the hon. junior member for Christ Church and people who think like him, people who are opposed to nationalisation, some argument, because broadly speaking, the question of the public owning the Transport service or the telephone service or the Light and Power service is something which is not extraordinarily new; these are services which, in the United States of America, are run by the State, but the question is that you must have somebody who really understands what he is doing, to run a service. The Government will have to take its beating on this matter.

2.45 p.m.

What is evident is that you might win an election but it does not necessarily mean that you have sense to run a particular business. You must have a memorandum prepared on these things. What was wrong was that the Government had no detailed plan for dealing with these things and they had to be run by an administration, and an administration can take you for a ride anywhere because you cannot tell the administrator that this cannot work, it just does not make sense and you cannot do it that way. You have something run by an Administrative Board but any positive direction comes from you because you are responsible for policy. It is a pathetic case and one in which you have gone so far that you cannot turn back. Nobody is going to buy it now. When the Government shows up a bad case no private employer is going to buy it, because if you went on a market and asked anybody to take over, they would want to give you less than half the price; they would say that if you are not making money and you are the Government and can tax, they want them at this low price. If you went back to the hon. senior member for St. George and asked his firm to take them over, do you realise the price they would offer? Do you realise that an arbitrator cannot come now and ask anybody to pay a certain price? You can arbitrate when the Government is buying, but when it comes to private enterprise you will have to sell at the price which they offer. It is a pathetic case, Mr. Chairman, which we really and truly cannot afford and I say that with a full sense of responsibility. Barbados cannot afford a deficit on what could be regarded as a business enterprise like this. Do you realise, Mr. Chairman, that if you have a deficit at the rate of $250,000 a year for ten years, that would mean $2,500,000 00, nearly half of what you propose to spend on the new Hospital? Do you realise what the sinking fund would be if you had to provide a loan of this amount which you are running as a deficit? Let any of the people who like dealing with figures tell you if you had a sinking fund at 1 1/2% and it is the equivalent to $150,000 what the capital would be? You would then get some idea of the amount of money which you are using that way, and it would be as much money as you can put into another type of investment which would bring back to your country something of which you are really in need. I say that because I am not wedded to the idea nor am I a believer like the hon. junior member for Christ Church that the Government has no right to take over the transport service. What I do say is.....

Mr. GODDARD: On a point of explanation. If I said Government had no right; I said it had no right at the time, because it was not in a position to operate this efficiently. I am not opposed to Government owning something but the provision is that they must do it as efficiently as private enterprise; that is the only condition.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I know that the view of the hon. junior member for Christ Church is part of his Party's philosophy - non participation in this sort of business. They believe in private enterprise as against nationalisation; Government on the other hand believes in nationalisation, and why I say that Government must come in for a bad beating is because they have now exercised their doctrinaire philosophy. You have failed so badly that you have given the hon. junior member for Christ Church, who does not believe in your taking over, a golden opportunity

to prove that his philosophy is right, and that is why I say that for a long time Government should be very diffident about taking things over. There are things like light and and other public utilities which are run by public authorities in other places.

Some mention was made about the service and workers here. If you look at this Balance Sheet, Mr. Chairman, prepared by the Auditor, you will find that the wages of conductors and the like as compared with the total expenditure could not be regarded as something exorbitant. The wages here in dealing with conductors and drivers show an expenditure of $211,000 in an expenditure of $955,000, and that cannot be regarded as unreasonable because when you look at the salary of monthly paid employees and Board members, you find that that represents $72,000 which is about one-third of the number of people who are drivers and conductors. I therefore do not think that that is an unreasonable figure.

I have been to the Transport Board and have seen a lot of people on the staff just as at the Housing Board, and it has been drawn to my attention and I will point out that the time has come when I feel that recruitment into these places should be dealt with in the same manner as people recruited into the Public Service by the Public Service Commission. The days for nepotism and finding jobs for this person's son, uncle, uncle's aunt and such in these places is not good enough for the Public Service. It kills efficiency and it makes the people believe that some of those people employed are related to somebody who is Governor General of Barbados and you cannot tell them anything if they go wrong. It kills discipline and it makes those responsible for the running of affairs feel that they cannot say anything to these men or these women. I believe that is a thing which requires a lot of investigation.

My attitude about all Boards is that there should be an over-riding Act in this island making it compulsory and obligatory that with all public authorities, be they Local Government or Statutory Boards, there shall be a Public Service Commission responsible for the appointment and recruitment of people into the Public Service, because they are receiving public money. Now, Mr. Chairman, can you tell me the real difference between money we vote here for this service as compared with money we vote for the Post Office? Do you mean that a five dollar note out of the Treasury for the Transport Board would be different from a five dollar note for the Post Office? It all comes out of public funds.

2.55 p.m.

It is what the taxpayers throw up and I do not feel that we should have these systems that give rise to nepotism and favouritism. We must get down to the job with the view that if you want a job in the Public Service and you have a service, let it be done by the Board or by anybody; therefore nobody need fear. If we have anybody to appoint, let us tell the people, never mind how much you may like them, that, say, there are one hundred jobs to be had but you cannot appoint one hundred and one people: you can only appoint one hundred.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I rise to get this point clear. The hon. member referred to wages being $100,000. Is he referring to the wages of conductors and drivers alone or is he including the other people along with them.

Mr. WALCOTT: I was only making comparison because some discussion took place about the conductors and drivers. As a result I said that the amount paid to conductors and drivers was $211,000. I was comparing that with the $72,000 which was paid to the monthly employees and Board members and I felt that that should be much lower. I know that there are other people who receive wages because there are wages being paid to the mechanics and the yard staff and that comes to another $80,000. I was comparing that of the conductors and drivers with that of the monthly employees and Board members because the conductors and drivers seem to represent the biggest bulk of employees at the Transport Board as a section of workers.

Sir, I believe I have said a lot on this question. I have heard it said that the success which one receives in an election does not necessarily mean he has been given the approval to see after every aspect of running the affairs of Government and I do not know if any member of the Government will pat himself on the back over this unhappy inheritance. It has been drawn to my attention that what the hon. senior member for St. George has said is that the Mercedes Benz buses have proved to be a failure. If that is so, the Minister should say so. I now understand that he said so too. However, I understand that they have arrived from a source which should know something about buses. If they have proved to be a failure on the basis of their performance, I will say that that is something which is liable to happen to you because you are running something new. When you are running something new, you can expect these things to happen as they are part of your experimentation.

So far as the Workers' Union is concerned, I will tell the Hon. Minister this. In the Union we do not represent inefficiency; we do not pat people on their backs. We have told workers both of this Government and private employers that we are here to defend their rights but not to support their wrongs. The Workers' Union is not a party to any dishonesty or indeed to any aspect of dishonesty. We feel that if a man is working with any employer, either the Government, the Transport Board or anybody else, his work should be honest and that if there is any aspect of dishonesty by him he should be disciplined for it even if the maximum disciplinary action, which is dismissal, is required. We tell the man that he must be prepared for that and he must be one to admit that he deserves that treatment if he is dishonest. We are no party to blind-eye Trade Unionism. We have had instances where we agreed with the management and where we did not agree with the management.

I may say that since the present Minister of Trade has been dealing with the Transport Board he has not interfered with it. Apparently the Board seems to work with less fear of political interference from him. There was a time when I myself had some difficulty with the Board, when a man was dismissed whether he was right or wrong at the instigation of somebody from very high up. We do not like that sort of thing. When such a sort of thing happens, it makes Board members feel that they are not free to act on their own: and I feel when you set up a Board like the Transport Board, you are answerable to Parliament for it and if anything goes wrong it is the Minister's duty to see that it is corrected; but if it is a Statutory Board, it should be left to the people whom you appoint to correct those things because the people whom you appoint are appointed with the approval and knowledge of the Minister concerned. In short, the Board is the creation of the Minister in so far as personnel is concerned.

I say that this is an unhappy situation but I think that a bit of re-organisation or a bit of re-examination will help. I am speaking as a trade unionist with the full sense of my responsibility. If you are not getting in the revenue from bus fares which you believe you should get in, you should be prepared to state that and give a warning. You can say that the General Secretary of the Union has said this: if you are satisfied that the conductors and who are responsible are not building the economy, give a warning that you will have the buses built with such a system that you can get the maximum amount of fares in. If you are not getting in the maximum fares, tell us because no bus conductor has any right to claim the money that is being paid in to him as bus fare just because he is the bus conductor. I hear people in a loose way say that the question of bus conductors taking out some of the fares is nothing and that is far different from a man going and stealing something. They say there is nothing in that. I do not subscribe to that view. I feel and I have told them that we cannot get more wages for bus drivers and conductors if they supplement their wages before we go around a table and talk. If you are prepared to play the game, then it must be reflected in the profit to the people who hire you and they will have to pay you more wages. Of course, there are some people who have no need to do these things but who do them, and sometimes it will happen.

The Hon. Minister of Trade said that somebody was severely disciplined or dismissed by a private employer because that person did not bring in enough money as bus fares. I cannot say that that person did not bring in enough money but I have been made to understand that you have these sort of test cases in which somebody else works on the same route over the same period and you find a remarkable difference in the amount brought in.
3.05 p.m.
I have some dealings with administration; apart from being a member of this Chamber I have an Organisation to run; and the same problems which will present themselves to the running of an administration will present themselves to my Organisation; and if you have to discipline someone because the cash is getting low, I do not think that anybody can say that you are not working in the interest of the community. I hope it will not be thought that I am making any apology for what I am saying here; I am a Trade Unionist who is known for telling employers and workers where they get off at, if any of them seems to be wrong. These people who are employed by the Transport Board are in the Trade Union; the Board has given the Union recognition and we meet them frequently. We have set up a Works Council over there. I take the view that in view of the fact that this is a public body, the workers must appreciate what it means to work in the interest of the public and not believe that things belong to them.

When I come to the Budget, I will say something and I will draw to the Premier's attention that the services which are run in the interest of the public want a complete overhauling from top to bottom. You will find that at the Transport Board or anywhere else, as long as we have anything to do with the representation of workers and a man is not prepared to be honest and do his work in an exemplary manner he will not have any representation from us. If it is a question of more wages then we will go after more wages. I do not subscribe to any wage of $13 a week because nobody can live on that; it is a subsistence amount. Sometimes the reaction is against that. I see that the wages of conductors and drivers have been increased but you can well understand that these wages should be increased. You cannot ask a man to drive one of these Mercedes Benz or Leyland buses at the same price as you would pay for driving a gasolene bus. And then you want to have good drivers.

I should like the Hon. Minister to give instructions to the Board to the effect that these big buses are being driven too fast on our narrow roads. That is a serious thing; I have passed many of these buses of that size and it is only God's mercies that some of them have not yet come into contact with a small motor-car and killed everybody in it. That is a serious business. Barbados is too small for the drivers of these buses to be in that hurry because you can get from point to point fairly quickly. The better the bus is and the more moderately it is driven, the better the people will enjoy the ride. We have some good drivers in this island; we have some careful ones too; but I would ask that special care be taken in the selection and the type of drivers because it is all right to say, when an accident takes place, that it is an accident, but you might have killed ten or twenty people and we have the common phrase used "the man is dead already" as if he is a fowl-cock; it is not realised that it is a breadwinner who has been killed and that some poor child's education has been left in mid-air. I believe that we should avoid murdering people on the streets; I hope that the Hon. Minister will see to that. I believe that the use of more propaganda on driving along the roads in a general way would be of use to the community and to the drivers because they are driving the largest vehicles which are now on the roads in Barbados. I think the Minister will have to admit that this is a legacy - well, it is not a legacy left with him, it is something which he has undertaken; it was one of those things in connection with which when you look back in retrospect you can say that it would have been better to have gone on in the old way. It is not that the old way was so good, but the money which we have expended on the Transport Board is something which none of us can say that we are happy about.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Acting Chairman, I cannot sit here with the intention of voting for this amount of money without saying something on this Resolution. I am not opposing the Resolution because this is money which has to be paid, and if another amount of this kind should come in again, I shall have to vote for it; but the question is: How long are you going to continue to spend money in this way? In respect of any businessman who began any kind of business with a capital of, say, $1,000 and at the end of a year he has to go and borrow $2,000 so as to make up his bills, if he succeeded in getting the $2,000 and in another year he has to go and get $4,000, he would be obliged to cry halt.

As far as this Board is concerned, I would not say that the members of the Board do not know what they are doing; in my opinion, they are all hard-headed businessmen. I know that one of the members there - I would not care to call his name - is such a keen businessman that he has his servant selling his kerosene oil and when he checked up with this particular man, he was a few dollars out. In that case, some persons like me, if they were not satisfied with the way in which this man conducted the sales of their oil, would have discharged him and become the losers; but what did this member of the Board do? He stopped every cent from the man's wages and that man's wife had no money to provide food for him during the week; she could not get any breakfast for him. But that member of the Board suffered to give that servant some of his breakfast in order to keep him alive and in order to be able to stop some of his money from his week's wages. That man is still a member of the Board and do you want to tell me that he does not know when a business is paying or not? I cannot credit him with anything more than being a hard-headed businessman. It seems to me that either the members of this Board are afraid of somebody or of something or they want to be dishonest to this Government and therefore they do not give us the true figures. There is something wrong.
3.15 p.m.

I cannot blame or would never blame the Minister because in my opinion he knows nothing about transport as far as the administrative side is concerned; he might only know how to get in his motor-car and drive along; but he has elected or nominated members there to represent him and this Government by way of their administration, and he is so confident in these members that he would not interfere - and rightly so. If you appoint a man to do a job and then go behind that man to give him orders, you will never get things working right, and I really am in agreement with the Minister for not interfering. I feel, however, that the members of this Board are to be blamed because they know that this Transport Board will never be able to make a success of the venture. If they used to talk in their sleep at night I believe their wives might have heard them saying: "it cannot pay, it cannot pay", and I do not see it ever paying over my living body - not the way this Transport Board is being run.

I was in favour of the taking over and voted for it, because I thought as other members did that we could have made a success of it. We were looking in one direction and never had the slightest thought of the greatest obstacle, and the greatest obstacle in this affair is to get the money coming in. We never thought of what would be happening to the income of this Transport Board until we found ourselves in it. One may say that the Minister has to listen to experts, and I believe that these experts are responsible for us being in this predicament today; because if we were told or if the Government were told by the experts "hands off", "have nothing to do with it" I am sure they would never have been in this; but I believe the experts said it can be done and then left us in the mire. You must listen to an expert but you must use your commonsense sometimes along with it.

Now the hon. junior member for St. Lucy opened up his remarks by saying that it could not pay if we are going to run half and allow the private concessionaries to run the other half of the Transport service. If it is not going to pay with half and this money is being spent in this way, what do you think it would be if you had the whole thing? If we are voting $259,000 and we do not have all the buses, what do you think it would be if we had all? I am very glad that the Government did not take all, and rather than taking more,

they should give out what they have because it is no use trying to give the public a service one way and disservice the other. I feel that we could get the Transport of this country as good as anywhere else and we would not have to subsidise it. It is very easy to give these buses out and control the service. You have a Managing Director now who, I understand, knows transport backwards; therefore you should give them out and put him over them and you would not have any worries or headaches, nor would you have to come hat in hand every time an opportunity presents itself to ask for money. Give the buses back out and let the Managing Director see to them. There was a time when some of these same old gasolene buses were given to private concessionaires, and these buses are working first-class today, and as far as I know, speaking under correction, these concessionaires paid off for the buses or owe very little on them. These are the same old gasolene buses which the Transport Board has today which are no use and are frittering away money.

Let us take a private concessionaire like Mr. Trotman who is running these buses in a first-class manner. I do not know if he is making first-class profits, but they are running on the road and he is trying in his small way to run them to the best of his ability; but if you should take all transport and give it to Mr. Trotman, he would become a failure too, because it would be too much for him to run on his own and he would have to rely on other people to help him, and they might help him down. He can control the few which he has now in hand and it would be the same with the other concessionaires. If Government takes it upon itself to take over all and has no proper control over the administration, over the bags or over the forms, then instead of going into the bag, a conductor's hand may slip into his pocket instead of into the bag, unless you are going to make straight clothes with no pockets at all, and even then I feel, like the hon. member on my left, that he may slip money into his shoes. We have a big job in front of us and I can clearly see that Government is trying their best because we cannot afford to spend money in this way.

Now the Hon. Minister said that we have to give the Managing Director a chance, but I wonder what provision is being made whilst awaiting the Managing Director to prevent us from having to vote another $259,000 by the time he is ready, because while we are awaiting, more expenses could be building up all the time. I hope that something is being done to pull us out of this mire.

I see from the notes that due to the continual digging up of Highways 1 and 7, considerable strain is put on the springs and tyres of these buses. Now buses alone are not travelling on these particular roads; there are heavy lorries with five and six tons of canes or sugar travelling on these roads also; but if you drive over these roads at the same speed as if you are driving on a pine floor, you must expect all these breakages. The driver should slow down when he is approaching these bad roads and take it quietly, and I am sure all would be well with these buses.

3.25.p.m

That alone will tell you that I am not blaming the buses for it. The buses can only go along at the same rate at which the bus drivers are driving them. You have a person in the employ of the Transport Board who I believe is a first-class mechanic and he should draw it to the Board's attention that it is not the fault of the buses but that it is the fault of the bus drivers. That is where I have to blame the Board. If the Board had to pull some of this money out of its own pockets and pay for this deficiency, I am sure they would tell the Minister after trying their utmost best that they could do no more and they would give them up. The hardest job they have to do is to get the Clerk to make up this deficit and hand it to the Minister. Of course, the Minister is in trouble now; he has to take the matter to the Cabinet and get them to give him the authority to come to the House for the money.

The Transport Board started out with a Manager and then they had to import a Managing Director. I do not know what the Manager is doing since they have a Managing Director. It is my feeling that if the Board was doing its job efficiently, they would not have to import a Managing Director. The St. George Bus Company, the Diamond Motor Bus Company and all the other bus companies have not gone to the trouble of importing a Managing Director to run their companies; the Directors of those companies direct and run their business themselves. They have to sit down and sprain their brains in order to get their business working efficiently. That is all that is happening.

I do not know if the Transport Board is doing this but if I had to direct it, the driver and conductor whom I put on Highway(1) this morning would not be put back there this evening; I would put somebody else. I would change them around often and by doing that I would be able to tell who are the ones to keep and whom I will have to discharge. I would "fix-it-right". You cannot sit back and allow these people to say: "These are our buses."

No one can say that all is well with this Transport Board and the Managing Director cannot do anything either about it. If you bring down all the new buses you want, that cannot remedy the case because you cannot remedy the real trouble so long as it is Government. The Minister says that he has an efficient working Board. He feels so. That is his opinion: but if I were in his place, I would not say so, because if they were efficient, things could not have gone as far as they have gone. Let me say this. I was a Managing Director too. As soon as the Government took over the buses my business began to go down because I lost the sale of gasolene which I made to the private concessionaire. I used to make an average of 4,000 gallons a week and it came down to 2,000 gallons as soon as the Government took them over. I did not wait back. I called a meeting of the Directors and told them this: "Gentlemen, I am not in a position to tell you if I am losing money but I am in a position to tell you that I have lost business and my overhead expenses are just the same. Rather than wait until the end of the year to find out my losses, I would like to find them out now." The Board did not back me. As a result of that, I left the business and after they would not appoint people to go into the accounts, I had to appoint a secretary and an auditor to go into them. I do not know if the Transport Board is telling the Government that the Government is not taking the Transport Board seriously. I know that as long as your overhead expenses are still up in the air and your business is goir down to the ground you are bound to be losing money. That Board should be in a position to say to Government: "Our expenses are one dollar and receipts are 90 cents." Do not go any further; draw it to the attention of the Government at once and let Government know the nature of things. That is business and you do that when you are trying to run a business successfully. You only do this sort of thing that you are doing because you can get your Clerk to make out a report and send it to the Ministry and you know when the Ministry decided it with the Cabinet that it will be sent on to the House and you will get your money, and so you do not care what happens.

Sir, I blame the creditors of the Transport Board because they have no right to let the Transport Board owe them all that money. Of course, they have done that because they know that the business is good. I am saying this now. Let us pay all our debts; let us cease to run them ourselves and let us call in concessionaires and give them the service to run. I am not in favour of giving the buses to those concessionaires who threw in the sponge but give them to those people who are now willing to run them and le' them give us so much per month and that will be the end of this matter. Why carry on just to say that you are carrying on? Why lose $259,000 every year? If it were only, say, £2,000 a year, we could carry on because we could say that we are doing a service to the people who are not able to buy a motor car. Surely we cannot carry on this way. What will become of us? I say, give out the buses rather than run at a loss of $259,000. Let us take this money and spend it on something else to the service of the people. Let us budget for this amount just as if we were budgeting for it to spend on this deficiency, but spend it on something else, because I am sure that if we give these buses to the concessionaires who are carrying on part of the service now, we would not have to subsidise them or give them anything; they will carry it on and make a success of them. I know that those concessionaires who threw in the sponge are sorry enough

today. One of them told me that he made a mistake. He knew that all along he was playing man; he was too ashamed to back down.
3.35 p.m.
We should always be on the alert for these things. With respect to these buses, I am not going to sit down here year after year and say "yes" to the spending of money of this kind; I do not think I would thereby be doing my duty to the people. In paragraph 3 of the matters noted in this Report, we have this:- "Storage for spare parts which had been properly listed and carefully indexed, had been provided, thus facilitating spot checking of spares."

I am wondering if the Transport Board are importing goods from overseas or if they are still getting them from the local garages. If they are doing that, I do not see why they should be carrying such a large amount of spares. I remember that when the buses were first taken over, I went over to the Transport Board and offered them to allow me to import goods for them. These goods would come direct to them and I would only be getting my commission as an agent rather than buying these goods outside. Up to now they have not done that, as far as I know, and I am sure that they would be saving 25% on each dollar. Why are you going to store up all of these parts if you are buying them locally? You would not want more than half a dozen of these spares; but if you are importing them, then you would want to have space for them. I made them that offer but they would not listen to me for a moment. They thought that I was trying merely to get a commission, but I was also trying to help the Government.

When we were about to establish this Board, I said that provision should be made in the Bill whereby one member on each side of the Legislature should be on the Board. I want to say that if we had a member from this House on that Board, the blows would be on him today. As a matter of fact, there would not be any blows because he would not stand for them. If we had a member from this House on that Board we could lash him up side down, but we cannot lash the Minister because he does not run the Board; he only goes by what he sees in front of him. I am quite sure that if a member of this House were on this Board he would cry "halt" and he would come to this House for assistance; but as long as you have people who have not got to tell a lie or the truth or who do not have to pay the deficit (A MEMBER: The deposit) well, they should be made to pay a deposit and if they fail, then the money is forfeited. But you have a person sitting there who is responsible for a lot of money and he cares nothing about it! I would have to blame the members of the Board for this state of affairs and they are not efficient members either. I have given an instance of a man who gave some of his breakfast to his employee so that that employee could repay the money which he had lost; that employee had to wait for some of that man's breakfast so as to keep himself alive, so that that man could deduct the employee's money until what had been lost had all been repaid. When you get a man who is so keen with his business he should be the same way with regard to the Government's business.

I do not think that I would have to go any further with this Resolution. I only wanted to let the public know my view about it and how I feel about it, and I would appeal to the Minister to see to it that the Managing Director of the Board comes out of his shell as quickly as possible and does not sit inside too long, because it might be a question of another $259,000 awaiting us. I believe that the Board are very much ashamed to give us the full amount; I believe that something has been left back. That is my opinion, and you must not blame me for my opinion because it can be a foolish one. If they were giving us the true figures, do you think that all of this money could be required when they have the diesel buses? If the gasolene buses sank a dollar, then the diesel buses should be making $20 and that would keep matters level; but although we have put in so many new buses we find that things are still going wrong. I feel that an investigation should be made about this Board. I am not saying that this Board is like the Vestry of St. Lucy, but an investigation should be made and let us have the true picture of the working of this Board.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Acting Chairman, I have sat and listened to the appropriate Minister speaking relative to the Transport Board. I have also listened to the remarks of the hon. senior member for St. Peter and to those of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, and it seems to me that if the Government does not give back the buses to the concessionaires, it will have to be continually paying out this money. What we have before us is a proof as to how much the concessionaires used to suffer. They asked for an increase of bus fares but the Government said that they would run the service and now we find that they are running it at a loss. The Hon. Minister might be trying his best and everything may be going all right in his opinion; in the morning the pipe might be holding water, but in the afternoon it has a hole and the water is running out. If the Government is like that, then what do you think of the private concessionaires? To whom must they appeal? If the running of these concessions profits the concessionaires, then it should also profit the Government because the private concessionaires are using gasolene while the Government is using diesel. Why then is the Government running this transport service as such a loss? I think that the Hon. Minister should look into this matter because it is his job to do so.

As I see the position, the only possible way in which we can save the taxpayers' money is if the Government give back these buses to the concessionaires and the Government should control the fares and the service. That is the only possible means of saving the taxpayers' money; otherwise we will find ourselves in a dilapidated state. If we continue in this way we do not know where we will end. From the time that the Government took over the buses, they have not saved one penny; they have saved nothing. Therefore, let them give back the buses to the concessionaires; the concessionaires are not crying out and why should the Government be crying out?
3.45 p.m.
The private concessionaires are not crying; the fares have been raised and therefore it helps them, so why can't it help the Government too? Can't Government make money at all? Where is the Government's money going? Wherever you turn you can see these Government buses packed with passengers, and yet you cannot make money. I will advise Government to give back these buses to the private concessionaires and control the fares and service of the buses. That would be my decision, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TALMA: Before you put the question, Mr. Chairman, as one who happen to have been committed to this policy of taking over the buses back in 1955, I find myself in a very peculiar position. Yet I must say, Sir, that I am very disturbed as I was not here to have listened to the Minister's opening remarks in introducing this Resolution, and I suffer now from not knowing what he did actually say.

I would say that the Transport service is an essential public utility service and one which is to be continued and run on efficient lines for the service of the public, because first and foremost there should be no turning back as far as our policy of nationalisation is concerned. I will say at the outset that the policy in which the Government apparently persisted in expecting the twenty-four members or at least the Opposition - not to say anything of their backbenchers because they do not seem to matter sometimes - to pass a Resolution like this without first of all submitting the Auditor's Statement of Account and also the Report of the Transport Board is expecting too much, because it is on the Transport Board and the Auditor's Statement of Account that the whole thing is based, and I regard it as being very insulting of the Minister to expect the Opposition to deal with a Resolution which calls for the expenditure of $259,000 as though it were just $20 or $30 without being first satisfied as to the reasons for voting that money.

Now, anyone who has studied this Report will see that all is not well at the Transport Board. All is far from well with the Transport Board because it is running at a loss, but if you study the Report you will see on closer examina-

tion the reasons or some of the reasons - the ones that are patent and not latent. One of the first reasons for this loss is, as stated here, that the Transport Board is running 36 of the 40 petrol driven buses which are more than eleven years old, and they are reported to be over-aged and uneconomic to operate. That is the first reasons why we have to vote this large sum of money. It is a fact that there are 36 of the 40 petrol buses which are being operated steadily in order to maintain this service, and to operate these 36 buses which are unserviceable and which were taken over at the time in order to maintain the service, to repair them and to pay wages and so on they have to spend enormous sums of money. In other words, whatever profits are derived from the running of the new diesel buses and the losses entailed in maintaining the 36 petrol buses in so far as repairs, maintenance and mechanics' wages are concerned amount to $157,347.57. That is an enormous sum of money, Sir; so it would seem to my mind that that is the crux of the whole thing.

While I am on this point as to what are the losses directly attributed to - the losses which are patent as distinct from the ones which are latent on which the hon. senior member for St. Joseph seemed to be more *au fait* than I am - first and foremost are these 36 of the 40 old petrol buses which are operated at a loss and which have been repaired and maintained from time to time to the tune of over the last year of $157,347.57; that is a substantial sum. Then mention has been made, and I am aware of this fact, that the roads along certain highways, Nos. 1 and 7, have been continually dug up within the last year, and I refer to the Hastings and St. Lawrence Roads over which I drive several times in the course of a day. I know for a fact that that road has been dug up about a dozen times last year because we had all the services - telephone, electricity and water - and each service in turn dug up the roads to lay mains at different times of the year. My colleague, the hon. junior member for Christ Church, has in this Chamber made mention that some sort of coordination should be adopted in the laying of mains and the digging up of the roads; so that is the reason why it is stated in the Report that as a result of the prolonged digging up of Highways 1 and 7 tyres and springs were subjected to excessive strain and that overall replacements during the year amounted to $39,000 as compared with $29,000 during the previous year. That is a fact. I am giving what I consider to be a fair and impartial consideration of this Report. That is an absolute fact and that too is a substantial sum, because if we add $39,000 with $157,000 you will see that that is almost $200,000.

In my view, Sir, there is a redundant office staff. It may be that the Board or the Minister may say that they are trying to have an up-to-date staff and proper system of accounts and so on, but from reports I have got, it seems that there is a redundant office staff and a lot of money is being spent which could be saved. I am not in a position to criticise the new Manager who was recently appointed in July; He is well qualified as far as I can see; he is an A.M.I. Mech.E., A.M. Inst.T., so he is well qualified on paper, and I understand that he has the necessary experience in the running of buses.

3.55 p.m.

The question is whether this Manager, competent as he is, should be the centre of our attack today. Speaking for myself I think it is a little too early to do so. I think if he has been here only from July last year that he is now only trying to acclimatise himself and to learn things and the topography of things here; therefore, it is too early to criticise him, especially in view of the fact that he only took over something approaching chaos - and I am not speaking disrespectfully of the present Board because I feel the Board has done its best but, nevertheless, the present Manager has only met chaos. If he has been here only nine months, it is hardly fair to criticise him.

I see that he has submitted a report and has made recommendations for re-organization of the entire service. I do not know if the Hon. Minister of Trade in my absence touched on that. The whole trouble is that a bold policy needs to be laid down by the Minister.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would allow me to explain, I would just say this. I admit that he is a bit at a disadvantage because he did not hear my speech on the matter. I said that the recommendations of the Managing Director involved certain expenditure and called for policy decisions of a major nature and that they are being considered. We would have to give very serious consideration to them. I hope now the hon. member hears this that he will understand.

Mr. TALMA: I thank the Hon. Minister for appearing to assist me but I am not much wiser now than before because he has not disclosed much. As to what the policy would be, there is no knowing; perhaps, he will let us know in time. I say that enough time has elapsed even since the present Minister of Trade assumed that office for him to have issued some bold policy on the matter. I do admit that he was the legatee of a legacy which was a bunch of confusion, a lot of chaos and trouble and I sympathise with him a lot. The things which he had to deal with and the confusion which was handed over to him in that transport set up were certainly some things which you could not be happy about and while I sympathise with him to that extent, I still feel that unless some definite and bold policy is adopted and outlined to the Board, the whole thing will always be run at a loss.

Let me ask: are you going to continue to run the service? If so, are you going to continue to run it with the majority of the fleet which you took over and which were falling to pieces and which were junk and in a dilapidated condition? Or are you going to replace this old fleet of buses with new ones? Or are you going to hand over the service to new concessionaires? You say that the loss on operation of 40 old petrol buses for three months amounted to $42,142 and if you continue with them, then you will have to come here every year for money for the deficiency. Has the Managing Director agreed with the recommendations of the Board? I see some recommendation here that all the worn-out petrol driven buses should be replaced by modern deisel buses so as to provide the public with a safer and more dependable and up-to-date service, and that the minimum fares and fare stages be so adjusted as to enable the Transport Service to be operated without subsidy from Government. As regards this second point, I do not expect to see that. As long as the Transport Board is operated by Government, you will always have to subsidise it.

Sir, on perusal of this Report on the Transport Board, you will see that an enormous sum of money was collected by way of bus fares. During the year, the total revenue from bus fares, school tickets, charters, advertising and interest on savings account, amounted to $738,987.99 as against $617,055 for the preceding year but you have an expenditure of $955,060.11 for 1958 as against $823,193 for the preceding year. In other words, the expenses have gone up. Whereas in 1957, your expenditure amounted to $823,000 roughly speaking, in 1958 your expenditure amounted to $955,000 which is about $130,000 more. Unless something is done and done quickly for the running of the buses in 1959, the expenses will continue to rise to probably another $130,000 more; so instead of the Minister coming for $259,000, he will have to come for $450,000. If you persist with these old petrol buses, you will have this same state of affairs.

Sir, this is a very expensive organisation to run because here you have receipts totalling $738,987.99 - and that is a lot of money to get in, therefore it cannot be said that the buses are not making money - but the expenses are $955,060.11. The buses are always filled and they run more regularly than they did before and on more frequent schedules, so the intakes would be better; but, as has been stated here, although there has been an improvement in the system of accounts, it may be that you need a more competent and reliable type of accountant so as to keep a closer check on the taxpayers' money. In any case, all is not well with the Transport Board. We have to vote this money in order to keep the service a'going but the Minister will hardly be able to give us the assurance, as I see it,

that he will not be coming back again for more money. I say that as long as you have a certain percentage of the fleet uneconomical and unserviceable, that is to say, 40 old petrol buses mixed up in the fleet, you will always be coming here for money to subsidise the service.
4.05 p.m.
Therefore I am hoping that the Minister will work on this matter as quickly as possible; he should try and see that the taxpayers' money is not frittered away as it has been by the Transport Board. There is no doubt that the service has been improved along certain routes; I can speak of the route which leads to Silver Sands and I am very grateful to the Minister or the Manager, whoever is responsible for that, or the Board generally. The buses are very comfortable and commodious and the service is a better one than has existed in the past. This is no getting around that, but it is a question of management or mismanagement. It is a question as to whether the money collected by way of bus fares is received and properly accounted for when it is received. I am hoping that the Minister whose responsibility it is - unlike the opinion of the hon. member who spoke before me, I feel it is the responsibility of the Minister to see that this Board does not sink any money. In the final analysis it is the Minister's responsibility. The Board is responsible to the Minister and the Minister is responsible to the House and to the Government; therefore I am hoping that the Minister will, if necessary, increase the personnel of the Board; perhaps he can get his Permanent Secretary, who is competent and well-equipped, to streamline that office because he has a redundant staff and the money is being frittered away.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Acting Chairman, I remember that the first debate I heard when I became a member of this House was on the Transport Board. I seem to notice that the Transport Board is one of the most favourite subjects of debate for the members of this Chamber and I think that it is a very topical subject with the public outside. There have been quite a number of speeches made on this Resolution and I notice that the first two hon. members who spoke on it - the hon. junior member for Christ Church and the hon. senior member for St. George- did bring a lot of their private enterprise to bear on the matter; but they did not seem to stress very much what has been stressed by the hon. senior member for Christ Church, that is to say, the service which this Board is expected to offer to the general public. I do not therefore want to go too much into the details of the figures which have been presented across the Table. I believe that the Hon. Minister has something more to add to them, but there are a few things on which I want to touch, things which have been passed on to hon. members and which have been mentioned in the Report.

I want to refer to the question as to what attitude is being adopted towards the Transport Board, what is the attitude of the House and the public towards the Board and what attitude do the people who work at the Board bring to bear on the work which they are supposed to do. Are we going to be faced with the lackadaisical attitude that it does not matter what is conscientiously put into the job? Is it that the people who work on the buses feel that they do not have to give as detailed an account of their stewardship to the Board as that which they would have to give to other concerns? I believe that the attitude of the public and the people who work at the Transport Board is one of the most serious problems which the Transport Board and the Ministry have to face. I am a believer in public utilities and public service and I do not think that there is going to be the argument used that the Transport Board must make a profit. I do not believe that the London Transport makes a profit; but in any business concern there is that question of how big the organisation will be - whether the organisation is too small and what the ratio will be because you plan according to that ratio. I am quite certain that the Board and the Minister have those problems under consideration and they have given them serious thought; but the problem is the attitude which we are able to get and the interest which people must show in the running of this Board.

I believe that the Minister is demanding that tickets be given to the passengers. I am not so sure that all of these requests are being complied with fully, and this abstract and intangible attitude has a very great bearing as to the success or failure of the Transport Board as such. That is certainly one of the Minister's greatest problems; how well he can educate the public that this service is an essential service and that it is to the benefit of everybody to see that they put in it the most conscientious people possible.

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

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to move, Mr. Acting Chairman, that you do now report the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply and the postponement of one.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER who took the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. L. ST.A. THORNE in each case, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

4.15 p.m

APPROPRIATION BILL

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave to revert to Order No. 1 as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to revert to Order No. 1 as the next Order of the Day, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish at the outset to express our gratitude to the staff of this Chamber for so promptly supplying us with a copy of the Budget Speech, the subject matter of which we have to consider. We are breaking new ground in an expressive manner because I am sure that we were all very pleasantly surprised yesterday to be the recipients of a copy of this Budget Speech, and if it could be done in respect of one thing, it can likewise be done in respect of other debates of this Chamber. By that, I do not necessarily mean that on every occasion that a speech is made on Tuesday, we should be supplied with it on the Thursday, but I am saying that since this copy was done with so much despatch, there is no reason why we should have to wait weeks or months for a copy of our Hansard. The incidence of efficiency and effective co-operation by members of our staff, I think, sets a first class example to the public as a whole as to what can be done if people really set out to do it. When on my way home last night I stopped in at the home of the Clerk in order to collect my copy, it made me feel what a great loss would be sustained if he were to accept any other appointment such as the one one hears about in the offing for him, and the question of filling his place if we were to lose his services; but so long as remuneration of the office is so inadequate, one cannot expect him to remain indefinitely as Clerk of the House when the remuneration is so extremely poor for a professional man of his ability and his years of experience.

Sir, to consider the speech of the Hon. Minister of Finance, I think I would observe at the beginning that there are one or two omissions which are quite startling, particularly the absence of any reference to the burning question of the disendowment of the Church. As you know, Sir, we are called upon to vote on this occasion out of a total sum of $114,048 for the established Church the sum of $44,496, and I certainly thought that the Hon. Premier would have made some reference when he was dealing with so many Heads - and a large new number of Heads received specific attention - to the important matter of disendowment of the Church. Or has that matter now been relegated to some pigeon hole from which it might not be rescued in the next decade or so, because in a matter which affects the lives and the habits of so considerable a number of persons, it is curious, to say the least, that no reference of disendowment should appear in the Budget Speech of the Hon. Premier. Perhaps when we come to

that Head he may in that specific instance shed some light on the matter which otherwise is puzzling us as to what is happening.

We remember during the regime of the previous Premier we heard that when he was in the Island the Lord Bishop was out of the Island, and when His Lordship was present the former Premier was on one of his numerous trips abroad, and therefore they were never able to meet. I wonder if they really wanted or had any sincere desire to meet and discuss this matter, or if they were afraid of what might happen if any decision were arrived at - if on the one hand the former Premier was afraid of losing votes as a result of disendowment, or if on the other hand the Lord Bishop was worried about losing a solid, stable, reliable and set income not only for himself but for his Priests. It may be that neither one of these two worthy gentlemen was very serious about having a meeting, but it may well be that in his detailed survey of the various Heads the present Premier overlooked that particular Head or maybe he purposely decided to leave it for Committee when we were considering Head XIX.

Apart from that omission, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in respect of Capital Works, especially as we now have a functioning Ministry of Education, I was looking forward to some item under that Head for vote for new Secondary Schools; I do not mean the Modern Secondary Schools but the old-fashioned reliable Secondary Schools which turn out people for the Civil Service, for Universities and for the Professions - another Combermere, Alexandra or something like that. No reference at all has been made under the Head "Capital Works" of any such thing, and we read in the Press, Mr. Deputy Speaker, reference to new Private Schools being opened, some of them good, some of them merely indifferent and one or two quite bad, with the result that because there are insufficient Aided Government Secondary Schools and there is a growing demand for that type of education today, so long as an institution is opened and it is called a Secondary School, however inadequate the accommodation, however unskilled and inexperienced the tutorial staff may be, children will be sent to these schools because there are no other such schools to go to, and the parents fervently desire that the children should have the benefit of secondary education, particularly in the cases where the parents did not have such an advantage themselves.

4.25 p.m.

Of course I may be told that this represents so much in the beginning, and that the supplementary resolutions which we receive from time to time may far exceed the actual amount which we are being asked to vote in these estimates. I think this is the last year's part of our 5-year Development Plan and the money asked for this Capital Development still forms part of that Development Plan. I do not know if because this is the last year of the Five-Year Development Plan and it has not been envisaged in that plan the building of any new secondary school whether that is the reason why there is no reference to that, but although the Minister did not make any reference to that, I wonder if provision is made for the accommodation of at least 3,000 more children than is provided for by the Government Aided Secondary Schools.

Then, Sir, I did hope in relation to the Fisheries Department that one would have seen some mention made of capital work such as some proposed expenditure on a fully equipped workshop for major repairs to the engines of the fishing launches. As I have pointed out before in this Chamber, the prices charged by the private companies for major repairs to the engines of these fishing launches are actually prohibitive. As you know, the launch owner has not only to pay his instalment and to try and keep that payment up-to-date, but he also has to pay for any major repairs to the engine, plus the fact that he wants to earn something out of the boat. The prices which are charged for major repairs are actually fantastic from the standpoint of the pocket and the economy of the person who has to get something out of the launch. As you know, every day is fishing day but so many of these days are not catching days; therefore, it is essential that Government faces the fact that with so many hundreds of fishing launches which have received the assistance of Government for the purchase of the engines, not only should Government assist them in carrying out minor repairs but there should be an adequate and fully equipped workshop to undertake any kind of repairs for the benefit of the poor fishing boat owners who simply cannot manage to settle the sometimes staggering bills which they sometimes receive from these capitalist enterprises from whom unfortunately they have to purchase their engines. As a matter of fact, as soon as you establish such a workshop, obviously the next stop is clear for the Government, whether through the Crown Agents or through any other source, to import themselves the engines for the fishermen to install in their launches and then, of course, the poor fishermen will be saved not only the agent's commission but the commission of the merchant who sells them retail. Therefore, Sir, I deplore the omission with respect to Capital Works and Expenditure of any vote being asked for these two essential items.

I must say that this is a very beautiful and most clearly typed document of the Premier's budget speech and I must say that it was refreshing even at the late hour I received it last night to have it to read, so clear, so plain and so extremely well done was it. Sometimes one gets copies of things with words which are blurred, sometimes printed too fine: but this is really good stuff. The only thing is that since our staff is capable of doing this, they must realise that they will have to surpass this or at least to continue to supply us with our material as promptly and efficiently and as well as this is done on this occasion. May I suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, so as to assist us in getting things done like this in the future, an additional typist might well be all we need in order to maintain such a service as we have seen from Tuesday until today. I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, one additional typist would be most helpful in order to ensure that we will be able to read within two days what the other said and to see it stated so well and with such facility as this extremely neatly done document. Sir, if we do that, we will not have to depend on a garbled newspaper account in which something is purposely left out, depending on the policy of the particular reporter. We will have before us a verbatim and absolutely clear and distinct copy of the speech which was made.

Sir, glancing through this document, I notice that reference is made to the fall in the consumption of rum. Bear in mind, Mr. Deputy Speaker, not only was this a speech by the Premier of Barbados but it was the speech of a medical practitioner, and he is deprecating the fall in the consumption of rum and is advising us that this fall has been in evidence for some time and, according to the learned and experienced medical practitioner, naturally, when so little is consumed, it must reflect on our finances by way of less money received from excise. The learned and Hon. Premier who, as I have reminded you, is an experienced part of the medical profession goes on to say that he does not know whether it is that apparently the people are drinking more beer and less rum but that it is something for further consideration and some step will have to be taken to offset it. We have been told by a medical practitioner who is also advising the public of Barbados that some step will have to be taken to offset the fact that people are drinking more beer and less rum.

4.35 p.m.

I am wondering if the question of helping local industries is not being overlooked. I am wondering, from the standpoint of the Minister of Social Services whom I am glad to see is in his place at the moment, whether from the point of view of the health of the community and from the advice of his adviser, we should drink more beer and less rum, or more rum and less beer. The economy of the island can be affectively disturbed by the ill-health of the people of the island. I am wondering from the standpoint of the Department of Finance, whether it is better to drink more rum and less beer or more beer and less rum. I want to say that an increase in the price of beer will put that product beyond the capacity of all hon. members, except two, of this House to drink. I can only see two hon. members who will be able to enjoy the same quantity of beer which they have been accustomed to use

in the past - those who would buy plantations as you would buy a cartoon of beer.

In considering this Budget Speech further, there is the question of the Government Savings Bank and the withdrawals of 1958 which apparently are causing the Ministry of Finance some concern because this is what the Premier said:-

"In 1958 withdrawals from the Government Savings Bank exceeded ordinary deposits by $230,954. In the previous year ordinary deposits had exceeded withdrawals by $1,111,600. At the same time savings in the commercial banks rose by a million dollars. I do not know much about figures, but I do not think that it reflects sound business when savings rise by a million dollars and loans and advances by the banks over the same period rise by seven million dollars. It shows that probably some of our people are getting further in debt by having loans and advances on the banks."

The reason for these withdrawals may be that either the rate of interest is not sufficiently attractive to encourage people to leave their money in the bank, or it may be that that thrifty section of the community which deposits this money in the Government Savings Banks are finding themselves unable to live on their normal earnings and they have to subsidise their salaries or wages by constant withdrawals from their savings in the Government Savings Bank. Because of the increased cost of living, it may well be that the savings are being steadily and constantly withdrawn, month after month and year after year in order to maintain a normal standard of living having regard to the increased cost of living which obtains today. Perhaps the Savings Bank might be asked to give an expression of opinion as to an increase in the rate of interest by the Bank; it may be that an increase in the rate of interest might encourage people to allow their savings to remain in that Bank.

The Deep Water Harbour has received its fair share of attention in the Budget Speech and the Premier has observed that there was a large Government expenditure on Development in 1958. He went on to point out that we were overjoyed over the success of the loan which was raised in England especially as it is the first loan of that nature which Barbados had to raise. The Premier said this: "I feel that there is in the money market a continued confidence of the lending public in the Government of Barbados." The Government has satisfied itself of the continued confidence of the lending public in the Government of Barbados, but the money lenders always had confidence in the Conservatives of Barbados and we see no difference between the present Government which is named "Labour" and the one before it which was known as "Conservative". Once the Government is satisfied of this continued confidence of the lending public, especially now that the Deep Water Harbour project is in process, would it not be well for us to give consideration to the making of a deeper harbour? It would not be so difficult to carry out the operation so that we would provide a Harbour in order that every boat which comes down to this part of the Caribbean would be in a position to berth in this Harbour.

At this stage, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I think that instead of our being satisfied with the original idea of a Harbour which cannot accommodate boats of the biggest tonnage which come here from time to time, it would be appropriate to give consideration at this stage, before this job is completed and before the contractors pack up and go elsewhere, to making proper provision for the largest type of boat to be able to berth in our Harbour. As you know, Sir, there is this continued confidence of the lending public in Barbados and we will be able to get the extra millions which may be necessary to finance the project. It is a great pity that we have not embarked on a scheme for the accommodation of the bigger boats to come out to the West Indies; we should be able to berth the biggest or even the sufficiently large number of boats which come out here.

Reference has been made on page eight of this Budget Speech to the questions of pensions. The Premier said this:-

"The increase under "Pensions" is made up of increases of pensions and gratuities of $75,000 to Police and the Fire Brigade, $50,000 to other public pensioners and $55,000 in cost of living allowances."

Now, Sir, may I specifically deal with the amount of $50,000 for public pensioners? I have not had the opportunity of discussing this slightly revolutionary proposal with my colleagues, and therefore I am not expressing our point of view in relation to the proposal that we may revert to the former compulsory age of retirement of 65 years. Frankly, I am not disposed to disagree with that proposal; I find that there are many people who have retired and who are on full pension at the age of 55 years, working harder than they have ever worked before. We have seen people who have been in the Public Service and who have retired at that age, get other jobs in the Public Service. That is ridiculous; you retire at the age of 55 years because you are unable to carry on with 100% efficiency and yet you are soon afterwards found in another job in the same Public Service and sometimes you are in a job of greater importance that the one before.

4.45 p.m.

Sometimes we see them being attracted to private employers, and some of the big firms in Broad Street are ready to recruit pensioners from the Government - the fifty-five and too old Government servants - on contract to their firms. There is obviously something wrong, Mr. Speaker, and I entirely agree with the Government's suggestion that they regard as a matter worthy of their consideration the reverting to the former age for compulsory retirement. You know, Sir, if you are contemplating in the interest of the economy of the island reverting to the former compulsory retiring age, you also at the same time have to think of something else, a radical revision of these leave passages. I think that after one you must have the other, and there is no question about it. Some people are doing well after they retire at 55, and as the Hon. Premier said, over the last few years with the advent of antibiotics and other drugs, these people at 55 are younger than some at 35, and with that youth and that nice pension put aside, they go into another job and put more energy in the new job than they ever put in the old job in respect of which they are drawing this pension. So, Sir, the matter deserves reconsideration.

We were asked to reduce our compulsory age limit to fall into line with the other islands, but as the Hon. Premier pointed out, "there is an increase in the span of life - people are living longer - and I see men today of 70 and 75 years who are still living an active life;" people like Sir Winston Churchill - of course he is not of the tropics - Alexander Bustamante and others. The Hon. Acting Chairman today, Mr. Speaker, is a man living an active life perhaps without even the use of antibiotics; imagine him being pensioned off, even if he needed it, at two-thirds his salary! This thing needs going into again in the interest of the taxpayers, and as I said, when you go into that you must realise that you will have to go into the matter of leave passages. There is too much spreeing going on at the expense of the taxpayers of this island, and at the moment it is a legal and legitimate racket and we give it our sanction. Government should bear in mind that if they decide to revert to the former compulsory age, that does not apply in respect of the old age pensioners, people who had to work really hard for their living by using the fork. I feel that the age should be reduced from 68 to 65 years or something lower; they are the people who would not be able to carry on now at 68. It is absolutely ridiculous to keep that present 68 years of age as the minimum limit whereby one is entitled to draw old age pension, but if you put back up the former compulsory age, that is, from 60 to 65, with the money so saved it would make it much easier for you to find a means of helping the old age

pensioner, the old lady and old gentleman at 68. I cannot help looking across at the hon. junior member for St. James to see how well a person at that age can look. Of course, he has never had to toil as the people who draw old age pension had to toil; he was born with his bread buttered. So, Mr. Speaker, you will gather that I relish the idea of Government giving that matter of the compulsory retirement age their early consideration.

I now turn, Sir, to Head "Education". I think it is quite time that the Hon. Minister become not only fully acclimatised to his office, but he should lay down the law to his colleagues. It is time that he realises that he has a lot of support in this House and a lot of goodwill with his Parliamentary colleagues, and it may be time for him to tell his colleagues where they get off at, so that in certain things, which I cannot imagine them in agreement with, they must give him their support in order that they might be implemented.

I do not need to stress or reiterate that this should be the last Budget Speech in which we do not see reference to the provision being made in the nutrition scheme of the free hot midday meal for elementary school children. It may well be that this is the last Budget Speech where no reference is made to that, because the next Budget Speech will be the one before the General Elections, and I know how Government works; just before a bye election you promise some increase to the lowest grade of worker on the staff; but not only should you promise, you should make sure that you give them and not delay them unduly after the elections. As I said, I am expecting in the next Budget Speech to hear reference by the Government of the long awaited decision to provide that free hot midday meal for elementary school children, and provision to be made for the free secondary education for such children whose parents are unable to pay for them. Of course, Sir, that can follow so easily and so readily as soon as the Department persuades the possibly recalcitrant Ministry of Finance of the need to provide for the building of two or three more Government-aided secondary schools. Once you provide the schools, there is no excuse at all for not enabling such children that are likely to benefit from free secondary education and whose parents are unable to pay for it to be given the facility to have that education.

Continuing my tour of the Budget Speech, Mr. Speaker, I was quite intrigued and quite curious, and I tried unsuccessfully to read between the lines in the paragraphs by the Hon. Premier in connection with the Tourist Board, and he was more emphatic than the Hon. and Learned Premier usually is. He reiterated himself more often than he normally does in respect of this particular phase. This is what he said: "In short, what I want to say is that apparently the Tourist Board is not pulling its weight and expects the Government to supply everything. We will do our duty, we will grant concessions which we think advisable on that matching, and this money will remain in the Estimates. We do not intend to withdraw it; but we also do not intend that the Government should supply all the funds necessary. The Tourist Board through the merchants and the hotel-keepers and people of that sort must pull its weight. We are all anxious to see tourism succeed, but I repeat that there must be co-operation in order to effect that success.
4.55 p.m
I want to repeat that the Tourist Board has not been pulling its weight." I am curious, Mr. Speaker, to find out what really is going on behind the scenes. Does the Hon. Premier mean to say that he has in mind that the merchants and the hotel keepers are not pulling their weight, or is it that the Tourist Board is not pulling its weight? I trust that he will let us into this secret so that we on this side of the House can pull our weight in ensuring that the Tourist Board pulls its weight and that the merchants in Barbados are pulling their pockets. It might cause another storm for the merchants and capitalists to pull their weight except they see immediate resulting advantages accruing to them. I will be glad to hear from the Hon. Premier what he feels and what he recommends should be done in order that the Government will no longer be dissatisfied by the failure of the Tourist Board, as has been put by him, to pull its weight.

Now, then on page 11, continuing my ramble through this document, under the Head, Highways and Transport, it is stated that the largest is for Parish Roads, to meet the cost of the wages of cantonniers not on the Unestablished Staff. He goes on to say: "Here, I would like to say that it is well known that there is a revision by way of cost of living for cantonniers undertaken by the Government to assist the lowest paid staff in helping them to meet their obligations. I say that while there is an increase here, yet in a short time we will be faced with further increases so as to satisfy the demands not only of the cantonniers but those other employees in the various Departments."

May I suggest this, firstly in respect of the cost of living, that I prefer an increase in wages because there is no chance of the cost of living, at least for the next two years, going down. You should make it an increase in wages which of course is automatically pensionable and in your dealing with the least paid men - the subordinate staff, the Unestablished Staff - there is no use fooling yourself, the minimum appreciable increase, the only increase by which they can really feel a reasonable benefit accruing to them, is a 50% increase. Let us face facts. Thirteen dollars and twenty cents plus 50% will be less than what would be expected and what would be favourable, and it will not be sufficient in order to put that lowest paid worker in the reasonable minimum standard in which he is entitled to be placed for the service which he renders to the community. The fact is that he is entitled to live and drink reasonably even through your increase of the price of beer that would be a thing of the past to him. When you are considering the cost of living for these people, whether it is a natural cost of living or an increase in their substantial salary, do not waste time by saying that you will be faced with further increases in a short time. You are faced with the absolute necessity for that now; therefore, there is no use doing this and have to wait however long the short time may be; you are faced with making further increases now, therefore tackle the problem now. Do not do something now and wait until next year so as to satisfy the demands of the cantonniers along with the other employees in the other departments. Let us face up to it now. I would suggest that the question of increases for the people at the bottom be put to as high as $15 a month. That salary raise demands immediate attention now and certainly not less than 50% for those people who get less than $15 a week.

Well then, Mr. Speaker, as we continue through the Budget Speech, I have nothing to say as regards the Information Service. The Fire Brigade deserves every penny spent on it. We have at the head of that Department one of the most outstanding and efficient officers in this country - and not only is he efficient, judged by the ruthless crushing standards of efficiency, but he has endeared himself to every person in the Department working under him and to every member of the community who has come into contact with him. The fact is that he has provided the *esprit de corps* and won the goodwill of the entire community in a fire service which is second to none on this side of the Atlantic, and we bemoan the fact that he will soon come under this age limit of 55 or 60 years and hope that it will be altered in the near future.

I do not know the site in the northern district which has been selected for another Fire Station and which is to house the offices in connection with the Local Government setup for the Northern Council. I do not know whether it is in the parish of St. Peter which is the most convenient site for the immediate parishes of St. Lucy and St. James and even St. Andrew, or if the site is in the southern part of St. James which is not at all convenient for the people in the six parishes which constitute the northern ward. I do not know who is the owner of this particular property nor have I had a word with the Acting Chairman about it, but I wonder why a piece of land in the southern part of St. James should be selected for that site instead of Speightstown. But perhaps, I may have been misinformed.

Well, Sir, reference is made to the new hospital. We

discussed that subject at length on Wednesday when we were dealing with an omnibus Resolution and I do not think it is necessary to say anything more about that now.

I notice that Education has received specific consideration in respect of the Capital Estimates and the Hon. Premier in making reference to it has said that Government is continuing its policy of providing additional school accommodation both in the primary and secondary schools, and that the conversion of St. Giles' Girls' School to a senior school to accommodate 240 pupils is proceeding. He goes on to say that the building is well on the way and he understands that a new building is being put up.
5.05 p.m.

I regard it as a startling matter that no provision is made for at least one State-aided secondary school so that those unfortunate children who cannot get into the Government aided secondary schools would not be forced to be confined and restricted to some of the new private schools which are really only a source of livelihood for the people who have established them. These children attend these private schools for the lack of somewhere else to go; otherwise they would not have any secondary education at all.

As to the Public Library, I again remind the Hon. Minister of the necessity for having the Library opened at night, at least until 10.00 o'clock, and on every afternoon of the week. Of course, the present staff must have ample time off, but there is available material for filling the posts of attendants or assistants. You can increase your staff and give ample time off to that staff and you can also ensure that the public is in a position to reap the full benefit of the Public Library. The Hon. Minister of Education is a person who is deemed to be aware of the need for education more so than any other member of the Cabinet and I submit that Library facilities should be made available to all. At times when people would not normally be working, they have the opportunity of patronising the Library, and closing it on any evening of the week is to be deprecated. There is no reason why the Library should not be opened until 10.00 o'clock p.m., and you would see how widely it would be patronised. People might even think it a waste of time going into the cinema or night club instead of going to the Public Library.

As to the Development Board, I hope that the members of this Board will not regard it as a Board which is expected to provide help only for a certain type of person in the community - the type of person who is a social "hail fellow-well met" of certain members of the Board. I hope that with the well-merited criticism of this Board last year, it will not be regarded as a favourite of a certain number of people who are highly esteemed and who can be nightly seen drinking their champagne. Help should also be given to the small hotels and those people who do not have the means of developing themselves. There is no justification for spending the Government money, although it may be possible to receive the money back, on things like swimming pools. I have met no fewer than six or eight people touring the West Indies and they have been taken to see the swimming pools in this island; it was thought that they would be interested in these swimming pools. If the Development Board is out to help tourism, let them understand that visitors from the United States of America and the United Kingdom are not interested in any swimming pools; they have left the swimming pools behind them and they have come to bask in our sunshine, to loll around the shores of this island and to enjoy the scenes of Barbados. Therefore, let us not help people to establish these swimming pools with the money from the Development Board, because in doing so we are not achieving anything for the tourists. The tourists do not want to see any swimming pools; they want to go to St. Andrew and see the people loading the lorries with canes or they want to go to St. Lucy and see how the rum is produced; they want to see things like that.

In continuation of this Budget Speech, I notice that the Government is giving consideration to legislation having for its effect the obtaining of revenue from pool betting. This is a matter which should not be overlooked; after all, we provide for entertainment tax in this island; the people who go to shows have to pay for them. There are some very large amounts which we can touch in respect of one or two local people who have been fortunate with the football pools.

As to the question of Income Tax Allowances for children this is what the Premier said:-

"The present allowance is $270 a year and it is proposed that there should be an increased allowance for children of over twelve years of age. Where the child is over twelve years and under sixteen years and is receiving full-time instruction as a student at a secondary school or similar educational establishments the allowance will be increased to $360 a year. Where the child has attained the age of sixteen and is receiving full-time instruction at a university college, a secondary school or a similar educational establishment within the island, the allowance will be $420 and if it is receiving that education outside the Island the allowance will be $600."

That is only a step in the right direction; it is not bold enough. As to a person who is studying outside the island and who is receiving full-time instruction, an allowance of not less than $1,200 should be given. Of course, this amount of $270 a year for a child is ridiculous and it is the laughing-stock of the West Indies. I do not remember what the figure in Trinidad is but if it is less than $1,200, it is not much less, as a reasonable amount for an exemption.
5.15 p.m.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that I have drawn the attention of this Chamber to the outstanding features and omissions of the Budget Speech, and at a later stage when we go into Committee, there are other Heads which I did not deem of sufficient importance to refer to in the second reading speech to which I will draw the attention of the Committee.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to cover as fully the Heads covered by the last hon. speaker, but I hope to restrict myself to the finances of the island as they are today, where we have come from and whither we are going.

The Premier in his speech pointed out that last year we had a very poor crop. When we had started planning for the Estimates this time last year, if I may remember rightly, the plan of the Budget at that time was based on a crop of 190,000 tons of sugar. At the beginning of the year the crop looked very healthy indeed, and it was expected from all estimates that it should be in that vicinity; then came along a drought, and as we can all remember, the canes began to dry very rapidly; and then there were interruptions in the reaping of them caused by labour disturbances and as a result that estimate of 190,000 tons of sugar dropped to 152,000 tons. Some of it was our own making and the rest was a result of nature, but we are feeling the results of it this year.

Anyone in business would assure you that the latter part of last year was quiet; there was a business recession with us, and I am sure that this year's income tax which will be based on last year's crop will fall very far short, and I think Government has anticipated that by a reduction of $1 3/4 million. I would not be at all alarmed if it were much less than that. Over a period of years not only Government but business people build up their businesses, and when they get this sudden adversity, that expense cannot come down very easily, if at all, then you find the result in a rising expenditure and diminishing returns, and we are faced with a loss and others with reduced profits. That is the picture today. Fortunately, we have the expectations of a good average crop of 160,000 tons of sugar this year, and as the Premier assured us yesterday, he has heard that there is a possibility that it might be increased above that. I have heard that too, and I do hope that it is so, because when we look around and think of the thin benefits of other industries, even the tourist industry, it is sugar we must fall back on. The Budget is based on

160,000 tons of sugar and Government is wise to take into account what happened last year and to remember that you do not pull out of a bad year in the first year; it takes a period of time.

What I wish to commend the Government for at this stage is what I have just said; and with the Gulf Oil Company leaving our shores at the present moment, being faced with the fact that the mineral resources we had pinned so much hope in do not seem to be there, with efforts as late as they are to attract tourists and industries to this island still far away from us, and having to fall back on sugar and sugar alone, they have seen it possible to make a sort of concession to the taxpayers both by way of allowances for their children, a reduction of income tax in the category that needs it very badly, and also allowances to encourage the increase of Life Assurance and if possible to establish in this island a Building Society, the need of which is very pressing indeed.

Now, anyone of those will form a big subject and you can expand quite a lot on either one of these, but this as a group is what Government has done today, and what I say is that it could have been done not only today but four years ago; that is what we have been pressing for because taxation in Barbados, as the Hon. Premier rightly said, has been the highest in the West Indies not today but for the last five years.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I want to correct the hon. member. I did not say it was the highest. I said we used to think so, but I discovered a few weeks ago that Dominica is very much higher.

Mr. GODDARD: If you are talking about Dominica, there are not thirty taxpayers there, and besides there is no land tax in Dominica. These things are irritants. Let us talk of Jamaica, of Trinidad and of British Guiana and then of ourselves. When we are having a salaries revision, do we bring Dominica into it? We never think of them. But what I would like to get out of the Premier more than anything else is why at this stage - there are reasons that will come to me, maybe this being his first Budget Speech - the Premier has gone out of his way and done something that could have been done five years ago. He probably realises now or it has been brought home to him by another quarter or by members of this House that taxation as it exists in Barbados today - direct taxation and the cost of living - is such that we find it difficult to recruit qualified people to do jobs in Barbados. This is found not only with Government but with private industry as well. When you advertise for posts that cannot be filled here, you are asked what is the income tax, and when you show them what is taken out of their pay packet monthly or annually, they say that unless you can put up the salary or give other allowances, they are not coming because they can do better elsewhere. It is that taxation that has been bearing down not only on the local ones but on those we hope to attract.

We have been losing from the shores of Barbados the best brains of our youngsters; our sons and daughters are leaving and going overseas for the same reason, all because we have been driving them out with high taxation. Civil Servants have been faced with it and when you have a salary revision they often say that you put up their salaries but take it away in another way. In this case you have brought a measure of relief to the entire population. I have heard complaints here from personnel who have been brought in to do jobs. I have heard employees with the Gulf Oil Company and from Costain's and those in big works say that the income tax in Barbados is such that if they had known before they left to come here they would never have come.

5.25 p.m.

And it is wise that Government pay some regard to that question, because there is such a thing as deficiency returns. You can tax and tax a man until you tax him out of existence; you can tax yourself out of existence because it is only from what you put back in that you get anything in the following year.

It is refreshing to know that the Hon. Premier in his first effort has been able to go in the path which we have asked many years ago. Indeed, there has been a stubborn resistance against us but you can keep that up for only so long. I would like him to tell us what is the real reason for that: if it was because he now realises that it is bearing down on the Civil Servants and those other people whom you try to tax and that the taxpayers are crying out.

Now, as regards Building Societies, there are such things as Building Societies in other places. There used to be a Building and Loan Society in Barbados but it went out of existence. One of the reasons may have been that the interest rates in Barbados were probably too low but, however, it went out of existence before my time and we never ever had anything since to replace it. It is amazing that without Building Societies or a Building Loan Fund we in Barbados have been able to continue to build houses to house the population of Barbados: but I do know that it is catching up with us because the cost of building is so great. Therefore it is your duty to pay attention to this matter and try to find some means and resources whereby some people who have a certain amount of collateral can find loans. If a man invests in a house, it is surprising to know that he will deny himself many of the little luxuries of life in order to pay for that house. And it is more so in Barbados than in any other part of the West Indies because we have people at all levels in life owning houses. There are more house owners in Barbados *per capita* than in any other part of the West Indies.

The idea of encouraging Building Societies is a good venture. There are young people getting married today who are unable for the want of a Society like this to pay down the first payment on a house. When you get settled down today in life, you have to go to an Insurance Company, to some solicitor, or to a lumber store to get credit to build a house. Of course, he will finance the project but on the completion of it, he wants his money to extend the same benefit to somebody else. This venture will encourage investors with large capital to come in and that will be to our profit. No matter what form of profits they are, capital will follow profits providing there is such a thing as security. I commend the Government again for the step in this direction.

The Budget Speech of today has not got the same significance as it did before we had a Five-Year Plan. It still does have some significance today and it should be our duty to tell the Government at this stage the things which we hope Government will put into effect in the next Five-Year Plan. Now this is the last year of the Five-Year Plan. We are completing what we envisaged in that plan and we are moving into another. It will be during this year that the Government will be paying attention to the next Five-Year Plan and it will be very important because we will be finishing a very large phase of our capital investments. As you know, Sir, the Deep Water Harbour calls for a large sum of money. It is in the vicinity of $25 million and that has taken up a very large portion of our revenue and we have asked for loans on the strength of our position towards the completion of that project.

But what will Government pay attendon to in the next Five Year Plan? We have drawn their attention to the East Coast Road. Although we have been told that it is under consideration, we cannot repeat it too often that if we are to develop Barbados it is essential that that part of Barbados which consists of one-seventh of the land area of Barbados should have a proper road system: and if that road is extended right into St. Andrew, it would be a sound investment and it would be the beginning of the opening up of an undeveloped part of Barbados. Let us admit that it is a backward part of Barbados but that is only for the reason that there is lack of communications. There is expansion going on in St. Philip now, but the development there was awaiting the extension of a public utility. That is going ahead this year. The Telephone Company is also expanding in that direction and I am sure that the Electric Company will extend by the end

of this year its power in that area. When that is done, you will have development in that area.

It is Government's duty and it should be done before other things, to have a proper road system there and Government should turn its immediate attention to the East Coast Road. We cannot afford to delay that any longer. That has been settled already; it goes back 15 years ago. Of course, we have to await money to do these things and something has to wait over, but I do not think we can put off that development any longer; it must be an early development in the next five-year period. I think it is my duty to call that to the Government's attention today.

We know that Government has been borrowing large sums and that they have been very gratified at the quick way the last loan was taken up in London. We in Barbados are very pleased to know that the stable conditions here is one of the reasons that have attracted investors to subscribe twelve million dollars in a matter of seconds or minutes. Government went on to say that the amount was over subscribed. I do not pay much credit to that because if I am raising £100 and anyone knows that the security is good and I am going to give them the good interest rate of six percent and another two percent for depreciation on their money, you are going to have a million people coming to you to ask you to allow them to subscribe that money.

5.35 p.m.

Do not let us run away with the idea that because it was over-subscribed twenty times, that $240 million is there for which we can go, because it is not so. I have heard remarks made in this House which will lead people to believe that that is so. I can tell you that money at 6% and at 98 or 98 1/2 is an attractive investment to come from Barbados today. I doubt very much that the Government would have been permitted, under the existing law, to raise that money in Barbados because in that case there would have been an infringement of the Usury Act. Local investors could not take it up on these terms, but the foreign investors can do it. The Canadian investors or most of them, when the restrictions were made on local investments, enquired as to why the local investors were restricted and at the same time we were asking foreign investors to come in. It does not make sense to them that these are the things which are happening.

As to the tourist industry, we all know, and the Government realises it, and he would be a very foolish man who does not realise it, that this industry is our second industry. The figure is now in the vicinity of $10 million and the industry has potential for much greater development. The Government has offered certain incentives and it has established a Tourist Board. The Hon. Premier has said that the Tourist Board is not pulling its weight and he repeated that statement. I do hope that he will explain a little more fully what he means by that statement. The Tourist Board has been established and within a number of months it has appointed a Manager and is awaiting the Government's sanction for his appointment. When the Premier says that the Tourist Board is not pulling its weight, I do not know what he means, and in fairness to the Board I think that that statement should be explained. If you have misfits on the Board which has only just been appointed, I think that they should be given a chance.

The section of the Hotel Industry which represents 50% of the rooms in Barbados, was completely left out in respect of the Tourist Board. I am speaking of the Goddard and Marson interests. They have been in the industry for ten years or longer. Their interest involves five hotels with over 50% of the rooms today, and yet we find that people with only ten rooms, people who have borrowed money from the Development Board, people who have been expanding in every direction, have been put on the Board to represent their interest; but the biggest people in the hotel industry, comprising the Goddards and Marsons, have been left completely out! You cannot say that you did not know that they were interested in membership of the Board, because the bodies which were asked for nominations, the Chamber of Commerce and the Tourist Board, submitted names to the Minister. Each of these Boards named a representative. We can probably hear for the first time why that is so. That large section of the hotel interest found itself wondering about this discrimination. They talk about co-operation being needed from the tourist industry, if it wants funds from the Government; we want to know when the co-operation is going to start and where it is going to start. If you are not allowing people to have any say in the matter, that is not our idea of co-operation. The Government cannot say that we are not tourist-minded because there has never been a debate in this House or an occasion outside when our interests have not been brought forward and represented to be one of the major industries in Barbados. We had a big job in persuading the Government and some members of our Party of the advantages of tourism for Barbados. I claim to be in the forefront of the pioneers for tourism in Barbados, and I would like the Premier, when he gets up again, to explain what he means by saying that the Tourist Board is not pulling its weight. I have reason to believe - and I will say it now, because I may not have another chance of saying it - that - this - $50,000 which has been put in to be matched with the tourist industry has been put in for business houses and whoever can subscribe dollar for dollar. If you want co-operation you must start in the right way; but if a large section of the industry has been left out and ignored, then you should not open your hands and ask for money. I go further and say that that part of the tourist industry which we represent does not qualify for exemptions either under the Pioneer or the Tourist scheme. We pay our taxes; we have got one single new hotel which gets any benefits. But I have pressed for them even to my disadvantage. There is a feeling that you can take a section and do whatever you like with it and then ask for co-operation in another quarter. Many members of the public have wondered why our interest was not represented on the Board. It has been drawn to the attention of the Government and it has never been explained; but today the Premier can say that the Tourist Board is not pulling its weight. I am not a member of the Tourist Board.

5.45 p.m.

I presume they mean dollar for dollar on the $50,000, but I want to reeat what the Hon. Keith Walcott said in here in one of the finest Budget Speeches he made and it is that when you are making these Estimates and you turn to the Agricultural vote and you find it in the vicinity of $1 million, one has yet to see any part of that where you call on them to put up dollar for dollar. Go through any industry which is being assisted and see whether you have put in any section where they must match dollar for dollar. When you are raising a fund, as you are doing for the Museum, and you have well-wishers, you can put up a scheme like that, but if you want to assist an industry you cannot say you are going to do it that way.

As far as I know, hotel owners pay taxes equal to the others; they pay the same 40% as anybody else and it is that money that is going to further the interest of the tourist industry. This is a national thing and you are either improving the economy of Barbados by way of tourism or you are improving it by way of sugar. I can only see it one way. Tourism is either good for Barbados or it is not good, but if you really want to see it furthered, Government has to do something about it. It is true that we are late because we realise that a section of the Labour Party resisted it all these years. They have resisted it so long that they cannot continue to do so because the other islands have jumped ahead of us. It was amazing to hear the speech of our last Premier in Trinidad at the turning of the first sod for the new hotel. I wonder if he was thinking back of Barbados and thinking that a Hotel, if not as large as beautiful as that, might have been in Barbados had he not had a hand to the contrary. If you want the tourist industry to develop you must have cooperation from both sides.

Now, I see that Government is paying attention to the increasing of the retirement age. We had asked for something like this for about ten to twelve years. It is

only a matter of time and I knew it had to come. There are some things which we just cannot afford in Barbados and this is one. Anyone who has a glance at the pensions we put aside year after year will realise that it is just a matter of time, and I am going to say- and there are other things to come-that this is a matter for the Federation. Federal action is to be taken at this level. Let them start their duty today, because if we are asking for aid from outside, one of the things they will be looking into will be how we are doing things within our unit, things that cannot be afforded in big countries, and those are leave passages. Can we afford this luxury? I say "No!" We may be able to do it today and for another five years, but the expansion of Barbados cannot afford this. We have to meet the needs of the people, we will have to build more schools, we will have to look for more food; so although these things in themselves may be nice, we cannot afford them. At the last Parliamentary Delegation Meeting I asked either the Minister from Nigeria or Ghana about these things, and he told me they had to stop them. Their resources are better than ours; they now have their independence and say that these things must stop; so it will have to happen in the Federated West Indies, from Jamaica back down.

Now that I am talking about pensions - we talked about them as recently as a few days ago - I do hope that Government will separate the pensions that we spoke about from any salary revision whatever. We are speaking of pensioners, those who retired five years ago and back. I am not going to worry you with it again, but in your reply to us you got us rather involved in saying that pensions were under consideration with a salaries revision. We are not asking for that; we are asking you to do justice to those pensioners who came out of the service before the last salaries revision because they are at a great disadvantage, and those were the category of pensioners we had in mind when that Resolution was passed. Please do not mix them up or attach them in any way to any other scheme.

Now we come to "Town Planning", Town Planning has been a question in here for many years. At last we have appointed a Town Planner who arrived here some time in October. We were told that he is making surveys and we have seen evidence of the fact that certain surveys have been made with regard to traffic which is very pressing and urgent; but what I cannot understand is this: why is it that in the four or five months he has been here he has not been able to convince the Minister of Social Services, who I believe, is responsible for that Department, that a simple bit of legislation is so urgently needed to protect us from the things we are doing today which are going to cost us money to repair, and that is the establishment of a building line on our highways? By that, I mean that there are no building regulations whatever in Barbados today; you can do just what you like and people are doing just what they like. In Hastings or Blue Waters Terrace Mr. Barnes has just put down a building; I am told it is a home, but it looks like bathing cubicles, right on the front road which creates a blind corner. It is a big structure which is a hazard to traffic. There are no building regulations whatever to prevent a condition like that. Mr. A. E. Taylor goes further up to Worthing and he is putting down beautiful motels. With that we have no quarrel; but after that is finished, he is going to put down a Bank directly on the road, so that when you make your deposit and step out of the door a bus will hit you and you are finished. That is what is happening today. You have people building garages in Hastings whose doors open onto the highway. Do you think it takes a Solomon to draft some sort of simple legislation to prevent these things from happening?

5.55 p.m.

I have told the Minister that I would draft it for them because even if I made a mess of it in here somebody would correct it. Make a bit of legislation which would prevent us from today putting up a building less than 10 feet off the highway. All the legislation that is needed for that is something like this: "no building shall be constructed within ten feet off the highway." It is as simple as that. You will not construct a building within that distance in Broad Street where you have businesses there, but certainly there are highways where this sort of thing is happening and it is going to cost us money to correct it. The Planning Oficer has been appointed since October; this is now March and that is one of the things which should have been done immediately as he took up office.

This sort of thing comes up at meetings of the Board of Health and we have not got the power to say "No" to anyone who wants to cut up a piece of land and do any of these things. We have to plead with them not to do it but we have no power to prevent them. The most we can do is to delay the matter. This piece of legislation should be put into effect as quickly as possible because this thing is happening all along our highways and our streets are being ruined. You have big wall fences going up and creating blind corners and the only way they are taken down is when one of those big buses knock them down; but even so, that is not for long because the person who knocks them down will have to put them back up. I hope the Hon. Minister will take note of this. Then he can follow up with other things as he sees fit. I do not want a lot of regulations but this is so important that I am at a loss to know why it has been neglected for so long.

Well, Sir, another bit of intended legislation will be the taxing of these pools which are taking place in Barbados. That must happen. I would say that the pools in Barbados today are a menace but you must satisfy the gambling instinct of the human race because it is human nature to gamble. I am going to buy my race tickets because I hope to be able to win some money that will take me too long to earn. It is in all of us - the spirit of gambling - and we all would try our luck: but today these pools are creeping in and you will be amazed at the amount of wasted time in everybody's office in Bridgetown and to see these pool tickets all over the desks and everybody's interest is in them. It is a really a time waster. If the people would do it at home, I will have no quarrel with them, but they do it first thing in the morning after reading the newspaper. That is happening in Government Offices too. It is a matter with which the Government will have to deal.

Personally I think you will have to tax it at the source; do not say that you will tax it after one wins it. I do not like that. When you do that, you are only asking the fellow to put down the address of another island. I win it here but I put down an address in St. Lucia and I will go there and collect it. There again, this is original matter and it is a matter for all of these islands because I know that it has spread to all. Of course, people can do what they like with their money but it is becoming alarming the amount of money which is leaving Barbados for betting purposes.

I see Government at last has been persuaded to allow depreciation on industrial buildings for income tax purposes. Now, we have been asking the Income Tax Commissioner about six years back to allow something off for that. It has now caught up with Government and I must say that we are only doing these things today because they are done in the other West Indian territories. No doubt, Federation is playing its part. It is evening up things between these islands. Barbados can now expect relief in this sort of thing. If Trinidad's income tax rates are lower than ours, ours should be as low as theirs. We were not in the Federation before but we are becoming closer to them. When the big questions are being solved, all of these things are going to have a bearing on them and no taxpayer in Barbados will be satisfied to have a Custom Union for the West Indies, and to have the consumer in Antigua paying $2.00 on his bottle of whiskey while the consumer in Barbados is paying $4.00, and at the same time they have a lower income tax than ours, because we certainly would be subsidising them. It is time that the evening up takes place; so you could as well start at once. Our rates of income tax are so high above the other territories that

ours will have to come down a great deal. I wonder how much of this is the pleasure of the hon. Premier to do something in his first Budget Speech and how much of it is pressure from the other commissions to do these things so that when Federation begins to work we will not be out of step with the other islands. I hope I will have the pleasure of hearing him say that it was a genuine desire on his part to relieve the over-burdened taxpayers in this colony.

Anyhow, depreciation on industrial buildings for income tax purposes will be here for the first time and although he did not explain it quite fully I think I know what he means. He means that any commercial buildings that are put up this year or any extensions made to existing buildings, for the purposes of income tax next year you will be able to write off the depreciation on those buildings. As the law exists in Barbados today, you put up a $100,000 building and you put in machinery worth another $100,000; next year when you make out your returns you are only allowed depreciation on your plant but not one penny on your building. If you carry out repairs to that building, you cannot take off anything for depreciation of that building. I do not know what the depreciation allowance would be; I believe it will be the same thing as in England. There again, the outside investor is pressing for these things; we have had to put up with them all these years. It is the outside investor who is saying that you must do for us in Barbados what is done for us outside of Barbados if you wish to attract our dollar. That is what they are saying. If you want that Canadian, American or English Company to come in and establish industries and to put up industrial buildings, they are going to demand these things and if you do not give them these concessions they are going to Trinidad. I am glad that this softening-up is beginning to take place; you cannot be too rigid about these things. It must be a concession for all and not the outside dollar alone.

Sir, I was very pleased to hear, in the Budget Speech of the Hon. Premier, him saying that you can only borrow from savings and it is better to borrow from local savings than outside savings. That is true; that is a fact. You can only borrow from savings and savings in a country are better than the savings outside. When you borrow local savings, the interest which you pay remains in the country: but when you borrow outside savings you have to remit the interest outside. That is one of the salvations of Barbados. Barbados is owned entirely by Barbadians and not by absentee proprietors and that is what has saved us and why we are what we are today. That is why when overseas people come here they do not want to trade with us. They think that too much money stays in the country: but it stays in here for the benefit of Barbados. I am proud that Barbadians invest their money here and I do hope that this state of affairs will remain for many years to come. If you can get a local dollar you should get it from here instead of getting an outside dollar.
6.05 p.m.

It is not my intention to touch on Agriculture at all, but I regret to hear the Premier say that Mr. Collett is leaving us soon and the Government is experiencing difficulty in finding a replacement for him. Mr. Collett, I am told, is a good man in his job: he is doing a good job and it will be a great loss to this colony if the work he is doing there is allowed to get out of order, that work in connection with soil erosion with which we have been faced all these years. It is a long-term policy and I hope that the Government will be fortunate enough to find a successor to Mr. Collett, one who is as good or nearly as good as Mr. Collett. I can only hazard a guess that Mr. Collett is leaving for the reason I have enunciated earlier this afternoon, that is, that the income tax rate is too high for him. I do not know if that is the reason; I am only guessing at it. I have heard it said that with the cost of living and the income tax rates as they are here, people do not have what they expect to have from their labours. I repeat; I am not saying that that is so, but that might be one of the reasons why Mr. Collett is leaving. We have to guard against losing people who have been doing jobs in Barbados. There are some people who come here and we can really appreciate their work. I hope that the Government will find a worthy successor to Mr. Collett.

The finances of the island have been clearly put before us. There is nothing about which to be alarmed and the Budget for this coming year is nothing spectacular or nothing which should cause any great controversy. As I said, Capital Expenditure goes on in relation to how it was set out in the first Five Year Plan. This is the end of that Plan, and it is our duty to bring to the attention of the Government our feelings as to how we want the next Five Year Plan presented as a matter of priority. I am not going any more fully into the matter than to state what comes uppermost in my mind. I am sure that the Government will pay attention to what I have said and give us the opportunity of discussing very fully the next Five Year Plan which should be more important and more interesting to us than this Budget today.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member who just sat down has approached this Budget from the point of view of a financial balance sheet, but not from the point of view of public finance. In reading this Budget speech carefully -- and we are very pleased that we were able to get a copy of it -- the hon. member who has just sat down has not realised that one of the main planks of this Government's industrial expansion is the building of the Deep Water Harbour. That is only one project. What is gloomy about that is what the hon. member has not indicated but I will deal with that matter first. On page 16 of the Budget Speech this is what the Premier stated:-

"In connection with the Deep Water Harbour I will take this opportunity to say that a Port Manager has been appointed and he is expected to arrive on or before the seventh of May. His services are at this stage urgently needed because we want a man of his experience to inform us on the question of the planning of certain buildings, and regulations for the operation of the Port, and we must get ahead with these as soon as possible. We do not want to wait until the Port has been actually opened for this gentleman to come; we want to have him come here earlier, and from his knowledge and experience, advise us on the question of making regulations for the operation of the Port. Meanwhile we propose during this year to push on with the access roads which are necessary to expedite the flow of traffic in the harbour. The contract for the loading equipment to be used in the handling of sugar in bulk has been awarded to Messrs. Spencer (Melksham) Ltd., in the sum of $1,801,417, and the work on drawings of the sugar stores is in preparation."

This is the only major scheme which is going on in this island and we hear an indication of what is to take place in connection with the East Coast Road. I will deal with that at a later stage.
6.15 p.m.

What is very important at this stage, Mr. Speaker, is that in this Budget no mention is made of Government's intention as a result of the construction of the Deep Water Harbour with a bulk installation of 80,000 tons of sugar and with plans to pump the sugar into the hatch-hole of the ship at the rate of 500 tons per hour; that means that if you would normally load a ship in 10 days it can now be done in one day. No indication is given as to what is Government's intention in so far as industrial expansion or employment expansion is concerned which is likely to take up not only the slack which will result, but also the number of people who are going to be available for work at the time of their twenty-first birthday.

May I refer you, Mr. Speaker, to the speech of the Head of the Administration at the opening of this Session? This is what he said: "No reliable statistics of unemployment are available, but the number registered at the Employment Exchange at the 31st December was 1,162 as compared with 2,239 a year ago." Now that very optimistic picture which should never have been printed to give the impression to people that there has been a drop in the

unemployment situation in Barbados is to my mind one of the most serious statements we have ever had made in any public document for some years, because the fact is that there has been a recession in the United States and in the United Kingdom, and in one part of this Budget Speech it is said that that recession had its effect on Barbados; yet in the Speech by the Head of the Administration, which I presume was written by the Premier or the Government, it is said that the unemployment situation in Barbados unlike other places in the world is healthier, because when it went up in other parts of the world, it went down in Barbados. That type of stupidity cannot go on; that type of nonsense should not have been written. Not only is it nonsense from any basis of good reasoning, but when you are dealing with the unemployment situation in Barbados, the Employment Agency is not a place where you get employment, but a place where you go for recruitment for work, and cannot give any indication of the employment or unemployment situation in Barbados.

What has struck me in this Budget Speech is that nothing is said to indicate that you regard this as a serious matter and you intend to meet it. I say that because unlike the hon. junior member for Christ Church my interest is not in the financing a hotel or of any business; my interest is mainly concerned with the increasing of opportunities for greater employment flow, and as this is going to be something in which there is the likelihood of lower opportunities for employment, I do not regard it as a matter for the Port Manager to decide. It says here that they are waiting for this gentleman to come in and they want him early to from his knowledge and experience advise on the question of making Regulations for the operation of the Port. But we have to go a little further. Government must be in a position as their own policy to say what type of Port they want. Do you want a Port that is run on the basis of a Port Authority in which you set up a Statutory Board to deal with it, or do you want a Port running on the basis of the present one? I do not know if the Port Manager is going to determine policy along that line. You would think that if you decide to build a harbour, the person who decides to build that harbour should be the person to decide how it should, as a matter of policy, be run.

In the Governor's speech credit was given to the Report of the Shipping and Mercantile Association and they said that the Report was under study. Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity of reading that Report, and it has in it many features that could be very alarming and misleading, because speaking now from memory, in that Report they made a calculation in 1957 on what the number of workers should be in the Port when the Deep Water Harbour came into operation. The figures they gave are alarming and could not be regarded as approximating to reality, because they take the ordinary arithmetical basis and divide the number of man hours and arrive at the number of people you should have. That cannot work in a Port because all the ships do not come in the Port on that basis; but I am glad to hear that the Report is under study, because it is a Report from people who themselves are not interested in the Port as it stands, and I do not think they would say they do not have any financial interest so far as the future goes.

The Government has agreed to spend $3 million on the bulk installation; the majority of money is being spent out of the public purse. The ones who are going to suffer are those who have no finances; so what is going to be Government's policy in meeting a situation which is as near around the corner as 1961? If you are now dealing with the 1959-60 Budget, and if it is proposed to have this Harbour by 1961, at least it is not too far ahead to let us know what are your proposals on these matters. We do not want another situation with the bulk shipment of sugar as we had with molasses. I received today a letter from one of the Ministries saying that they had received a petition from people on the basis of the final method of computing what to give to these coopers. You do not want another situation like that. You want a situation in which the Government can say in their budget policy that they realise that by the construction of the Deep Water Harbour there is the likelihood of a greater number of people being unemployed, and that certain jobs of work will become redundant. The question of lighterage will be reduced; overtime will be reduced through bulk shipment; and if your export figure is in the vicinity of 175,000 tons, you can see how long that would take to get off. In Barbados the greatest proportion of wages is made in the Port because of sugar; that is where the port workers earn the greater part of their money. You will see, therefore, that I am pressing not for a narrow class but on behalf of 2,000 workers to know what are Government's proposals in these matters. I think that some indication should be given to them.

Now I go from that to the statement which Government made in respect to the East Coast road, and I think that is a very good thing. The East Coast Road as a development programme in Barbados should not await the closing off of work on the Deep Water Harbour. Some mention was made earlier of utilising the equipment there, and I believe that Messrs. Costain are people who go in for all types of things. 6.25 p.m.

When I went abroad I had the opportunity of seeing a building put up by them for the British Industries Pavilion at the World Fair which took place at Brussels last year. As I have said, they go in for all types of contracts. I believe their presence here can be utilised in surveying the East Coast Road. We should begin to do that because I regard that project as development in the sense that not only will it relieve unemployment but it will provide seasonal employment in that there is land in that area to come under cultivation and you can increase the domestic products of this Island from it. When you put down the East Coast Road, you are also providing apart from employment more development from the earth which means that you will increase the earning capacity of the community as a whole.

I believe and I think that the Government should embark on an intensified programme for industrial development and I am making this known to the Hon. Premier so that he can tell it to the Hon. Minister of Trade. One of the best things I think the Minister of Trade should do is to go to Israel and see their system called "Histadrut". I see hon. members smiling at that. You will find that Israel has made a faster industrial development than any other part of the world and if you go there you will find that conditions there were almost the same as conditions we have here. The "Histadrut" movement is one that ties in the trade union as well as the political movement and you will find as well there some of the biggest cooperative movements in the world. I hope I will be able to go to Israel soon to see it for myself. I am sure that the Israel Government would welcome people from these parts, but it depends on the mentality of the people with whom we have to deal. We are plagued with the unfortunate condition that you would not believe that the Minister of Trade would say that Barbados is a closed book so far as these things are concerned. Just fancy his saying we have no mineral resources.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to know when that impression was given by the Minister of Trade.

Mr. WALCOTT: He said so some years ago at a meeting of the I.L.O. Let him go for his speech at I.L.O. and he would see where I got that impression. He said that we have no mineral resources and as we have none, the question of industrial development seemed to be a far way yet. That is why I say that it would be a good thing for the Hon. Minister to go to Israel which was a country like Barbados. Israel had no mineral resources; it was merely an agricultural community; but if you go there you will see the type of development they have because they accepted the challenge.

We cannot go on to fold our arms and believe that growing sugar cane is the only thing we can do. The tendency in the West Indies is to regard industry as a rumshop or a trade. If I open a business which is the same as somebody else's, I am not increasing the wealth of Barbados. It is the same number of people we are catering to; but what I am thinking of is somebody coming in and getting down to doing something which was not

done here before. That is why I say that we should utilise the engineers we have here doing the Deep Water Harbour, in surveying the East Coast Road for us. If you do that now, you will not have to pay anybody's passage. I do not believe that is something beyond the financial capacity of Barbados to do because when you look at this Budget and the statements made here, when you look at the balances on the back page of the Estimates, you will see that there is a General Revenue Balance of $7,614,293.26 and you have that when you only have a budget of $20 million. If you go to the United Kingdom, you would not get a s relatively a rosy picture as that.

6.35 p.m.

With the amount they budgeted for, they may not find that they have a sort of liquid situation as rosy as that. Our position is not gloomy, and I feel that what we can do by means of the East Coast road would be a means of increasing the national income apart from the question of employment, because you will put certain things into operation. That has not been budgeted for and I hope that something will be done about the matter. I have raised the question of the Deep Water Harbour and the consequences which are likely to arise from it.

The Hon. Minister of Agriculture is not now in his place, but I hope that the Premier will be able to answer this question about Dodds Plantation. I believe that the time has come when the Government should carry out a bold experiment in relation to seeing how Dodds can function as a full-blooded co-operative scheme and not merely employing workers on the plantation system and paying them week by week. One offers this challenge so that the employers can see what should be done. You could put by 25% of the profits which you have made to share with the workers. I believe that that enterprise could be the means of showing to the planters of this community that in the plantation system which they are operating, there is a system which does not provide people with a fair living. I remember that on one occasion when the Hon. Minister of Agriculture was not occupying the position which he now occupies, he was very vehement on the question of separating Dodds from the plantation and now that he is in this other position, now that the separation has taken place, I hope that he will carry out the experiment at Dodds plantation in relation to the people who work there and say: "We have a pool of labour," and stop this week to week payment.

Let us see how this collective system works. I am anti-Communist because I am anti-dictator but I think that we are intelligent enough to understand this question of examining the economic system. Some people believe that there is only one economic system and that is the Capitalist system; but what I want to say is that what takes place in Russia in collective farming must have been a very excellent example if Russia has produced the power which it has today on the basis of its economic development. I am asking the Hon. Minister to examine this question and see what is the position with regard to working Dodds Plantation in this way. The collective farming system in Russia has been responsible for Russia's power because it has given Russia the economic stability which a country requires to build up the other things. Russia has serfs but you can see how their children are comparable with other children in other parts of the world.

There is a phrase used in the memorandum to the Estimates and I would like to ask the Premier what is meant by that. It says this:

"In the island an inflationary tendency is noticeable, but, because of the pressure of population, it is essential to press on with expenditure on development."

I do not like to use phrases which you find in use in Great Britain or the United States of America; do you really seriously talk about inflation in Barbados? In a country where you have people working for $13.00 and $15.00 a week, do you talk about inflation in a community in which you say that you have $14 million in liquid cash and you budget for $21 million? Is that an attempt to tell us that we should not spend any more money? I remember hearing the question asked: "Where are we going to get money from because we have reached the limit of our expenditure?" I have been hearing that solidly for the last ten years; I have been hearing the argument of the hon. junior member for Christ Church from the time he was a member of this House that all we have to depend upon is sugar; that we must remember that and we must "remain put". Whenever you hear anybody speak about inflation it is an attempt to stop you from spending more money.

I hope that the Hon. Premier is not serious when he says that the Government is examining wages in the lower bracket on the basis of the cost of living, because you really cannot begin by saying that. Can you increase the wages of a man who is getting $13.20 a week on the basis of the cost of living? You cannot really begin in that way. In giving an increase by way of the cost of living you are not really alleviating the situation; you are just laughing at it. The cost of living may not rise by more than 5%, but are you suggesting that you will pay a 5% increase? That is all right for the unaware, but when you realise what a man in the lower rates is working for - I do not think that any member of this House would say that he regards a rate of $13.20 a week as something which could give a man the barest necessities of life. What type of house can you rent for less than $3.00 a week? And if a man is paying $3.00 a week for house rent, what can he do with the other $10.00? The Government does not employ people in the sense that the Ministers employ them and I think that the time has come when a local Committee should be set up, a Committee representative of people in the community, to go into certain sections. The unestablished staff are not going to ask about a Whitley Council to determine their wages; they cannot do it adequately. I warn the Government just as I have warned them about the pensions; are you going to give a man a cost of living allowance only? Nothing has been indicated here and when the time comes I hope that someone will look at this matter in a bold way.

On the question of the football pools, it is true that the Premier is not a forceful character. What you really want to do with pools betting is to ban it, not tax it; if people want to gamble, well it is a bad thing for any growing nation anyhow, because it is the most sordid side of your life. The people who resort to gambling are people who have not yet attained other things in life. If you regard taking a chance in life by allowing your money to spin on a table as something worthwhile, and you are raffling money, I have some strong views about that. If you allow that and if you believe that people should not throw dice, well, they are one and the same thing. I believe that a person who is playing cards gets more entertainment value out of that than a person who likes to spin money. I think that we should ban these pools. The Hon. Premier says that they are going to tax these pools because the amount of sweepstake money seems to have dropped. I do not believe in taxing one type of gambling so as to offset another type of gambling. The community is accustomed to its sweepstake tickets; therefore, let the people continue with them. You cannot buy Irish Sweepstakes in Scotland because they are banned.

6.45 p.m.

In England people believe in betting on the day of the races; they do not sell you tickets. You do not walk around in England buying tickets. It is true that the Pools come from England and therefore they are there; but it is something we should stop, and I will tell you why. When you are in a poor community and you get its mind focussed on the aspect that this is the only incentive in life, it is fooling the lower groups that you are getting money. Take an analysis of the amount of money that is leaving the island now and take an analysis of what is spent at the Garrison and see how much it represents in the community. All this money is spent in this way, yet in the same breath people say there is not enough money to send their child to school; it is the same community which has focussed itself on gambling. It is there-

fore necessary for you to provide compulsory elementary education so that a boy or girl must of necessity go to school long enough, because there are some half-baked ones who feel that the best way is to get easy money. The leaders have not accepted the challenge that they have to find profitable things for the people to do in the community and not worry to legalise these little ends of nonsense to make people believe this is a wonderful land in which to look for prosperity. They are looking for prosperity in the Pools and not in themselves. You would be surprised to know the amount of money a man saves week after week as in a meeting turn to go to the races, and yet he hasn't got a proper pair of pyjamas to sleep in; but he perpetuates the idea in the hope that his dreams will come true. I mix with them and see how they put up 50¢ with the idea that one fellow built a house out of money he won. Do you believe that the houses in Barbados have been put down by money from Sweepstake tickets?

I know that the Hon. Premier might be guided by people whose gambling instinct is very high in their land, and some people find it is a good way of finance. In St. Vincent they want to run a Lottery because in these Latin-American countries, after the Spaniards left, there was nothing; but if you want to find a lot of poverty, go to any of these places. The dirtiest place for a City which you can find today is Panama City. Any hon. member who has been to Panama will tell you that it is a shocking state of affairs to see Panama City; a lot of gambling goes on in that place. I feel that you should ban the Pools. There is a type of gambling you know about and they can continue with their fun in that.

There is something, too which this Government should consider and it is the loan made to the Cricket Association. In this community you cannot afford to waste money, and though this might be a small amount, I want to tell the Premier that it is time that he called upon the Barbados Cricket Association to repay the money. I am telling you that they can repay it; I am one of the Vice Presidents of the Football Association and I know that thousands of dollars are paid over to the Pickwick Club every year. Ask them to give you a statement on the amount of money which the Football Association paid over to the Pickwick Club in the last ten years. Not only that; we agreed to lend money to provide facilities, so if money is being made out of the facilities which were rendered them, why not repay the loan? Cricket, Football and Athletic Sports go on there, and now Government has a Sports Officer. What is the use of having a Sports Officer and you are lending out money? I am a member of both Associations and I do not agree with it. The Barbados Workers' Union has as much community significance as playing cricket, but do you think because we are putting up a building that I should come and ask Government to lend us money? The English Cricket Tour made £30,000; the second was nearly £30,000, but they are getting on like business people telling you about losses when they had one big unholy row over the Pakistan and India Tour. There is this idea in this country that the Government seems to be benevolent, so that whenever somebody wants something they take it to Government. It is just as if somebody opens a Baby Welfare League and a baby is crying, you ask Government to hold the baby! It is time that we call back for the money as a matter of principle, and I hope the Premier will not bring any Resolution back here talking about waiving it. I am very glad that reason prevailed somewhere and you did not worry to consider the Resolution to waive the amount, because as soon as you do that you are opening the flood gates and those who owe you will never pay; and if you are going to open the flood gates I would not pay my income tax and you can add on 5% until it becomes too much, and then you can lock me up. If you cannot take away $24,000 from the Cricket Association, I do not see why I should pay my income tax.

On the question of Education, I am very glad to see that there is a new Minister, and I hope that he has dropped this fancy idea about open-air schools, because to my mind that was one big joke; you would then have an open-air school and a closed market. You usually have an open-air market and a closed school. I do not think that the Minister of Education who has been in the teaching profession for so many years would perpetuate any nonsense about an open-air school. You have open-air Church meetings and sometimes you take children out of the school to have an open air class, but you should not build an open-air school.

There is this matter which I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister of Education. I read the speech of the Premier nearly twenty years ago advocating compulsory elementary education. Now we are fooling ourselves in Barbados that our educational standards are higher than all the other territories in the area, but we should not fool ourselves with that because the others may be very low. You go among the working class population and find that they have a house of children who have only had third or fourth standard education; do you regard that as education to be proud of? That sort of thing cannot serve the community today. Even elementary education is not enough because we have to get away from the idea that a boy at 14 years has acquired all that he needs in education to start off life quite apart from further education at an older age where he can begin to grasp some of the things he has to face. Compulsory education is a 'must' for us: otherwise you will not be able to carry out industrial expansion, because the human material to carry it out will not be at your disposal.

6.55 p.m.

Having this same industrial expansion that you want to vie with, you will not be able to vie with it because human material to carry out the expansion would not be able to vie with it. That is the only way in which you can go and as long as you can go at that, it is O.K. They are the people you want today; we want the carpenters and masons who would not have to be told what to do. Let us say that you have an area of so many cubic feet of wall to build. The mason should know how many stones you will have to buy to build it instead of having a man to tell you to buy so many stones and then you find out after the wall has been completed that you have 50 stones left. I feel any Government should accept the challenge and go ahead with it.

For some years now- I think for the last five years- you made out a Budget for a surplus of $50,000 but we know it turned out to be a surplus of $2 million. I will wager a bet that the Income Tax for this year will be higher despite the fact that the crop which you produced last year was over 160,000 tons and was higher than this year. The Hon. Minister does not seem to know that although the Sugar Industry this year was lower than that of last year that the Income Tax will be higher. You will find that the amount of Income Tax collected will be equivalent to the year when you had a crop of 180,000 tons because you are collecting Income Tax by the P.A.Y.E. system. Of course that system does not make any difference to those of us who draw salaries but it will make a difference with those who have to produce profits.

I feel, Sir, that education is something for which a community must budget. Of course, this country budgets for education. Why postpone compulsory education? Some people say that compulsory education is now an academic subject because the people are sending to school their children now. But the question is, for how long are they sending them. They have always been sending their children to school but they feel, when they send their boy or girl to school until he or she reaches the fourth class, that such a child has been in school long enough and has known enough that they can take him out. I feel the time has come when compulsory education should no longer be postponed and I think that is the view of all of us who come into contact with the people.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 7 o'clock, this Sitting now stands suspended until 7.45 o'clock.

7.00 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, there is no quorum and I would like you to instruct the Clerk to have the Bell rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum obtained.

HOUSE RESUMES DEBATE ON APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: Just before the Suspension, the hon. senior member for St. Peter was addressing the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, before the suspension, I was making the point that as regards education in Barbados I feel that we have been going on long enough speaking of our education and saying what a nice country we have, but unfortunately we do not have on our Statute Book compulsory education. I feel that this is something which we should not continue to postpone and take it for granted that all is well without it. If you look at education as it should be looked upon, you must regard it as something which you should not allow people to slip out of into a voluntary system of sending their children to school as exists here. The system here should be tightened up. I feel that we have long passed the stage when we should allow people to send to school their children at their will and just as long as they like.

On this question of the Development Board, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I have been watching for some time the method of dealing with the Development Board and there seems to be the idea of somebody to keep certain people away from the Development Board. On the last occasion that I saw the personnel of that Board, I saw that they had included Mr. Wilson and Mr. Ashby. I make no apology when I say that the Trade Union Movement is an estate of the realm these days and there should not be the idea of putting industrialists and small businessmen on that Board and that the Trade Union Movement should not get any representation on it. Do you think that will happen in the United Kingdom even with a Conservative Government? How can you say that you are trying to create employment for helping workers but the one organisation which you refuse to look at and find someone from to put on this Board is the Trade Union Movement? Of course, I have seen you have made a step. What you have done in the Other Place is proof. Let me say that we have some men in the Trade Union Movement who are as capable to be put on this Board as some of the businessmen. You have this idea that with a Board of this kind the only person you can put as a member is somebody who is a member of a Bank. We have the idea that if you are to qualify for a seat on the Industrial Board, you must run a business. The Trade Union Movement is at a stage when you can find a man to put on that Board.

7.50 p.m.

Great Britain has Boards, the Education Board, the Industrial Board - all types of Boards are set up and you will find T.U.C. representatives there. Lord Citrine, who is Chairman of the Electricity Board, was the Chairman of the T.U.C. when he was asked to go on that Board. The Trade Union Movement in Barbados is bigger than any other Institution which you have; there is no voluntary organisation, apart from the church, which is bigger than the Trade Union. I do not think you would bind people to religious bodies and leave out the Church. You have a representative of the Union on the Tourist Board and on the Water Board and why can you not have a member from the Trade Union on the Development Board? Do you feel that people from the Trade Union are too ignorant and that they cannot mix with the people on the Development Board? The Civil Servants said at one time: "We had a Trade Union member on a Board and he never said anything", but you have members of this House who do not say anything either. (Laughter). The members of the Barbados Workers' Union representing the workers are not accustomed to sitting down at a Board with a lot of papers before them and with people smoking; a member of the Union would want to catch himself first.

I see that they have on the Board, Mr. Hunte and Mr. Corbin. Whom do they represent? - The business interest, not the interest of the community. On a Industrial Development Board, the very name of which connotes labour, you do not put a Trade Union member on the Board! We want the public to be there so as to know what the employers want to plan and the sort of people to whom you are lending money. I want to say that there are some people to whom you lend money but they do not like the Trade Union Movement. We lend money to the hotel interests and they pay out wages just as they pay them at Eastry House where the employees there are dependent upon the tips. With all this tourist industry you are turning people into glorified pimps. That means that when a person cannot come out with as big a tip as he should come out with, he does not get the service which the others get. The people who operate these hotels tell you that the tourists are the people who are paying you. I am saying that you should develop all sorts of industries, but somebody must be present when you are doing all of this business.

In the hotel industry you have people who are paying low wages and the idea of serfdom has already been inculcated in the minds of people. The hon. junior member for Christ Church says that he is not represented on the Development Board and I say that there must be no Board on which a worker as such should not have a seat because it is the workers who have put the Government in power. I want to say that a man never learns to swim unless he jumps into the sea. I do not make any apology for saying this. You bring a lot of fancy people about here and you put them on Boards. When you multiply 17,000 by 4 you can see that it is not nearly one-third of the population which is being dealt with in an indirect manner. When our representatives from the Trade Union go on these Boards they represent what the Trade Union stands for in this 20th century. The Trade Union is, in fact, a part of the realm; Sir Winston Churchill had to admit that after he came up against Mr. Ernest Bevin. I have no objection to Mr. Wilson or Mr. Ashby or anybody else being on this Board but I do not see why a member of the Trade Union should not have a seat there as well. Do not tell us that we have a place on some other Board because this is the Board about which we are talking.

8.00 p.m.

Now I will say, Mr. Speaker, that this is spite. You cannot see this being done in every circumstance, and you cannot forget that you have a Movement like that when you are appointing Boards. You have just changed the personnel and added people; can you say that you have forgotten the Movement? What is wrong? Is it that they cannot make a contribution? You are not dealing with somebody like the Transport Board where you may say that it is difficult to put an active Trade Unionist on the Board because he is likely to be biassed in so far as his interest is concerned, and would not be able to discipline any of the workers; so even if you escaped by that you cannot say we do not have a retired man as a Trade Unionist to put on the Board just as you have retired officials. We do not have dealings with the Industrial Development Board. They do not employ in the sense that they would have to deal with the Trade Union; the Manager would not be a Trade Unionist nor would be typists; therefore I feel the time has come when you cannot escape it and no apology can be made when you put people on Boards. You have not appointed a Trade Unionist to the Industrial Development Board and I said so from the time the Board started. What are the reasons? Why can't you find a place for a Trade Unionist on this Board?

I am very glad to see that the Premier has come around on the question of Income Tax because the former Premier used to play stubborn and ignorant in a matter like this. It is bound to catch up with the Ministers. As soon as you are drawing money in that bracket, you are bound to see that there is no point in telling the world that you are getting $800 and carrying home $400. $800 is a lot on paper but if you are only taking home $400 or $500, you are not as well off as some people think you are. On the question of child allowance, $270 a year cannot support a child, so it is only an allowance. As I have often said, if some people pay for what they use in a community, they relieve the Government of paying for it for them, and this income tax allowance is a step to relief. I am still a believer not necessarily in comparing our selves with

Trinidad because each island compares with the other, but I think the Premier was making a joke when he talked about Dominica. You only go to Dominica if you want to sleep; Dominica is a sleepy hollow. You do not talk about taxation in Dominica; there is no land tax in Dominica; you are 'cool breeze' down there, and if they began to have a taxation policy, no one man would pay it; so I am sure the Hon. Premier was not serious in comparing Barbados with Dominica. It is just like putting one of those Derby horses in a goat race; there is no comparison. On the question of allowances, I am still wedded to the idea that for a single man the taxable amount in Barbados could be reviewed in the light of money values, because normally for people who have to pay income tax, the money value they are dealing with today is not what it was originally.

I am also going to raise this point which members of the House seem afraid to raise. Members of the House of Assembly should be allowed travelling because they have constituencies to go to, and I feel it is fair and reasonable that there should be an allowance for members for travelling . In the Federal Government a man gets travelling no matter where his constituency is. In Jamaica a man gets travelling if his constituency is Kingston, St. Andrew, and I am not talking about aeroplane fares. There is still that old time bogey idea that the emoluments you get is a salary, as if that is not subjected to income tax! In England it is subjected to certain expenses; they give allowances in England. Do you know that if you employ a secretary, they do not regard that? All your money is regarded as capital and you cannot get anything off. I feel that the time has come when members of the House of Assembly are entitled in a similar way to not as much as a Minister, but at least to £50 a year as travelling allowance. It should cost a man at least £50 a year to travel in his constituency and I do not see anything wrong with that. You cannot stay at one place and represent people because these are not the days when you had 89 people on the voters register; these are days when in any constituency you have to think of no less then 4,000 or 5,000 people. That is the number on the roll; but you cannot only face the roll, you have to face the whole population. Sometimes you have to be a Sanitary Inspector because if you are going from house to house, you have to touch every one; otherwise they tell you that "you went at So-and-so and you did not come here, and so you do not seem to want my vote."

I have already made this point which does not apply to me, because I do not own a house: so you will see I am not saying anything for myself - and it does not seem as if I can own one in the foreseeable future, because I do not like the idea of a millstone around my neck. I feel that a man having a house for his private purpose and not renting it out should not have the rental value included in his income tax. He has to live somewhere. I know lawyers are liable to say that if you build a house out of gold and you want to sell off a piece you should pay income tax, but the idea of a man owning a house and being taxed on it should be amended, because you are now starting on the business of a Building Society which I regard as commendable; you should encourage people to build their houses. *(Mr. Speaker knocked his gavel.)* If the Minister of Trade wants to speak so loudly, why doesn't he go outside? He has an unmannerly way whenever I am speaking; yet he will get up and reply subsequently to something he has not even heard.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come when Government should give this sort of encouragement which is likely to make it cheaper and foster more building than they can undertake themselves, because I am of the opinion that if a man attempts or starts to build a house and you have these Building Societies, they would be a means of helping people to own their houses. The hon. junior member for Christ Church said it is something that the Barbadians like, but it looks as though Barbadians will have to catch up with other parts of the world and satisfy themselves with living in flats.

8.10 p.m.

However, if you want to build houses and build them out of stones, I would say that it is a good idea to relieve these people by having these Building Societies. The Trade Union Act is very restricted when it comes to being able to do something in a manner like this for the workers. I would like to know if the Trade Union Movement could have the same opportunities of doing something like this so as to create good houses for workers. I feel that a scheme like that would be of great benefit to them.

On the Government's fiscal policy, I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Premier that it seems to me that his fiscal policy was based on the fact that there has been a drop in the consumption of rum and that is why the tax on beer has gone up. It seems to me as if you are saying that if there was no drop in the consumption of rum there would not be any increase in the price of beer. I hope that it is not worked out on that basis because it would mean that if we were to have a drop on one item you will increase the price on another item which comes in the same category. Of course, it is not my business to advise Government, more especially on its fiscal policy. It is not my business to advise Government on what aspect of its fiscal policy it should attempt to raise money because each Government has that as its own preserve. However, I do feel that if you want to raise money in Barbados we still have a lot of sources from which we can do that without any harm being brought to bear on anybody and in order to get the money you require.

There are still many avenues from which you can raise money without any injury to people. For instance, let us take motor-cars. A man gets a lot more out of his motor-car now than what he used to get ten or twenty years ago. It is true that the prices of motor-cars have increased but when it comes to that, you can say that everything has increased. Anything which you tax, you do not tax on the basis that the price of it has not been increased. The general life of a motor-car is better than it was 18 or 20 years ago. I have driven a motor-car which has done 34,000 miles and I have not had the cause to change the tyres. I am not saying that every motor-car tyre will give you that service, but it is something which we can look into. In passing, I just would like to say that I do like the coming into operation of Local Government because you will not have eleven different motor-car numbering signs. Another thing which they can look in to is the tax on bicycles. It is now 64 cents and there is no harm if that goes up to $1. I am sure nobody will ride a bicycle less. There are other avenues from which you can raise money if you think of them. I am sure that no young man would say that $1 tax on a bicycle is something unreasonable. Bear in mind, why I say that you can raise the tax on that also is because you can get more life out of your bicycle tyres because you have better roads. I think when it comes to these matters of raising more taxation, you can begin to examine these things. As I have said, it is a matter for Government in its fiscal policy to determine what type of taxation it is going to impose.

Sir, I would like to re-emphasise that the East Coast Road is something which should be examined now that the Costain people are here. I would like to say that the Government should undertake to impress upon people of the outside world its policy for any type of industrialisation and investment as a nation. The reason why I say that is because someone wrote me about three or four weeks ago from New York asking me for the type of investments there are here. I see in Barbados a gentleman by the name of Mr. McGregor speaking to people about this same sort of thing and I have had the privilege of meeting him in New York. I feel the Government should send a Trade Mission to some parts of the world to investigate things. Do not sit down here and wait until somebody comes here and does it. Trinidad is sending out Trade Missions as well as Jamaica; they are not waiting for the Federal Government to do it for them. Send out a Trade Mission with a view of letting people know what are the advantages to be gained by coming to Barbados and undertaking some industrial development which would be of some use to us and to them. I repeat that I feel that the Industrial Development Board should advance money to help other people apart from

those in the hotel business. I feel that certain projects and certain buildings which you find necessary to do, could be worthwhile things which this Development Board should aid. You are building a lovely airport at Seawell but there is no building near there which can be used as a hotel. Nobody would go up there to build a hotel because they would say the site is too far from the City; but somebody may be coming to Barbados who would not want to come all the way to Bridgetown when he is only here as an intransit passenger. It is true that they do not have any hotel at the London Airport but every time I go there I do not like the idea of going to the middle of London to stay. When you get off a plane in New York, you do not have to go into New York City to stay and the same thing can be said of Peurto Rico. They have international hotels at the airport. These are just some of the little conditions that you can make. If somebody comes over-night here to catch a plane the following day, they do not want to come to Bridgetown: therefore there should be some place where they can stop over near to the Airport.

I think that you should also adopt a policy in Barbados as they adopt in England when it comes to having some of your industries in certain areas. You should divert some of your industries to the rural areas. When it comes to the constituency which I have the honour to represent, I do not see why it should not be a matter of Government policy to encourage and to lay out that in certain areas you should have certain businesses there in order that all the employment should not be obtained in Bridgetown.
8.20 p.m.
You put something in an area like St. Peter, St. Lucy or some of the rural areas and build up something out of sugar. On the question of electrification, you have places in this island which are without any light. Let us take the Minister of Agriculture; I do not see why there should not be in that whole area of Church Village or Six Roads and other parts of this country the type of electrification which you have associated with electricity. I do not see why Four Roads district should be in darkness; but even in these suburban areas you have places in which there should be some light. In the Welham Garden Schemes you have all sorts of things going on; they zone an area and you are told: "We will give you land and we will push the scheme for you ". I feel that that sort of thing can be of use. In Puerto Rico they have carried out a fine scheme. I have a Report on the conditions obtaining in that island and it was like Barbados- but they have accepted the challenge and they did the work which was all done by Puerto Ricans. Now that Professor Lewis is the head of the U.C.W.I., whatever is his line it will get a little more emphasis. We are pleased to see that. If all these things are undertaken by the Government then we can make a step forward.

I feel that the Government should not have withheld necessary information from us. I understand that Mr. Cumper has been here; I do not know if he has submitted his Report and I think that it would be in the interest of this community to be given this sort of information. Sometimes I get information and I will have to let the Government members understand that I know what I am talking about when I ask them for the type of information which I am seeking here. What we have read through the Head of the Administration does not satisfy us; the information which I seek is the sort of information which we would expect to have with ease in a small place like Barbados, and it would easily give us some indication when we talk about inflation here. When I read these figures, Mr. Speaker, you will see what I mean.

These are some figures as to the unemployment situation. In Canada, in 1957, the figure was 293.5 thousand; in 1958 it was 254.7 thousand and according to the July figures, it was 310 thousand. In the United States of America, the figure was 2998.2 thousand and in 1958 it was 2.873 thousand. In Israel it was 14.2 thousand. In Barbados we had a visit from Mr. Cumper and the Head of the Administration, not having had all the statistical information, said that the unemployment figures went down. The Hon. Minister of Trade made a positive statement that they could not carry out all of these things because they had to wait until Mr. Cumper came here; now the hon. member has changed his Ministry and do you think this is fair to us? You hear that the population will rise; but as long as people are getting married the population will rise. In Barbados we are sorry about our situation: the anthropologist carried out a survey and wrote a very intelligent letter to the Press pointing out that the Barbadian is very prolific and the population rise in Barbados is low as compared with what is taking place in the world; but we are a small community. There is no more promiscuity in Barbados than there is immorality anywhere else. I believe that there must be 200 thousand people in Greenwich Village in the United States of America. We do not know what our problems are because we do not know these important facts.

I cannot understand how the Government comes down from year to year and makes a statement but cannot say what the unemployment situation is. I know what the Deep Water Harbour is going to mean, that if ten men can look for employment in 1961 they would have to be elsewhere. If we do not have this information which I am seeking our planning is not likely to achieve its desired end. In some instances, you can only plead with people; you can only deal with a Government's financial and fiscal policy and if you do not have the improvement you should have, I feel that some of the things I have indicated to the Government can be a means of rendering relief.

I welcome what has been set out by way of Income Tax and I refer to the broad question of industrial development, and by that I mean anything which will increase the employment numbers in Barbados. Finally I am making the plea that the Government should not bring down any cost of living allowance by way of an increase for these poor workers; let them bring down something which will really mean an increase in their wages and not anything in relation to the cost of living.
8.30 p.m.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, in looking through the Budget, I am sorry to see no mention with respect to the East Coast Road. The East Coast Road is one of the most important roads we have in Barbados, and if we are thinking of developing tourism, we should look for a road for the tourist to ride on, because they are not going to walk; they drive when they go around. I do not know if the Budget can afford a road from Bridgetown to Belleplaine, but we have to build a road from Cattle Wash to Belleplaine where the road becomes a kind of horse-shoe, and tourists would be able to travel in either direction. Hundreds of cars pass my home and the occupants ask whether they can pass that way to Bathsheba, but I have to turn them back. If we can build that road from Cattle Wash to Belleplaine, the tourists can drive from Belleplaine right through to Bridgetown again. That 2 1/2 miles of road would be very important, and I hope one of the Ministers, perhaps the Minister of Communications and Works, will visit the spot and see what I am speaking about.

I feel that the Government should have some sort of meeting before the Budget is made with all the members of the House where we can set out grievances before the Ministers or the Premier for consideration; it would give us a better opportunity instead of coming here all the time to argue over such things. Inside that area there are about 2,200 acres of land undeveloped. I can assure you that around Cattle Wash I have seen canes planted and cut and they yielded 35 to 40 tons per acre, and I know what it would profit Government if they had that 2 1/2 miles of road. Hundreds of people would be employed around there; carpenters, masons, house-maids and servants would be employed.

In looking through the Estimates, I see that there will be an increase of pay for the poor people in the low brackets. I see that cantonniers are getting $13 per week; some of these poor men have six children, and some seven and eight, so $13 cannot meet the cost. As the hon. junior member for St. Lucy said, a 50% increase would be the solution for these people. When the Government gives a 5% or 10% increase, it helps the bigger man, but

when you give these poor boys 10%, that only means $1.00 or $1.30 while the man who is receiving $1,000 would get $100 increase. I would be thankful if the Government would look into this and increase the wages of these people. They are crying day after day. We have Ministers and they should look into this, not the bigger ones but those who are suffering. We are sent here to look after the people's welfare and if we do not do that truly, you know we have a great Lord and he would have to look after us, and he has power to give the Government to whomsoever he will. If we fail to carry out our duty, we will be tried in the balance and weighed in the scale. I trust the Ministers will look after their duty and do their best to satisfy the people. Mr. Speaker, I thank you.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, first I would like to throw out a little warning; I do hope that this success will not be abused. The fact that we have been able to receive these copies is in my opinion for studious application and concentrated effort to produce a sensible debate in this House. I hope, Sir, that it will not be used for rambling. I hope that hon. members will not make it an occasion to go through it page after page and merely repeat what has been said, as one hon. member seemed on a number of occasions to be doing. Of course, if that is abused and we go a little further and have these rambling speeches also recorded and put out quickly, that, Sir, will spot the abuse as well; so however we turn it is a good system

You know, Mr. Speaker, that this Hon. House is the highest authority in the land, and it should conduct itself in a manner befitting that authority. If this House conducts itself unbefitting the people it represents, that is going to permeate through all branches of the administration. I do hope that we realise that, being the highest authority, our conduct should not only be of the highest nature, but our conduct should be an example which those in authority under this high authority will watch very carefully. If we conduct ourselves in a manner in this House unbefitting our stand, right down the line we will get the same effect, and it will spread throughout the Civil Service, and the Addenda will be such as you see now, which, in my humble opinion, are an insult to the intelligence of this House. I do hope, Sir, that this great achievement will not be abused.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Government has been commended by hon. members on this side of the House is rather unusual, but I do not think there is one of us who could not on this occasion commend the Government-the Premier and his Ministers and the Cabinet - on this Budget.
8.40 p.m.

We must commend them for allowing the taxpayers, particularly those in the lower brackets to be now in a position to have a few more cents, if not dollars, in their pockets. We must commend them for that because in turn that will mean that more persons will have jobs in this island. I think, Sir, that it is not very often realised that a community which is so heavily taxed such as this community cannot due to lack of the necessary finances create further jobs and further efforts for employing people. As I have said, we must commend Government for an increase in the allowances for children. I think it is regrettable that Government has not been able to go as far in that direction as has been done in Trinidad because everyone knows that the education of children is a heavy burden on every parent throughout the world. Sir, the most important part of any community is the child. I do regret, while I commend the Government, that it has not been found possible to go to the limit in the allowances for the education of children as that which prevail in Trinidad, particularly for those children at Universities.

Mr. Speaker, the Government must also be commended on its proposed scheme to assist housing. This has been long in coming and it has been something greatly in need of for many a year. I sincerely hope that every effort will be made by private enterprise as a result of this concession to help in this respect and I sincerely hope that if any further concession can be offered, the Government will do so. I do not know if there are any figures available at the Statistical Office, but by observation I would say that the building of houses today is employing a number of people only second to that of the sugar industry. I would like to be corrected if I am wrong on that. There are a large number of houses that are being built all over this island by private effort, by private loans and by loans from private enterprises, and the number of persons who are employed in the building of these houses must also in my opinion be considerable. The providing of employment for the people of this island must be one of the main objectives of any Government. The building of houses not only gives people employment but it also supplies the citizen with his own home and with a sense of security for himself and his family and all of these things go to the building up of a better Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately for us we often like to follow Jamaica and it seems to me that we prefer to follow rather than to lead that country. I mean in the sense of a racehorse leading not in the sense of leading by the Government. It is regrettable that we seem to follow them in most things. A vast number of things have gone ahead there and schemes have been assisted by Life Insurance Companies, and private enterprises are putting out - I speak under correction here now - at least hundreds of houses monthly. I understood on my visit recently to England in discussing matters with people who trade with Jamaica that they have got to such a stage of modern technical knowledge that the houses there are some of the most modern erected in any part of the Caribbean. That, Sir, is a commendable achievement. It is an achievement which I hope this Government, as it has now seen fit to give these concessions which are similar to those given in Jamaica, will see that it is achieved in Barbados and I do hope that Life Insurance Companies and the like will not be slow in making this move so that a beginning will be made to give more employment to the people and to provide our people with a more secure family life by the owning of their own homes.

Here, Mr. Speaker, I must throw a little word of warning. We have some development in this island by the Housing Authority which, by the way, must be commended on the recent report they have put out. I am not in any way adversely criticising this Organisation at the moment but I am wondering whether they are planning far enough ahead. Some of the developments by this Authority which I see going up today I believe in 20 years time will be nothing more than the slums of Barbados.

Now, Sir, that is a statement which I would like to clarify.
8.50 p.m.
Mr. Speaker, when one is planning for housing, one must not only plan for the present generation but for the future generation. We should benefit from experience gained all over the world. I have seen recent developments in housing which, not so long ago in the United Kingdom, you would have thought to be models of housing estates; I have seen flats which are today, due to the congestion and the lack of thought and foresight, no more than hovels. In Barbados, the amount of land which is being allocated to each house in these Housing Schemes is, in my humble opinion, much too small. I know that the problem is a difficult one in this very small island of ours, but although it may be only 21 by 14 miles, at least in these days, so far as I know, no Russians have yet inhabited the Moon and we have got the space between what is between us and the Moon. I am therefore throwing out this considered opinion in the hope that it will be given consideration.

I think that hon. members will agree with me that these houses are almost one upon the other. The privacy of one versus the other is not what one would feel should be the standards which we should try to emulate today. I should like to repeat a suggestion made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter in this particular case, and

that is that it would be well for the Hon. Minister concerned to take a trip. I agree with the hon. member that just as the Trade Union should be represented on all these Boards, the Opposition should be represented on all these trips *(Laughter)* A member of the Government as well as a member of the Opposition should visit not only the United Kingdom but the continent of Europe and see the development in such places as Germany, Sweden, Denmark and the like. So far as these countries are concerned, in their agricultural standards, in their facilities for the persons living in these places, their beauty, their surroundings and in every manner of which one can think, it would be well for the Hon. Minister and the member of the Opposition to invite some Englishman along with them so that they could see what is being done for the people in the lower brackets, not for the millionaires. It would open their eyes and it would give them something to consider so much so that when they returned to Barbados, they would think twice before these rectangular-shaped houses continue to be erected. So close are these houses to each other that in twenty years' time we should have - I personally believe that if it is not in twenty years' time, then in forty years' time, the standard of living of the people in these areas would have reached such a point that you and all hon. members will consider these areas as slums. Mr. Speaker, I think that in our planning we must consider such things; I feel that our planning today is somewhat short sighted; it has no force for the foreseeable future.

Mr. Speaker, I have quite a deal more on which to speak in this Budget. I have had, perhaps fortunately for the House, only a short time to speak. Perhaps it may be unfortunate for the people that I have had only a short time to speak, but I do hope to have the opportunity to further my constructive criticism in this matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 9.00 p.m., of the clock, this House stands adjourned until Tuesday next 17th March, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon. This House now stands adjourned.

9.00 p.m.