
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1960

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 19th July, 1960.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 noon o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*); Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, (*Leader of the Opposition*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); 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*); Mr. E. St.A. HOLDER; Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Hon. L. St.A. THORNE, (*Minister of Education*); and Mr. J. W. CORBIN.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meeting held on 12th July have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members, and unless there be any objection, these Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed.

There being no objection, these Minutes are now taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Barbados Savings Bank - Statement of Revenue and Expenditure for the year ended 31st December, 1959.

Barbados Savings Bank - Statement of Revenue and Expenditure for the half year ended 31st December, 1959.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to place the sum of \$13,769 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1960-61, Part I-Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1960-61 No. 9, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

On my own behalf, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to place the sum of \$1,150 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement

the Estimates 1960 - 61, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1960 - 61 No. 10, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, the Oral Reply to Question No. 36/1960 asked by the hon. junior member for St. John regarding the purchase of Barber Greene machinery is ready.

QUESTIONS

Mr. TUDOR: For Oral Answer:

To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education: Will the Minister state

- (1) Who is acting as Headmistress of St. Michael's Girls' School during the absence from the Colony of the Headmistress?
- (2) Who is now responsible for the arrangements for Hurricane Relief Work at that school which is designated as a Hurricane Shelter?

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour; to move the House into Committee of Supply.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move 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, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

12.25 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, in the absence of the Hon. Premier, I am asking leave to take charge of these two items.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1960-61, No. 8

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, this is an omnibus Resolution. I will deal with the first Head - Head V, Medical Services. Hon. members will see that the \$387 which is voted under this Head for Quarters, Medical staff, is a revote and I do not think it is necessary to say anything on it because the note explains quite fully the reason and, I hope, to the satisfaction of hon. members of the Committee, the necessity for this expenditure.

I beg to move that Head V, Item 2, Quarters, Medical staff, stand part of the Resolution.

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

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

HEAD VI - EDUCATION

Head VI - Education - was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, there are three items under this Head. The first is Item 4, Pine Secondary Modern School - and then there are two other items - Item 9, Alexandra School, and Item 10, St. Giles Girls' School. The notes explain the request for the sums under this Head and the same argument is used as to the reasons for the requirements. These are unspent balances; therefore, they are revotes. These balances are now required to finish the work.

I, therefore, beg to move that Head VI, Education, stand part.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I beg to second that, and in seconding the motion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a little to what was said with respect to the balance of work at the Pine Secondary Modern School. This balance of work consists of fencing, levelling of the grounds and putting on some finishing touches where painting is concerned.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I just have three questions to ask, two concerning the Minister of Education directly and one concerning, possibly, the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works.

With respect to the Pine Secondary Modern School, I would like to know if he can tell me from which schools will the pupils of that school be drawn. I am asking this question because I have been told that there has been some dissatisfaction by some of the parents of pupils who attend St. Giles' School with respect to the selection. If he can tell me the schools from which these pupils will be drawn and which will make up the number at this new school, I would be glad.

Secondly, with respect to the Alexandra Science Department, how near is that to completion and is there anything being done to provide that school with a much needed and commodious Assembly Hall?

Coming back to the Pine Secondary Modern School, would the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing say what is responsible for the apparent slowness in the erection of that school? Is it not a fact that the laying and sinking of the foundations took up considerable time and money?

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Mr. Chairman, I think I should be able to answer the questions. With respect, to the first, the Pine Secondary Modern is to consist of pupils drawn from the St. Giles Boys', the St. Giles Girls', the Pine Primary, the Belmont Girls', the St. Paul's Girls', the St. David's Boys', Vauxhall Mixed and South District Girls'. Those are the schools.

With respect to the slow erection of it, I have made inquiries about that sometime ago and I was given to understand that there are two main reasons. One is that by reason of the fact that that building is almost entirely of concrete structure, it was felt that the labour force employed should be small in order to allow proper supervision. Secondly, I was told that if the work has been slow, the cost is somewhat less than if a big labour force was employed. The simple reason is that when a small labour force is used, with the moulds which would have to be used for casting concrete, you would be able to cast a certain proportion; and when that sets, you could remove those moulds and cast another set of concrete. On the other hand, if you have a big labour force, it would mean that you would have to get more moulds in order to keep that labour force going. Those are the reasons which I have been given. However, we are hoping to have the building ready by the end of this month. We hope to start teaching in that school at the beginning of the next term. In connection with the Alexandra

School, I am not in a position at this moment to say what is going to be done there in so far as the provision of an Assembly Hall is concerned, but I shall give that matter very great consideration.

Mr. GODDARD: I should like to ask, Mr. Chairman, a question with respect to the schools from which pupils will be drawn for that Secondary Modern School. I did not hear the names of the St. David's Boys' School mentioned.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I said the St. David's Boys.

Mr. GODDARD: I ask about that school because the pupils of that school live quite near enough to attend the Pine Secondary Modern.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am going to take a different line from that taken by other hon. members who spoke. I do not think anybody would oppose money spent on education, but we do not want all to be spent in buildings. I do not think we like to imagine that Captain Tomlin is responsible for drafting these buildings and for allowing these big sums of money to be spent on their erection. It seems unnecessary to build these fancy looking schools at so expensive a price. As a matter of fact, if our forefathers had indulged in building these fancy looking schools, none of us would have got education. It may be said that we do not want the old time cowshed buildings in which our forefathers were educated for schools today; but nevertheless, we still received some sort of education in them.

My own feeling is this - and this is no criticism of the Government - but it is a criticism in allowing you to know that a school costing \$302,000 is a lot of money. Do not make any mistake about it. The position is simply this. I have visited this building, although nobody may have seen me, and I really do not see the necessity, when you consider our limited resources, for a Government spending so much on erecting these fancy buildings. Of course, you must have some aesthetic beauty about you, but you allow the private citizens to do that. That can very well take place along the St. James coast where you have people, some of whom may own the Bethlehem Steel Company, with a lot of money and who can do anything they want. Those people can very well afford to spend a fortune on beautifying a dining room. You do not even have enough schools yet so that you can afford to spend so much on one school. 12.35 p.m.

There are children who cannot get into the Elementary Schools. I think it is a wicked thing to spend so much money on one school when you can spend the same amount of money and put up shelters or schools to house more children in different areas. When the now Minister of Trade was in the Opposition and people of my Party were running the Government, one of the Minister's greatest criticisms would be of the extravagant expenditure; but, apparently, because Captain Tomlin has endeared himself to us in his genial manner, we sit down and allow these things to pass without any criticism. The Government and the Opposition come together as one with whatever estimate comes down from Captain Tomlin.

It is a matter of policy. I have seen people spending about three or four weeks in doing some little window, which is absolutely unnecessary, and nobody would know about that better than the Minister of Social Services. It is not absolutely necessary to do the things which are being done at these schools. You could possibly provide another building for this amount of money. The position is that as soon as Captain Tomlin comes in with a plan, whether it is one for \$400,000 or more, nobody will say anything; in days gone by, when something was brought in for \$80,000, it was a question of an underestimate; but now the tendency is to overestimate.

Captain Tomlin is a wonderful draftsman, but this is a tremendous amount of money which is being asked for. I say that we do not need these fancy buildings; they are absolutely unnecessary. The Minister of Education has been teaching for nearly fifty years - (Laughter) well, not fifty but for about forty years, because he might not want

people to know he is so old (*Laughter*). However, he must realise that he is being extravagant where this building is concerned. Let us call a halt in relation to spending so much money in one particular place when we can spend the same amount of money in two or three other places. I hope that what I have said will be a warning as to the stand which I am going to take in these matters.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, now that the Pine Secondary Modern School is nearing completion, I want to know what assurance the Minister of Education has to give in so far as the construction of a Secondary Modern School in Christ Church is concerned. I want to draw to the attention of the Minister that this Pine Secondary Modern School was superimposed over the Rendezvous Secondary Modern School which has been included in the old Five Year Plan. We have had certain alterations made and certain excuses formulated as to why the Rendezvous Secondary Modern School was not erected; without any definite inclusion in any Five Year Plan, this school was built at the Pine in place of the Rendezvous School. I do not know whether a school in Christ Church is excluded altogether or whether it is included in the same plan. The Minister realises the necessity for providing a Secondary Modern School in St. Davids and Vauxhall for instance, but the bulk of the population of Christ Church lives not in Sargeant's Village and Vauxhall; let the Minister think of Silver Sands, Below Rock, Pilgrim Road, Lodge Road, St. Patricks, St. Lawrence, Maxwell, Parish Land and so on. It is in these places that the bulk of the population lives.

I would like to hear some assurance about the provision of a school or schools for these areas. In Christ Church there is a population of about fifty thousand people and there is not one Secondary Modern School in the parish. Mr. Chairman, is it a question of prejudice? The position is that there must be no scope for the little children of Christ Church; they must be victimised where education is concerned. Is it because the parents of these children have seen fit to vote for people like myself for all of these years? I want the Minister to review his programme and not appear to be partisan, merely serving the needs of children whose parents voted for the Barbados Labour Party.

Mr. TUDOR: Before the Minister replies, would he say how many children it is proposed to accommodate at this school?

Hon. L. S. A. THORNE: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the hon. senior member for Christ Church has got the impression that I am going in for favouritism. I should just like to remind him that in so far as this structure is concerned, I have had absolutely nothing to do with his not having a School at Rendezvous. Where I am concerned, not only will he have a Secondary Modern School in Christ Church but I am planning to give him two schools (*Hear! Hear!*) (Mr. GODDARD: Location?) In Christ Church. The sites have not yet been decided on. I have been considering some four or five sites in Christ Church.

In connection with the capacity of the Pine Secondary Modern School, I should like to say that it is being built to accommodate 800 children.

Relative to the remarks of the hon. senior member for the City, I am to say that this school is being constructed at a cost roughly of \$377.50 per seat. I am not an architect and I do not profess to be any architect. I do not profess to know very much about architecture; perhaps the hon. member is right, perhaps he is not.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I want to thank the Hon. Minister for his references. At least we have always felt that he is gentlemanly enough to make references, even if he disagrees with the members of the Opposition. I am not suggesting that hon. Minister is an architect, but what I am saying is that you must bear in mind your limited resources. None of us over here would be opposed to any system which you have for education; we want to go on educating the people because we believe that when you educate the people you free them; but, on the other hand, our

resources are limited. Let the architect know that we just cannot afford the building of fancy schools; we can spend \$200,000 here and use another \$100,000 where we can help more children somewhere else. I do not care what the architect says; an architect can build a school at \$500.00 a child but we must have regard to our limited resources. I am not criticising the plan or anything like that, but it is for the Government to say that they want a building to accommodate 800 children and a plan for \$200 a child. Really and truly it is for the Government to realise that with the commitments and the pressure which I see is being brought on the Government today, education must come and it must play an important part in the minds of any Government. 12.45 p.m.

Education must play an important part. Education and health must be uppermost in the minds of any Government, and when you come to the new school in Christ Church or if you come to build any in the City, just say to your architect, instead of giving you a plan at \$370 per seat per child, give you one at \$200 and let you see what it would look like. At least you have someone in the Ministry who can read these plans and therefore you should have a plan at \$370 per seat and one at \$200 per seat per child. This is important because of your limited resources, and knowing that you have this great desire for education and people hammering and knocking at the doors, you will then be able, instead of producing a school at \$300 per seat for 800 children, to produce one at \$200 for 800 children, and have enough money to build another school.

I thank the Minister for his reply but I hope he will see the stand I have taken in this matter; it is a stand which any sensible Government should take when you see how many people are knocking outside the doors of these educational institutions.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that anybody can quarrel with the argument put up by the hon. member that it is far better to build a school at a reasonable cost and therefore be able to build more schools in order to stretch your limited resources. We all fundamentally agree with that argument, and I should like to assure the Committee that that is the policy we intend to adopt so far as these buildings are concerned. We do not want to go in for fancy and elaborate buildings.

As far as the forthcoming Five Year Plan is concerned, the Minister of Education has put up to us the requirements for primary education, and within our limits we will have to adopt the policy advocated by the last speaker so far as primary schools are concerned. I should like to say however that he should not lose sight of the fact especially with our Secondary Modern Schools that we should not go too far in adopting the policy of cheap buildings. Fundamentally the hon. member may be sound; but especially with secondary modern schools we like to instil a little pride in our schools in the children in their surroundings. You have to balance one facet against another. I agree with the hon. member that we must build more schools at a reasonable cost, but at the same time we must not forget that too far East, so to speak, is West.

I remember when we put up the Coleridge-Parry School. Of course that was bad planning and people generally see these things. If these buildings are too ugly and do not have imposing surroundings, people will criticise; so I just ask hon. members to remember that. We have to go between the arguments of those people who went in for extravagant expenditure and those of people who do not want to be too cheap. Fundamentally we are on all-fours, Sir; we have discussed it recently and we cannot possibly disagree with the hon. member's argument, but I still say that we must remember that in these sophisticated times if we go too far we are going to run up against the other opinion that we are providing cheap buildings. We cannot afford to go too far in the other direction.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member will appreciate that I did not talk about cheap buildings. In my experience, the expense of any building is in doing the interior fancy work; but if you put up structures such as Combermere School, Harrison College and so on, do not

let anybody fool you. I have seen people work on the spaces for windows for five and six weeks, and it is really unnecessary. I am not saying that you should put up cheap buildings, because I deprecate anybody putting up a plan like the Coleridge-Parry School and the St. Simon's School. I stood alone like a wolf in the wilderness on the floor of this House because I wanted to destroy Crowe, but the West Indian Premier said that as far as Crowe is concerned, we had to gain a lot, but he turned around and said that if he knew then what he knows now, he would never have had him here. We do not appreciate what he put up for the Coleridge-Parry School, but I advocate a type of building we could use more money in. We do not have to have a fancy building, and I repeat for the last time that Government would do well when a plan is to be submitted to ask for three or four, one at \$300 per child, one at \$200 and one at \$180, because you have members who can read plans.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, I agree that too far East is West, but no one on that side is making any apology for the fact that this particular school has gone too far into the pockets of the taxpayers.

Now, Sir, we have two extremes and what we are saying now is to find a middle course. You have got the Crowe monstrosities and you have got these other buildings which have recently been put up, such as this one at the Pine which can compare with any school in any part of the world. I have seen the actual figures proving that here in little Barbados - a backward country they say, in need of development and so forth - you can see a building of the imposing amount of money going up in this little island which I do not agree is backward, but I agree that it has got of necessity to account for every cent that it spends. At the rate of \$370 per head to build a school is going too far the other side of the Crowe monstrosities.

One will notice from this Addendum the attitude that there is in public spending today. There should be somebody to say what is needed and how much is to be spent. No architect can come and tell me how much money I am going to spend on the building of a house or a factory. I am going to tell him how much money he is to spend per ton of canes or per ton of sugar per cubic foot, and he will have to work by that; so whoever said that \$300,000 was to be spent on this building is the person responsible. The architect will spend whatever amount you tell him to spend; so do not blame any architect - Captain Tomlin or anybody else. If that was stated after full investigation by the Minister concerned, whether it was the present or the past and that is why I used the word "Ministers", that you were going to erect a building at the cost of \$300 per head, the architect would have to build a school at that cost. 12.55 p.m.

But what do we see happening? You will notice in everyone of the notes to the various items the phrase "the unspent balance is required" or "the balance is required to complete the project". Of course, it is always required as long as you put in these vast amounts of money, and it will be spent.

I understand from the hon. member on my right that you will be putting some in my parish too. I am glad to hear that some will be put in my parish, but I am saying that this amount of \$302,000 is a fantastic amount of money for building a school of that size. What I am amused at is to see that we can spend this fantastic amount of money on this school and then you say you cannot afford to spend a few dollars in St. George on the purchasing of some land on which sugar cane is growing and coming into the windows of a school next to it. I asked Government to do something about it sometime ago and up to now nothing has been done, and the sugar cane is growing in that field and coming into the windows of that school and if there is a fire, nothing can prevent that school from being razed to the ground. Yet, up to now, nothing is done to prevent fire coming through the windows of that school, and hundreds of thousands of dollars are being spent to build these imposing wonderful monuments. I am not one to say that these imposing monuments can be of benefit to us. I believe that the whole crux of a school is having a good

headmaster and staff and that they are well paid. I would prefer to see a reasonable building for these schools and for you to get the best staff possible to put into them.

I have been taken around and shown some of these schools which were recently finished and the person who took me around said to me: "These are much more lavish than anything that I have seen recently built in big countries."

I do not feel that we can afford to be lavish. I feel that we want education for our children; we want education for the children in this island on a large scale; and if we are going to be lavish even on a small scale - because when you really think of it we have not even started to build part of the schools which we need in this island yet - if they are to be built in this lavish manner, where would we get the money from? This school is not the only one which has been lavishly built. The Foundation School in Christ Church has also been lavishly built. If we go on spending so lavishly on these buildings, can we really say that we are spending what should be spent in the provision of education for the children of this island? I cannot see lavish buildings as all we need in education. I want reasonable surroundings, but certainly we do not want all the money spent on the erection of the building; we want to buy some land next to the school where the cane is growing and coming through the window of that school so that the children of that school may not only have a mental upbringing but also a physical upbringing. I want some money to be spent on purchasing of land in order that the children may get a little physical education along with their mental education. We do not want all to be spent on the erection of a lavish building. I do feel that a definite middle course has got to be taken. Of course, no one is recommending the going back to the erection of cowshed buildings for schools. On the other hand, nobody on this side is going to recommend these lavish buildings.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the debate has ranged rather wider than the point at which it started. Since it has developed in such a way, there is also the third point of view which has not necessarily been expressed and which I shall express now. It is true that Government has agreed to do what it can to keep down the actual expenditure on buildings. That is perfectly true; and it is also true, on the other hand, if you envisage a certain type of school for a certain purpose, that it is possible that the expenditure may be more than would normally be expected and that is where I think the dilemma comes in. The Government clearly in its attitude to the Secondary Modern School is faced with this choice. It has not yet settled in its own mind whether these Secondary Modern Schools are to be a permanent feature of Barbadian development or whether in the future they would be superseded by something better and, consequently, in the words of the Hon. Minister of Education, it has been found necessary to impart a certain amount of dignity to these new schools.

I have a point of view which is shared by a sizable minority. It is that the Secondary Modern School has no place in Barbados, but some of us feel that it ought to receive the fairest possible trial. I can well see that Government would be committing itself to building that type of school at that price and imparting that certain amount of dignity and uplift to make certain people believe that the school is filling the role of a Secondary Grammar School. That idea is not yet known and that is where the trouble lies.

I feel myself that the expenditure at the rate of \$377.50 per seat would be justified in certain circumstances. One of the circumstances in which I think it will be justified is if in the future comes you get that different slant on educational development - perhaps with a different Government - whereby it is decided that what is now known as a Secondary Modern School is to be a Secondary Grammar School and that these schools can be converted into that type of school. If that happens, then this expenditure would be justified because you will be able to get that extension or expansion which you would expect in a Secondary School, not only classrooms and such, but also the rooms which are

used specifically for the teaching of certain subjects. Nobody would object to that and it is possible that this figure of \$302,000 has arisen because in addition to the normal classrooms there are other rooms which are put in for the purpose of teaching subjects outside the curriculum. Because of that, I do not think that the Minister need to be worried, generally speaking, about the level of expenditure. What I am worried about is the whole principle of Secondary Modern Schools as such. A school costing that much is justified if the type of education which is offered is justified.

1.05 p.m.

I myself would be happier if I knew that the expenditure was estimated on schools which were offering full Secondary Education in the measure in which we understand it. We still have to suspend a certain amount of judgment on Secondary Modern Schools. I am opposed to them, but I am not so opposed to them that I am not willing to give them a trial. If an experiment is being made, the Government has to consider whether they are continuing to have the type of school at that price before we know whether we are entirely committed to that type of school; and, secondly, if we build that type of school at that price, are we building it in such a way that it could be extended in a changeover to a full type of secondary school without much additional expense? As I said, Mr. Chairman, these are matters which cannot be decided here and now across the floor of this House and the debate on Secondary Modern Schools has been going on for some years.

Mr. Chairman, my own view is - I give it for what it is worth - that the educational needs of the children of this colony can be best met, not by this type of school, but by secondary grammar schools, and as a corollary, perhaps, technical schools of various sorts. I am only saying that this type of school at this expense could only be justified if it can be changed over without additional expense and trouble; but if this Government has decided that, as a matter of policy, only schools of this type will be built and there will be nothing further than what is contemplated now, I think the Minister should think very carefully about pruning and cutting down expenditure. If no further expansion or development is contemplated, then this level of expenditure or building is not justified; On the other hand, if we are going to feel that there will be an extension of secondary education, then the expenditure can be justified.

Mr. CORBIN: Sir, we all know that education plays a very important part in a man's life. We realise that if the Government allows such structures to be carried out as are being carried out, then other schools or the children in other schools will suffer, because the Government will not have time enough to go and repair or enlarge these other schools. This sum of \$300,000 for the building of a Secondary school at the present time is too much money; the magnificent buildings which are being erected today are taking up all the money. It is not only a question of the building but the labour and the time involved. The very first consideration is the primary school, but nobody seems to be worried about them. I took the Minister of Education to certain schools in the parish of St. Andrew and he saw with his own eyes that the children are packed in these schools like sardines. I am certain that with the capacity as it is in these schools, it would take no more than about \$25 to have a proper seat per child, whereas in this case before us, it is estimated that \$377 would be required for the proper accommodation per child. Mr. Chairman, it would shock your modesty to see the accommodation in these primary schools; the teachers often have to send the children outside in order that they can get air. If the Government goes on to build these magnificent structures, it will take them some time before they are able to complete their task. I am asking the Government to see from henceforth and check with the architect, or whoever it may be, to see that they put down strong buildings but not such magnificent buildings with all of this polishing. You need to put down strong walls in these buildings, but there is no need for so much magnificent polishing. I do not think that the Government should spend so much money on one school when so many other schools are being neglected.

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

HEAD VIII - COMMUNICATIONS

Head VIII - Communications - was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: In connection with this Head, as hon. members will see, there is also the question of revotes. I would like to point out that we are dealing, not with supplementary votes as such, but with revotes. I hope the Committee will agree that these votes were originally approved by this House, so that criticisms of the nature which we have heard not so long ago are really criticisms of what the House itself has already decided upon. The House has already decided to spend "X" dollars on the construction of a school and the amount has not been exceeded by the department concerned. The money had not been expended at the end of the financial year and all we are asking now is that the remainder of the money be revoted. As hon. members will see from the notes to the various items, the information has been set out and I do not think it is necessary to say very much on these items. I beg to move that Head VIII stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Will the Minister who is responsible for this Head tell us what is the size of this Freight Shed? I just want to know if it is being built large enough because there is an increasing flow of freight by air into Barbados; and until this freight shed was to be erected, we used to see the entire terminal building almost blocked up. Therefore can the Minister, who is responsible for this matter, say what is the size of the building?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I was under the impression that I gave the size of this building at the time of the Estimates. I am looking for the information now so as to assist the hon. member, but it is difficult to find it at this stage. However, I will promise the hon. member to get the information for him before the adjournment takes place.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, it may be that the hon. member will get some more information for me. In providing this freight shed, it is a different thing from a passenger's baggage shed because a passenger's baggage must pass through the Customs and move out.

1.15 p.m.

Now can the Minister tell me whether this freight shed is going to be a bond with charges made or just an ordinary shed? You get planes coming in and bringing in cargo which remains in the shed over a period; so the Minister should be able to tell us today whether it is going to be a freight shed or a bond where, after beds or refrigerators are stored for a while, the Government will charge and get revenue from it. That would help you a tremendous lot.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I do not think you can call it a bond; it is just a temporary shed until the people to whom the goods are consigned can move them out. We know that in recent years this type of business has increased considerably, especially with refrigerators, but, Sir, we do make some charges. I will get the exact details if the hon. member persists for it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is not a matter of persisting; I want to get this clarified once and for all. As soon as you start dealing with your freight, you either have a bond or you don't. If three dozen refrigerators come in consigned to X and remain there over a certain period, there is no justification in providing a place for them unless you are going to charge. If the freight is consigned to Panam, they have a bond in town.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I misunderstood the hon. member. We would not provide this free of charge. All this is recoverable, because you charge a certain amount on the goods according to space. I thought the hon. member would know that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member must not take the attitude of just saying he thought the hon. member would know that, because he himself does not know. That is the usual attitude he adopts, and it is not kind, and I am going to challenge him now that he is

wrong just to say that he thought the hon. member knew. Of course when I ask questions, sometimes I know the answers; but I want to know how much the Minister knows; so do not try to pull that over on me. What the Minister said is not true because you have not been charging. If you are coming here for money to build a freight shed, as soon as you have built it and cargo stays there for some time, you are entitled to charge; but just to pass it off lightly like that is the usual way in which the Minister thinks he can get away with things. We are spending money in putting up a freight shed for storage which is different from spending money putting up a freight shed where things come in and go out. Where the people do not have the invoices, then you must charge, and the Minister should give me that information later; but he should not simply say that he thought I knew, because I could say I know the Minister does not know.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I am certainly one who does not know and would like the Minister to tell me. As I understand it, from what has been said, we are not quite clear whether Government is erecting a bond or a transit shed. It seems to me more likely that it is a transit shed the Minister has in mind, because if it were a bond it would be the importer's duty more or less to provide that, whereas facilities for placing goods for a limited time and temporarily would fall to the responsibility of Government. I believe the Minister has in mind that it is a transit shed which is being erected and I would like him to say so. An hon. member tells me that I am turning Minister smartly. I must try to answer for myself when Ministers do not answer.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, under Item 8, Wharf Walls, I see Sir, that we voted in the Approved Estimates for this year 1960-61 the sum of \$30,000. The note says that the sum of \$31,000 was provided for the financial year 1959-60 to continue the programme of replacing old wooden piling at the Careenage with steel piles. At the 31st March, 1960, there was an unspent balance of \$8,712. Of course, this unspent balance is required.

Now, Sir, a lot of money is being spent on this project, and I take it that the Minister has visited the project. Is he satisfied that this money is being well spent, or is it a fact that in spite of the expenditure of this money the condition of these walls at present being replaced is still not satisfactory? I feel, Sir, that the Minister would be *au fait* with his portfolio and would be able to give us immediately information as to whether this amount of money being expended on the wharf walls is not being thrown into the sea, and if he is satisfied that this money is being spent to good effect or is just a matter of being thrown into the sea.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I have no reason to believe that money is being thrown into the sea. We are within the estimate. This is, as the Leader of the House pointed out, simply a revote of a balance. I think a good job is being done. It is true we are building over the water, but as far as I can see no money has gone into the sea. If the hon. member has reason to feel that something is going wrong, I hope he will let me know, but I have been and seen the work for myself, and I have no reason to believe that money is being wasted on these wharf walls.

I am getting the information as regards Seawall for the hon. member. As far as the hon. senior member for St. Lucy is concerned, I have already answered that question because I have said they are not bonds; the goods are just temporarily there until they are removed. The hon. member asked if they are not, so to speak, transit sheds, but I think I have said in answer to the hon. senior member for the City that goods are stored there temporarily until the people to whom they are consigned take them out.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not need information, I know what I asked you. I repeat that when you said I should know what they charge, I know.

In dealing with Item 8 - Wharf Walls - you know, you do not have to be an expert, but may be you can answer me this question with respect to the replacing of wooden piling at the Careenage which the hon. member asked

about with steel piles. I am sure that hon. members on that side have done extensive travelling and must have gazed at some of the big countries which still use imported greenheart because it is felt that even in river water and sea water greenheart stands up much longer. The Hon. Minister might be able to tell us the reasons for changing over from wooden piles to steel piles.

1.25 p.m.

In all countries today, in all their harbours they use greenheart. Quite recently, I think it was the humble Americans who were building a big harbour and I read that they were getting down greenheart piles from British Guiana to build it. I wonder what has caused us to change from greenheart to steel.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Sir, we started with this programme of building with steel for a long time. I think it was between 1950 to 1951. I know the qualities of greenheart, but I think it must have been felt that steel would be better for our purpose. As I have said, this is a continuation of the old programme that had been started upon.

Mr. DOWDING: Sir, the fact that the House has to approve something in good faith does not allow the Minister to shirk his responsibility. If this House sits here in all good faith and votes this money, it is still the Minister's responsibility.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. What does the hon. member mean when he says "to shirk my responsibility"? I thought he would have said our responsibility. I have accepted my responsibility.

Mr. DOWDING: Sir, his responsibility as a Minister - and if he does not know it by now it is a sad case - is that he is responsible to his Government and to the taxpayers for what is being spent here. This House can come here any day in all good faith and vote \$30,000 for this purpose.

As the Hon. Minister has rightly stated, this project has been going on for years. All I am asking the Hon. Minister is this: what is his impression about this project being undertaken with steel instead of greenheart? Does he think it should be done with steel? That is not the impression which I have or that of the hon. member on my left. I do not think that steel should be used. It would be a very simple matter for the Minister to handle. If, say, on 1st July, 1951, this construction was viewed and it was in perfect condition, and if, say, on the 1st July, 1960, he viewed it and saw that the steel has started to erode, he could come in and say "I viewed it on the 1st July, 1960, and I recommended that the building of it by steel be stopped at once." That is the Minister's responsibility. That is his job. He asked for this money, he put it to his Cabinet and it is for them to see that this money is well spent. We cannot say whether it is well spent or not. I do not know if he is able to tell us now. He said that he went and looked at it. I think that steel should not be used for this work in this part of the world where you have good greenheart and that is why I asked the question. I know that for one to get a steel bottomed boat painted, it is a big problem. Can the Hon. Minister tell us what is his impression? I am not trying to blame anybody; I am only trying to gather some information. Will the Hon. Minister just tell us what he knows about the job? That is all we are asking.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister seems to be in a good mood and so am I. However, do not answer the question like that. Let me tell him that I know the reasons. The trouble is that the Hon. Minister underestimates members of the Opposition. When I asked him to give me the reasons, let me tell him that the reasons are fairly obvious. The reasons are not the reasons which the Minister gave that you are using steel sheets. I repeat when I ask questions sometimes it does not mean that I do not know what the answer is. It is just that I ask the question to find out what the Minister knows of it. You are removing the greenheart piles - and this was passed on to you - because you have found out that it was not quite the right thing. The sea water was coming right in and undermining your piles. That is the reason why you are now using the steel sheets.

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

HEAD IX - MISCELLANEOUS

Head IX - Miscellaneous - was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that Head IX stand part.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, will the Hon. Minister state how many flats would result from the renovation of the Stone Barracks? We know that many of these flats are unnecessarily large. By today's modern method of building and furnishing, many of those flats can be cut in half without any interference with the amenities of a good home. Now that the opportunity has been taken to renovate and reconstruct the Stone Barracks, will the Hon. Minister tell us whether we are getting more flats than we had before? In other words, let us say that before renovations started, there were ten flats. Can the Hon. Minister state if there will be ten or fifteen? Unless there has been a saving of this wasted space, I do not think that they would have done a good job.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Now, Sir, I want the Hon. Minister to tell me a few things. Mr. Eric Williams made a statement on this in Trinidad. The Hon. Minister must answer this question now. You are spending this money to renovate Government flats. Is it the policy of the Government to continue to charge Government officers a percentage of their annual salary for the rental of these flats? Has the Government decided upon a policy to increase these rents which are paid by those officers of the Government who are fortunate in securing flats from the Government in the same manner as those officers who are not fortunate in securing flats from Government have to pay for rental of houses? Let me repeat that question although I am sure the Hon. Minister understands me clearly. You are spending money here for the renovation of flats and, in other words, an officer who is getting \$400 per month would pay \$20 a month according to the Government's policy for the rental of a flat in the Garrison or anywhere else that he is renting one from the Government. Now, Sir, most of the time it is an imported official who is renting these flats and who would pay \$20 a month if he is working for \$400 a month. Now these officials are in the minority. There are other officials of the Government who are not so fortunate, who work for less than £1,000 a year and in order for them to get a similar flat, they have to pay \$60 or \$80 or even \$100 a month for rent. Is it the policy of the Government to allow this 5% of salary as rent to this privileged class who occupy these houses or do you intend to bring the percentage which they should pay to that which your lower income officers have got to pay if they are renting? I want the Hon. Minister to answer that.
1.35 p.m.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, the Government is to be complimented on the expansion of these fire services, but I want to ask that a little more consideration be given to the matter. It is unfortunate but true to say that, with the increased standard of living, a number of oil stoves are being used in these small wooden houses and, unfortunately, these small wooden houses have not quite maintained the advance of the oil stoves in that they are not properly protected. I have known recently in country areas where, in spite of this expansion of the fire services, two houses have been burnt flat before the arrival of the Fire Brigade. I am not casting any aspersions against the Fire Brigade because they are doing a wonderful job; but it is a question of their capabilities at some distances. I am suggesting that in these built-up areas which we call villages of a large size, a small supplementary fire unit could be kept stationed. In many cases life and property could be saved. I am throwing that matter out for consideration and I hope that the Minister concerned will try to do something about it. From my own experience it has been found that a small unit close to the spot could, in many cases, save life and loss of property. I do not believe that this would be a costly thing to get done throughout the island and I would like to hear something about it in the future.

With reference to the matter of these flats, could the Minister state if there has been any definite declaration

of policy as to whether in any of the Government houses, whether they be Government officials or not, people are going to be allowed to continue their own private business in Government buildings, whether it be schools or any other type of business? Is the Minister willing to make a definite statement at this juncture either in one way or in the other, as to whether that policy is to be allowed to continue or not?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, this is the first time that I have ever heard it suggested, or hinted or charged that business is being carried on in these flats. I have never heard of officers, who are occupying these flats, carrying on business in them. They are not allowed to do that, and I would be glad, if the hon. member has some knowledge of it, if he would bring it before us and let the matter be investigated. These flats are supposed to be residential flats and an economic rent is being charged for them. I would like to give the Committee that assurance; rents are increased if any repairs or renovations are made so that the hon. member can rest assured that no privileged class is being assisted in this way.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. Is the Minister aware or can he tell us whether it is a fact that they charge as rent 5% of the salary of the officers who occupy these flats? Is it or is it not a fact? That is a straight question which needs an answer, and is it within the Minister's knowledge that officers who occupy these flats rent out their own houses? Is it the policy of the Government to continue to charge five per cent of the salary of the officers who occupy these flats? And further can the Minister tell us in relation to this \$79,000 for the repair and conversion of these flats, how many flats there are and what revenue do you expect them to bring in? You are now in the seat of Government and the Government has to administer its business. You do not want to take advantage of anybody, but while you are building houses for people in the lower income group, and you must agree that you must subsidise the people who go into small houses because of the economic position, and you subsidise people who go into the houses of the Housing Board, there is no justifiable reason why you should subsidise people who are earning \$600 a month. There is no reason why any such person should live in a flat at a rental of \$30.00 a month. That is what is happening today all round in a circle. I want the Government to declare its policy and not play ostrich and bury its head in the sand. What you are doing is that similar people

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I was speaking..

Mr. MOTTLEY: I really thought that the hon. member had finished speaking. I am sorry.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I thought that the hon. Minister had given way so that the hon. member could make his position clear.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The hon. member said that he had risen on a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am sorry.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: There are officers who are engaged on contract terms and under the terms of the contract, they are usually charged five per cent of their salary as rental (Mr. MOTTLEY: I say that you are going to revise it.) The Premier will say what is happening, but I think there is some uniformity throughout the area in respect of technical officers, and if one island does less than what another does, then it would be difficult for us to get the services of suitable officers. If these people are willing to offer five per cent and we say: "No, they must pay ten per cent", other things being equal then these other places will get the officers and we will have to do without them. But, Sir, as to some of these flats - I believe in the majority of cases there is a fixed rent and, I say, an economic rent is being charged. (Mr. MOTTLEY: What is the rent?) I am looking for the file so as to tell the hon. member what it is, but I have gone into these rents. We are spending some money on these flats.
1.45 p.m.

We said that an economic rent must be charged with a varying rate of interest and so on. There are eight three-bedroom flats down there; we know what the capital cost is and what we are spending, but I am getting the information for the hon. member. (Mr. MOTTLEY: How many two-bedroom flats are there?) The hon. member can answer that. (Mr. MOTTLEY: How many two-bedroom and one-bedroom flats are there?) I can only give the hon. member the information I have.

Mr. MOTTLEY: When the hon. member says there are eight three-bed-room flats and stops there, what am I to infer? When I get up to criticise he can say that he did not say there are only three-bedroom flats. I am asking if there are only eight three-bedroom flats.

Mr. TALMA rose.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Does the hon. member want to speak on a point of order?

Mr. TALMA: I got the impression that the Minister had finished his speech.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: There is a *tete a tete* going on. Mr. Chairman, I am giving the House the information I have, and I am telling the Committee that we went into all these figures, the capital cost, the additional cost, and we have increased the charges considerably so far as these are concerned. (Mr. MOTTLEY: What is a three-bedroom flat rented for?) I will give the hon. member all the information as soon as it is available.

Mr. Chairman, no privileged class is being created. If the hon. member knows that any person or persons are supposed to be renting these flats and renting out a house somewhere else, I hope he will give me the information because this is the first time I have heard it. There are a lot of things that come to the Ministers through the grape vine; we are supposed to hear and know about them and when you try to get the facts to investigate, you cannot get the particular thing pin-pointed, because nobody will come out with certain things you want. The hon. senior member for St. George gave some implied information some time ago, and I am asking him to let me get on with the investigation. It is difficult to get at these things when you see allegations made in newspapers that so-and-so is going on; somebody will come to you and whisper something in your ear, but when you ask, if you have an enquiry, whether he will put this down on paper, he refuses.

Mr. DOWDING: On a point of order, the hon. member referred to me as asking questions and talked about putting things on paper. He knows that I am one who will put anything on paper and go to anybody in this island. Let him get that clear. It is a matter for him to be able to tell me the answer and not suggest that the member for St. George would not put anything in black and white which is in the interest of this island under any condition. I have done it already and will do it again.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I would not reply to the hon. member for St. George. As regards the hon. member's question about small Fire Stations throughout the island, I do not think he will expect me to answer that. That is a matter of policy and does not concern me. If I am asked to provide them, my Department will. But, Sir, with regard to these flats, I want to assure this Committee that we have revised the rentals and are charging economic rents. We are very fair in our distribution of them, but I am getting more information for the hon. member.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say this to the hon. member: he said that there is uniformity in the area. It would appear that he is trying to draw a red herring across the trail. Of course you have revised the rents from time to time. The rents were \$12 when people went into the Service at \$40 and so on a month. You had to revise them, but what we are asking you now to say is this: you said there is uniformity in the area, but what has happened in Trinidad about two years ago with Eric Williams? How can you offer people £2,000 a year and charge 5% of their salary for rent? You can tell me what you like, I say

that is creating a privileged class. You cannot go on doing that; you have to come out and say what is going to be your policy in this respect.

The hon. member talked about members coming and giving him information. What information have I got to give? I am making a plain, straight statement that you have people in Government houses who are not on contract and you are still charging 5%. I will put one question to you: is the Chief Justice on contract? I am not mincing any matters about it. I do not want to be personal but I can call all the names, from start to finish, of those whom you are charging 5% of salary. When you make a comparison and come down to the man lower down the ladder getting \$300 a month, he is paying the same rent in this country as a man getting £2,500 or £3,000 a year, and I say here now that it is for you to investigate that there are people in Government houses paying a cheap rent and renting their houses out. You are afraid to say today - at least you have not said yet - that you only have three-bedroom flats. How much are you renting them for? You are talking about a reasonable rent because you have brought the rent from \$12 to \$20. Of course you have revised them but are you going to revise them again? You are going to spend \$80,000 and you are telling us that you are charging 6%, a reasonable rate of interest. Do you know you have to get them insured? Do you know you have wear and tear? It is true you are not paying taxes to the Municipality and that is why you do not have to worry about that part of it. You are creating a privileged class because you are subsidising, so to speak; you are putting people who are getting a salary in the bracket from \$400 a month in a position where you are subsidising them, and you are paying no taxes to the Municipality while you allow them to pay \$20 a month out of their \$400 a month.

1.55 p.m.

That is what the Barbados Government is doing tonight and the taxpayers are bearing the burden of it. It offsets the whole situation. No one in his right senses will do that. I suppose that there are Ministers who sat with me on the Housing Board and know that it is the general housing policy of the world that Government must subsidise the lower income group when it comes to houses; that is to say, if the house and land cost the Government so much, although they cost you so much you must subsidise the renter who is in the lower income group. I sat on the Housing Board for twelve long years. We decided that although the place may have cost you \$X and the land \$Y - therefore, the rental value would be 8% or 9% - you would have to give up renting it for so much because the people in the lower income group for whom we were building these houses would not be able to pay that much rent. However, can an officer who is getting \$400 a month be termed a man in the lower income group? We are putting people who are getting \$400 a month in these flats and the large body of your Civil Servants who are getting much less have to remain outside and must pay \$60 a month for rent. What is that but creating a privileged class? I say that you must go into your whole system of rent. Dr. Eric Williams recently decided that he must raise on the rent of the people who are in the higher branch of the Civil Service.

You have considered it a reasonable rent on your capital cost. Let me ask you what is the capital cost to you? If you take the capital cost in 1900 or 1902 when you were paying \$100 or \$120 a month to your Police Magistrate, are you going to say now that you have carried that same officer to \$500 a month that 5% of that salary is a reasonable charge for rent? There is the idea of uniformity of everything in the area but I can tell you that in Trinidad they do not pay 5% of salary for rent. There was a big row about it and Dr. Eric Williams stood firm on it. He said that people asked for a higher salary and got it and then did not expect to pay anything out of it. If you give people higher salaries, they must expect to pay something out of it. I hope the Hon. Minister will be able when we take the adjournment to bring back in some information with respect to the rental of three-bedroomed flats. I want to know something of these flats. There is no catch in this. Surely you are creating a privileged class by doing this.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed 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. 2.00 p.m.

On reassembling.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to your attention that there is no quorum and I ask that the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. John.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:-

"Does Government intend to purchase suitable Barber Green machinery with a view to improving the general standard of the road surfacing in the Island?

2. If the answer is no; will the Government acquire such equipment either by purchase, hire, loan or otherwise without delay?"

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, the reply to those questions is that the purchase of an asphalt paving-finishing machine is being considered in connection with the Development Plan 1960-65.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I will put a supplementary on that answer. The Minister says that the purchase of an asphalt paving machine is being considered. Can the Minister say whether he has rejected the idea of hiring a machine from, let us say, a neighbouring colony until such time as they make up their minds to purchase one?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: If the idea is feasible, but we do not think it is. We are just considering it in connection with the Plan and if we decide to purchase one, it will not be necessary to hire one.

Mr. BARROW: Does the Hon. Minister imply that if the Government does not decide to purchase the machine, such a machine will be unnecessary just because the decision is not to purchase one?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I have been very precise. I have answered the question quite precisely.

Mr. BARROW: Will the Hon. Minister state whether any neighbouring Government has ever offered to lend such a machine to the Government of Barbados?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: No; not to my knowledge.

Mr. BARROW: Will the Hon. Minister make enquiries from the neighbouring colony of Trinidad to find out whether they are willing to lend the Government of Barbados such a machine when it is not in use down there?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: If the necessity arises, let us say that there is a hurricane or otherwise.

Mr. BARROW: Does the Hon. Minister consider the present condition to road surfacing in Barbados is contingent on an act of God or does he consider it satisfactory at the moment and incapable of improvement? 2.35 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: That is a different question.

Mr. BARROW: Will the Minister give an answer to the question? I am sure that if I had put the same question again Your Honour would rule me out of order. I appreciate that it is a different question, but I would like an answer.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister does not seem to be desirous of answering that.

Mr. BARROW: I am asking if the condition of the road service is incapable of improvement because the Minister said that they will consider that matter if we had a hurricane.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: That is an easy question to answer; the road service can be improved, but that was not the question which the hon. member asked at first.

Mr. SPEAKER called Private Members' Business.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I thought there was a question which was left unanswered from last Tuesday.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no question which was left over. It is now Private Members' Business.

RESOLUTION re LACK OF CONFIDENCE IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy:- a motion for the passing of the following Resolution - Resolution re lack of confidence in the Ministry of Communications. On the last occasion, the hon. member was speaking when Government Business was resumed.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday I was about to close that phase of my remarks in connection with the "pick-ups" to which I had referred at the beginning because the matter, having regard to a certain deadline to be taken, had a very urgent aspect. That deadline is still, so far as my information goes, the 31st of this month; but I have been reminded since last week by various League Cricket Players who belong to the B.C.L. how gravely they would be inconvenienced, how their cricket would be adversely affected, if they are not allowed to use these vehicles for the transportation of their teams to the various grounds.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order. Will the hon. member repeat the name of the team and from which parish it is.

Mr. BRANCKER: I said that various cricket league teams would be inconvenienced. I have not specified any particular club, but many clubs will be affected because the "pick-ups" are the sole means of transportation on Saturdays and on Sundays for those who play cricket in the various parts of the island. It would be a serious blow to those people who are not in a position to use, or who do not own, cars and who cannot afford to rent taxis for this purpose. The cessation of the service of the "pick-ups" may well have an adverse effect on the cricket, for everybody is aware of the outstanding Leagues which have introduced Barbados players *par excellence*, those players who have been introduced into Barbados cricket through the Leagues. It would be a serious thing if cricket were to be hampered, disconnected and affected as a result of this veto of the Department of Highways and Transport in respect of the renewal of tickets after the expiration of the 31st July, a date which is not more than a fortnight off from today.

As to the belief which I understand is held in certain quarters that if you put the "pick-ups" off the road the buses will make so much more money, that seems to me to be a complete fallacy. The people who travel in "pick-ups" are those for whom there is no room in the buses or for whose luggage there is no room in the buses. The amount of intake by the bus service would be completely negligible if the "pick-ups" were taken off the road. The increase in the transport service will not suffice to provide transportation, certainly not at the peak periods, for the people who use "pick-ups", not to speak of the numerous other services which the "pick-ups" render in respect of funerals, dances, school children and in respect of other functions to which the buses do not cater and in respect of hours at times when the buses have ceased to function. My closing observation in connection with this aspect of the transport policy is that the Ministry

be advised to give instructions for the cancellation of this directive dated 5th May of this year to these "pick-up" owners telling them that after the 31st July of this year their permits will not be renewed in view of these alleged complaints which, apparently, the Director has been unable to specify, itemise or particularise. The Director of Highways and Transport has sent out his circular letters to the "pick-up" owners. I am submitting that although he is the Director, the Minister directs the Director, or he should direct him, and let him understand that he must immediately cancel that letter to the "pick-up" owners so that at least for one year more, the "pick-ups" will continue to do the public the service which they have been rendering so effectively and satisfactorily during the past years. During the period of one year, until the 31st July next year, the matter may be reconsidered in the light of existing conditions, but, for now, we say that it is the duty, the inescapable duty of the Ministry to let the Department of Highways and Transport know that the instructions which they have issued should be cancelled and the minds of the "pick-up" owners relieved as well as the minds of those who travel by the "pick-ups" and the minds of the community as a whole. The public should be relieved and satisfied that the service which has been rendered by these people at such great sacrifice to themselves, will at least be carried on for one more year until some other arrangement is made, if it can be made, whereby the public will receive as adequate a service as, or a better service than, if the "pick-ups" were still running.

2.45 p.m.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, if the "pick-ups" are to be put off the road as from 1st August this year, there is no question of people getting a more satisfactory service and being catered for in the various ways in which the "pick-ups" cater for them now. I will leave that aspect of transport and consider the more general phases of transport policy.

As you will recall, Sir, in (a), the Address speaks of public passenger transport, including its present attitude towards motor vans, known as "pick-ups". I will deal with public passenger transport generally, and in this respect I will naturally turn to and attempt to analyse this Statement of the Minister. Dates, Mr. Speaker, are interesting things, and it will be noticed that although we have tried to prod the Hon. Minister in this House time and time again whenever there has been a request for supply, whenever there has been a Resolution for a vast sum of money in respect of transport, we have been unable to get an adequate answer from the Minister appertaining to a statement of policy. The instant motion was tabled on the 24th May this year. It was on 16th June that this statement was laid in this House, and I think it was on the Friday of that same week when a statement was also given in the time of the Government Information Officer over Rediffusion; and incidentally, Mr. Speaker, if I may just appear to digress for a moment, if there is one good regular piece of canvassing done on behalf of Government, it is done in that period over Rediffusion whenever that item comes on. The Government Information Office, whether it is using transport or whatever it is, is really first-class and effective.

You may agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that that should be factual, but it goes far beyond the factual on many occasions. Anyhow, this motion on 24th May made in this Chamber was followed by this Statement of the Minister on 16th June and by the Rediffusion broadcast by the Government Information Officer. Now let us, Mr. Speaker, consider the Statement in detail. No one can disagree with the last sentence of the first paragraph "to serve the public must be the first consideration". That is not what is the bone of contention or the point at issue between any of us in this Chamber. It is not of the first consideration to serve the public, but on how best to serve the public, what is the means of best serving the public, most effectively providing them with the service which will give satisfaction and which will be most convenient to the numerous people who have to travel by motor omnibus.

The Statement in his first sentence says "the road and transport facilities of the island are a public service and a Government responsibility." One thought that perhaps the Minister would have been going on to say that Government accepted it as a responsibility completely and were proposing to nationalise the entire passenger transport of this island, but far from it he went on to paragraph 2, and that really, Mr. Speaker, is the most, I should say, amusing or the most fatuous of the paragraphs in this sentence, and I do not think I could do as much justice to this paragraph as was done to it in an article in the *Barbados Advocate* by a well-known West Indian journalist, Mitchie Hewitt two Saturdays ago under the caption "Pickups meet unfilled need in transport" when that author was analysing this particular paragraph in the Statement of the Hon. Minister. Of course, if such a document to which I have referred is desired to become a document of the House

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not sure that the hon. member is in order to quote from a newspaper at all.

Mr. BRANCKER: It is entirely immaterial, but if you, Mr. Speaker, are of the view

Mr. SPEAKER: I have no view. There are Rules.

Mr. BRANCKER: Your Honour is the interpreter of the Rules, but the judge also interprets.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Rule 26 (1) reads as follows:-

"A member shall not read his speech, but he may read extracts from books or papers other than newspapers in support of his argument and may refresh his memory by reference to notes."

Mr. BRANCKER: That has been interpreted to mean from a newspaper itself, but when a portion of a newspaper in which an article happens to appear

Mr. SPEAKER: I think I shall have to read the Rule again. There is no other possible interpretation; extracts are mentioned specifically. I will read again.

"A member shall not read his speech, but he may read extracts from books or papers other than newspapers in support of his argument and may refresh his memory by reference to notes."

That means extracts from newspapers and it can be nothing else.

Mr. BRANCKER: I trust Your Honour does not think I am questioning your ruling because this is really immaterial. I was only drawing to Your Honour's attention that although it is English, I know that English has been interpreted to mean that it ceases to be regarded as an extract if it no longer any part of the paper from which it originally came.

I almost said "My Lord" because one is so accustomed to having one learned judge giving one interpretation and another of equal status giving a different one that it occasions no surprise to hear Your Honour with that vast amount of wisdom which abides in Your Honour taking that point of view, and it is entirely immaterial for the purpose of my argument. It is only because it would be rendering unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's by quoting or referring to, as I do not have it all in my memory, the analysis of paragraph 2 of this statement which I am sure I could not better, had Your Honour taken a different view from that which Your Honour takes, by allowing me to use the language and the pertinent phrasing of that particular feature writer.

2.55 p.m.

"The continuation of the present Transport service or its expansion into an integrated all-island service depends in large part on the following: (1) adequate management; (2) the possibility of raising finance; (3) good management/employee relationships; and (4) the co-operation of the workers and the public. The necessary steps are

being taken to achieve these objectives and thereby increase the efficiency of the Board. These will be vigorously pursued."

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister would, when he is replying, if he replies and does not leave it to a junior, actual or potential designate, tell us what he thinks about this. I notice that the Hon. Minister is not in his place, but I shall still say this. I hope he may enlighten us as to what he regards as necessary steps to be taken to pursue these objectives and how it is proposed to pursue them. He says that they will be vigorously pursued. It is difficult to understand that Minister pursuing anything vigorously and as to the necessary steps, we are completely left in the dark as to what he has in mind or what he contemplates by the use of that phrase.

Let us start off with (1) adequate management. Of course, if these four objectives were realities, one would have an ideal and Utopian service; but how can one hope to achieve adequate management unless first and foremost you have as your manager some one who has some long and practical knowledge and experience of the transport service of this island, and of the workings of a transport system? You have brought out an Englishman on a very large salary and contract. Presumably and theoretically, that gentleman would be able or should be able to adequately manage a transport service such as ours, but after his term of office has expired - I presume it is - can we see a result of any adequate management as a result of his stay in this island and for the considerable amount of the taxpayers' money which was expended from the Treasury and put in his pocket? Is it the intention of the Hon. Minister to have his place filled? There is no question about it, the Transport Board does not make any decision without the knowledge of the Minister and without his sanction and approval. Is it the intention of the Transport Board to secure as Manager a Barbadian or West Indian who has had experience of the running of a public transport system in this part of the world, or, is it proposed to bring another Englishman, whether he has spent a year or two in Trinidad, Jamaica or anywhere else, to follow in the footsteps of his immediate predecessor, that is to say, to come to the island, see the situation, draw a superb salary, enjoy our climate and seabathing and after the expiration of a certain number of years say *au revoir* to Barbados and leave us in no better position, and our Treasury more impoverished as a result of his stay in the island? And it does not deal with the top people alone. It goes right down the line.

As regards the question of staffing the office or over-staffing it, the general opinion is that there is no more over-staffed office in the public service of this country than the office of the Transport Board. Not only is it over-staffed, but the personnel in the majority of cases is below par, because there are nothing more than political protégés of the Minister and there is no hope of efficiency because they have not a certain standard of academic attainment and general all-round efficiency. Because they subscribe to a particular ideology they find themselves in such excessive numbers on the staff of the Transport Board. One has heard of the case in which an individual was either dismissed or threatened with dismissal by the Management in connection with some, shall I say, allegedly unaccounted monies, and I understand that he was reinstated on the pretext that if that were not done there would be no means or hope to get back into the Treasury the money or monies which were unaccounted for, because by the reinstatement so much would be paid every month of the amount which was probably short or not properly accounted for.

Now, we come to good management/employee relationship and the co-operation of the workers and the public. One hears as often today with the Transport Board as one did with the private concessionaires or when the entire passenger transport was run by private concessionaires of the laying off of employees. Every now and then, I meet a conductor or driver who tells me that he has been laid off and then after a few days he is sent for and reinstated. This laying off is the sort of thing which must stop.

If the Minister has, as he says in his Statement, any plans for good management/employee relationships and the co-operation of the workers and the public, that is another important aspect of which we would like to hear something.

Well, now, as to the question of turnstiles which have been recently introduced in the buses of the Transport Board, I do not know whether there is going to be a directive to the private concessionaires that they should install turnstiles in the process of time in such units as they would be in a position to operate. However, the Minister must have realised this and passed it on to the Transport Board that we cannot at this time, with unemployment so rampant as it is, contemplate with any equanimity the replacement by turnstiles of conductors.

3.05 p.m.

There is a general feeling and fear now that although, for the time being, conductors are still being retained until people get to know that they must bring the exact fare - there is a general feeling and fear by the conductors employed by the Board that sooner or later they will be told that they are not wanted because the turnstiles are in full operation and everybody knows how to use them. It will be as well for the Minister to make an unqualified statement in this Chamber with the publicity which will accrue to it, that there is no intention of replacing conductors and that they will remain employed on the buses whether there are turnstiles or no turnstiles. We just cannot risk the unemployment which would result from the installation of turnstiles and doing away with the conductors on the buses.

Mr. Speaker, the position with the conductors is not on all fours with the position as to overstaff, because the majority of people who are in the office at the Transport Board are people who may well not have been accustomed to being regularly employed or who may not be employable at all. On the other hand, we have had generations of conductors; from the time we have had the trams we had conductors, and now there is a generation which has been born and grown up to realise that this is an occupation to which persons who are so inclined, who have the necessary ability and skill, may devote themselves and look forward to being permanently and continuously employed in that capacity. Mr. Speaker, the Transport Board has sprung up first a few days ago and some people are lucky to be employed by that Board. They would have no grouse if, where they are superfluous, they are laid off or knocked off, because this is something which they never expected; it was something which came to them out of the blue. They were not doing anything and all of a sudden the Transport Board came up and they were employed *ad lib*. The same thing is not the case with the conductors because they have been either with one company or with the other and they will remember the first bus which ran from Bridgetown to Speightstown. Even in the days of the old tram cars we had conductors so that the people of this island have grown up and have learnt to appreciate that just as there is a field for carpenters and masons, lawyers and physicians, there is a field for conductors and drivers, as the case may be. We cannot risk interfering with the unemployment situation of this island by finding mechanical means whereby the conductors would be thrown out of work. It would be as well, if, at the earliest possible time and with the maximum publicity, the Minister or the Transport Board - or both - would let the public know that there is no intention of displacing conductors, and if there is any such intention, to allow us to register our protest and take whatever steps that are necessary to be taken in order to ensure that this wholesale laying off should not come about.

Mr. Speaker, then we have to consider paragraph 3 of this Statement; This is what it says:

"Whether the Island's services are integrated into one concession and a unified system to be operated by the Transport Board or by a privately-owned concern will depend on the outcome of these steps and the success of these efforts. A recent survey of Omnibus Operations in this island is now being studied. Any future decision will

be made on the basis of what can be offered by alternative operators in the way of services to the community and at what cost to the public."

Mr. Speaker, let us consider this matter for a moment. On every occasion that the Minister has come to this House - and he has come to the House on numerous occasions - for specific sums to be voted for the running of this Board, the purchase of buses and the removal of the deficit, I have said that there is only one alternative; it is a question of the Government running all the services or running none of them. The Government must run all of the buses or none of them. Personally, I am an unrepentant believer, an advocate, of the Government running all the buses. The present system is intolerable in the extreme. (ASIDES). Mr. Speaker, I am trying to speak above the asides and I trust that you are hearing me. I was saying, Sir, that the system in Barbados in which there are a certain number of private concessionaires and the Transport Board running buses, will be found to be as unworkable as it has proven itself to be; but it is the duty of the Minister and of the Government to make a decision, not to go on year after year and session after session stating that they are unable to make up their minds. Up to today the Government does not know what it is going to do; it is just temporising, vaguely promising that after consideration it will know what is best or what should take place. That will depend upon the outcome of these steps and the success of these efforts. Mr. Speaker, what is the point in making a Statement which should really convey something definite and give the clear intention of the Minister, but which is saying again that there is no decision even about to be taken and everything will depend upon the outcome of these steps and the success of these efforts? What are the necessary steps referred to in this Statement? Well, Sir, to address that question to the Minister would be to address it to the person in this Chamber who is least qualified or least able to give an answer. What are the necessary steps being taken? I submit, Mr. Speaker, that no steps are being taken. 3.15 p.m.

If steps are being taken, why did he not insert it in this Statement which had been long awaited, long heralded and long delayed? What is the result after we have waited so many years, so many meetings of this House? A mountain has been in labour and it has brought forth this mouse. The answer is that steps are being taken. What are they? The Minister does not say, so obviously he does not know; so what will happen will depend on the outcome of these steps. I will go on to read.

"Whether the Island's services are integrated into one concession and a unified system to be operated by the Transport Board or by a privately owned concern will depend on the outcome of these steps and the success of these efforts". The phrase "by a privately owned concern" is intriguing. I rather gather that in a way the cat has been let out of the bag. Either the buses will be run by the Transport Board as one concession or by a privately owned concern. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if a good friend of certain members of this House is in any way connected with this privately owned concern which might well be interested in operating the Transport Board. I wonder if a member of the other branch of this Chamber has had this sentence drawn to his attention, because obviously it is not intended that Mr. Alleyne or Mr. Birch and those gentlemen and ladies, Mrs. Rock, for instance, who are running the present privately owned concessions, will run the Transport Board. The Hon. Minister called the name of a lady whose name I have heard called over Rediffusion. (Hon. M. E. COX: A friend of yours.) The Hon. Minister should realise that my friends are my clients. I do not remember being in receipt of a retainer from the lady whose name the Minister called. This does not suggest that the Minister is contemplating that these services should be run by the present private concessionaires and some others, or the private concessionaires may take over and have distributed amongst them the services now run by the Transport Board. What he has said here very clearly to the Committee is that the service will depend on the outcome of these steps as to whether the Transport Board operates all or whether a privately owned concern operates all.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Hon. Minister will let us into the secret of the privately owned concern or the owner of the privately owned concern whom he has in mind. If he does not, I will in this debate enlighten this Chamber and the public as to whom I have no doubt he has in mind in respect of this privately owned concern. It may not have been brought into being; that particular business man is too shrewd; he has made investigations; he has been around to the various omnibus concessionaires, he has got his facts and figures, and of course he would know where his agencies are. We would just wait and hear the outcome of the necessary steps which the Ministry is taking and the success of the efforts which the Ministry is so vigorously pursuing.

Well then, the Minister went on to speak of the recent survey of omnibus operations which is now being studied. I take it that is a reference to Mr. Cadbury's investigation; but, Mr. Speaker, is that really so recent and is that really being studied? One wonders how long this Ministry has to study a particular matter, how long a matter will be kept under, forever under and permanently under consideration. It really is not good enough with Cabinet status, with Ministerial responsibility, with a Minister not being able (a) to make up his mind and (b) to present a definite statement of policy after a lapse of time such as occurred between the 'take-over' of these buses and the present day when we are still faced with a wavering, vacillating policy on the part of the Ministry and the Board which is under him. "Any future decision will be made on the basis of what can be offered by alternative operators." What does that mean, Mr. Speaker? That is much stronger whereas earlier on the Minister speaks of the alternative of either the Transport Board or a privately owned concern, leaving it as if it is in the balance - Transport Board all or a privately owned concern all; but then he goes on in this sentence to say that "any future decision will be made on the basis of what can be offered." I wonder what kind of offer can be envisaged! What can be offered by alternative operators? What does an alternative operator have to offer? How much, Mr. Speaker? (Laughter by Opposition.) When we see here now that any future decision will be made on the basis of what can be offered by alternative operators, and in view of the fact that earlier on it is envisaged that either the Transport Board would run all or a privately owned concern all, when you come here now to what can be offered by alternative operators, that suggests as if there might be a little auctioning going on. Alternative operators will offer and I presume the best offer will not be refused. Does this mean, Mr. Speaker, that the highest bidder would offer what can be offered by alternative operators? Any operator interested in the service would naturally say: "I will give a first-class service and provide x buses in marvellous condition." All the alternative operators will offer a wonderful service, the best service in the Western Hemisphere with the best buses and the finest employees; so obviously the Minister is not referring to that when he says that a decision will be made on the basis of what can be offered; he is obviously referring to something which is perhaps too subtle for me and might even be too subtle for you. What can be offered by alternative operators in the way of services to the community and at what cost to the public? If too much is offered by alternative operators, the cost to the public might be too great, and we have to be very wary about that.

Now it was very interesting, Mr. Speaker, in studying the Order Paper for today to get indirectly a little insight as to the future policy of this Board, because we have before us a proposed amendment to the Gaming Act of 1891, and you will notice, Mr. Speaker, that we will be asked to approve of a Bill whose object is amongst other things to exempt from the operation of the Gaming Act of 1891 lotteries conducted by the Transport Board in connection with the bus tickets issued by the Board. 3.25 p.m.

Well, that certainly is a novelty and an innovation that the Transport Board will be conducting lotteries in connection with bus tickets issued by the Board. What I gather that they have in mind - and I heard it from an official of the Transport Board - is that every bus ticket

is supposed to have a number, passengers will insist on receiving a bus ticket from the conductor and keeping it when they get in the bus so that they will have the winning number when the Transport Board is conducting its lotteries. That is to ensure that the Transport Board will collect all the fares, because everybody will insist on receiving his ticket so that he might get the lucky number and win the first prize. I do not know how this will be managed in connection with the buses with the turnstiles. Maybe, there will be no lottery conducted in connection with the buses with turnstiles and that may be an indication that they have definitely as a long-term policy the dispensing of the services of the conductors.

I must confess that I was never so surprised by any official document of this Chamber or by any copy of a Bill than when I received the copy of the Bill, intituled an Act to amend the Gaming Act, 1891, to see as its object the exemption of lotteries conducted by the Transport Board in connection with bus tickets issued by the Board. At least we have got that little insight into the policy of the Board. We understand now that they have come to one decision and that is that the Gaming Act is to be amended so as to permit the Transport Board to conduct its lotteries.

Hon. M. E. COX: I rise on a point of order. I think we have a Rule somewhere that if there is a measure before the House or on the Order Paper, it cannot be discussed on a motion prior to that. Here it is, we are discussing a Bill on the Order Paper which will come up for subsequent discussion; therefore, I do not think the hon. member is in order to discuss that Bill in the present debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: I myself, have been watching him particularly and I too am wondering if he is discussing that Bill now; but it does appear to me that he has only made a cursory remark on it. I have been watching the hon. member very carefully.

Mr. BRANCKER: I have not begun to dream of trespassing on the Rules of the House, and the cursory reference which I made on that Bill has nothing to do with the Rule which the Hon. Minister refers to on the implication of the Bill. It is no question of my discussing it at all. I have mentioned it because it seems to be the only insight - that particular aspect of the Bill to which I mentioned - which we have got in this Chamber as to whether any policy has been arrived at by the Transport Board in connection with the running of the public passenger transport in this island.

Another aspect, Mr. Speaker, of this problem and the Transport Board's reference to adequate management, good management/employee relationships is this. The constitution of the Board has been maintained at severe cost in this Chamber and because of that it should be non-Party. When people are being selected for this Board, not only should they be selected from amongst members of Parliament, but they should be selected from a panel of persons irrespective of Party. They should be selected from people who have a contribution to make to the solution of the transport problem of this island irrespective of the political complexion, ideology or the political camp to which the individual person belongs. I must say that in respect of the recent appointments, even although they have been confined to persons of a particular political Party or persons of a particular political persuasion, they have been all people of a better character than many of those who had been originally appointed on the Board. The original persons appointed on the Transport Board were utterly incapable of performing the duties of a Director with intelligence, ability and acumen; but, recently, although the same narrow field has been used to secure the personnel of the Board, there has been an improvement in the individual calibre of these recent appointments to the directorate of the Transport Board.

I wonder if the Hon. Minister would let us know if he or his Ministry or his Cabinet feels that there is no living Barbadian who is capable of filling the office of General Manager of the Transport Board. I understand that it is the policy of the Ministry of Education or it is their desire

that in the filling of appointments, preference should be given first to a Barbadian, secondly, to a West Indian other than a Barbadian and, thirdly, to someone who is not a West Indian at all. I would be interested to know whether the Ministry of Transport agrees with the expressed views of the Ministry of Education that that should be the order of preference, and if the Ministry agrees with the Ministry of Education as to that order, does the Minister of Transport see or contemplate any Barbadian with sufficient experience, integrity and ability who is effectively able to perform the duties of General Manager of this Transport Board.

3.35 p.m.

Let him go right through the field of "probables" or even "possibles" and see whether he cannot find one or two or three Barbadians who are capable and honest enough to fill the office which has been recently vacated by Mr. Bowen, who left this island as recently as last week. As a member of the public, I understand that the post has already been filled or is about to be filled. The rumour is that the post will be filled, or is likely to be filled, by a U.K. individual who is employed in the sister island of Trinidad. That rumour lacks official confirmation, but I wonder if that individual has been able to demonstrate that he has qualifications for the particular post in this island superior to any Barbadian born who would be willing to accept the office of General Manager, at the handsome salary which appertains to it, of the Transport Board of this island. I would be interested to know from the Ministry what are the qualifications which they regard as being necessary for the post of General Manager of the Board; what were the qualifications of Mr. Bowen in so far as the local Transport problems were concerned? It is a fallacy, and I thought we had passed the stage that what is suitable for the Mother Country would, of necessity, be the proper and the best thing for this island; that an individual who has a good record in a certain line of business in England would, of necessity, be better than a Barbadian or better than a similar individual who was born in this island or in the West Indies, and who has similar experience of the matters with which he would be called upon to deal. It is not merely a question of dealing with the buses; it is a question of dealing with the individuals who would be working under him; it would be a question of dealing with people and being able to maintain the co-operation of the workers and of the public.

Mr. Speaker, in these days, is there any reason in the world to assume that an expatriate is more likely to be able to ensure good management, proper relationship and the co-operation of the workers and of the public than a West Indian born? It would be worthwhile hearing the Minister answer that query, because it has been causing a lot of heart-burning in this community. The news that the General Manager of the Transport Board has retired and the rumour that he is to be succeeded by another non-Barbadian, a non-West Indian - and I take it that it is not assumed that the salary, as it is now, would be too good for a fellow-Barbadian or a fellow West Indian who happens to be a layman to receive - a salary of \$800 a month or something in that vicinity. There must be some reason why everybody locally seems to ignore the post; however, unless the Minister can assure this Chamber that no Barbadian has applied, no Barbadian who had the suitable qualifications and the suitable knowledge of local conditions - and the knowledge of local conditions means a knowledge of, and the ability to get on with, one's own class, with the class above and with the one below. Mr. Speaker, was there no Barbadian or West Indian found for a job of this kind and therefore they have to appoint an expatriate to this job? Is it because the Ministry feels that certain posts must still be reserved in the highest-paid category for non-Barbadians or non-West Indians? What is the reason why the post cannot be filled by a fellow West Indian of ours?

Mr. Speaker, to continue to analyse this Statement and to consider the question of an adequate service, well, I would leave out paragraph four because that has no special bearing on what I am discussing, and I will go on to paragraph five. That is the paragraph which says that

other passenger-carrying vehicles will not be allowed to compete with licenced bus services on routes which are adequately serviced. I dealt with that paragraph in detail last Tuesday when I was dealing in detail with the question of the "pick-ups" and the deadline for the services rendered by them. As to what constitutes an adequate service by the buses, the public is the best judge. I would say today, as I said last Tuesday and as I have been fortified in it by opinion which I have heard expressed between last Tuesday and this Tuesday, that there is not a route run by the Transport Board which is adequately serviced. Between the last meeting of this House and this one today, I have been given a document which has been prepared by some users of the buses, some school children who use the buses of the Transport Board. I do not mind referring to it even at the risk of its being made a document of this House. The school children generally complain that because they pay a reduced bus fare, less than what the adult pays, for this reason they are given the shabbiest treatment, in connection with their service, of any other section of the community; they complain that the service which is rendered to them is inadequate as it could possibly be, and that it is not only inadequate but indifferent. 3.45 p.m.

I have told this House of experiences with school children's buses, how one night at 7.30 p.m. I saw a Transport bus parked in Black Rock just outside St. Stephen's Church, a bus which had left at whatever time the school buses leave—presumably around 4 o'clock—headed towards the country. It had broken down and no relief bus had been sent. There was another case in which, in your constituency, Mr. Speaker, at Diamond Corner a bus broke down there, no relief bus had been sent and the children had to walk from there to the various outlying parts of St. Peter - Boscobel, Grave Yard, St. Lucy - in order to get home. No relief bus was even thought of or contemplated. Well, this Report to which I refer, Mr. Speaker, was submitted to me by school children who want this Chamber to be acquainted with their plight, the unfortunate position in which they find themselves - unfortunate in many respects. One is, Mr. Speaker, that since this ticket system had been introduced in connection with school children, the tickets are not obtainable from the bus conductors.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as it is now, a school child can travel on the school bus by means of a ticket, a weekly season, but he cannot purchase that season, I am told, from a conductor. One would think the obvious thing is to give the conductors a certain number of these tickets which they would have to account for and either return the tickets or produce the money for the tickets; that does not seem to require much ingenuity in administration, but it does not happen. A school child has to go to the Transport Board only on certain days and buy these seasons from the Board. He is put to inconvenience, obviously unnecessary inconvenience and unnecessary trouble because of the lack of intelligent administration by the Transport Board in connection with the issuing of school children's tickets, and these tickets are not transferable. They are not, as I said, obtainable from the conductors of the buses and they represent a week's supply; but if the child is ill, Mr. Deputy Speaker, or if there is a day that for other reasons he cannot attend school, he cannot transfer that ticket or allow that ticket to be used by his brother or sister on the same school bus.

The document to which I refer, Mr. Deputy Speaker, before Your Honour took over the Chair and concerning which I say it is entirely immaterial to me if it is insisted that it becomes a document of this House, which was prepared for me and handed to me by school children on behalf of themselves, says that formerly ten tickets could be obtained from the Transport Board for a week; these tickets were valid up to a month after the date of issue so that if the owner of these tickets happened to be ill or had to stay away from school, the ticket for the day in question could be used the next week. The present ticket

system, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am informed by this is as follows: one ticket is issued for one week from Monday to Friday; the ticket is shown to the conductor who punches it to show it had been used. The cost of this ticket is the same as that of the ten formerly used. If a child does not travel by bus, no money is refunded and you will quite understand, Sir, that there are cases in which the children are of very poor parents, and sometimes have to stay away from school, even secondary school, if there is illness in the family.

Now as to an actual incident in connection with the school buses, in particular now with Routes 1B and 1C: one afternoon recently last term on Route 1C the school children were forced to travel from Bridgetown to St. Lucy by three different buses because, as it is here stated by the children, of lack of interest by those concerned. Firstly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, one bus took the children from the bus stand, and it was taken into the Transport Board for repairs. They did not travel very far before it had to go for repairs. That is the sort of bus which was selected for the school children, as they feel, because they pay a little less than the adults and they receive such treatment. That bus was taken to the Board for repairs and a number of buses, at that time new and old buses, were in the yard and were marked "Private"; but after over an hour's waiting, the school children were put into a dilapidated bus which managed to reach Speights-town; so they waited in the Transport yard for over an hour, then one of the oldest buses was assigned to them, and that managed to reach Speights-town. After another half hour or so a Mercedes Benz took them to Boscobel, St. Lucy and other outlying parts of the Leeward. That, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you must realise and I am sure you will agree, is not good enough; that sort of thing is what certain people regard as immaterial. No wonder these coloured children had to stand an hour in the Transport Board yard waiting for a bus, after which they were put in an old bus which managed to reach Speights-town and had to wait half an hour before another bus arrived to take them to Boscobel, Pie Corner or Half Moon Fort.

To a certain type of mind, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is nothing in that, and that is not a thing of which the Board could be unaware because the first bus which took the children took them into the Transport Board yard and it was there they had to wait over an hour before another bus was assigned to them; so it would hardly be necessary to tell the Board about what takes place in the yard of the Transport Board. Then the complaint goes on to say that the St. Lucy routes, 1B and 1C have always suffered from lack of transport. 3.55 p.m.

Two buses supply Route 1C transport and both are invariably full. On many occasions one of these two buses is working elsewhere and so the children have to be satisfied with one. At present, two are not adequate and are not sufficient, yet on many occasions, the two are reduced to one because one is assigned to another route. Whether they have children elsewhere to transport or adults, that is immaterial. The children of this route should be the first consideration to a Board such as this, regardless of the fact that the children pay a smaller fare than the adults. That does not matter. Your consideration is invariably children before grown-ups.

So far as the Transport Board is concerned, the children who are least able to protest for themselves, who are the least able to stick out for their rights, are the persons who are the most shabbily treated by the Officials of this Board. I know on many occasions, particularly on Monday mornings, certainly last year and year before last, I have had to go and complain to the Chairman of the Transport of the Board of the failure even to send on some occasions a bus to take the children to the Alexandra School. Certainly, during last year and year before last, time and time again it happened and particularly so year before last in the rainy season. If the children have to go to school in rain - I am not saying when the rain is too severe - if they have to venture out from their homes, then it is equally so that the Transport Board supply buses

in order to convey them to their schools. They should not in any way try to hamper the children from getting to school and receiving the education to which they are entitled despite, of course, the fact that the policy of this Government is not to encourage secondary education by providing it free to the parents of such children who are unable to pay for it themselves.

The statement is that the present tickets for school children are only obtained at the office of the Transport Board; hence there is grave inconvenience to children who cannot get them from conductors on the buses. I know cases, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in which the children cannot spare the time during the week that they go to school to go to the Transport Office to collect their tickets for the next week; and because of that, they have to go to town on Saturdays, and pay bus fare in so doing. That is of course a day when they cannot even benefit by the reduced school children's fare because they are then travelling on an adult bus. I know of some who have to go from St. Lucy and no doubt, Sir, there would be some who go from your parish of St. Joseph on Saturdays in order to purchase their season tickets for the next week. Therefore, you can very well see that they have to pay not only for their weekly season tickets on the buses in order to get to the City and back, but they also have to pay a fare to get them to the City and back to purchase their season tickets on Saturdays. You can very well see that their weekly season tickets do not at all effect any economy for them, because if you add to the price of the season tickets for five days the amount of the bus fare which they pay from the country to the City and back on a Saturday in order to purchase these tickets, you can very well see that obviously these children are more out of pocket and seriously handicapped. For a great many of them, Saturday may be the only day that they can buy these tickets and do anything for the parent, because the majority of parents in the country are paid on Fridays and it is only when a school child goes home on Friday that a parent is able to give him the money so that he can purchase these tickets; consequently, these school children will have to pay bus fare to go to town on Saturdays to the office of the Board. That is a difficulty in the system which can be so easily remedied. All that needs to be done is every morning to give to conductors of the school buses a certain number of tickets to sell to the school children, and the conductors will either return the tickets or hand in the money for them to the office of the Board. One cannot understand why so obvious and simple a thing has not been resorted to by the Transport Board. It is so clear that one cannot understand how the Transport Board even cannot see it — unless they see it and are so unsympathetic and unmindful as to how far these children are put to inconvenience by their method of selling these tickets.

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this matter has been brought up as a motion of "no confidence" because as I explained last Tuesday, we regard it as an issue of extreme gravity, one of the two most serious issues confronting the public of this island at the present moment, one of the issues which deserve not only the fullest ventilation, the fullest explanation by the Ministry, but a clear indication by the Opposition as to how strongly it feels on this question. We feel that nothing short of the method with which we have approached this question is demanded for the existing transport situation; nothing less than a vote of 'no confidence' in our opinion can adequately show how strongly we feel on this matter. Nothing less than a vote of censure with all that implies can meet with the situation as to public passenger transport of this island because it is your duty. You have a Government, you have a Cabinet System and Ministerial responsibility. It is the duty of the Ministry to make up its mind within a reasonable time, and whether it makes up its mind rightly or wrongly, it is its duty to let the public know what is its intention and how it proposes to effect its intention and to bring about a change.

4.05 p.m.

We just cannot continue indefinitely to tolerate this perpetual shilly-shallying of the Minister in charge of Communications who is going on in this way meeting after meeting, month after month, year after year and almost session after session. Certainly in the last session the Minister of Communications is now the same and he had ample time to make

up his mind; but it seems that he has no mind to make up or he is incapable of making it up or he is not prepared to make any attempt to do so, but is disposed to carry on marking time while the people suffer. Nero fiddles while Rome burns; that is what is happening in this island with this transport problem.

Mr. Speaker, in dealing with this question of a motion of "no confidence", the result of it is, as I think is well known now and as I reminded the House last Tuesday, the Minister resigns or if the matter is of sufficient importance or is sufficiently far-reaching, the Government resigns. It is a question of the Government's policy and whether it is expressed in this Statement or not it is the policy of the Government because this Statement is headed: "Statement of Government's policy on the future of the Transport Service of the Island." It makes one wonder whether at last there is unanimity on the part of the Cabinet as to its transport policy. One could not help hearing that while some Ministers say that they have no unified system in the operation of the Board, others were in favour of a private concern and yet others were most concerned in taking a future decision on the buses as to what could be offered by alternative operators. It may be that there is complete unanimity with members of the Cabinet, or there is no such thing, but they have decided to accept and to act on a majority decision.

I would make some reference *a propos* of the type of motion which is before us on this question of "No confidence" and the duty of the Minister is as is set out by Sir Ivor Jennings on Cabinet Government, Second Edition, published at the Cambridge University Press. On page 190 is the reference to the dismissal of Ministers. This is what Sir Ivor says:-

"The Prime Minister's power of appointing ministers with the consent of the King and his power to dissolve a Government by a personal resignation are referred to in Chapter III. He possesses also the power to advise the Sovereign to dismiss a Minister. According to law, the Minister holds his office at the pleasure of the Crown. He can therefore be dismissed, according to law, at any moment; and this prerogative is exercised solely on the advice of the Prime Minister. Such advice would be given only in the most extreme cases. A dismissal is a declaration of weakness which necessarily has repercussions in the House of Commons and in the constituencies. The Minister dismissed may have support in the House or even in the Cabinet. If a sufficient section of the House supports him, the Government will be defeated. If a sufficient section of the Cabinet supports him, the Cabinet will be broken up. Moreover, a mere disagreement will lead to the resignation of the dissenting Ministers."

As the learned author of this celebrated textbook, who is also Vice-Chancellor of the University of Ceylon, goes on to remind us, "In the great majority of cases, a Minister who is responsible, either in fact or merely technically, for some maladministration, will resign, as Mr. Lowe and Mr. Ayrton resigned in 1873, Colonel Seely in 1914, Mr. Montagu in 1917, Mr. Austen Chamberlain in 1917, and Sir Samuel Hoare in 1935. It must be remembered, too, that the Prime Minister's decision to bring about a change of Ministers is not necessarily an accusation of incompetence or bad administration; it may be due to political conditions. A Minister always holds his office 'at the disposal of' the Prime Minister, so that he may be said to have resigned — and the newspapers will announce that he has resigned — when he knows nothing whatever about it. There are parts of the world where no public servant is ever 'dismissed' because 'discontinued' is not so harsh a term; similarly in Britain a Minister is not dismissed, he 'resigns' in order to facilitate a reconstruction of the Government."

I am sorry, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the local Prime Minister or Premier is not present this afternoon because I would be glad to avail myself of the opportunity of refreshing his mind as to these relevant passages of Sir Ivor Jennings whom he would regard as respected, whom you and other members of my profession so regard. On page 196, dealing with the dismissal of Ministers Sir Ivor says this:-

"The piece of sharp practice by which Mr. Balfour rid himself of some of his free trade colleagues in 1903 produced from Lord George Hamilton, one of the sufferers, the comment that: 'A Prime Minister has an undoubted right to request any of his colleagues, whose presence in his Cabinet is, in his opinion or judgment, prejudicial to the efficiency or policy of the Government, to resign his office'."

And the last quotation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, which I will make is from page 197 which reads as follows:-

"Conflict between the Prime Minister and a colleague is, however, a rare occurrence. There is, usually, on the one hand confidence in the colleague and on the other hand loyalty to the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister rarely has either the time or the desire to interfere in departmental matters. If a colleague cannot be trusted, he will not be appointed. If he proves inefficient, a hint is usually enough to produce a resignation. If he proves ineffective in a particular office, it is usually possible to obtain his consent to a transfer, provided that it is possible to make it appear a promotion or that some good reason can be assigned for it. The offices of Lord President of the Council and Lord Privy Seal are very useful for this purpose."

I commend this passage in the absence of the Premier to the Deputy Premier. In this passage it is stated: "The Prime Minister rarely has either the time or the desire to interfere in departmental matters." Perhaps that is the case in this island at the present moment. As set out in this passage, in respect of a colleague, "if he proves inefficient, a hint is usually enough to produce a resignation." Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hope I have dropped more than a hint.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let it not be suggested that we are adding to the burden of the taxpayers of the present Government by the reference to the Lord President of the Council and Lord Privy Seal.

4.15 p.m.

I am only quoting this in order to complete the paragraph.

"The offices of Lord President of the Council and Lord Privy Seal are very useful for this purpose. They give the holder a high precedence and they involve no contact with major administration." That would be a blessing in the present case, and Mr. Deputy Speaker, the last sentence of this Chapter says "In the last resort there is always the House of Lords"; and of course the equivalent in the local set-up, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the Other Chamber.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member seems to be quoting from a document, and I would like to know if it is a document of the House.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not quoting from a document. I referred to a well-known, leading and celebrated text book, and I even thought that that particular Minister, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, would have been aware and would have heard, even if it conveyed nothing to his mind, of Sir Ivor Jennings.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order, I think there is a rule that if you quote from a book it should be made the property of the House, and I would just like to ask if you intend to make it a document of the House, or if it is the property of the House already?

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, remembering that on one occasion the hon. member who has just spoken suggested that some fruits of some sort may become the property of this House, I do not know what Rule he had in mind then, I threshed out the matter of this text book with His Honour the Speaker in the presence of Mr. Clerk this afternoon, and His Honour the Speaker ruled as stated in the presence of Mr. Clerk that if reference is made to or quotations are read from a well-known and recognised text book, and the name of the text book, the edition, the author and all information as well as the page are given to the House, that such book may not be made or be requested to be made a document of this House. Knowing the hon.

member and always leaving nothing to chance, I took that precaution, and I would not anticipate Your Honour's ruling on this point; but I have no doubt, with my previous experience, if I may say so in all humility, of the soundness of your ruling, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it would not differ from that of His Honour the Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, if I may just for the benefit of the less knowledgeable members of this Chamber read Standing Order No. 26 (1) headed "Rules of Debate - Time and Manner of Speaking and Contents of Speeches", it says:

"A member shall not read his speech, but he may read extracts from books or papers other than newspapers in support of his argument, and may refresh his memory by reference to notes."

Mr. SPEAKER: I have heard that earlier in the day.

Mr. BRANCKER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, but I am sure you realise that all of us in this Chamber are not of the same calibre, and even if others have heard it more often than Your Honour, it still might not have left an impression in their minds. So, Mr. Speaker, there is one other reference.....

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is going off my point of order, I am not giving up so easily. It is very important. I raised in your absence in a point of order this question as to whether the hon. member was quoting from a book or a document of this House and asked, if he were quoting from a document which was not a document of the House, if it would become a document of the House in accordance with the Rules. I raised it for a very good reason because we on this side have in the past been challenged and have been debarred on occasions from quoting even at times from official documents. Members of the Opposition have risen on occasions and challenged us and said that such documents should become documents of the House, and Your Honour had to remind them that Ministers are at liberty to read from official papers.

It is only in order to make it perfectly clear what the position is that I rose so that in future we will know what the procedure will be. The hon. member referred, Sir, to an incident and said I challenged some fruit or asked about fruit being the property of the House, and I am sorry I was not taken seriously on that occasion. The Leader of the Opposition referred to me as having challenged him on a previous occasion, and said that he was aware I would have risen to do this and he was quite prepared for me because I had challenged the exhibition of some fruits. I did not know they were fruits and that is why I challenged them. I did not know what was in the tin, and I presume he is speaking about the occasion on which his colleague exhibited a tin alleged to have come from South Africa in here and I challenged it for a good reason. I think it is a very good thing for the House that the House can only be sure of the authenticity of the exhibit and be sure it is not being led down the garden path by having something which is claimed to be authentic become the property of the House, and I regret I was not taken seriously because my interruption was not intended to be puerile or making sport. It was meant to be a serious point of order, and I hope the Leader of the Opposition does not think we want his book seized.

We want the position made clear because we have in the past been challenged by members on the other side even when it came to quoting from official documents of Ministers; so we are not being peevish or frivolous. I want the position made clear as to procedure now and for the future.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member wants to know if he is being led down the garden path. I am also interested in the House not being led down the garden path, and that is why when the hon. junior member for St. Lucy approached me earlier in the day and asked me if he quoted from a text book written by Sir Ivor Jennings if there is any danger of that book being seized, I told him that in my opinion, which is always genuine, that he need not have any

fear, as long as I am satisfied he is quoting from an established book and not just reading from a book and saying it is an established book. As long as I am sure that this House is not being led down the garden path, he may quote from the book without any danger of it being, so to speak, seized by the House.

I do not think the House wants to expropriate the hon. member's property; it only wants to be sure that when he is quoting from Sir Ivor Jennings he is actually doing so, and that is why I told the hon. member not only to name the book, but the author, the edition of the book, the chapter and the page from which he is quoting. As long as he can do that and satisfy me with that, I think the House is well satisfied; so I think the hon. member was in order. 4.25 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I just want to get that a little more clearly on this matter because it is customary for members who want to quote to ask the permission of Your Honour to quote in this House and a similar thing was not done in this case. Am I to understand that as long as a member discusses the question with you that it would be alright?

Mr. SPEAKER: Not as long as he discusses it with me, but if I am satisfied.

Hon. M. E. COX: Thank you very much.

Mr. BRANCKER: There is only one other passage which I wish to quote and it is from another leading textbook by Professor A. V. Dicey on the Introduction to the Study of the Law of the Constitution. This is the ninth edition and it is published by Messrs. Macmillan and Co., Ltd., in 1956. The name 'Macmillan' means a great deal to the Parliament of the United Kingdom which is sufficiently reputable to have a Prime Minister as a former leading member of the firm. As you know, Professor Dicey's Law of the Constitution is the 'vade-mecum' of every law student and everybody interested in pursuing the study of that subject and under the sanction of convention of the constitution dealing with the resignation of a Ministry which has not the confidence of the House, Professor Dicey says:

"To see that this is so let us consider for a moment the effect of disobedience by the government to one of the most purely conventional among the maxims of constitutional morality - the rule, that is to say, that a Ministry ought to retire on a vote that they no longer possess the confidence of the House of Commons."

I earlier reminded this Chamber of a former quotation if the situation does not arise that the Ministry retires on a vote of 'no confidence' such as this, then in my submission it is the humble duty of the Minister to accept the hint and relieve the Prime Minister of his embarrassment by tendering his resignation and permitting at least a reshuffle if not a replacement.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I may now be allowed to finish for today and resume when the House of Assembly meets on the next occasion to discuss Private Members' Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 4.30 o'clock, the House reverts to Government Business.

On the Suspension, the House was in Committee of Supply.

NOTICE OF QUESTION

Mr. BRYAN: Before the House resumes in Committee of Supply, I am asking permission, as I was not in my place at the commencement, to ask a question.

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

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following questions:-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

How many water mains have been laid in the parish of St. Michael during the years 1956 to date?

2. Will the Minister give the location of the said water mains?

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

How many standposts have been erected in the parish of St. Michael during the years 1956 to date?

2. Will the Minister give the location of the said standposts?

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to tell the House that it was with much hesitation that I allowed these questions. They are the type of questions to which one can get the information under ordinary circumstances through the Head of the Department concerned, but I have been made to understand from the Hon. member that the Reports are not available and that is why I allowed them. I would just like the House to know that.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, are those questions to be taken as an intimation from the Government Benches that a General Election is imminent? (*Laughter*).

HOUSE RESUMES COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the suspension, the hon. senior member for the City, who is not now in his place, was addressing the Chair.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I just want to say this. I am sorry that the hon. senior member for the City is not in his seat because he ranted and railed and said that we were creating a privileged class in these flats and he seemed not to accept my information - in fact, that is the case with all hon. members opposite - that we only have eight three bed-roomed flats there. I do not know the reason why, but I can only tell them what this House has passed and agreed to. I can only tell them of the amount which was put in the Estimates and the information given this House.

I think it was the hon. senior member for the City who referred to Trinidad and Dr. Williams being strong on this question. Nobody has to follow Dr. Williams; as a matter of fact, Dr. Williams is following us. I told the House that I was not *au fait* with this matter but I am told that in Trinidad they may have been raised recently. But let us not forget that rents are usually higher than in Barbados. The position is that in Trinidad these officers pay 8% subject to a maximum of \$50 a month. In Barbados it is only the Medical Staff who pay a percentage of their salary and they pay 6%. All the others pay a fixed rent and so far as these flats are concerned, I know that because, as I have told the House, I went into the position and decided that the rents should be raised.

4.35 p.m.

Sir, the position is that we are charging \$60.00 a month for these flats. There are one or two inside which are hotter than the others and we rent them at \$55.00 a month. The rents were very much lower; long ago these buildings were leased to Mr. Hutchinson and when the lease was terminated we decided to convert them into flats. They were leased before this present Government came into power and the lease only terminated in recent times. Mr. Hutchinson used to sub-let or lease these buildings and I do not know what rents were charged on the property but they got into a very dilapidated state. I know that I did give the House some information about these buildings during the consideration of the Estimates. You have the propaganda, Mr. Chairman, that the Government is not revising rents and things of that sort. I hope the Committee will be satisfied with this information. It will be said that the rents are not high enough but we did not work them out in any willy-nilly fashion. I hope the Committee will be satisfied that there is a fixed rental for all Government flats except in the case of the

medical personnel at the Hospital. We have to treat them differently from others because it is difficult to get the services of these medical practitioners.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I promised that I would give the Committee some information. The hon. senior member for the City is not now in his seat; he made a good by-play, but my information is that this piling has been used since 1955. I am told that this greenheart piling should last for about twenty to thirty years but some of it only lasted for four or five years. Hon. members have said that the Minister does not know this, that or the other, but this work was not done during my regime; it was done since 1945.

I am sorry that the hon. senior member for the City is not here, but I will say that this piling is not standing up to what it was proposed to do.

As to the Freight Shed, the dimensions are 75x36 feet. Previously the refrigerators used to be left in a corner of Seawell Airport to be transferred very quickly to Bridgetown, and it is only in recent years that this air freight has sprung up to these dimensions. Now I understand that it is cheaper to get these goods down by air, we have decided to make charges, but legislation will have to be provided for these charges. Legislation will have to be drafted for this purpose and that legislation is now being drafted. We are charging 10 cents per square foot for the space required.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, there is one question to which the hon. member did not reply. I asked what were the dimensions of this building.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think the Hon. Minister did mention that it was 75x36 feet in size.

Mr. GODDARD: I am sorry I did not hear it. However, whatever you may want to call it, the Government has to provide for transit sheds.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. That matter is not now before the Committee. It has already been resolved and the Minister promised to give that information which was required.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, just as the hon. member replied, I am replying. However, in getting back to Head IX of the Schedule, when you say that you are charging \$50.00 a month for these flats and there are eight apartments, that is still not an economic rent, whatever you may like to call it. You are spending \$80,000 in the renovation of these flats; you have to insure the building and with these two things alone, the sum of \$60.00 a month would just barely cover the expenditure. I am not proposing that rents should be skyrocketed, but \$60.00 a month is more in keeping with what the rents used to be. Is this the rent applying to all the flats or only to some of them? Six per cent of the salary plus what the Medical Officers receive in and around "Enmore" - well, it is not generally known to the public that this provision applies only to Medical Officers, and it was felt that many other imported officials were enjoying the living in these flats at a rental of 6%. With that assurance of the Minister, I want to inform him that this economic rent will apply to all of the Government flats in and around the Garrison not occupied by the Medical Officers. That is really what the Minister has said, but it was not generally known by the people. If that is so, that is what we want.

4.45 p.m.

As the hon. senior member for the City said, to treat one section of the Civil Service in one category and the ones lower down in the bracket in another way is wrong. It would appear that at least the Medical Officers in Barbados are enjoying a 2% reduction on their rents over and beyond those in Trinidad; but I would just repeat what the hon. senior member for the City said: if they continue to base the rents on these Government-owned properties in which you are housing Civil Servants, particularly the imported Civil Servants, it would be unbalancing the privilege granted to the rank and file of the Civil Service.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, before this debate concludes, I should like to say that the time was when these

barracks or these flats at the Garrison were rented at \$12 a month. That was prior to the introduction of full Ministerial Government; at that time these flats were the special preserves of Heads of Government Departments. I want to know if these flats are still the preserves of Heads of Departments, or whether a more liberal policy is being executed at present, because if the same flats at the Garrison are being rented now at \$60 a month, as the Minister has just explained, well if owing to the changes and the cost of living and so on what was prior to 1946 rented at \$12 a month is now bringing \$60 a month, I am not arguing that either one is economic, but it seems that the old policy is being observed of not charging an economic rent by the present Government. But the question I am most concerned with, Sir, is not whether or not a real and proper economic rent is being charged; I am more concerned with who are enjoying the right or benefit of living in these flats which are being let at an uneconomic rent, and if the present Government is pursuing the policy adopted by former Governments prior to 1946 in regarding these flats as the special preserves of Heads of Departments.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, if you are actually subsidising rents for Heads of Departments or semi-Heads to the exclusion of, say, the Senior Clerks or others in the regular graded Service, then I feel that the rank and file in the Government Service is being denied a right or privilege which should of necessity be theirs, because the ones who need assistance most are not the ones who are receiving a salary of \$400 and upwards, but the ones who are in receipt of a salary ranging from \$150 to \$300 a month. If Government has flats which it can afford to let at an uneconomic rent - and in some cases these same flats could be made smaller, and instead of having three bedrooms you can have flats of two bedrooms, and instead of charging \$60 a month, you could probably charge \$40 a month for two-bedroom flats - by all means let the ones in the regular rank and file of the Service receive those benefits and do not reserve them for the Heads of Government Departments, because the present Labour Government in office should not necessarily pursue a policy which was laid down by the Conservative Government prior to 1946, especially with regard to having a special privileged class enjoying certain facilities.

I am happy, Sir, that the Minister has revised the rent charged. I am not suggesting any rent which is unreasonable, because in my humble opinion it is not so much that the Government rents of these flats are uneconomic; it is more that house rents generally are unreasonably high and it is for that reason since World War II and the introduction of Rent Acts and Rent Control Acts that I have had the honour of tabling questions on these lines, but the then Premier or Chief Minister did not see fit to implement them. It was never the policy of the Government to establish a Rent Control Board or Rent Acts, and I may say in passing that Rent Acts and Rent Control Acts are still on the Statute Book in England, and are still exercised rigidly, because it is the only means of controlling a reasonable rent for the average person. I am saying that what we need even at this stage is some sort of Rent Act, and not so much censuring of Government for charging what today in my opinion can be regarded as an unreasonable rent, because if you expect to receive a rent exceeding \$60 a month, from the average man in the Government Service - I refer not to the Heads of Government Departments - that is as much as he can pay. If the houses or flats are granted specially to Heads of Government Departments, that is a different matter, and that is really what the Government needs to look into and release these flats to the ones in greatest need, to the ones whose salaries are small and who find it difficult to pay \$80 a month rent outside. Let the cheap rentals be reserved for the rank and file of the Government Service.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister would be good enough to inform the Committee as to the basis on which these flats are given to tenants. One wonders how an officer gets a flat. Does it work by a lottery or what? One imagines that with the rents as low as they are, they must be in great demand, and it should be interesting to

know the manner in which they are allocated. I agree with the hon. senior member for Christ Church that in many instances rents in this Island are excessively high, but in this case as in most other cases, the rents have to bear some relationship to the cost of the houses involved. 4.55 p.m.

Here we are spending \$80,000 roughly to renovate these apartment projects, so that the total cost including the land, it must be assumed, must be nearly in the vicinity of \$160,000 which would mean that each unit would cost about \$20,000. The whole structure is valued at a certain amount as well as the land; so, really a \$20,000 unit at \$60 a month rental is only about 3% on the investment and that 3% cannot cover your maintenance cost, your insurance and what not. Really, they are really getting that as a gift and, therefore, Mr. Chairman, the Committee should be assured that there is no unfair discrimination or any undue preference in allocating these units to special people. While the Hon. Minister is answering that question, I would like him to answer another one. It is this. What is the total floor space of each of these apartments?

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, there is one remark which was made by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas the Hon. Minister for Communications, Works and Housing, which has caused me to rise to my feet. It was somewhat surprising for me to hear it. I remember when the matter of the renovation of the old brick building, the dilapidated building to the south of the Barbados Electric Company, was before the House that there was a long discussion during the course of which it was pointed out that the cost of repairing these maisonette flats, as the Hon. Premier then called them, was in the vicinity of \$10,000 each.

Now, it was pointed out at that time by me, Mr. Chairman, that the only person who could afford to live in those flats would be an officer of the Government, and this Government was asking His Lordship the Chief Justice, the Chief Secretary and the Prime Minister to live in those flats for the simple reason that it is a condition of service in the higher echelons of the Government Service that an Officer of the Government is expected to pay the rental fee of such flats to a sum not exceeding 5% of his salary.

I would like you to consider this very carefully. The very same point which was raised by the hon. senior member for St. Philip today was raised by me. It is that the minimum economic rent which can be charged for those flats would be \$80 and nobody would be qualified, excluding His Excellency the Governor who already occupies a duty free, rent free quarters, to pay an economic rent in accordance with their conditions of employment.

We have a considerable amount of difficulty in getting legal officers to come here to carry out the duties of the Attorney General's Department. It is within my knowledge that three of these Officers have recently been recruited and they now occupy the first three maisonettes from the east going towards the west of the flats which are now under consideration. If the Minister is saying that the Government has charged so much per month for each of these maisonettes, the Government is technically committing a breach of contract with these officers who at the time of recruitment would be guaranteed that they would have to pay rent for Government quarters of not more than 5% of their salaries. There is not one of them getting more than £1,500 a year. As a matter of fact, they are not getting that. If you consult the Civil List or the last Estimates you will see that. Even if they were getting £1,500 per annum, according to their conditions of service, they should be paying only \$30 per month and this is the point which I drew to their attention on the last occasion. It is that they were wasting a lot of money on renovating these flats which would not bring them in the actual amount they wanted. The rent which these officers ought to be paying if they work for £1,500 would be \$30 a month. That is all well and good for the barrack buildings around the Garrison because there are buildings which the Government paid next kin to nothing about 60 years ago, and they include the Savannah Club and the Savannah Lodge which were taken up by

private clubs. Practically nothing was paid for these buildings; but when you are going to spend taxpayers' money on an old brick building, the Minister would be far better advised to take that some \$80,000 and build a new lot of flats somewhere else. That is the advice which we tendered the Government when they came here for this money.

The remark which prompted me to rise to my feet was the remark that the Government was charging \$60 a month for these flats. If the Government is charging \$60 a month, then the general layout of these flats should be brought to the notice of the House. The front door is in the backyard. Having passed through the backyard, you then step down into the living room. Even the humblest Barbadian home 16' x 9' is built in such a way that he steps up into his hall, but in these flats, you step down into the living room which has a plain cemented, untiled floor. They have a barn look - and then you have the kitchen to the front and that is to the road leading to the British Union Oil Company and then you go upstairs to the other rooms. That is the layout of these flats at the Garrison. Contrast that for which you are paying \$60 a month which the house occupied by His Lordship the Chief Justice in the Pine which has gardens to the front and a beautifully balustraded staircase and servants' quarters and garage and which no doubt is a commodious dwelling which stands on at least an acre of land. Contrast that with these flats in the Garrison, the hall of which extends from where I am to where the Ministers are seated and which are without garages. You have to park your car in the open and they are spending \$80,000 in repairing this house! I say that something is wrong somewhere. I agree that you should get an economic rent for this house, but if by economic rents it means that Civil Servants far down the scale have got to pay the same rent as that which the Chief Justice pays for his house, then I do not understand what kind of socialism that is. 5.05 p.m.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know from the Minister if it was the intention of the Government to spend this \$79,000 in order to prevent the buildings from being dilapidated or if they were only repairing them for the sake of housing Government Officers. If it was for the purpose of saving the buildings, I know that the Government would have to seek rent for them. However, as to this amount of \$30,00 a month which is five per cent of the salary which the officers are receiving, as to this rental, I would rather allow these officers to occupy other buildings and rent out these flats at a high figure. I do not know whence the Government will get back this money which they are spending and I would rather, as I say, give these officers other quarters and rent out these flats to people who are able to pay higher rents; in the course of time we would get back this money. If I were in the position of the Government, I would use this money to build about ten more schools for the people's children. I would not be against repairing these buildings but if the Government is spending this money to house these officers, they should let the buildings remain, spend the money in some other direction and house the officers somewhere else.

Mr. BARROW: I would like an answer from the Minister as to the rent which is being charged for these maisonettes.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, after in all seriousness I told the Committee what the position is, does the hon. member ask me that question? I thought he was asking for an answer to something else. Surely the hon. junior member for Christ Church was not in the Opposition then and he would know that the position has been changed from the days when these buildings were in the hands of the Conservatives. Is he allowing the English weather to becloud him? (MEMBER: Answer the question.) I am answering the questions in my own way just as hon. members ask their questions in their own way. It is the policy of this Government to find houses for heads of Departments or to find quarters for these Departmental Heads. The policy is that in the case of these overseas officers who find it difficult to get houses, we have to find

houses for them and charge them a certain percentage of their salary as rental. These are the sort of people for whom priority would have to be given. That is the Government's policy.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that a Resolution for \$93,540 do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1960-61 No.7

Hon. M. E. COX: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution for the sum of \$471 to supplement the Estimates 1960-61 under two Heads which will be taken separately.

HEAD X - FIRE BRIGADE

Head X - Fire Brigade - was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, in connection with this Head, the explanatory Note sets out quite clearly that it is in consequence of the additional firemen who were engaged on the construction of the Fire Station in St. James. This amount of \$450 is required to provide these officers with suitable uniform and so on. I beg to move that Head X stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD XXIX - MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES

Head XXIX - Miscellaneous Services - was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: In respect of this Head there is an amount of \$21.00 required to meet expenditure which was caused by the visit of Mr. Cadbury to Barbados. I beg to move that Head XXIX stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I should like to ask this question: are we to expect the publication of any reports from Mr. Cadbury, or will his recommendations to the Government on economic development or even in connection with the Transport Board be made public? This Resolution should show somewhere in the note the total cost of Mr. Cadbury's visit to this country, since, I suppose, few of us will remember the original amount offhand. However, whatever it is, I think the public is entitled to some release explaining the advantages which are to be derived from Mr. Cadbury's visit.
5.15 p.m.

One assumes naturally that if a man of his eminence and attainments pays a visit to a country, it could not have been without some advantage in it; but we do not like merely assuming these things, and it is therefore sincerely to be hoped that the Government proposes in the very near future to inform the public in the most precise possible terms what were his main recommendations and what are the basic advantages which will accrue from his visit to the country.

Hon. M. E. COX: I think the House will remember, Sir, that we had a Resolution before the House setting out the amount. We were to pay an honorarium of \$4,000, and if I am not mistaken when the Resolution was before the House it included such things as hotel expenses, subsistence, car hire etc. I was under the impression that the House was well aware since the Resolution was only passed on 10th November, 1959 for \$10,040 to defray all the expenses of the gentleman in question.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I heard the hon. senior member for St. Philip raise the question of a Report. There is no Report to come forward. Mr. Cadbury says that no Reports are forwarded for public consumption, so to speak. These people come to advise the Government and not to report on anything, and that was his mission. He reported to Government on matters that he was asked to look into, but a general report for the public is not customary.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, does the Hon. Premier agree with that? That is Mr. Cadbury's version of it, but surely the Government or the Premier could state to the House that as a result of information they have got from Mr. Cadbury during his stay here, there are certain recommendations. Surely to leave the public after having spent \$10,000

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would give way, I will add that when we come to deal with the Five Year Plan such information will be given.

Mr. GODDARD: Are we to wait until the Five Year Plan? Suppose they go and make a mess of the Five Year Plan; we do not want to wait until then, we want to be able to formulate some sort of policy.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Maybe, Sir, Mr. Cadbury is quite right in his interpretation of what his duties involve. He is a specialist, and these specialists give advice and you pay high fees for it. In this case we did pay an honorarium of \$4,000 plus the cost of the subsistence here, but it not enough for the Premier to get here and say or repeat merely what Mr. Cadbury regards as what he should do or should not do. Let us say that as a specialist he feels that his advice is given to the Government and he makes no report for public consumption; certainly after having given the Government this advice, the Premier is in a position to come here and say that on the matter of transport we have profited from his advice to such and such an extent, or on any phase of the Government - proposed Development Plan, specifying what phase it is, his advice has been so-and-so, and we intend or do not intend to accept it.

Mr. Chairman, the Government has to understand that the Ministers did not pay for bringing Mr. Cadbury here out of their own pockets. Apart from paying his subsistence allowance and his honorarium and what not, the total cost of his visit here was \$10,000, and therefore at the earliest possible date after his departure the public is entitled to expect from the Government some statement demonstrating the advisability or advantages of having brought him here. That is all we are saying. The Government may have profited by his presence - we do not know - but this is not a matter which concerns them privately or their families; it concerns the public, and therefore the public at an early date is entitled to a statement in explanation of the expenditure involved, and furthermore explaining to the public the value of having brought him here. It need not be a detailed statement at this stage. As the Premier says, when it comes to the introduction of the Five Year Development programme, we can get from them in more detail a statement outlining the detailed contributions of Mr. Cadbury to the formulation of the programme itself; but certainly at this stage if they have not profited by his presence, it should not be beyond their competence to inform the public in a general way as to the justification for the expenditure involved in bringing him here. The Premier himself, Mr. Chairman, must realise that not only he, but the entire community, was interested in bringing a man of Mr. Cadbury's eminence here, especially after the work he had done in Jamaica; but I might say that at almost every stage of his visit there the Jamaican public was kept informed to some degree or other as to what he was recommending should or should not be done.
5.25 p.m.

Therefore, from every point of view, his visit to Jamaica appeared to the public to be more fairly rewarding than his visit to us here in Barbados. It is up to the Government to dispel this misconception if it is a misconception and, Sir, no better opportunity can be found

than this for the Government to make some statement in explanation of the general purpose of his visit and outlining in the most general possible terms the contribution he has made after investigating and making his report here. It is not too much to ask them to do that, and they should have expected on an occasion like this, even without being prodded by us, to come in here and make such a statement. When and if the new Five Year Plan is presented is a matter entirely for them. The public is not expected to wait until then to be given any detailed information as to the value of Mr. Cadbury's visit.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Head XXIX stand part --

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have not had any further statement from the Premier yet.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is ----

Mr. CRAWFORD: Are we to understand that no such statement is prepared? Is it that the Hon. Premier does not think the public is entitled to any such statement or is it that he is not prepared to make it yet?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Head XXIX stand part -

Mr. CRAWFORD: Nobody is suggesting that you or anybody else here can put a gun at the Premier's head and quietly force him to answer, but it is a question of a misconception of what the public is entitled to. It would be all well and good if the Hon. Premier went down Broad Street at his private bank and issued his own personal cheque to defray the expenses of Mr. Cadbury's visit to us; but since he has not done this and he expended public funds and has come here for more public money to expend on Mr. Cadbury's visit, certainly it is not asking too much to ask the Hon. Premier at this stage to let us know something more of Mr. Cadbury's visit. After all, it is of importance to the country. We are interested; and having brought Mr. Cadbury here, are we to be kept in the dark as to why he came? Are we to conclude, Mr. Chairman, that he has recommended nothing or are we to assume that the Government has not understood what he recommended, and therefore, they cannot pass it on to us? This was not the case when he visited Jamaica. Every person who could read or who could hear would be able to tell you something of what he did for Jamaica. I am sure that he, himself, would expect that whatever his figures were, whether some should be regarded as private or not, yet still by now the public would be notified as to some of the advantages to be gained from his visit. It is elementary. We did not bring him here to advise the Government on any special matter involving private investigation or in a matter which should not be within the knowledge of the public. He came here to consult with the Government on a broad development programme; it was nothing private and confidential; it was no Executive secret. It is not a matter which concerns the Minister; it is a matter which concerns the entire country and if the Minister in here cannot be in the position even to give a general statement or a summarised statement of what we are asking for, well then, he is neglecting his duties.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I will draw to Your Honour's attention what is contained in May's Parliamentary Practice at page 715 on Supplementary and Excess Grants. It is stated:

"Debate on supplementary and excess grants is restricted to the particulars contained in the estimates on which those grants are sought, and to the application of the items which compose those grants; and the debate cannot touch the policy or the expenditure sanctioned, on other heads, by the estimate on which the original grant was obtained, except so far such policy or expenditure is brought before the Committee by the items contained in the supplementary or excess estimates."

If you look back at the original estimate which was brought before the House, you will see in the Addendum that it was stated that:

"Funds are required to meet the expenses to be incurred by a visit of an Economic Adviser for the purpose of advising Government on Development Planning."

It goes on to state:

"It is proposed to pay the expert an honorarium of \$4,500 plus return passage, hotel expenses, subsistence allowance and other usual expenses. The expert is being brought to Barbados from Canada and the honorarium is calculated on the basis of American dollars."

There is absolutely nothing about a report or anything of the sort included in this Resolution or in the supplementary which is now before us. There is no reference to any report by the Economic Expert. I think I should draw that to Your Honour's attention.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Would the Hon. Minister read the quotation again?

Hon. M. E. COX: You can read it yourself. It is on page 715 of May's Parliamentary Practice.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: My view of the matter is this. The hon. senior member for St. Philip asked a question as to whether any information would be given to the House in so far as Mr. Cadbury's advice to the Government was concerned, and the Hon. Premier replied that that information would be given when the Five Year Plan is presented to the House. I understand the Hon. Premier to mean that when the next Five Year Plan is presented, the details of Mr. Cadbury's recommendation would be given along with it.
5.35 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do not see, Mr. Chairman, how you could interpret it in that way, because he said that he did not regard Mr. Cadbury's duties to involve the making of any recommendations.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Premier said that when the Government are about to implement the recommendations of Mr. Cadbury, information would be given as to the recommendations, which is nothing to do with whether a report will be laid or not. I think that the hon. member should be satisfied with that reply because he cannot force the hands of the Government to tell him what has been given to them confidentially. If the Government have decided that they will give the information when the recommendations are implemented, I think that that is the end of the matter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Head XXIX stand part

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, a quotation was read out to the Committee which I asked to have re-read because that could not apply *in toto* to the Resolution which is before this Committee.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have not made any reference to the quotation at all. I said that, in my view, the hon. member asked the question, he received a reply and he cannot force the Government to give the information. The Government may well regard that information as being confidential and private to the Cabinet. The Government will give that information to the hon. member when they implement the recommendations.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I also said that we cannot force them to do so; but the hon. member's conception of what he should do is one thing and we are entitled to our conception too.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is the Government.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Well, I must register my protest against their conception.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But you have done that already. After the reply from the Premier, the hon. member went on to state why he thought the information should be given because it was the taxpayers' money which was being spent

The hon. member has therefore registered his protest and I do not see that there is need for any further debate on the matter at all.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Am I to understand, Mr. Chairman, that freedom of debate must be stopped in this Chamber? I submit that there should be no restriction to my conception of the expenditure or to the nature of my protest against his conception of it. The hon. member feels that he is entitled to give a statement, and only God knows when, we may get the Five Year Plan. Are we to wait indefinitely for this information or until we get a reply from him? The position is that none of us would expect the hon. member to come in here and outline in detail every single matter on which Mr. Cadbury had made recommendations to the Government, or items to which attention will be paid in the Five Year Plan; I submit that it would certainly do no harm but rather contribute to any prestige which the Minister may hope to enjoy as far as the efficient execution of his duties is concerned, if, on this occasion, he could say to the public that Mr. Cadbury has been here, his services have been of use to us, he has recommended so-and-so and these recommendations of his will be detailed at the proper time. That is all. But to come here and merely say: "We will give you a Five Year Plan", the Hon. Minister has opened himself to the charge that he does not know what Mr. Cadbury has recommended.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I regret that you have not paid the attention which is deserving to the quotation which I made just now. I do not think it is fair to brush aside my quotation, which gives the position of Parliament, as you have done.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The Hon. Minister is censuring the Chair and, Mr. Chairman, you would not have allowed me to do it.

Hon. M. E. COX: I have drawn to your attention, Mr. Chairman, a Rule which exists.

Mr. CRAWFORD: You said that your remarks were based on the quotation.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am asking the Chairman to rule on the quotation which I have cited.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. member is telling you what to do.

Hon. M. E. COX: When a point of order is raised and it is charged that

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There are two hon. members on the floor. Will both of them take their seats? (*Hon. members took their seats.*) The Hon. Leader of the House has drawn my attention to a Rule and I did not intend him to infer that I was brushing it aside. There was no need for it. The hon. senior member for St. Philip asked a question, the reply was given and I think it was folly that the hon. member should try to force the hands of the Government. The hon. member has done his duty and at this stage I have ruled that the matter is over. The hon. member has asked his question, he has received a reply, he has registered his protest or disapproval of the matter and there is nothing further to be done in the matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, we will register further protest by voting against the Resolution which is before the Committee.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is what the hon. member can do.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If the Government makes it appear that they are so responsible that when the Resolution came before this Committee for paying the expenses of Mr. Cadbury they did not discharge their responsibilities, then the Committee should discharge theirs. But, Mr. Chairman, I resent your remarks that because I do not agree with their conception of the matter, my attitude was indicative of folly. It is just as much folly for them to adopt their attitude as it

is for me to adopt mine, from different points of view. They make their statements, we make ours and if that is their attitude we will vote against the Resolution. That is all.

The question that Head XXIX stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:-

AYES: Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS; Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. L. St. A. THORNE, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. T. W. MILLER, Mr. SMITH and Mr. CORBIN - 7.

NOES: Mr. GODDARD, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. TALMA and Mr. TUDOR - 4.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I now beg to move that a Resolution for the sum of \$471 do now pass.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. L. St. A. THORNE in each case, the Resolutions passed in Committee were read a first and second time and agreed to.

5.45 p.m.

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (No. 8) ORDER, 1960.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 8) Order, 1960.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This Order seeks to establish and make preparation to create officers for the Town Planning Office. I think it is well known that this gentleman has been operating here for some time and it is seen fit to establish the office by the creation of other posts.

These posts, Mr. Speaker, are as follows:- one Assistant Town and Country Planning Officer at a salary of \$5,760 to \$7,200; two Planning Assistants at \$1,632 to \$4,392; one Senior Inspector at \$3,000 to \$4,392; four Inspectors at \$1,632 to \$3,360; one Long Grade Clerk at \$960 to \$2,400 and one Stenographer at \$1,020 to \$1,440 or \$1,200 to \$2,016; that depends on the grade of stenographer; and a Messenger at \$768 to \$1,392.

The post of Town and Country Planning Officer is at present held by an Officer on contract, and steps will be taken in due course to have that post established.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, it does seem as if the Government is extremely anxious in extending this Department. We are going to add to the staff almost another 12 officials at a total cost of nearly \$40,000 a year including the salary of the Town and Country Planning Officer himself. While we are in agreement with the policy of Town and Country planning, we are still rather sceptical as to the necessity for this ambitious extension at one time at this stage. It does not seem to us, Mr. Speaker, that this Department needs all of this extension so quickly. I myself personally appreciate the importance of some sort of control over every stage of our development programme providing of course it is not abused; but certainly, Sir, the expenditure in this Resolution appears to be trotting much too far too fast.

The salary of the Town and Country Planning Officer is between \$9,000 and \$10,000 a year and you are going

to give him an Assistant at \$7,200 a year or \$600 a month, then two Planning Assistants going from \$1,632 to \$4,392, a Senior Inspector, four Inspectors, a Long Grade Clerk, a Stenographer and so on, and this is for a Department, Mr. Speaker, which the Government has repudiated. As a matter of fact, since the Government itself has refused publicly and in the most flagrant manner to accept the advice of the Town and Country Planning Officer where they were affected, one is surprised that they have not abolished the Department entirely. It is difficult to reconcile the Government's position with regard to this Department. In the only instance in which the Government was involved with the declared policy of the Town and Country Planning Officer, the Government repudiated him completely. They refused to do what he said in the case of the Bay Street Fish Market. In so far as they were concerned, he did not exist; the country need not have had the Town and Country Planning Officer at all, because so far as they were concerned, they were above and beyond his control.

In spite of that, Mr. Speaker, they are now calling upon us to expand the Department so abnormally so fast. It appears, therefore, that all we are doing is setting up a Town and Country Planning Department which the Government will ignore in so far as its own programmes are concerned, but which the public will have to maintain and obey whenever they are affected.

5.55 p.m.

Therefore, we are justified in saying, is it worthwhile to spend all this money on a Department which the Government is going to ignore? If the Bay Street fish market is to be proceeded with, despite the policy of the Town and Country Planning Officer, then why not close the Department down from the Government's point of view? As a matter of fact, it was seen from the Government's attitude in connection with this matter that in the only instance which the Government clashed with the Town and Country Planning Officer, there was no need for the Department at all. In spite of that, you are going to extend the Department and its staff in the manner as put before us in this Resolution.

Sir, the presentation of the Resolution is another example of the half-baked manner in which Government Business is conducted in this House. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, if a Department which at present only has one official and a few clerks needs this tremendous expansion, the Introducer of this Resolution should have come here prepared to inform the House as to the manner in which the duties of the Department have been extended to warrant this increase.

Up to now, the Department has not got control over the entire island. The Resolution says that it is proposed that planning control should gradually be extended over the entire island; in other words, when it is extended all over the island we would need two or three times this staff. If that be the case, it must be physically impossible for the staff to cope with what it has to do. I do not think it is too much to ask Ministers on presenting important matters like this to the House to come prepared to give the public some more basic information with reference to the matters which they are presenting. It is unfair and not good enough, Mr. Speaker, to come in here and read a Resolution and its Addendum and then sit. The Minister must have a file. (A VOICE: I would like to know if he has to read what is in the file to you.) The hon. member, unfortunately for him, has never been in another House but this. He has never been in a House constituted differently from this, so unfortunately he has no means of knowing how these things are done and that makes him to be really deserving of our sympathy. For his information, may we tell him, Mr. Speaker, that not in this House in the past, or in no other House or Legislature, it is customary for a Minister to read the Addendum of a Resolution and then sit. It does not even happen in the Other Place.

There must be, Mr. Speaker, important and far-reaching reasons which compel the Government to this enormous extension in one flash, so to speak. You do not extend the staff of a Department to twelve times its strength in a few

months except for extraordinarily good reasons. And what are the reasons? No reasons are given at all. You have a Department with one Officer and a few Clerks and you are now multiplying that by twelve times and for no reason at all, and somebody has the impudence to suggest that this is the manner in which these things should be gone about. If this forum is to justify its existence, it is incumbent upon us, members of the Opposition, to be the sort of purveyors of information of the sort we are seeking to get for the public. If that is not to be the case, well then, let us abolish the democratic processes and let us substitute a rank and naked dictatorship. Let the blind lead the blind, and let the public understand in the future that the election of a majority Party to conduct the affairs of the country implies absolute subjection of the country to the whims and caprices of that Party and that no attempt, and there should be no expectancy of information being given because it would not be forthcoming. (A VOICE: What would it be, if there is a coalition Government?) With regard to a Coalition, in my time there has been only one Coalition and that is between that Party and the Conservatives. (A VOICE: What happened when your Party was in the Government? That was the most unusual Coalition. It was in the sense that after we had the election here ---

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member making Asides part of his speech? Do not let Asides make you stray away from your speech and from the Resolution before us.

Mr. CRAWFORD: You are quite right, Your Honour. I really should not take notice of them but the point is that sometimes we have to make certain things perfectly clear so that the public can understand.

6.05 p.m.

As I was saying, Sir, if people believe that they are doing the Opposition anything when they make this spectacle of themselves, they are living in a fool's paradise. They are only making themselves the laughing-stock of the West Indies; they are only holding themselves up to ridicule; they are being laughed at, not we. When West Indians say that Barbados has fallen from its former high estate, they are not talking about the Opposition. When they compare the standard of debate in Jamaica and in Trinidad with the standard of presentation of matters in Barbados, they are not talking about the Opposition. (A MEMBER: The debate.) You cannot debate with them (Mr. SPEAKER: You can debate against them.) What you should debate is the Resolution. A debate means that the Government has something to say; it is not just a question of reading off what a Permanent Secretary has written. I am saying that, in what is going on now, we stand to lose nothing because the Opposition cannot present a reasoned or logical conclusion to a statement when there is nothing to which to reply.

In the old days when you had a proper presentation of the Government's position, then the Opposition could reply, and could be expected to reply to it; but if you are going to come in here and just be given a printed document which you may have read before and then the Minister reads the same thing and sits down, we need not come in here at all. It is only a waste of time to do so. That is not our conception of Parliament. If you pick up the Hansard of the British House of Commons or the Hansard of any other Legislature in the West Indies even like Montserrat or Bequia, you will find that things are not being done here in the manner in which they are done elsewhere. As a matter of fact, in some cases it is customary to find that the Government has more to say than the Opposition, because the Government has said so much and has buttressed its case so properly and completely that there is nothing left for the Opposition to say. You cannot ask for information because you have been given all the information which you require.

If you want any illustration of what I mean, you may compare the manner in which the Minister of Education attempts to present the Resolutions and Bills which come under his portfolio to the House, and the manner in which it is done by the others. It may be that that is not a fair comparison for obvious reasons, but certainly the youngest Minister might give some lesson to the older Ministers as to the manner in which they should conduct their business in the House.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: In reply to the last speaker, I would say that I am not a schoolmaster but I should just like to attempt to enlighten hon. members on the urgent necessity for these posts. I think that the last hon. member who spoke is labouring under a misapprehension. When he says that we are increasing the staff to this number of people, I think he mentioned as many as ten, what has happened is that at the present moment this Department has a skeleton staff which really and truly cannot be expected to cope with all of the duties - and onerous they are - and the work which devolves upon them. At present the Town and Country Planning Officer is assisted by two persons who are not established but, nevertheless, they are there and we have a Long Grade Clerk; therefore we are establishing some posts and bringing in others. We are establishing the posts of Two Planning Assistants as well as the posts of Inspectors.

Now, Sir, there is no Officer of the Government who is as hard-pressed, I would say, as the Town and Country Planning Officer. We have only passed an Interim Control Act, but nevertheless there are certain planning requirements which flow from it and which fall upon this Officer; and the administrative processes as a result of these requirements are continuing, and indeed are growing. This Officer finds himself inundated with applications in respect of all kinds of development and we just have to look around and see things for ourselves. Every kind of development, once it entails the use of land, has to come before this Officer and there are a tremendous number of applications which he has to go through, besides having to attend to his multifarious duties. He is expected to attend meetings of Committees, he is expected to meet the Minister and the various Secretaries in the Ministries. In addition to all that, he is expected to meet local bodies and have consultations with them; therefore, there are these various organisations in this island which this Officer has to meet. 6.15 p.m.

We have recently extended the Order to include as far down as St. Lucy to the North so that applications are now flowing from that side of the island. He is planning now in connection with the Deep Water Harbour, its completion and the traffic in that area, and members will know that as soon as he came here he undertook a traffic survey, and is studying the facts which have issued from that survey. There are various other things such as the bus terminus and the markets, as well as the Soil Conservation Resettlement Scheme. Those are only a few of the matters with which the Officer personally has to deal, and a bare statement of them will convey to members' minds the deluge of work that must descend on this officer's shoulders.

Besides that, Mr. Speaker, the legislation that has been passed is simply Interim Legislation, so that we are now working on a comprehensive Town and Country Planning Act. When the House passed it we made it clear that it was only for three years; a permanent Act has to come before this House and he has to advise us on that Act; so he has to work in connection with Town and Country Planning as a whole and produce a proper plan for the whole island. You cannot therefore expect this officer to really get down to the basic job of Town and Country Planning and at the same time deal with these multifarious details. For instance, he does not have building inspectors or inspectors at all, and he personally has to go around when applications are made and look at properties and so on. That is too much to expect; the pressure is terrific and we are asking for these five inspectors; one for the North, one for the South and three for the City area as defined in the Local Government Act.

The duties of these inspectors, Sir, are as follows and I have set them out for the benefit of the House; they will receive the applications, inspect locations and report back to the Officer; they will attend meetings of the Local Government Authority and report on the locations they have inspected; they will inspect works in progress of any sort, building and other works, check that these works are being carried out in accordance with the conditions granted or allowed; they must have a systematic periodic inspection of the entire area to see that they are carried out by law, physical planning survey and also building legislation

which we are now revamping in order to bring more building development in line with modern development and with what obtains in other parts of the world. We are now revamping our legislation and these people will have that under them.

I do not think, Sir, that I need say more to convince the House that there is urgent necessity for these posts. Everybody admits that Town and Country Planning is long overdue. Some control has long been needed in Barbados; we have lagged far behind and it is useless to pass legislation and not be able to carry it out quickly. Too many applications are there which cannot be gone into because of the difficulty of not having the staff. So far as the Assistant is concerned, I need hardly say to the House again that an office of this importance should have an Assistant, and a technical assistant, a man who is trained so that if anything happens to that officer he will be there. We have a first-class officer here now and we are lucky to have got him. I am told that officers of that calibre in England in a recent revision receive almost twice the amount of money he is getting, but we know that due to circumstances we got him here, but you do not pick up those officers very easily. Nevertheless he is on contract and when that ends we do not know what is going to happen; so therefore we must have an Assistant so that there will be no hiatus; he will be there to follow on and will know what planning is, because he will take part in the actual planning and you will have some continuity; otherwise there will be chaos. If the officer goes from there, we must have an Assistant who knows what planning is; so we must have an Assistant at an early stage to practise in an office of such fundamental importance.

As regards the other posts, Sir, we have two Assistants who are being trained; one is being trained already. The Institute of Town and Country Planning has accepted him, and we hope, Sir, that he will take the exams and qualify in England himself as a Town Planner. It is not easy to pick up Town Planning Officers in this area, and if you know what you have to pay in Trinidad and British Guiana, members will see that we have to be very careful and plan very carefully in this Department; otherwise in future there will be some difficulty. I do not know that I need say any more and I hope the House has been considerably enlightened and this Resolution will pass.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the Minister did not speak before the hon. senior member for St. Philip, because the information he has given us is what we really needed on the introduction of this Resolution. I knew from experience other than in the House that this officer really is tremendously hard-worked. He has undertaken the drafting of all the Regulations because it is a new Department to us entirely.

When we in this House years ago talked about a Planning Officer for the island, few of us thought that it would have developed into this size. We were thinking of controlling building on the roads, because many developers have put their houses, warehouses and even garages right bang on the road leaving no space for people to walk, and that is really what brought things to a head; but upon the remarks of the Minister you can quite see that this Department is developing very rapidly. The hon. member mentioned something just now about this Department even developing into a building planning department. I can quite foresee that the type of buildings that will be projected will have to be submitted to this Planning Officer or his Assistant with the types of material for building. 6.25 p.m.

That is done in every other country but Barbados.

When he said that we will be developing or extending our building regulations, he may as well say that we will have to rewrite our building regulations because there are no such regulations existing in Barbados today. You can put up just what you like for a building, out of any kind of material and regardless of what the public may say, particularly if it is a place of public entertainment. Not so long ago, theatres were put up here and to the amazement of the public some were put up out of material the strength

of which constituted a danger to the public. What happened? A storm blew down one. Fortunately, nobody was in it at the time. There was no one to whom you had to go; there was no authority that could tell you that you have to do this or that. That exists today. So when the Minister says that building regulations are to be the next step, I welcome that statement because we have been allowed to do just what we like too long and a lot of correction will have to take place now. Of course, that would be hard on some of us and I may say that some of the regulations do cut very harshly on some of the small land owners. They are expected to step back their buildings to an extent which to our way of thinking is too far from the road because of the smallness of their land area. Too much is expected to be given up to the road and we are not told to what use that is given. The Town and Country Planning Officer has promised a Development Plan and that the public would know what they have in mind. I know that he has all of that in an Order, but it does not convey to us in any real way what contribution we must be expected to play in widening those roads and for what uses the giving up of this land to the front would be put. There are such roads as St. Matthias Road which connects two main roads. He says that may eventually be needed for a B2 road. Let the public know what a B2 road is meant for and what they have in mind whether it is going to lead to a development or from an industrial area.

When we first talked of a Planning Officer, what we had in mind then was the widening of roads, the cutting down of corners and compelling the developers of land to step back from the roads. But the Town and Country Planning Officer has gone further than that. We are planning industrial sites as well. He is saying that this area must be free and earmarked for industrial development and that such and such an area must be allowed to remain for residential areas; therefore, no industries are allowed to move into that area. I know that he has gone as far as to say that certain minor industries must not be extended on the spot where they are now because of the noise, hazard maybe to schools, clubs, and things of that sort.

We will have these little encroachments on our way of life but we must look to the future and if they are for making a better Barbados, we must put up with some of these things that are happening now.

The Town and Country Planning Officer, as I know, has to undertake the entire duties of Inspector as well as Planner and that is an impossible task. Many a time he will go on land and find that a house is being constructed without any application at all, and I may say now that he is finding the greatest opposition to his authority not from the big developer of land because the big developer would have too much to lose. It is from the small developer who thinks he can add on to his building, without any danger to anyone, an extra room or a gallery and by which addition may carry his house further on to the street. I must say this for the Town and Country Planning Officer. Where his attention has been brought to the difficulty confronting some small holders of land, he has tried to show them other means of getting around his Order, in other words, he has helped them in making other arrangements.

I agree with the Minister in his saying that we are fortunate in having an officer of this calibre in Barbados. I am no expert but I have been told so by one of the top notch architects of Trinidad. He has seen some of his work and some of his planning and methods and he told me that by the way the Planning Officer has gone about his business you can see that even if he is not in his office, he has so trained the assistants under him that they know what to expect and what answers to give. Because of that, I am agreeing to this Resolution. As the Hon. Minister has said, it is of no use our having this Officer here unless we can have a second man along with him. This is continuous work. It will always live in Barbados and it will grow. I do hope to see the time come when we will be so developed in our Local Government that this Department will form a very vital department of Local Government. Either it should be transferred or so integrated into Local Government that the functions which are now being undertaken in this De-

partment will be part of Local Government. Applications will be made to him directly and they will have all the Officers to deal with all development and buildings.

Sir, it is common today to see business houses springing up all around Bridgetown and throughout the island, and I do not think that there is a single regulation saying that you must have so many public toilets in that business. We are lacking in that. Buildings are allowed to be put up for catering to the public without any provision being made for garaging or parking. Those are things which today in a big country are undertaken by the Planning Officer. This Officer will look at your plans and say that it is a lovely plan. He will say that you are going to have so many square feet of office space but then he will ask you where are the provisions that you have made for sanitary conveniences for your office staff; where are the public conveniences for the people who will be coming daily to your building and who will require sanitary conveniences. He will also ask you, where are your employees going to put their bicycles, far less their motor cars. Those are things which we have to be thinking of today, and buildings which will go up in the future will have to pay strict attention to that sort of planning. As I have said, we have been allowed to do just as we like for too long and there is going to be a certain amount of undoing; but the longer we delay, the greater the burden will be on the people in Barbados.

I have always welcomed the establishment of a proper Town and Country Planning Department. I do not wish to see one which is so stereotyped and with so much power that it is going to cut across the customs of some of our people and that is why it is necessary to have a consultative body of Barbadians, such as Local Government Councils, to try and get over to the Officer in charge what are the engrained customs in Barbados and how some of the planning from big countries is unnecessary in a small island like Barbados.

6.35 p.m.

But we also want to get some of the experience of the new top people from overseas. It is a matter of give and take although it cuts both ways. These Inspectors will have to be another expense and responsibility which we have not seen today. They will have to be travelling Inspectors; they will have to be furnished with a car or be allowed to buy a car, and travelling allowance will have to be given to them. It is much cheaper to save a person from doing wrong than to compel him to pull down a structure after he has put up that structure through ignorance or otherwise. We have not yet had an example of that, but unless the public realises the authority of this Town and Country Planning Officer - he will compel somebody to pull down a building at that person's expense and set back that building according to his specifications. The public will also have to realise that when they are buying property, they may have in mind buying some property with a view to establishing something other than what was being undertaken in a particular building and they should be able to get something from this officer in secrecy, because people do not want the public to know what they intend to do, if he will permit business of a certain type before they actually close the deal.

It is important that we should have an officer who will not relate to other parties what is the intention of certain business people or of private individuals. I welcome the development of this office; few of us envisaged that that it would have cost so much, but it is of no use going halfway. If people are working on proper building plans, they will have to submit them to this office and the Inspector will have to see that these plans are carried out. There are cases in which, when people draw their plans and they ask to whom they must submit such plans, they are amazed at the lack of planning in Barbados.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, the last hon. member who spoke said in his early remarks that if the Minister had spoken before the hon. senior member for St. Philip there might have been some difference in this debate. I myself was listening to the hon. senior member for

St. Philip and I am convinced that whether the Minister had spoken before or after the hon. member, it would have made little difference to the kind of remarks which he was making.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. May I suggest to the hon. member that he cease to regard this House as a place for exercising his imagination?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Mr. CRAWFORD: All my remarks, Mr. Speaker, were based on the fact that there was no information on the introduction of Government measures.

Mr. STRAUGHN: I will repeat a few of his remarks and they will show that the hon. member could not have meant just that. He certainly wanted to get on the record the favourite hobby-horse which he has been riding for some time now, that the Government actually has refused to accept the advice of this Planning Officer. He did not seem to see that, indirectly, he was giving credit to the Government because he said that there was the only occasion on which the Government had to clash with this Officer. Indirectly that must be a credit to the Government.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The context in which I made that remark was this: It is peculiar that the Government is planning to extend this particular Department, when, on the only occasion that it was involved with the Planning Officer, it repudiated his decision.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, how does the hon. member know that this was the first occasion on which the Government was involved with this Officer? Obviously there must have been more times than that. If he says that the Officer has rejected applications and the people concerned appealed to the Government - obviously there was a plan which the Government had themselves gone into before the Officer came into existence. If the Government says "We will carry out this plan before the Officer comes into office" what is wrong with that?

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. The Officer laid down his policy with regard to a position for which the Government already had a plan. Is the hon. member suggesting that there were no other occasions in which private individuals had plans which were changed?

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member says that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is twisting what has been said, he can speak in explanation of that; but I will not allow the hon. member to put the question to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph as to what he meant by this, that or the other. In that case, that will lead to another kind of altercation.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. member said that I must know of other cases in which the Government accepted appeals from people; well, I know of one.

Mr. STRAUGHN: I hope the one of which he knows was the one at Pegwell, Christ Church.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I hope the hon. member does not give the impression that I was involved. *(Laughter)*.

Mr. STRAUGHN: I have never attempted to say so. If the hon. member is showing the interest in the Department which he pretends to be showing, he would have got that information at any rate.
7.45 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I object to his suggestion that I pretend to be a Minister of a Department. I am here to question anything that comes before the House. I am not pretending anything. Does he know anything about the Pegwell case. He had better find out.

Mr. STRAUGHN: The hon. member also tried to discredit the Government by saying that the measure of

control would be greatly extended, and what is the Government doing, extending the Department twelve times the size. I am sure that neither the Introducer of the Resolution nor anybody on the Government side said that these people are going to be appointed tomorrow. Obviously all this Resolution is for is to establish the Department, and when it is found that the officers with the extension of the work of the Department are needed, that would be the time when you would really employ them; so when he says you are extending the Department twelve times the size, all he is trying to do is to discredit the Government for something that the whole House must know and realise is essential and an example of good planning.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I really had not intended to speak, but just as the hon. member claims that he was moved by the speech of the hon. senior member for St. Philip, I too am moved by the speech which he made, if he may call it a speech. I was reminded as I listened to him of a remark of the late Lord Balfour when giving advice to the most junior member of the House of Commons; he said "Speak often, speak at length and you will soon enjoy that contempt for your audience which only a bore commands." The hon. member of course does not speak often, but for what he says he speaks at great length, and I was rather interested to hear from his lips that most spirited defence of the Government in which I understand he anticipated playing a considerable part. He has given us a few things to go on; he has chosen to speak on something of which he is not very familiar.

It should occasion no surprise to anyone to find that the staff of this Department is increasing, and there were some of us who knew that long before the Minister for Communications, Works and Housing gave us his full explanation. What worries us, however, is this: with the increased work which necessarily falls upon the Town and Country Planning Officer and by the fact that having more subordinate staff he will be able to give more of his attention to major projects, can we expect to see from him a more satisfactory approach to the problems which come before him than we have seen in the past? Now, Sir, I do not think too much need be made of the fact that some people have to appeal over his head to the Cabinet. When they do so they do so obeying the law of the land. Any land which was bought before the Ordinance came into effect allows the purchasers and owners to appeal to them in cases of dispute; for anything bought after, appeals lie with the Courts. What worries me is this, Sir! In the case mentioned by the hon. member just now, the Pegwell case, with which the hon. senior member for St. Philip is entirely unconnected, the person involved who appealed to the Cabinet over the head of the Town and Country Planning Officer happens, I think, to be a good friend of several members of this House, a man very much appreciated, and I believe that members on the other side think highly of him. They have placed him, I believe, in a most responsible position; they have given him membership on one of their most important Statutory Boards, and I do not think - I must not be misunderstood on this point - that it is for any of those reasons that he won his appeal. I think he won his appeal on genuine grounds; I really do think so; and in a case which was well presented. What worries me is this:

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order, there is just one point; the hon. member said that this gentleman appealed over the head of the Town and Country Planning Officer.

Mr. TUDOR: I mean from the decision of the Town and Country Planning Officer.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The Town and Country Planning Officer is very sympathetic and as the member said, it is quite genuine.

Mr. TUDOR: I am familiar with the case, Mr. Speaker. What I wonder is whether a person not so well placed and not so highly favoured as the gentleman with perhaps a similar problem can expect that if he had to appeal

from a decision of the Town and Country Planning Officer he would meet with the same sort of treatment. That is all that worries me.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order, I cannot reconcile the two statements made by the hon. member. On the one hand he said there was merit, and on the other hand he said this man was highly placed and highly favoured.

Mr. TUDOR: Just let me explain. I said he was highly favoured, and by that I mean he was a man of prominence. What I am trying to emphasise is this: there are hundreds of people who have cases currently being considered by the Town and Country Planning Officer who may have in due course to appeal against his decision, and I would like to know that the Cabinet will consider each and everyone of these cases on its merits with the same care and attention which was evidently given to this case. As I said, I have nothing at all against this decision or against the manner in which it was arrived at, because it was a case well put up and the results were as to be expected; but if the work of the Town and Country Planning Office is to be expanded as we now fore-shadow, there has got to be a minute sifting of all these cases on their merits, and one possible justification for giving him the increase of staff for which he now calls is that more minute and detailed attention should be given to these cases as they come up.

It will take some time, Mr. Speaker, before the entire population of this island gets accustomed to the idea of Town and Country Planning; and it is good, it has much to recommend it, and when it has caught on, it will do a lot of the development of this island. Until that time comes, there will be numbers of cases of hardship which have to be very carefully gone into, and what most people complain about nowadays is that there seems to be a certain amount of harshness and general inflexibility on the part of the Town and Country Planning Officer in considering individual cases; I mean where persons who want to build or further develop their properties are asked to move back in so many feet from the middle of the roadway. 6.55 p.m.

Now, there are some people who are well able to make that kind of sacrifice without depreciating their properties and there are others who cannot. There has to be, therefore, some overall scheme which enables a person on whom it will be a real hardship to comply with the law to do so at the same time without worsening of his own position.

There is one other point which I would like to make.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Did I understand the hon. member correctly? Did he say that there appears to be a certain amount of harshness and inflexibility on the part of the Officer in reviewing an individual's case? I want to know if that is the point he said because certainly there is some difficulty about that.

Mr. TUDOR: Yes, that is the case in some individual's case.

One last point, Mr. Speaker, it is not often that we get opportunity to debate Town and Country Planning and I do believe that we shall probably have greater opportunity when the full legislation is brought to this House, if not to this, to another House, for its consideration.

However, I have noticed that there has been considerable criticism about the siting of the Public Market in Bay Street. Now, Sir, some months ago when that matter was discussed in this House, I very much wanted to make my contribution to the debate but it was felt at the time that since some members of my own family were involved in the transaction, inasmuch as Government was purchasing some of the site from them, two of my colleagues advised me against so doing and told me that what I may say then

may be misinterpreted, and so I should not say anything. I wished to say then that I saw no wisdom of placing the Fish Market there and if by my saying that then, Government had cancelled the sale, it would be a matter for them and the people from whom they were buying it.

Mr. Speaker, I still think that it is not too late for alternative arrangements to be made for perhaps the better, and more use to be made of those properties which Government has bought there. They can be used for the betterment of the area more so than for the erection of a Fish Market.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Is the hon. member reflecting on a vote of the House? Can he reflect on a vote of this House?

Mr. SPEAKER: I will answer that another time.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It being now 7.00 p.m. o'clock, this sitting now stands suspended until 7.45 p.m. o'clock. 7.00 p.m.

On reassembling.

Hon. M. E. COX: I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention that there is no quorum and I ask that the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Mr. SPEAKER: At the suspension, the hon. senior member for St. Lucy was addressing the Chair.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, at the moment of suspension the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries had got up to wonder whether I am criticising a vote of the House. I wish to say that I have no such intention. I think, Sir, that everybody realises the motives which prompted the Government on that occasion to formulate that policy for the Fish Market there although a lot of people did not agree with it.

The point which I was going to make was based on public criticism now. I was saying that it is not now too late for a rearrangement of Government plans. I feel that there is ample room for reconsideration, not by this House, but by Government, as to the use they can make of that spot. I repeat, I well understand the motives which prompted the Government to make the decision for putting a Fish Market there. However, since there is public agitation now against its erection there, perhaps, it is not too late for some reconsideration to be given to the matter.

Mr. Speaker, to sum up what I have been saying, it is that the public as a whole would like to understand more of the purpose and the workings of the Town and Country Planning Department and I think that one fair criticism which should be made is that not sufficient information has been given. I suspect that half of the worry and concern which people feel when they have their problems with this particular Department is because they do not understand fully what it is all about. I imagine that one benefit which Government can convey to the public would be to disseminate something of the workings of that Department. If that were done, people would understand more clearly what was asked of them and their co-operation which is a bit hesitant at this moment would be had.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I have spoken already but I ask leave of the House, in view of certain remarks made by the hon. member who has just sat down, to speak again.

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

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. Lucy a little earlier in his speech made certain comments about an appeal by someone. He did not

call any names but he made various innuendoes which have prompted me to rise to my feet. In his statement, he said that the person to whom he was making reference was high up. These were the words he used. He said that the gentleman is high up and well known to the Government and favoured by the Government and he hoped that people in a less favourable position would be favourably considered. I cannot allow this remark to be passed lightly, because these appeals come to me first before they go to the Governor-in-Executive Committee. I do not intend to let that pass lightly simply because the hon. member did not call names.

7.50 p.m.

I would like to tell the House this, that the day in which I do something which is unfair and lacking in integrity I will go out of public life. I would like to make that quite clear to the hon. member. I have only risen to my feet because these things can do untold harm. The hon. member is not alone in making, not innuendoes, but direct charges; and what is worse, he is charging dishonesty on the part of the Government. Of course, it is very difficult to get direct evidence in Barbados.

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of order. I can well understand how the Minister could put an interpretation of what I said different from what I intended, but I certainly meant no accusation of dishonesty. I expressed the hope that cases of certain merit and which had such good ground to recommend them, would receive equally beneficent treatment. That is the point I was making.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The very fact that the hon. member was forced to say that showed what was occupying his mind and he used the words "highly favoured" and "favourably placed."

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member explained what he meant by the words "highly favoured". He intended to convey the idea of prominent people. He has substituted the word "favoured" for "prominent".

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, at one time I interrupted him on a point of order and he said that this person was highly placed, but when he was on the point of finishing his speech, he ended up by saying that he hoped that people lower down in the community, or people in less favourable circumstances would be considered likewise.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that at the time when the hon. member rose he did convey the impression that he meant favoured people.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Lower down he made that comparison and I asked leave to be allowed to speak again. That is when he made the comparison which I felt would convey to some person's mind that somebody was being favourably treated because of some position which he had in this community. I am going to say straight that the particular person I know to whom the hon. member is referring - I will not call any name - is not a friend of mine. I do not consider that he is any more highly placed in the community than anybody else.

Mr. TUDOR: Again, there was nothing which I said which could possibly make the Minister labour this point. There is no need for him to labour this particular point. All I said was that the particular person was highly favoured and I explained that I meant that he was a prominent person in public; I explained that he was a member of one of the most important Statutory Boards in this community. I ended up by saying that I hope that people lower down who were not so well known and who had cases of equal merit, will be similarly treated.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member has omitted one of the most important things he said during the course of his speech. While he was making the point on which he is now, he said that so much did we think of this individual that we had placed him on the most important Board we had in this island.

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of order. I am sorry to interrupt the Minister. I did say that to emphasize the public position which the particular gentleman holds.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is denying what is being imputed to him and that is the least I can say of it. Whenever the hon. member rises he denies it and it goes on record.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I accept the hon. member's denial and that he did not mean to imply anything by what he said, but I still think that as Minister directly concerned I should say this: I hope that nobody who was listening to the hon. member and nobody in this House would feel that in these cases of appeal - the hon. member used the words "appeal above the head of the Country Planning Officer." But when an appeal is made to the Minister he goes into the case and there is no compromise to be arrived at. These cases have a very important bearing on Town and Country Planning in this island, because if the public feel that one person is treated differently from another, the whole process of Town and Country Planning will break down. I have refused cases of appeals from people very near to me. I have said: "I do not care how much it hurts you, but if once we treat somebody in this way, we have to treat everybody in the same way."

Wherever it appears that you treat "A" differently from "B", or if one law is made for the rich and another for the poor, the whole process of Town and Country Planning will break down. I want to make that perfectly clear. I am accepting what the hon. member has said. I want to be more explicit and I would say that this particular case was not a straightforward one. The gentleman had bought this land even before the Town and Country Planning Officer came here and it would have meant considerable financial loss; in other places, the Government would have had to refund some of this money. The hon. member himself said that there was some merit in the appeal.

8.00 p.m.

These innuendoes may have damaging effects, and it is not because of what the hon. member might impute or might not have intended to impute that I stand now to say what I say. It is because of the effect it may have on the whole course of planning legislation that I get up and say so. He is no friend of mine. We have had cases of people who are close to the Government, and we have had to turn down their appeals. On the other hand, we have had a case of a person who was poor and living in a certain housing area, and the Government considered the case and struck a compromise; so I want hon. members to understand that all these cases are judged on their merits and not according to the individual, whoever he may be.

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

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (No. 9) ORDER, 1960.

Mr. Speaker, Order No. 3 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 9) Order, 1960."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Order is to provide for additional staff for the Enmore Health Centre, the St. Philip Health Centre and the Public Assistance Board.

With regard to the additional staff for the Enmore Health Centre, these are one post of female clerk at \$960 to \$2,016 and one post of Laboratory Assistant at a salary of \$1,632 to \$2,400.

The figures quoted here will show that these laboratory tests are increasing practically weekly. In 1957 the number of tests carried out were 20,361, and in 1959 there were 39,555. I do not know what the figures are for this year, but I do know that the figures are steadily increasing and this increased staff is to meet the increased demand.

In the case of the St. Philip Health Centre, that has been functioning for a very short time. The work there is also increasing, and they are going farther afield at the Centre. These nurses have to carry out the examination of patients, and they are also involved in giving lectures and visiting people. This additional post of Junior Health Nurse is therefore sought.

In the case of the Public Assistance Board, as is set out here, it was intended that this Board should function in the same office as that occupied by the Local Government Commissioner. After that decision was reached, Sir, and the place visited, it was found impossible for the two staffs to occupy one office, and the Public Assistance Board is now removed to another place, so that this post of Messenger is to serve in that office. I think this Messenger is there carrying on in an acting capacity, and it is now sought to make the office permanent and pensionable.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (No. 10) ORDER, 1960.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 4 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 10) Order, 1960."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Order is to make provision for the setting up of an Economic Planning Unit. Government has had advice from two or three sources within the last two years relative to the setting up of this Unit. We were advised by an Economist who was attached to the Federal Government, Mr. Straw, who came here, I think, last year and spent a few days with us and came to the conclusion that we should have a planning unit set up. I think that hon. members can very well understand that it is because we are spending a lot more money than we used to, we are having more offices and more development work, and all this calls for greater expenditure of money, and from time to time it is necessary that we have advice along the economic line.

Subsequently to Mr. Straw, as you will know, Sir, we had Mr. Cadbury earlier this year who came to the same conclusion that we should have a planning unit in Barbados. These are the officers that we seek to have immediately and to establish.

With regard to the Economist, we have made application to the Technical Assistance Board of the United Nations and we are expecting some help from them in the near future of somebody of experience who would come down and set up this Unit and help us for probably about two years. There is a second post I see here, so that this salary here does not apply to this person whom we expect to get from the United Nations.

There is an Administrative Assistant whom I believe you well know; he is a Barbadian who went up to England, London University, and did take a course in Economics. Mr. Cadbury thought very well of him and he will be the second man, so that when this particular person from the United Nations goes, our local trainee will be in a position to take over. Then, Sir, there is the post of Stenographer. I think members of this House should be happy to know that at last we are embarking on a scheme of this sort.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

ORDER No. 5 POSTPONED.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone Order No. 5 and to take Order No. 6 as the next Order of the Day.

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

THE PUBLIC TRUSTEE (AMENDMENT) RULES, 1960

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution to approve the Rules entitled "The Public Trustee (Amendment) Rules, 1960."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, Order No. 6 is a Resolution to approve the Public Trustee (Amendment) Rules, 1960. As will be seen from these Rules set out in the Schedule to this Resolution under Rule 26 (1) of the Public Trustee Rules, 1938, as amended by the Public Trustee (Amendment) Rules, 1944, any corporation constituted under the law of the Colony or of Great Britain, or of Canada, and having a place of business here is entitled under certain other conditions set out in those Rules, to act as a Custodian Trustee for the purpose of undertaking Trust business.

Very recently, other firms have made applications and this amendment is just to give legal authority for other places of business to take advantage of this provision. The amendment now proposed seeks to extend this provision to all corporations incorporated or registered under the laws of the island. In other words, it would be no longer confined to those corporations incorporated or registered in Great Britain or Canada.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE PENSIONS (PENSIONABLE OFFICES) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1960.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1960."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Order is to give effect to the Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1960. As can be seen in the Schedule, certain amendments are to be made to the principal order. If you look at the amendments on the left of the Schedule, you will see that "Confidential Records Officer" is added to the Head "Chief Secretary" after "Information Officer". "Senior Examiner" is added to the Head "Auditor General", after "Senior Auditor". Under "Customs and Excise", "Senior Supervisor", "Rum Bond Clerk" is added after "Customs Guard", and immediately after the Head "Legal Department", you are inserting the Head "Crown Solicitor", and under it, "Crown Solicitor". Then, as can be seen from the Schedule, there are amendments right down the line. For instance, for the Head "Government Industrial Schools", you substitute "Government Industrial Schools", and under it, "Principal, Matron, Assistant Matron, Instructor, Instructress". Hon. members can see for themselves the amendments. These are the result of amendments to offices effected by this House during the past year.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO SANCTION THE MOTOR VEHICLES
AND ROAD TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT)
REGULATIONS, 1960.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing: To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution to sanction the Regulations entitled "The Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations, 1960."

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, as hon. members are aware, the use of turnstiles was introduced in buses belonging to the Transport Board recently and we have as a result of that to alter the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Regulations in order to permit the use of these turnstiles.

As hon. members will see from the Addendum, these Regulations were made by the Director of Highways and Transport on the 25th June, 1960, under the provision of Section 7 of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937 (1937-16) as amended by Section 41 of the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945, (1945-12) and they were approved and sanctioned by His Excellency the Governor on the 29th June, 1960. The object of the Regulations is to permit the use of turnstiles in motor omnibuses.

I will say that these turnstiles are in use in other countries even nearby. They are in use in Puerto Rico and so far as the collection of fares is concerned, they are actually fool-proof and it is principally for that reason that they are introduced here. One of the drawbacks is that under the system of collecting fares, they can only use a single coin; therefore, they can only be used on routes for which you pay a single fare; so it is not possible to use them on all of the routes.

I have seen them in use in Puerto Rico and I think that most of us, at least those of us who have been to New York and other parts of America, have seen them in use. In Puerto Rico, they had changed over to the slot system but they have now gone back to the use of turnstiles which are more fool-proof.

Sir, I believe that you will have initial difficulties by the use of these turnstiles, but I think, in the process of time, the public will get accustomed to them and they will prove an easy and efficient mechanism to our buses.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this is not a really important matter which is now engaging the attention of the House. As the Hon. Minister has told us, it is rather routine and it is necessitated by the change which the Transport Board has brought about.

There are just one or two things which I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister. He has told us that turnstiles are the fashion for collecting fares in bigger countries. We know that and we know in those places where the Transport authorities used turnstiles, they are used for labour saving reasons and it is very seldom in the outside world for you to see a conductor on buses.

8.20 p.m.

Of course, conditions here are rather different. It may well be that the Board cannot commit itself entirely to the turnstile system until it knows how to solve the problems which would result from the redundancy of labour. Be that as it may, if you are going to use the turnstiles, the best justification for them surely is the matter of quickness and efficiency of the new system. I have been informed that what is inconveniencing the travelling public since they have started to use the buses in which turnstiles are installed, is that the conductors do not appear to be armed with sufficient small change and in consequence of that, particular on rainy days, passengers are forced to stand outside the bus for several

minutes sometimes while the change is made and the monetary adjustments handled. That is not, of course, a matter in which the Minister is himself personally involved, but he may like to straighten up that matter by giving directions or making suggestions whereby that inconvenience could be removed.

Mr. Speaker, that does not seem to me to be an insuperable difficulty. If you give a conductor \$10 worth of change in five-cent pieces, at the end of his period of duty all of those five-cent pieces should be in the receptacle prepared for them, and he should have the equivalent in larger denominational change. Therefore, I do not see that there is any great difficulty lying there. Of course, if the Transport Board wants to publicise the turnstile idea, it should make an appeal to the public, particularly those who use the buses every day, and the parents of small children, to see to it that they are armed with the necessary coins. I suppose that in two or three months' time these difficulties would be resolved, but it seems to me that at an early stage this inconvenience could be done away with if conductors have sufficient change until the public gets hold of the idea. The Hon. Minister might want to give directions to the Board so as to smooth out these difficulties.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if some bright businessman were to suggest to the Ministry of Communications and Works that the bus conductors should wear fur coats in the flying fish season, whether in desperation the Minister of Communications and Works would not turn to this as some new measure which would make the transport system more acceptable to the general public and the taxpayers of this island. We have got to this ridiculous stage now in the Government of this country, as I have had occasion to remark before, when the power of advertising, the power of salesmanship is much more important than the general welfare of the community. The only *rationale* of the turnstile system I can see is in a country where there is a shortage of labour, and where perhaps the distances which the buses have to run are so great that the services of conductors and conductresses would be unnecessary. It is over 15 months ago that I used to travel about two or three times from the main street in New Jersey to 41st Street, to the Port Authority Bus Terminal in New York. There was no conductor on those Greyhound buses for the simple reason that once you got into the bus it never stopped until it reached the Port Authority Terminal. When you got in at the fare stage at the Main Street in Orange, if you did not have the change, the bus driver made the change for you and you deposited your money in the machine which revolved until the coins were sorted out, and then you took your seat until you are safely deposited at the Port Authority Bus Terminal. The use of the turnstile method here is as ridiculous as providing that a bus conductor should wear a fur coat in the flying fish season.

I want hon. members to realise the absurdity of the system which the hon. member has introduced at the Transport Board and which he has tried to operate. In metropolitan London they do not carry any turnstiles in the buses. The reason for that is that the fare stages are numerous, the stops are therefore numerous, and the delay involved in operating the turnstile system would far outweigh the economic saving which would be effected. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, as you know - and I hope that you have had the advantage of seeing London from the upper deck of the buses rather than from the sanctity of the taxicabs at your disposal - you enter the buses not from the front where the drive is situated, but from the rear of the bus, and to introduce the turnstile system there, would mean that the bus driver would have to run back and make the change and then jump to the helm as soon as the passengers had got on board. Therefore, there is no turnstile system in London at all.

The hon. senior member for Christ Church, whose experience is a more recent one than yours or mine, assures me that there is no turnstile system in London and the bus service is operated quite efficiently. It does

seem to me that the hon. member in his ignorance, is clutching at things and is willing to carry out any operation which is imposed upon him in order to make the public feel that he is doing everything he can do in order to get the Transport system squared off.

At this stage, it being now 8.30 p.m. of the clock,

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now 8.30 p.m. of the clock, the moment of interruption, and unless this matter is non-controversial it cannot be proceeded with any further.

Mr. BARROW: It is controversial.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member says that the matter is controversial and therefore it may not be proceeded with any further at this stage.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, the 26th July, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.
8.30 p.m.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question for the adjournment, on a matter of privilege, is it possible at some time for us to know if and when the Select Committee.....

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order, has the hon. member given notice of this question of privilege, and is it a question of privilege to talk about Select Committees?

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to hear the hon. member through first.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, there are some Select Committees, and I would like to know if they have anything to report.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order, I understand that Your Honour asks after 12 o'clock every Tuesday if there are any Select Committees prepared to report. Is the hon. member arrogating to himself the functions of Speaker?

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 26th July, 1960, at 12 noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

8 35 p.m.