

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1961 - 66

THE

House of Assembly Debates

**(OFFICIAL REPORT)
SECOND SESSION OF 1961-66**

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 23rd February, 1965

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.00 o'clock (noon) today.

PRESENT

His Honour E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P., (Deputy Speaker); Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, (Minister of Development, Trade, Labour and Social Security); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. E. D. MOTTLED, C.B.E., (Leader of the Opposition); Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries); Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (Chairman of Committees); and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (Minister of Health, Housing, Local Government and Community Development).

Prayers were read.

DOCUMENT

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Statement of Accounts prepared by the Accountant General for the month of July, 1964.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier I am commanded to lay the following-

The Customs Duties (Carton Boxes Label sand packaging Materials for use in the Manufacture and Marketing of Locally produced paints) Order, 1965;

Barbados Statistical Service-Quarterly Digest No. 3I September, 1964.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Also, on my own behalf, I am commanded to lay the following -

The Customs Duties (B.U.O.C. Crude Petroleum, Chemicals and Materials) Order, 1965.

The Customs Duties (B.U.O.C. Machinery and Equipment) Order, 1965.

The Consumption Tax (Petroleum Products) Order, 1965.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following, on behalf of the Hon. Premier

Resolution to place the sum of \$155,407 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1964-65, Part I Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1964-65, No. 61, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, I beg to give notice of the following-

Resolution to authorise the Government to waive the repayment by the Transport Board of the sum of \$2,253,904.45

Resolution to place the sum of \$600,000 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1964-65 Part II - Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimate No. 58 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

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

Resolution to place the sum of \$29,507 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1964-65, Part II - Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1964-65, No. 60 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following-

A Bill to amend the Petroleum Act, 1882.

A Bill to impose certain duties of excise in respect of petroleum products withdrawn or supplied from the Refinery to be operated by the Barbados Union Oil Company Limited.

A Bill to amend the Package Tax Act, 1941.

A Bill to repeal the British Union Oil Company Oil Station Act, 1919.

A Bill to amend the Consumption Tax Act, 1962.

Hon. G. E. TALMA:

I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Electricity Act, 1936.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

Mr. Deputy Speaker. I beg to give notice of a Bill to provide for the establishment of an Agricultural Development Corporation.

REPLY TO QUESTION

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 29/1964, asked by the hon. junior member for St. John, is ready.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply, at its next meeting in order to deal with the Money Resolutions of which notice was given today.

Hon. Co E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking for leave to withdraw the Resolution of \$600,000 for the Transport Board Service which I gave notice of last week.

It will be recalled that there were two matters embodied in that one Resolution; so we are asking to withdraw that one Resolution which was given notice of last week, in order that it may be replaced by two separate Resolutions which were given notice of today, copies of which are here.

I am also asking leave to proceed with these two Resolutions in all their stages today.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES Mr. LYNCH:

I beg to give notice of the following-

BE IT RESOLVED that this House views with grave concern the sharp deterioration in the Island's academic educational standards as mirrored in the recent public examination results and the stultification of the technical education programme.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to amend the Petroleum Act, 1882, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to impose certain duties of excise in respect of petroleum products withdrawn or supplied from the Refinery to be operated by the Barbados Union OH Company Limited, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. W. A. CR4WFOPD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to amend the Package Tax Act, 1941, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. W. A. CR4WFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to repeal the British Union Oil Company Oil Station Act, 1919, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to amend the Consumption Tax Act, 1963, was read a first time.

12.25 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker. I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Electricity Act, 1936, be now read a first time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that. The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to provide for the establishment of an Agricultural Development Corporation, be now read a first time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Committee of Supply be the first Order of the Day.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

I beg to move, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction of the House when in Committee to deal with the Money Resolution for the sum of \$600,000 of which notice was given earlier today, and of which it was asked that it be dealt with in all its stages today.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. BATSON in the Chair..

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1964-65 No. 57 DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL SERVICES - TRAVELLING

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is a Resolution for the sum of \$600. This money is required to supplement the provision under Item 21, Travelling, of Head 39 - Medical (1) Director of Medical Services. This amount of \$600 is to be made available to the Director of Medical Services for travelling.

It is consequent upon the increase in the rates of travelling and to the end of December, 1964, the sum of \$2,957 out of the sum of \$3,000, which was provided in the Estimates, was spent. It is estimated that it will be necessary to have this additional amount of \$600 in order to allow these officers to continue at the present rate of travelling to the end of the financial year. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

**SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1964-65 No. 58
COMMUNICATIONS - TRANSPORT SERVICES**

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is a Resolution for the sum of \$600,000 under the Head,

Communications, in the Capital Estimates and it is in connection with Item 16 -Transport Services. This Resolution seeks to make provision of the sum of \$600,000 available for transport services, and the Addendum sets out the purpose for which this money will be needed. The Addendum sets out the position as follows:-

The Ninth Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the Transport Board for the year ended 30th September, 1964, have been laid in the Legislature.

The Statement of Accounts shows that the capital supplied by the Government to the Board amounts to \$2,253,904.45 while the Board's accumulated losses amount to \$2,358,097.21. The Board has been unable to honour its undertaking to repay loans raised for the purpose of carrying out its obligations. The payment of interest on these loans is also in arrears. In these circumstances the Board will be unable, on its own, to raise the capital required for the purchase of rolling stock and equipment and the provision of adequate workshop and office accommodation which are necessary if the travelling public is to be offered a satisfactory service.

It is therefore proposed to make available to the Board additional capital of \$600,000 to liquidate arrears of principal and interest due on the outstanding loans. The Government has also decided to write off the \$2,253,904.45 which has already been advanced to the Board and will authorise the Board to reduce its capital by writing off the accumulated losses by a similar amount.

As a further measure of assistance to the Board it is proposed to assist it in raising capital for the purchase of forty (40) new buses and for the provision of workshop and office accommodation over the next four (4) years.

When the proposals outlined above have been implemented the Board should be in a position to carry out its obligations without further financial assistance from the Government.

That is the Addendum to this Resolution; but in fairness to hon. members, many of whom are new

members and are serving their first Session in this parliament, and inasmuch as the Transport Board has a long history attached to it. I think it is only fair to hon. members to give them a sort of background story of this Board so as to assist them with all the information which is available and which, I know, the public is entitled to. The Transport Board in August, 1955, was given its sanction by the Legislature through an Act entitled the Transport Board Act which was to implement a decision of the Government of the day to appoint a Board with corporate status for the purpose of operating a passenger road transport service on those routes which were relinquished by concessionaires who found it uneconomical to renew their concessions on the basis of the terms stipulated by the Government.

12.35 p.m.

At its inception the new undertaking was provided with working capital of \$30,000, which as the relevant Addendum to the Resolution of the Legislature indicated was to meet the cost of wages for a certain period, and fuel and oil presumably for a similar period. By the end of September, 1956, after a little more than a year, the Board had incurred an operational deficiency of \$232,181.20. At this time provision was made in the sum of \$110,000 towards this deficiency. It was also recognised that the buses which had been taken over at a cost of \$394,051 were uneconomical to run, and a tentative provision of \$25,000 was made to meet the cost of one new trial bus. Attention was also given then to the need for additional accommodation, and for this purpose a further sum of \$75,500 was provided.

In the Estimates of Expenditure for 1957-58, provision was made for new buses expected to cost \$300,000, but at this time It was estimated that the operational deficit would be \$150,000. In the course of that year, however, it was necessary to call on the Legislature for additional funds for the Board on three separate occasions. In the first in-

stance, a sum of \$123,200 was required to meet the cost of duty on the new buses for which provision had been made earlier in the year. Secondly, \$50,000 were provided for equipment and accommodation. Thirdly, a further sum of \$177,000 was voted to supplement the \$150,000 which, it was envisaged, would have been the operational deficit for the year. At the end of 1957-58, Mr. Chairman, there was an accumulated deficit of \$714,499, and the net loss on the operation for the March quarter alone was \$50,372.

It is possible to continue with an exhaustive recital of the amounts of public funds made available for this section of public passenger transport service, but probably Sir, it will suffice to record that accrued amounts from year to year ending in December 1961 were as follows:-December, 1955 - \$30,000; December, 1956 - \$440,899.33; December, 1957 - \$868,448.57; December 1958- \$1,256,857.17; December 1959 - \$1,703,924.91; December, 1960 -\$2,020,341.15; and December 1961, Just around the time when this Government came into office the deficit was \$2,253,904.45. So hon. members will realise - and I will bring it to their attention here now - that it is an old deficit which we met. In other words, the Transport Board has never shown a profit; it has always operated at a loss and has been subsidised in the past. When this Government came into office, the monies owing at the time amounted to \$2,253,904.45; so in short, the amount which we are asking the Legislature to write off is more or less old arrears which we met and for which no provision could be made and which the Transport Board is totally incapable of repaying.

Now of this last mentioned sum, approximately \$11/3 million were advanced in aid of revenue, and the

remainder for development capital. There must be many factors which contributed to the unsatisfactory financial position of the Transport Board, as we read in the Ward Committee's Report, and reference to several of them have been made in that Report; but the basic factor is one which is common to all business, and it is that no enterprise can remain viable unless principal, rising costs in labour and material can be offset by a corresponding rise in revenue. It is for this reason that the Government has placed the responsibility for determining the level of fares and principle for charging fares and for many other regulations appertaining to transport on the Public Utilities Board. I only mentioned the increase in bus fares, but anyone who was a staunch critic of the increase in bus fares will realise that the Transport Board is now in a state of bankruptcy, and there is little left for the Government to have done but to increase bus fares by the most reasonable amount which would be added at the time. In other words, the increases were very slight and in some cases almost negligible.

Mr. Chairman, the bus fares were revised last October and the Profit and Loss Account in respect of the operation of the Transport Board for December, 1964, showed a profit for the first time in the Board's History. As will be observed from the Balance Sheet for the year ended 30th September, 1964, the Board's indebtedness amounted to \$1,062,140.73 as follows;- Creditor and Credit Balances - \$190,169.97; Loans and Accrued Interest owing to Royal Bank of Canada - \$871,970.75. These figures, however, do not take into account the funds made available by the Government amounting to \$2,253,904.45 as was stated earlier. This Resolution therefore, Mr. Chairman, is to give the Board a new lease on life - at least we hope so - by waiving the repayment of the amounts which were made available by the Government and which will provide a further subsidy to enable the Board to liquidate the greater portion of its liabilities which it could not otherwise be expected to do in the foreseeable future even with the proceeds of the increased fares recently authorised. These steps will place the Board's Accounts in a more favourable light and in time enable it to develop public confidence in its ability to cope with its statutory responsibilities.

I have a lot more information here, Sir, but I do not want to tire the House with all the information I have got; yet for fear least the Government may be accused of withholding information, it really is as well that I continue to give you more information which I have here. You probably

would like to hear something about the old buses which were taken over and I had better touch on that before another member makes a political speech on it although it does not affect this Government as such. (Mr. SMITH: What are you making now?)

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The Chair is making no speech.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

The number of buses taken over by the Transport Board in 1955 was 106. 12.45 p.m.

There were 116 originally, but ten were returned to the Progressive Bus Company in May, 1956. The number of buses owned and operated at present by the Transport Board is 98 buses. The number of obsolete gasoline buses is 21; and the number of buses in rapid state of deterioration is 19. The number of buses sold to concessionaires is 33. That took place in January, 1957. In January, 1961, 15 buses were taken over by the Transport Board from the Liberty Bus Company. There were comprised of Bedfords, 10; Austins, 4; and one Leyland.

Mr. Chairman, I have a lot more information as regards Resolutions for money for these buses from time to time, and I propose to answer any questions put to me on the matter. We are now asking on this information for a Resolution for the sum of \$600,000 in order that the Transport Board would be in the position to write off all interests which are due and owing.

I may add that the Transport Board was unable to pay the arrears of interest and all arrears of instalments which were owing to date. This would now mean that the Transport Board would not be owing \$200,000 to sundry creditors, such as the Royal Bank of Canada, and assume a better role; in other words, they would be able to regain its confidence which probably may be lacking at the moment and it would be possible for the Transport Board to be accommodated with a further advance in order to assist it in the acquisition of new buses.

There are also schemes to be considered and for which we are now negotiating. At this stage, I can really say that we will see to it that the Transport Board is given assistance whether by direct cash or by way of guarantee. What I can say now is that at least 40 new buses would be secured over the next four years for the Transport Board in order to improve the service.

While I am at it, I may say that after the bus terminal in Fairchild Street is improved and a new bus stand is placed along the Princess Alice Highway - we hope to make a bus terminal adjacent to the Barbados Marketing Corporation in order to accommodate buses from the Northern area and so obviate the necessity of their passing through the crowded Baxters Street area - we are going to introduce a system of queuing, but we cannot commence that system until such changes take place. In other words, we need some relief from the congestion in the Fairchild Street Bus Terminal before we can talk of introducing the system of queuing.

As regards buses actually parked in the Fairchild Bus Terminal, we are also considering their remaining there for ten or fifteen minutes. We want to introduce a system where those buses will just circle the bus stand and take up passengers and then proceed in the same manner as is done in London where buses are not parked, but where you get one to take you where you are going every five minutes. Instead of buses being held up and parked for 15 minutes in the Bus Terminal, may be, they will come in and stay for five minutes just to give the drivers and conductors a little relief and then they will move on.

Sir. I think I have said enough and I will wait for any queries which hon. members may ask and do my best to explain. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, as Leader of the Opposition, I have made it abundantly clear when I accepted this office that it was not my duty to oppose really for the sake of opposing, but where we differed on principle and it came before this august Chamber, we would give our strongest opposition although our forces may be very vulnerable. However, today, the two Labour Parties along with the Socialist Independent will find as a target the members of my Party who will be in opposition to this Resolution,

and we will face their attack with broad shoulders.

To begin with, Mr. Chairman, it is not because we, as a Party, favour free enterprise. As a matter of fact, we have even expressed our view that all public utilities should not be operated by private enterprise. Far from that, we feel that in this twentieth century era. there are certain public utilities which should be state-owned and that must have been the latest conservative view all over the world. No Party or person, no matter how diehard he may be would say in this twentieth century that certain utilities should be in the hands of private enterprise any more. However, we think that certain public utilities should be run by private enterprise. 12.55 p.m.

Nevertheless, Sir, we cannot at this stage, even despite the golden picture which the Hon. Minister has stated about the Transport buses, those which are owned and operated by the Government - well, I am satisfied that what the Hon. Minister has said is true and he has not withheld anything from us. In the course of my speech, however, I shall ask him to give us a little more information. I do not say that after a further examination, we may not be able to come to the conclusion that there is the possibility for private enterprise to carry out the transport services in this colony. If you read the Ward Committee's Report and you think of the recommendations, you will clearly see that it seems possible now that as to the transport service which has been backed by the Government, the Government has no other alternative than to honour its pledge. I want to be very rational in what I am going to say. If the Government takes over the transport service of this country or if the Government takes over a portion of that service, and if they guarantee an amount of money to an established board and pledge themselves to back this money at the banks, there is not only a moral but a legal pledge which must be carried out. When the time comes, I do not see how any of us in this Chamber could say that we have made this pledge but we are not going to pay that money. What is worrying us today is the fact that you have about 200 buses operating the transport service in this country. We know well enough that the overwhelming majority of the people in this country depend upon the Transport Service for going to and fro in the country and in the suburban areas. We know that such a service is very essential, and if there is one thing which can be considered as a public utility service, this is one.

One section of the buses is owned and operated by private enterprise and the other half is owned and operated by a Statutory Board which is backed by the Government of this country. Let us examine the matter in this light. I do not think that anybody would deny the fact that most of the best routes on which service is operated are at present owned by the Transport Board. (Mr. WALCOTT: The worst are owned by them too.) I do not think that any of us would deny that some of the worst routes are owned by them too. I will be prepared to show, if I have to get down to it, that it works out at 70% to the Transport Board and the other 30% in favour of the local concessionaires. We can all remember the fiasco and the stupid utterances made during the regime of the last Government about bus fares going up on their dead bodies. I suppose that I have been in the vanguard of causing an enquiry to be made into the Transport system of this colony because, from my position as a member of the Local Government in this colony, I was taken back to find that certain people were not making any contribution to the coffers of the Local Government revenue. I have questioned this matter and it eventually reached the height at which the Government took notice of it and it also reached the Department of Inland Revenue. There the ball was set rolling. You had an enquiry and a recommendation was made for an increase to the concessionaires. Nobody wants to create any burden on the people who use the transport service. I have found from the Transport Report that if people had not been so stubborn and thought that they knew everything, if that increase had been granted, possibly we would not have been in this dilemma today.

Whatever you might say, you can still say that private enterprise was giving a satisfactory service. It is true that you had a type of bus which was unique in the sense that they were made for the North climate and the Transport Board had to take over some of these buses.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going into the question as to whether these buses are most suitable for Barbados or not; but after the service was operating for a number of years, you have a position where one half of the buses are on one side and the other half on the other side. Now I come to the touchy question affecting the Trade Union Leader. Whether private enterprise or the Government is operating these buses, it is the business of the Trade Union to see that those who work in this service are well compensated and well treated in the service which they render to the community and to their employers. That does not necessarily mean that because they are backed by the Government they and they alone should be able to enjoy increased salaries and so on. I say that because whether people work for private enterprise or for the Government, when the bus fares are increased, these people also have to bear the burden of that increase. I concede that they would have to be considered in whatever you may do. You have two important businesses of a similar nature in relation to the Transport Service of the island, and when I said that the Government backed the Transport Service and that they have some of the best routes, I heard a sotto voce remark to the effect that they also had some of the worst routes. 1.05 p.m.

If I am to admit that, then it follows that private enterprise have some of the best and some of the worst. (Mr. WALCOTT: No I) I am strictly dealing with facts, and I have read the Report very carefully; and if it is to be admitted that the Government-backed buses have some of the worst routes, the others must have some of the best and therefore it is divided. I would not say it is equally divided, but I am in a position to say that from my experience in looking at Reports and seeing returns over the past 20 years, I am absolutely satisfied that the Transport Board has some of the best and most paying routes.

I am ready to admit, Mr. Chairman, that you have some of the worst, but the same works for private enterprise. Now if my friend, the Hon. Minister or the Trade Union Leader feels that it is to be owned by Government, then that is their view; but do not say that because we hold the view that if you have it divided, unless you can satisfy us that demands have been met or with the glowing picture as painted by the Hon. Minister in dealing with transport, - a picture which he has painted to show that they have been giving service - that we do not agree with the taking over of buses and so on. We all know that everything did not work well in this service. I have stood here and defended the fact that I would not accept some of the utterances made on the floor of this House that all the losses which the Transport Board had were because of the fact that conductors and others were taking the money and not carrying it in. I accept that there is the probability that conductors and people who work in transport service - not only the Government Transport service but in private enterprise - might take the opportunity of borrowing some money sometimes which might not belong to them, but I made it abundantly clear that it was within my knowledge that whereas a man might take out \$2.00 a day, that was not sufficient to give us an insight into the losses which the Transport Board is suffering, and that there was trouble from the Office right down. There was the question of buses going out with four or six new tyres and coming back with six old ones, and those persons on this side of the Table who might be able to help with the price of tyres, though they may not agree with me, will tell you that for the price of two or three new tyres, a conductor would have to be carrying away money for six months to be able to make up for the losses there.

The Report which came in, Mr. Chairman, is very enlightening. but there are those of us who knew

what was going on, and that a tremendous lot of these buses were being chartered out and the hundreds upon hundreds of dollars received never saw the cashier at all, and I challenge the Minister to deny that. (Mr. WALCOTT: How could you challenge the Minister?) I would even challenge my friend, the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I have never suggested that the Minister would condone this, but these are things that are known. As a matter of fact, he knows that an enquiry was instituted and some people were dismissed for this very reason. I want to be very rational in my utterances on this matter, because I do not want to incriminate anybody or do anything that would cause any further embarrassment to people through this particular Resolution.

As soon as the Government-backed company brought in new buses, the private concessionaires in turn went to the expense of getting new buses to the tune of \$25,000 each. I do not want to be personal, but if you start to name the various concessionaires, you will find that they have been getting in buses in proportion to the amount which the Public Utilities Board said they must keep. They have been doing everything in their power to get in a different type of bus, and it is a question of difference of opinion as to whether this type of bus is suitable. I feel that a steel frame and a different type of body has a tendency to last longer.

Now the hon. member has come not only for \$600,000 to pay off this debt, but also to liquidate the present expenses which they have. He has told us, Mr. Chairman, that the Government has decided to write off \$2,253,904.45. My Party has always felt that to write off a guarantee like that over this period, something would have to be going wrong, and according to this, the other concessionaires should be in the almhouse or in prison for money, because they could not possible be running buses. There is nobody in this country who can get up and with honest Justification say that the service backed by Government is better than that run by private concessionaires. I would say to the contrary, Sir, that if you make a complaint to one of the private concessionaires, you get immediate attention paid to it. On the other hand, if you make a complaint to the Transport Board which is backed by Government, you have to wait days and days possibly to get your complaint heard. The service is divided approximately into half with one or two more buses on one side. I know that the argument which is going to be used is that the private concessionaires have the best routes, but I do not agree with that, though I do not propose to waste the time calling the routes. 1.15 p.m.

The hon. member will have his chance to talk and he must not lose his temper. I know the views of the hon. member. He has never changed his views on this matter and I have never changed my views; but I am not annoyed because of that. He says that the service should be nationalised. He feels that the entire service should be nationalised. (Mr. WALCOTT: The Report says so.) The Reports says so on one, two and three. It has given three alternatives. You get private enterprise or you go for it being state-owned, but, as I was saying, when you look at this Addendum, you will see that not only is the Government asking for \$600,000 to liquidate this debt, but they also propose to write off the \$2,253,904.45 which has already been advanced to the Board. All it means that they are going to pay all that. If I decided to back the hon. senior member for St. Michael to the tune of \$100,000 to open a business and the business failed tomorrow, I am the person who must pay the \$100,000. All that this says is that the Government has decided to write off the \$2 million odd. It means that the Government is going to pay that sum. That is what it means. I am going to draw a comparison between private concessionaires and the Government. The routes can be said to be divided in half; that is to say, that part is operated by the private concessionaires and the other part is operated by the Transport Board. You are precluding a thing of a similar nature to the other half. If I say that the position is that somebody has come to the rescue of one-

half at the rate of \$2 million odd, what happens to the other half which has seven concessionaires? Must these seven persons remain static? These

people had to pay increased wages; they had to pay the same back-pay and the same wages as the Transport Board as was put up by the Trade Union. But it must also be noted that they did not remain the same way. You will admit that they have not carried on with what the people call the board- and-shingle buses. Look at every one of those concessions; you will see that every one of them has got modern buses so that you will have to say that every one of them has aligned themselves with the Transport Board which is running the other half of the service. Therefore, Sir, the position is a very simple one. You have the sum of \$2 million to be paid for and I am speaking more strongly about that than the \$600,000.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The \$2,253,904.45 has accumulated over the years. These are monies by way of advances made from the Treasury to the Statutory Body, the Transport Board. Therefore, it is a question of writing off these advances granted by the Central Government to the Statutory Body, the Transport Board. In other words, this sum of money will be written off so as to clear the Transport Board of this debt.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I am sure the hon. member will realise that he has the opportunity to reply. I will remind him that some time ago this was brought to us and it was supposed to be a guarantee for the Transport Board. As a matter of fact, this sum was brought to us from time to time. This is an absolute fact. What you have said here in the Addendum is that the Government has decided to write off this sum. It is a question of control. I hope the Hon. Minister would look back and see that these are not all advances which were made from the Public Treasury, I am not certain if all of these advances were made from the Treasury or from the banks, but you came in here and backed them. All of these advances were backed by the Government.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I rise again on a point of order. It seems as if the hon. member has not accepted what I said. I will go to the trouble of giving him more information.

By Resolution No. 58/1956, a working capital of \$30,000 was advanced for the official operation of the Transport Board. By Resolution 62/1956, the sum of \$110,000 was advanced. In the Estimates of 1957-58, the sum of \$150,000 was provided and by Resolution No. 115/1957, a further sum of \$177,000 was provided.

By Resolution No. 23/1959, the sum of \$259,662 was advanced and in the Estimates of 1959-60, the sum of \$191,500 was provided. Resolution 19/1960 provided \$141,500; the Estimates 1960-61, \$180,000. Estimates 1961- 62, \$150,000; thus making a total of \$1,359,662.

Now, the votes for Capital Expenditure were as follows:- Resolution 62/1956, for one bus \$25,000, and for accommodation \$75,500, Resolution 1/1957, for the acquisition of concessionaires bases, \$399,254. In the Estimates of 1957-58, for 19 new buses, \$300,000; By Resolution 58/ 1957, for duty on new buses, \$123,200; Resolution 58/1957, for accommodation and equipment \$59,000; in the Estimates

1958-59, for new buses, \$158,648.

In the Estimates of 1960-61, for new buses, \$166,638. The Estimates of 1961-62, for new buses, \$409,000 making a total of \$1,707,240.

Well, Sir, I think the hon. member should be satisfied that the money was voted either in the Estimates, or by way of Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Now, Sir, what the Hon. Minister has told me is that all of this money was voted. They still owe the bank. May I ask what for and how much?

You put money in the Estimates every year for the Transport Board and yet they could not balance their accounts. I am a person who believes that you should run public utilities, but what I object to is that the Government must come to the rescue.

What I am saying is this. With all this that you are paying and doing during this period for the Transport Board, on the other hand, from the other seven concessionaires all that you have been doing is collecting rates and income tax. During that same period, you have been collecting income tax and trade rates from the other seven concessionaires, but on the other hand, you have been balancing the Transport Board. Something must have been going wrong. 1.25 p.m.

If during that period you have been collecting income tax and trade rates from these concessionaires, and during that period you find that there have been complaints then something must have been going wrong. At one time the gentleman would have you to believe that this was a matter of the conductors and drivers taking the money. It is definitely our policy that this matter should be in the hands of free enterprise and let them satisfy us beyond any shadow of doubt at all that the service cannot pay. Let me see them stop going under, let me see them stop paying trade tax and income tax and let me hear them saying that they cannot pay the same thing as the Government is paying. Then I would be satisfied. The Hon. Minister has not yet been able to tell us anything about that. On the question of tyres, the hon. member told us about the time since Transport Board came into being. I am now referring to the \$28,000 buses. Can the Hon. Minister say if, after working these buses for a period, they have had to instal any new engines or re-conditioned engines or if they are putting these buses in the grave yard? Is the Hon. Minister aware that in a country like the United States of America, after buses have done a certain amount of travelling they are reconditioned?

I am not referring to the bodies of the buses; I am referring to the motors. The recommendation which has been made does not refer to anything like this. You are talking about building sheds for buses. The Addendum to this Resolution states that this money is required for the purpose of liquidating arrears of principal and interest due on the outstanding loans; but, according to what the hon. member has said, and according to the figures which he has read out, there are no loans. The hon. member has read out all of these figures. He has mentioned the sum of \$2,253,904.45 as capital supplied to the Board; he has also quoted the figures of \$2,358,079.21 which is the Board's accumulated losses and the amount of \$2,253,904.45 which the Government has decided to write off and which has already been advanced to the Board. The Addendum to the Resolution states that it is proposed to make available to the Board this additional capital of \$600,000 which is for the purpose of liquidating arrears of principal and interest

due on the outstanding loans. Well, Sir, this sum of \$600,000.00 is a lot of money, and I take it that the loans would have to be at the rate of 3%, 3 1/2% or 5% interest. I am not suggesting that the Hon. Minister is withholding anything from this House.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

All right, Sir, the hon. member has the right of reply.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I thought that the hon. member wanted to be enlightened on that point.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

A lot of hon. members will be speaking on this Resolution and I do not want unduly to burden the Hon. Minister by his rising unduly on points of order. This is a matter of opinion. The island knows that we, of this Party, have always held these views. We do not feel that, if private enterprise cannot run the bus service so as to make it pay, the people should be allowed to walk. If the people who run one half of the services in this country cannot make them pay, then we will say that this is a public utility service which should be run by the State. If it cannot be run by private enterprise but by the State, it might be because the people would be unable to pay the rates which would make the service a paying concern. I believe that this Board should be able to come out of the red at some time or other. I do not believe that any attempt was ever made by them to

come out of the red. You have five people doing what one man in private enterprise would probably be doing. Today they have discovered that if they quote with a particular company for the supplying of tyres they have to see that those tyres do a certain number of miles.

As far as we are concerned, there is no point in my generating any heat on this matter because we have always taken this stand. We feel that where private enterprise is carrying on a service the State should stand by and draw its income tax. We feel that it is infinitely much better for private enterprise to be owning this business than for the State to be owning it, unless it is proved beyond any shadow of doubt that this business cannot possibly be run by private enterprise. In accordance with the Report which we have read and digested, there are three alternatives, and this is one occasion on which the two Labour Parties will have the opportunity of fighting their target with members of my Party on this side of the House. We favour one alternative in the Report, that we have the service run by private enterprise, leaving matters to be dealt with by the State and by the Trade Union. In the circumstances, I am afraid that my Party will not be able to give our support to this Resolution at all.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, in his closing remarks, the hon. Leader of the Opposition spoke of the three alternatives and I am quite satisfied that he has not read the Report at all. 1.35 p.m.

I am satisfied that the hon. member did not read the Report, because if he had, he would not have made those statements as he would have seen the three alternatives. I will read the three alternatives before I begin so that it would set his mind at rest, and also show that his closing remark shave no

validity whatsoever with what the Commission put up as their three alternatives, because when you read them, you will see that what he is saying now they did not say.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, if the hon. member would give me a minute....

Mr. WALCOTT:

The hon. member can only rise on a point of order if I have misquoted him.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

The hon. member said he is satisfied that I did not read the Report. I said I favoured one of their alternatives, but he is misquoting me as saying that I am favouring what they favour.

Mr. WALCOTT:

I have not said so either. The one he says he favours is the one which the Report has not recommended seriously, and that is why I said he has not read it.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

The hon. member cannot say I have not read it.

Mr. WALCOTT:

I have said so.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

It is not fair for the hon. member to say so. I said I read the Report and there were three alternatives, and there was one which we favoured, not which the Committee favoured. The one we favoured is the one I have been suggesting. He cannot say I did not read the Report. It is something I am interested in.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, that is not a point of order. The hon. member is going to get up ten more times because I am going to read the Report. This is one time I agree with the Government because they have acted sensibly in not allowing the pressure of the Opposition to make them act stupidly in relation to financing public transport with this bogus idea that public transport must pay. I have said that public transport no part of the world can be a viable commercial entity. Now the Report states that 'the results of our investigation have shown that a new and more purposeful approach to the problem of public transport is essential,' and it sets out that the first course is for Government to be solely responsible for the provision of a public

transport service. The second is what Mr. Gibbon recommended. Private enterprise was advocating and willing to recommend that you turn it over to a company, and the third course is to continue the existing arrangement. The hon. member says that they favour the one which Mr. Gibbon recommended, and that is why I said he has not read the Report.

The Report says that the second alternative of leaving these services to private enterprise was advocated by Mr. Gibbon, and in theory has much to recommend it. But the problem is to find a company or companies adequately financed to undertake the provision of these services. A single

company operating all the routes would be better equipped to organize routes, standardize equipment and reduce the overhead costs of administration. It is likely that such a company in the present conditions would be required to compensate the Government and the present concessionaires for their buses and other equipment and it is exceedingly doubtful that any such company could be found or formed. Further it is the experience of other countries in the Caribbean and elsewhere that the directors of such a company would require a subsidy or a guarantee against losses with a reasonable return on working capital, which means that if you give them a private company, you have to subsidize the private company because they are not going to work it without a subsidy or a guarantee against losses with a reasonable return on working capital.

Where I do not agree with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is that we are not discussing this against the background of an open argument where hon. members use the Transport Board as a football. We are discussing it against the background of a Report. A committee was set up to investigate the matter, and no Government in a state like this can do better, because Government is not acting on its own, but on the views of persons in the community. For that reason the Committee gave the Government three alternatives. but the Government has stuck to the present form, though the Report says that the Government should try and get a company or two formed from among the private concessionaires, because gradually you are going to have to consolidate these companies anyhow. The Minister will have to make his position clear on that part of the Report. But if the hon. senior member for Bridgetown had read the Report, he would see that this idea that the private concessionaires are making money is not true, because the Report says that all of them lost money, but the Transport Board lost more than the private concessionaires. Now you either agree that the Report is sound and accurate, or you say the Report is nonsense.

The hon. member must bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, that the Report has criticisms too. They were not clear as to how the buses were turned over, and how they were paid for, or what sort of agreement was reached because nothing was signed. Maybe the Minister will be able to tell us today. The hon. member said that the Transport Board has some of the best routes, and I interjected sotto voce and said they had some of the worst, but I am going to say here now in making this speech that the Government has some of the best routes and all of the worst. (Mr. MOTTLEY: That is not true.) The hon. member tells me that is not true, but I know what I am talking about. The private concessionaires have what they want. Let the hon. member call a concessionaire who was commandeered to take over a route. I would challenge any concessionaire in Barbados who say she was commandeered to take over a route, because when you offer a man a business, he need not take it; but the Government had no alternative.

The members of this Government were opposed to the Transport system, Mr. Chairman; but when you take over a Government you have to take over the old shoes, the new shoes, policemen and everything and then deal with them. The Government is now attempting to deal with what was once regarded as a politically explosive matter. Thank God the Barbados Workers' Union was able to explode this myth some months ago that an increase in bus fares would create a penalty on the people. as was trotted out by cheap, local parish-pump politicians who want to use the masses when it suits them. 1.45 p.m.

Now, Sir, I take the half-way house. I feel that when you examine the cost, the financial and economic cost of public transport to the community, then you must be able to say, is this within the economy of the country? The fare structure for the longest route in this Island is 30 cents. You have to ask yourself, is that an unfair price to pay for this sort of service which you have?

Now, you will find the density of the population and the movement of people by transport very great in the City of Bridgetown. It is one of the cheapest routes for anybody to travel on and, therefore, you will find that the people with the highest incomes, comparatively speaking, have the nearest distances to travel, and therefore, they have the cheapest bus fares to pay because the people who live in the rural areas have the longest distances to travel and the dearest bus fares to pay while the density of the population in the rural areas is not great. They have to pay the highest prices, and the mobility of the people and the movement of traffic are not as high as in the City of Bridgetown.

The hon. senior member for the City spoke of the route to Paynes Bay and the route to St. Lawrence, but in those places, you will find that you are providing a service which the others would not provide. It is the more frequent.

You had sixteen concessionaires before, and hon. members in here know that at that time all the transport service was in private peoples' hands. What I do not understand is this talk by the Conservatives of the buses when they were in the hands of the private concessionaires. It was the private concessionaires who said that the buses were not paying. The private people said that they were not paying and they were losing money even on those precious routes which you hear the hon. member was talking about. The background to all of this was that the transport service as a service was not paying to the private people who were running it. The hon. member is talking as if the private concessionaires were making a profit. The Government of that day called a bluff - or if it maybe that they felt it was a bluff - and the private people owning them handed them up. (ASIDES) You know, Mr. Chairman, I do not like this heckling. Both the Party represented by the hon. senior member for the City and that of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph are heckling. Both of you belong to two foolish parties. The private concessionaires appealed to the Government of that day saying that transport was not paying them. (A VOICE: They asked for an increase by one cent in bus fares.) Suppose that they had even asked for .0001 of a cent, they said that it was not paying them whether they were running the Black Rock Route or the Cave Hill route. They said the service was not paying. A cent in relation to three cents is 33 1/3 per cent. If you asked to carry up workers' wages by one cent in three cents, everybody would walk out and say that you want to bankrupt the particular industry to which these workers had belonged.

Sir, what I was saying is that the transport run by private ownership was not as good as that which is run by the Transport Board. The bus service in Barbados provided by the Transport Board is superior to any service which Barbados has ever had. Can you compare those juke boxes which you had before as buses which kept a lot of noise, with the equipped buses which you have today? My only view against the service is that the capitalisation of this bus service may be too much for Barbados. The cost of \$20,000 for a bus is in my view a high cost for this Island to pay. I do know that the people of Barbados are very sophisticated and they like high standards: but the cost of \$25,000 for a bus is a high one as regards the general economy of the country. However, if you start to give a dog milk, it is very difficult to give him something inferior, and it is the same thing as regards this matter. If you have started to give them better travelling facilities, I do not see how you can do away with it.

Mr. Chairman, I do not subscribe to the view that private transport per se is better than public transport, because there is no political philosophy or there is no doctrinaire policy; I am indicating by public ownership as against private ownership, because this is a matter of time, a matter of thinking and a matter of emancipation of the mind.

If you can say that it is the public interest for something to be owned and operated by the public, it should be operated by the public. When you talk of your opposition to nationalisation, it is your interpretation of what you think. There was a time when the Post Office used to be run by private people, but you turned over that to the public. We cannot turn over everything to private companies because, in the public interest, they feel that this service should be owned by the public. The idea of having public transport is nothing new; it is only that in Barbados you do not have the large communities you have in the United States of America. 1.55 p.m.

It is only that in Barbados you do not have the large communities as in the United States of America where the New York City Council would be controlling the Transport. In London, there is a National service. The London Transport Executive is not privately owned, and anybody who has been to England knows that London has one of the best Transport Service in the World. More people radiate in Greater London at 6, 7 and 8 o'clock which are the peak hours, than in any other city in the world. The Transport system in London is better than that of New York because the underground system is smoother, quieter and more efficient than that of New York. The French people have a good system too and the Russians have one; but when you come to the total overall service, you cannot get that bus service which is operated in London and in New York during the peak hours.

Mr. Chairman at this stage, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. YEARWOOD:

I beg to second that.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for three quarters of an hour.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

On re-assembling,

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no quorum present, and I ask that the Bell be rung.

On the bell being rung, a quorum was obtained.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

When the sitting was suspended, the House was in Committee of Supply.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Prior to the suspension of the sitting, the House was in Committee of Supply and the hon. senior member for St. Peter was addressing the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, when the sitting was suspended, I was attempting to show that the private concessionaires prior to the Government taking over the buses, had requested an increase in bus fares. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition made an analysis between the Government owned buses and the privately-owned buses. I would like to point out that, with the 98 buses owned by the Government and the 101 owned by private people, the position is

that the private people owned routes which they applied for, whereas the Government had no choice. The Government is now asking for this money. I think the Government would be very unwise in handing back these buses now. In fact, the Government would not get anybody to take over these buses now, and it would be a bigger headache to the Government to give over their assets. They would be devalued and then they would have to be subsidised. I have expressed my view that the public operation would be a good thing and, as I was saying, I support the Government's stand in putting the Transport Board on its feet.

I am speaking now, not as a worker's representative, because I remember that the Hon. Premier said on one occasion that when I am asking for wages for the workers, I do not see anything wrong in the Government providing the money. What I would like to say is that the attitude of my Organization in a matter of this sort is not in any way sectional. The Barbados Workers' Union has a wide national interest, and we are interested in the economic viability of Barbados because there can be no progress for workers if there is poverty in the country, and we are interested in the prosperity of the country. I am not viewing public transport from the narrow position of being the Leader of the Barbados Workers' Union; I am dealing with the matter of transport in its wider context, that it must be giving the country a better service, a better distribution of the economy and of its income because the Transport workers will be in a better position now as working people than when this system was a privately-owned system. Now the workers have a 44-hour working week and they get sick leave with pay. The private concessionaires never paid these workers any sick leave before, and so you provide people who are performing important services for the public, with proper, fundamental working conditions which are normal. I feel sure that there is nothing wrong in having a service which can provide these facilities.

2.50 p.m.

Only yesterday I read that more people were required to come to London to run the transport service, though they had to pay more money last year as wages to drivers and conductors and other people in that service. From what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said about private concessionaires, he must bear in mind that a public service is a different thing from a private service. In a public service, you demand democracy, and it is inevitable in a public service that you must have the bureaucratic methods that you do not necessarily have in private business. The reason for that is that if you run a private business and lose money, it is nobody's business; but if it is a public service, it is everybody's business and they are going to ask if you did not have a cashier, an accountant or somebody to check, and these checks and balances are expensive.

The Report states, Mr. Chairman, that the Board had a bad start. The Government started a Department that was quasi-commercial without the know-how, and I would ask the Government always to keep close scrutiny on these Boards. We have agreed to the dismissal of workers, and there is a code of discipline in our contract. We do not believe that in a public transport service or in any service you can permit indiscipline to take place, and you know, Mr. Chairman, that where you have large stocks, the temptation for losses would be great; therefore supervision must be very strict. You must have responsible and dedicated people to the Service because it is not private, and I feel that what the Government has done today is not a criticism of the Government. Boards are individuals, and I would say that the Government and the Minister would be well advised, in selecting people to these Boards, to select people for their knowledge and integrity, people who are not afraid to make decisions in the interest of the undertaking for which they are responsible.

Mr. Cadbury made a statement that I can say I am in complete agreement with, and it is quoted in the Report. He said that the Transport Board should be operated, as Government enterprises are operated elsewhere, on a commercial basis in which there is no concept of appoint-

ments being as secure as those in the Civil Service. There must be no dishonesty and no political interference with either appointments or dismissals. Now I hope the Minister will adhere to that. I find too much in Barbados, because it is a small community, that if you are going to dismiss a man whom you expect would not have fallen into trouble, somebody is looking through to know who is his brother, his aunt or his father. That is none of your business. He was given a job, he has fallen down on it, and the only person to be dismissed is he - not the father and not the mother. If my son accepts a job and falls down on it, why should he not be dismissed? I feel that the Government should be willing to adhere to that rigid and strict policy in these Boards.

We in the Trade Union fight unfair dismissals, Mr. Chairman, but when a man contributes to his dismissal, we feel he must go if there is no other alternative. For that reason, Sir, I feel that in supporting this Resolution we should not go over the dead past. The Report has analysed the situation, and this is one of the recommendations of the Committee in the light of these things. The Transport Board as a Transport Board was in that position because of the original appointments.

One other thing I would like the Minister to pay attention to is this: I am wondering if the best way of financing public transport is through the Banks at the interest rate of 7 1/2% when you are subsidising the system. I think that the Government should examine this method of public financing. Only last week we spoke about a Sinking Fund and the investment of money. If the Government is going to guarantee these loans and the Banks cannot give you loans at rates lower than 7 1/2%, you should undertake to

provide them by some other means. If you are going to make up the losses of the Board, and you are going to guarantee these loans, it means that if you go to the Bank and guarantee these loans at 7 1/2% and the interest falls at you, you are paying both; so it means that you are taking more money out of public revenue. I think the Report notes that the rates of interest were high. You cannot do anything about depreciation because you have rolling stock. I do not feel, Mr. Chairman, that it is wise financing to finance a subsidised part of your economy at the same interest rates as you would do in any ordinary profit making enterprise, because a profit making enterprise is likely to absorb the interest rates that you pay on your original charges. I would therefore suggest that loans for the Transport Board should be taken at a lower rate of interest than at the high rates which have been mentioned in the Report. 3.00 p.m.

That would relieve some of our future burdens because I am satisfied in my mind, as I have said here previously, that in Europe, in the United Kingdom, in the United States of America and in Canada, public transport like this receives subventions from the respective Governments. Therefore, it is nothing new. Airlines all over the world today, so long as they are the national carriers, are carried on with a national subsidy. In Barbados, a large number of the lower income sectors of our community uses the bus transport, and that is one of the reasons why subventions are necessary in order to keep the fares from rising and falling too heavily on the poorest section of the community. School children who are not yet working have to be taken to school; therefore, it means that parents have to carry this burden. But they carry a burden for a sector of the community which is not yet income-bearing; so it is a charge on their own income. We, therefore, have made concessions to the children.

I must tell the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that the Transport Board carries more of such children than the other concessionaires. That is an analysis of assessing the losses of the Transport Board because this Board carries the greater burden on their route. When you look at this matter as a whole, it is not only a question of subventions which should be given, but it is also a question of efficiency and it is Government's business to see that an efficient service is rendered within the organisation and that the people are getting their money's worth.

Sir, I would like to see more public discussion on the Transport Board so as to deal with these matters and the recruitment of people. I think the Transport Board should have a Personnel Officer, a man who understands the human element of management as distinct from general management. The Transport Board, unfortunately, has not had a man to deal with this matter. Mr. Hunte was a good manager, but he did not deal with this matter. Wherever a Government or any employer is employing 500 people, that number is enough for that organisation to acquire an expert to deal with the recruitment and the maintaining of people. That should not be left to chance.

Sir, we train men to go and take up positions with the

London Transport. What the public complains about now is the crude behaviour and coarseness of some of the conductors. You are recruiting men who, by and large, are drawn from the coarser elements of our society, and their behaviour is not going to be better when they get on the buses.

It is remarkable how you can get raw material and how you can train it. You only have to tell a bus conductor or a driver sitting in a class what should be his behaviour as against saying "woman in the red hat, let me get it", "blow hot, strike up now and let me get it". All of that is crude Those are the

things which you get. When some of these young men go to London and address you, they say to you \"fares, please\", and they do it with as much polish as an Englishman. It can be said that Barbadian bus drivers are sometimes more English than the Englishmen. It is true that the whole atmosphere here is different from what it is in England, and we must tell the general public when they get on a bus what they should do. When some of them get on the bus, they tell you when they are asked for fares: \"Let me catch my wind\". They get on as if they had just run a hundred yard sprint.

Sir, I feel that a Personnel Officer would help in this matter. I would like to see that come into being. Another thing which is necessary is a proper workshop. You have a bad \"workshop at present and we of the Union have told the Transport Board that. You do not have the nice facilities there. You do not have places for drivers and conductors to wait when they come for buses. You also need some of the other facilities. In London, Mr. Chairman, the London Transport Executive has a good ground where the workers can play cricket or football and, as a matter of fact, many big companies in London provide such facilities for their employees. Any company which carries more than 500 employees - it would not be unlikely that it would provide its employees with these facilities. For example, the Cadbury people started the idea of providing facilities for their employees to play games. They have provided tennis courts and so on for their workers. I have travelled around London, and I have seen many of the big firms with these facilities for their staff. They make their staff feel, apart from working, that they have some of the facets of life which can bring happiness to them. The best way of removing this crudeness which people complain about is to have bus drivers and conductors trained. 3.10 p.m.

There are many places in which, I feel, we could improve our transport services, and we should see that people give us the co-operation which is necessary. We of the Trade Union, who are on the side of the workers, will see to it that the workers give of their best. We do not want to represent workers on the basis of exploiting the employer and taking money out of his hand without giving him proper service for it. That is no good either to us or to the man. Any productivity is related to progress. I do not want you to believe that we are asking for money and for a better service but we do not want to see good service rendered. I hope the Hon. Minister will accept any criticism which I may make. As I said earlier, I do not regard that public transport could be commercially viable Just as you can make light and power or the telephone service commercially viable. You cannot compare the bus service with the service of the Telephone Company or the Electric Company or the Natural Gas Corporation. These are commodities or services which you are selling and you arrange

the prices for them. When you come to the Transport Service, that is a service which you are providing, and you do not know how many people it would require in order to make the service economically profitable.

Wherever you are providing this service, you should provide it at a cost which is not hard on the people. I was very pleased to hear the Hon. Minister say that they intend to rotate the buses. It is a luxury for Barbados to have buses sleeping, as it were, in the mid-day in the centre of your City and on valuable land when they should be rotating. A ship does not make any money when it is lying in the Harbour; it makes money when it is plying on the sea. I am sure that where there is anything which can be done to improve the service, everyone will be interested in it. I have read a lot of things in the newspaper about the bus service., and there is not one answer. Everybody seems to think that Barbados has grown up overnight and that a badbehaved man was only bad-behaved on the morning you saw him; whereas it is not realised that he was bad behaved over a number of years when his parents did not know

any better. He is therefore the product of those hardships which are experienced. Some people think that when they join a Trade Union they can expect the Trade Union or the members of it, to be magicians so that we can turn Saul into St. Paul. They believe that you are the Lord Pope when they join the Union. Sometimes you are precocious when you Join an organization, and sometimes the best does not come out. In a crowd, a quiet, good-natured man will probably come out to be the worst because the crowd gives him that sort of impetus. Some employers are not interested in the behaviour of people. The other morning I saw a bus driver who drove a bus very slowly along Trafalgar Square as if time did not mean anything to him; he was very contented in the evening because he did not expect that I would follow him until he got down to where the employer was. I travelled in front of him and stopped. I said that that was only to let him know that I would report him. He was a member of the Union, but he was working with an employer. That is only an example of the behaviour which you get from some of these employees. On the other hand, there are some people who are gentlemen and they give you good service.

Mr. Chairman, do not let us worry to talk about the employers. A few nights ago there was a party which took place at the Premier's residence. I telephoned for a taxi and the person who replied said: "I cannot hear you, who -are you?" I was very exasperated. I said "This is Frank Walcott speaking; send a taxi to Bank Hall." When I said "This is Frank Walcott speaking," he apparently felt that I should have said "This is Mr. Walcott speaking." Because I did not say what he wanted me to say, he could not understand me. It appeared to him that what I said was too ordinary. I tried to get in touch with the employer, but It appears to me that these employers are usually not at home at night; (Laughter) so it was hopeless to get that employer. The employers do not have a staff to whom you can lodge any complaint, because you will find that you are going from bad to worse. However, Sir, you will experience all of these problems when it is a question of private employment, and you also get them in Government employment. On the other hand, the Government will have a staff which is big enough so that they can employ a Personnel Officer, an officer who knows his business in such a way that he is able to assist in the administration. 3.20 p.m.

I would say that the structure of that organisation can carry a man who is Secretary to the Board. You should be able to employ a man of the qualification to be a Personnel Officer and Secretary, because any man who has risen to the stature of a Personnel Officer is competent to perform the duties of Secretary to a Board, but he would be carrying on technical functions in addition to that. That is a matter purely for the Board, and if I were Chairman of the Transport Board, I would have to recommend to Government or to any other directors the appointment of a Personnel Officer of a staff as big as 500 so that you could keep them under training, explain the policy of the Board, make them understand what public transport really means,- that

it is the public they are serving and not themselves - good manners, tidiness, behaviour, deportment and all these things. Training is essential for the job, and not where they were educated. just as teachers, doctors and other professional people have to be trained, these workers in these special categories should be indoctrinated as to the requirements that would satisfy the public rather than have this hit-or-miss method, so that the public would not have to depend on good nature which is not always in large sup

ply.

Mr. COWARD:

Mr. Chairman, I think that I would be lacking in my responsibility to the public if I did not get up here

today and express my views on so important a subject with which we are now dealing. It is known, Sir, that the three essential services in this island are water, electricity and transport. Transport in this country may be unlike transport in any other part of the world, in that people like the best for less, and transport is no exception. To enter into the merits and demerits of this Resolution, one would have to look back to the days when the Government railway was indicted before a jury in this Honourable Chamber, and despite the representation that was made then by one of the colonies most faithful orators in this House, the late C. L. Elder, the Jury of this House then returned a verdict of "guilty" against the railway and it was condemned and put out of existence.

At that time, Mr. Chairman, the transport of this island was run without any organised form, and there were: a few adventurous people who took over the running of transport in this island, some of whom died poor and some of whom still exist. It was in the year 1938, Mr. Chairman, when transport had reached such a stage that the then Government set up a Transport Board under the chairmanship of Mr. J. H. Wilkinson, and the island was divided into concessions, and concessions were awarded to certain concessionaires who had to enter into bonds and sureties so as to keep up with the requirements of the Board. What was surprising is that it was set out in the concession that the concessionaires would have the sole right to operate the concession thereon. It was from 1938 to 1954 that the then private concessionaires who operated the buses were constantly appealing to Government to increase bus fares in order to allow them to pay better wages, to improve the bus service and purchase units. As you will realise, Mr. Chairman, that when the concession was granted in 1938, the then price of a motor omnibus chassis was \$975, and in 1954 the price of a chassis was \$3,000 and over.

The then Government was stubborn enough to say that there would be no increase in bus fares, not over their dead bodies. I am only saying this to show the reason why we have this Resolution here today. It was because of stubbornness on the part of the Government who refused to increase bus fares by one cent or a penny. They felt it would be better to purchase the buses and so they did. 3.30 p.m.

I, at this stage, must compliment the hon. senior member for St. Peter for the manner in which he defended the Transport Board. The hon. member pointed out that the private concessionaires have the routes which they wanted. But I would say for the benefit of the hon. senior member for St. Peter, that the private concessionaires do not have the routes which they wanted, but they have the routes which they got. I quite remember that in 1957 when certain concessionaires who could not carry on any longer refused to carry on, the then Government was appealing to the other concessionaires to take over any of the routes which they felt they could carry on. At that time, I applied to the Government for Route 25 which runs between Bridgetown and Deacons Road, because I realised that the most profitable routes are the routes around the City of Bridgetown. The then Government refused to give me that service running to Deacons Road and the route which they granted me was Route 6 in St. Joseph. Mr. Chairman, you will understand that Saturdays are the days when the most business goes on between the country and Bridgetown and I am sure that that business is from Saturday to Saturday. It is also the day when you may have a lot of breakdowns. There was a

Saturday when there were not less than five buses which broke down on the Route 6 area.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter said that the Transport Board give a better service than private concessionaires. Mr. Chairman, I am not speaking here because I am a concessionaire, but I am speaking from experience as a man who operated buses for the past 30 years. I am not going by what somebody

told me; I am going by what I know. Today, what we are experiencing stems from all that we have heard; it is due to the stubbornness of the last Government.

I would not tell you that I am in favour of this Resolution, but as a representative of the people and as a concessionaire, I know what it is to carry on a public service. I know what it takes, and for that reason I would suggest to the Government that the time has come when the Government should declare its policy on the transport service of this Island.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know that the Government has proposed to make some changes into the transport system and I am appealing to the Hon. Minister to see to it that concessionaires in this Island will be treated as a responsible body. I hope that the Hon. Minister will so see his way to invite the present concessionaires to a meeting and discuss the matter with them so that transport in this Island would run smoothly. I am not serving any reflection on the Department of Highways and Transport, because that Department has always had a battle to see that transport is run smoothly in this country. But I will suggest and I hope the time will soon come when one authority would be set up to handle the transport of Barbados.

Mr. SEALEY:

Mr. Chairman, I am a director of a small taxi firm, and I feel that I would be lacking in my duty if I did not add my quota to this debate. I am a bit baffled from what I heard on both sides. The Transport Board today is asking for almost \$3 million for what it has lost in a matter of between five to six years. On the other hand, the private concessionaires who are supposed to be running the same type of transport over the same time have provided everything which is required by the Transport Board, that is to say, paying the same salaries to its employees, buying tyres and buying vehicles; yet the Transport Board is running into trouble day after day and the other private concessionaires can still hold their heads above water.

I am not accusing the present Government. What I feel is that the last Government made a blunder; therefore, they had to take over the Transport Board. The fault of not voting one single cent to the concessionaires had brought this Island as far as transportation is concerned into a lot of trouble.

Sir, I remember as a mechanic the time when you got a truck chassis for \$800 and one tyre for a truck was bought for \$50. As years rolled over, you had to pay \$4,000 for a truck and two years after you had to pay \$8,000 for the same truck chassis, which you bought for \$800. That meant that there was a rise in revenue for drivers. The same bus concessionaires asked for one cent increase in the bus fares, and I read it and heard it over and over that the last Government said that they would give them the cent more over their dead bodies.

You will agree with me, Mr. Chairman, when I say that the hon. senior member for St. Peter is an experienced parliamentarian and a good debater, but he knows absolutely nothing about transportation. The only transportation which he knows something about is the motor car which he is driving. I think the present trouble today with the Transport Board is with the whole structure in that its overhead expenditure is too heavy. The Transport Board has an office staff which, as it stands today, can deal with three times more the number of buses which it operates. Its overhead structure is too heavy. 3.40 p.m.

That is the sort of office which you have at the Transport Board. I say that the overhead department is

too heavy.

You will also agree with me, Mr. Chairman, when I say that where there are ordinary minor repairs which would normally be done in two or three hours, in that Department those repairs will take two or three days. They therefore cannot get the vehicles on the road so as to make money. A repair Job will take two days in that Transport Board Department whereas it will take two or three hours in other places. I am suggesting that instead of taking a bus off the road in order to repair the engine, it is better to keep engines so that they can be transferred where it is a question of transferring the engines. Also in the case of the differential and the gear box, they should be kept intact; they should be ready for making a transfer.

Mr. Chairman, we, on this side of the House, believe in private enterprise. We believe in giving a man a chance to help himself. You cannot take Barbados and compare this small island with places like Trinidad and the United States of America with all their international resources. Trinidad has bauxite; Trinidad can boast about having \$31 million with its oil rights. I see that the bus concessionaires are carrying on their business on the various routes, and I have not seen any one of them run into bankruptcy yet. The workshop management at the Transport Board lacks initiative. What the Government wants is to have a man in the workshop in order to see that work is properly done. You have a man taking two or three weeks to do a job where in the cases of other garages they may only take two or three days. You take Eckstein's Garage, McEneaney's, and others; they have more workmen at the Transport Board than there are at these garages which I have mentioned. What you want. I repeat, is workshop administration. You want things to be kept going. Your trouble is to get the vehicles on the road so that they can make money. It does not require five or six men to attend to a job and taking four or five days when the job can be done in a few hours. I feel that this \$2 million odd could be used in the building of another Hilton Hotel in this colony. If the private concessionaires can run their services and make a living out of their buses, why is it that the Transport Board cannot do the same? Mr. Chairman, I have to burn the midnight oil in trying to pay my taxes, insurance and so on. I feel that the Government should return these buses to the private concessionaires and waive their hands out of it.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, some people step into things which they really do not understand, and the hon. senior member for St. Michael is a classic example of that. The hon. member will remain where he is and my position is one which will be different from his because I am representing something which is needful in this community. The hon. member is holding on to a political philosophy for which he himself has no bearing; he is holding on to something which his whole background cannot be in. If the hon. member is bringing forward any Conservative idea, that shows the stupidity of present-day politicians. If there were more Conservatives in Barbados, the hon. member would never have had a seat in this Chamber.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Will the hon. member stick to this Resolution?

Mr. WALLOTT:

I am sticking to the Resolution. If the hon. member subscribes to that philosophy which he has mentioned, then he and all of them will be outside this Chamber, because the days of Conservatism are dead and gone for ever. No emergent country can talk about Conservatism and about putting back things in the hands of private people. It is only an idiot who has been blind-folded, who can talk about putting

things back in the hands of private people at this stage. Some fifteen years ago, the private people had these buses and they ran the service in this country. (ASIDES) The hon. member is asking me what I know about transport, but in reply to that I would like to say that if they ran the transport how the hon. member would run it, then many of the people would not be able to get to work. Did the private people run a theatre bus to St. Joseph, St. George or St. Philip? You can go in the bus stand and you will find that you will have a bus to carry you to St. Joseph at 11 o'clock at night. You can go to the bus stand on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday and you will find the Transport Board with buses lined up at the theatre.

As far as the hon. senior member for St. Michael, who believes in Conservatism is concerned, I want to say that if he really believes that Conservatism has a chance of survival in Barbados just because he is holding a seat in this Assembly, he will see how many more of his colleagues will be able to come in this Assembly with that concept, 3.50 p.m.

A man looking like the hon. senior member for St. Michael cannot be a Conservative.

Mr. SEALEY:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I never said that I am a Conservative; I said I believe in Conservatism. You should give a man a chance to explain himself.

Mr. WALCOTT:

The hon. member is just like a person who says he believes in Christianity, but he is not a Christian. What nonsense is he talking? When you have a philosophy and believe in Conservatism, you are a Conservative; so do not be silly. You cannot say you believe in Conservatism, but you are a Socialist. When you talk about a political philosophy, you are what you believe in, if you know what a belief is. You cannot be a Socialist and believe in Socialism, but say you are a Fascist. How can the hon. member refer to 1942 in making a comparison with the present transport system? At that time twenty-four years ago, you had the "fly" buses. If you wanted to get on a bus going to Silver Sands, you had to ride up to the Garrison, then the bus would bring you back to Bridgetown, and you would be driving through Dayrells Road and around the Garrison and probably back to town if they thought people were there waiting before you eventually got to your destination. How can you compare 1942 when you had that cutthroat madness with the present system?

I would say, Mr. Chairman, that Barbados has the best public transport system of the whole West Indian islands from Jamaica back down. I have been to Jamaica, British Guiana, Trinidad and all the other islands, and I can say that it is the best transport service in this area. Jamaica has nothing like it, and people do not begin to ride in buses in Port-of-Spain; they use the taxi system for 12 cents, but I am not asking the taxi people here to run their taxis for 12 cents. With regard to the workshop, anybody can make a criticism. The Committee made a criticism of it, and I would say that it needs regularising. It is true that the hon. member may have a knowledge of engines, but the person in charge of the workshop at the Transport Board has as much knowledge as the hon. member has and even if he is not a strong man, he is knowledgeable so far as his job is concerned.

The hon. member is not the only taxpayer. Mr. Chairman. I am a taxpayer too. Does he believe that I live in Barbados free? I was a taxpayer from the day I was born because from that time it cost something to feed me, and this country imports commodities. This criticism of the Transport Board and the private

concessionaires is what the Report makes, and the Report has been laid on the Table of this House for members to read. It states that the private people lost money. It is a little difficult for the hon. member to preach that bankruptcy is the last phase of losses. If everybody that loses money in any given year or period went into bankruptcy, very few would not be in Banruptcy. Some people start a business knowing that for the first four or five years they are going to be in the red. It is not a question of bankruptcy, but a question of what is going to tide you through.

When I hear this talk about Conservatism, and I look at the hon. junior member for Bridgetown and realise that he is the Principal of a school, I would say that the whole composition of his profession and his projections is the antithesis of a Conservative approach. People regard Conservatism and private ownership as synonymous, as if when you are a Socialist you do not believe in private ownership. They have the idea that Socialism means taking away things from people. I am a Socialist; but I do not think the Government should take over the school which the hon. member is running and in which he is producing results. If I were a believer in Conservatism, I would say that the

only schools you should have are the old established schools we came along and found where you had this rigid system, and those schools would be St. Winifred's, Queen's College, St. Michael's and Codrington High School. That is why you have so many ignorant people in Barbados, because they believed you should only have these schools, and people were leaving school at 12 and 13 years of age and walking about without any further education, because these schools were filled. If you were a Conservative, you would want to conserve there. But it is a completely new projection. You will find that education in Barbados has taken a completely different turn from what it was twenty years ago when the rigid public-aided schools were the only schools, when we talked about secondary education. That is why I say that Conservatism today has no meaning, just as you cannot tell a person that the only school to go to is Harrison College. There are old time idiots who claim that a boy who goes to Harrison College and does not win a Barbados Scholarship, or a fellow who qualified as a lawyer and comes back here has no sense. When it comes to the transport system, therefore, you cannot attack it, because you have a Report here setting out the difficulties of the system. We see the difficulties, but what we are doing is trying to live with the difficulties. 4.00 p.m.

It is impracticable. You cannot go and take 198 buses and share them out as you would share out plums. You want to know the person or those who have taken over, and the system which a private man can work. If he dies tomorrow - God forbid this premonition - the hon. member cannot say that he is leaving anything as a deed of gift for his wife and that she must carry on a bus service. I would like to see somebody signing something which says that I must carry on when you die. You may sign something and give it to me, but that does not mean that I am going to carry it on. I do not know that the hon. member can sign something which says that I must carry on. All I am saying is that you can leave it and say how it is to be carried on, but that does not make it that somebody must carry it on. You cannot tell your wife or family to carry on any estate. Estates have been left for people and they refused to carry them on. There is no law to make any person do anything in a British territory so far as work is concerned. You can leave something for your wife, but you cannot say that she has to operate it. How can you tell your wife that she must be the manager of a bus company? You better tell me that you leave something in the will which says that she must not marry again. You get some fellows who when they are in the grave want to be controlling what they had on land too.

Sir, I do not see how anybody can read this Report and say that you are subscribing to the principle

that private enterprise must run the buses. The Report deals with a principle. It shows that even if transport is run by private enterprise, it has to be run by a company, and even if a company runs it, you will have to subsidise that company. All of the alternatives put it back in the Government's hands. You have three alternatives, and the one which they have chosen is the centre. Sir, you have to be practicable. Who is going to take the buses over? Let us say that you put out tenders for the buses at a certain price. Who would take them over? At what price would you take them over? (A VOICE: At the market value.) That is not true. Market value! What is the market value of a bus? A bus has no market value to the man who does not value a bus. A train has no market value to the man who does not run a train. You do not have a train selling out at market value unless the train is old iron. When you have a bus, it does not have any market value. If you have no concession and you have a bus, it has no market value. The market value of a bus has no meaning to anybody. You cannot put up a bus for auction and say what is the market value. Let us say that you put up a \$25,000 bus for auction and the man who buys it has no concession, what could he do with it? Must he carry it to the beach? That is why I say 'rolling stock'. You can only sell an old bus to a bus company. That is why I say giving them back to private concessionaires has been an exemption by the Committee.

I am dealing with the Report. The Resolution stems from the recommendations of the Committee. This is the first time - and hon. members and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition would know - that we are discussing this matter since the Report was laid; therefore, it is proper that we use this opportunity for discussing the Report.

The point which the hon. member made was that they should be given back to the private concessionaires. Do you agree with the recommendations of the Report which I agree with, that that would be an expensive proposition? For these reasons: you are not going to find anybody willing to accept these buses as a company. The recommendation states that if you have private concessionaires taking them over, they have to form themselves into a company. The recommendation states that the Government should take over all or that a company should take over all. Would you say that you are going to find one company willing to take over the 200 buses which we have today? Nobody is going to take them over. That is why I said that you will have to abandon that idea. The whole idea is this, and you do not have to be a financier to know this. To take over these 200 buses would mean a capital formation of \$3 million or more. Use your common sense. No company is going to float capital to the tune of \$3 million to carry out the transport of this island. After all, to carry out the possibility of such a service, they will have to set up a prospectus and say, when you put money in this venture, what you will get. Tell me the man who has money to invest who would put it in bus transport. He would go somewhere else and invest his money after he has read all these Reports.

Mr. Chairman, I feel when you have a Report from a Committee which worked on this matter of transport, if you are going to abandon the Report, well, do so; but if you want to use it for practical purposes, you should read it. 4.10 p.m.

I was looking in the Report of the Committee, which was appointed by the Government to enquire into the public transport services of the island and to make recommendations, to find where the Report referred to the cost of financing the services. This is what it says:

"The immediate cost to the Government of assuming full responsibility for the provision of transport services throughout the Island will be considerable. On the evidence before us we estimate that forty

(40) new bus units will be needed over the next four (4) years to bring the service up to adequate strength. The cost of acquiring the units now owned by the concessionaires, on the most liberal estimate, cannot exceed \$750,000. To enable the Transport Board to run efficiently after reorganization, it will be necessary to improve the workshop and other facilities at an estimated cost of \$250,000 each. The cost of the new buses is estimated on present prices at \$25,000 each, making a total of \$1,000,000. Approximately another \$1,000,000 will be needed to liquidate the debts now owed by the Transport Board. A sum of \$3,000,000 represents a considerable investment, but the Government would have in return assets to the value of approximately \$2,800,000 and would provide a service which should not only meet the full needs of the travelling public, but which should be in a position to pay its way and to plan for replacements and future development."

Imagine that you ask somebody who is running a business to come in, and then you have to give up some of the things which you say would be in the vicinity of \$2 million! That kind of money does not knock about in Barbados, and none of the Barbadian people with money would put it in this investment. The hon. senior member for St. Michael would not put one cent in a company where, for the last ten years, the business done had been subjected to public enquiries and it has not been making any money. Who is the genius that will be the managing Director to run this business? Imagine floating a company at \$3 million and hearing what kind of returns some people will want on the money! What you would want is a safe return. In the telephone service, for instance, which is like a gilt-edged security.

The hon. senior member for St. Michael spoke about Trinidad, but I did not mention Trinidad in the context in which he mentioned it. Trinidad has just had a national transport, and you can get oil and gasoline at a cheap rate in that Island. The people who ran the bus service to San-Fernando gave them up, and when I say that, I mean that they did not want to run them any longer. If you have the wrong manager in a workshop, all it means is that you want a manager; it does not mean that you must not have a service. Again, if your workshop is being badly run, it does not mean that you should not have a workshop. When you go to the Transport Board and see the sort of workshop they have up there - they have a make-shift sort of thing. They want somewhere where they can lay out things on a better basis. The amount of money given to the Transport Service is not money given to support transport as such. I have no axe to grind; in so far as transport is concerned, it does not matter to me personally whether you have a Transport Board or not. The ownership or running of public transport is nothing new, and when you make comparisons you should make comparisons which are fair. You only use comparisons with rich companies in order to show that they have bus fares which are not exorbitant. When the hon. junior member for the City goes anywhere - he has visited New York and he knows that the bus fare for one stage is 15 cents. When you compare the bus fare of 15 cents in the United States of America where the economy is \$2 million or \$3 million per annum, you will see how the bus fare in the United States of America would compare with our bus fares in this island.

I have made my comparisons in order to show that if you were to subsidise the bus service you are only subsidising the domestic servant. You are subsidising the employee who receives \$20 or \$22 a week or the man who is getting a low wage. You are not subsidising the Board per se. That is where the subsidy goes. If it does not work like that, then you would have to close down the Infirmarys. Some of those people who are now in the Infirmarys have been living reckless lives when they were young and they spent all their money as they liked. Now the position is that our taxes are being utilised in the running of these Infirmarys. What I am saying is that if you put a subsidy in the transport service that is something which is fair and reasonable. I maintain and I contend that when we have the public

ownership of the transport service, that is in no way any imposition on the people of this island of Barbados. 4.20 p.m.

When the hon. member says that I do not know about Transport, I will tell him that I know as much about transport as he does in its political context. We do not deal with transport in here as mechanics; we deal with it as politicians dealing with the policy that Government lays down.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member who has just sat down had been as calm in the beginning as when he ended, quite frankly I would not have risen; but he was in a haranguing style to my friend, the hon. senior member for St. Michael, whom he castigated for being a Conservative. The hon. member knows well enough when he says nobody in his position or may be in my position could be a Conservative that that cannot be true within the literal meaning of the word "conservatism." It does not mean that you must be a big shareholder in Bulkeley's or own Wanstead or Haymans to be a Conservative. One could be a Conservative in outlook..... (Mr. WALCOTT And live in the almshousel) The hon. member could not be more right that people might be in the almshouse and be a Conservative in outlook. Anybody who studies Barbadians knows well enough that you can be Conservative in outlook, without money, but you can be human in your general public life, and my friend, the hon. senior member for St. Michael, being in a Conservative Party has nothing to apologise for. People take me for what I am and for what I have done The philosophy of the members of my Party is well known, and the hon. member knows that we have never been stupid to argue that you can have the Waterworks, or the postal system today run by private enterprise. We have outgrown those things, and even the most diehard person could not

begin to think of these things in that light. If, however, in an island like Barbados the last Government had taken over the entire service and run it and had shown a loss, and the hon. member had used the argument which he has, I would appreciate very much what he said. In the United States the latest figures I saw of people being moved between 4 o'clock and 6 o'clock are two million. It is possible to get a company formed in a big country; yet in the United States, you still have private enterprise taking people from the Garden City in Jersey. In one part of the Municipality, the transport is run by the local authority, and in another part it is run by private enterprise.

I have read and studied the Report, and I have also studied Barbadians. Like the hon. member, I was not born with any kind of spoon in my mouth; therefore we share things in common. The only transport system which existed in this country was the railway, and the Government took it over. The hon. member might not remember because he is much younger than I am, but I happened to be in the vanguard of those who said that the Government should be running transport because in America and England automobiles had come in, and buses and motor lorries had begun to squeeze the railway and it was not paying. The buses came in and were running helter-skelter, and hundreds of people came here and threw away their money. The Government then saw the wisdom of controlling transport in the island. The hon. member who is a concessionaire can tell you that people came back from America with \$10,000 and bought three or four buses, and through the years I had been appointed trustee-in-bankruptcy for the people who went into the bus business. A Conservative Government saw the wisdom of preventing buses from running here and there, and I can remember that I travelled around with the Chairman of the Central Road Board to see how this thing was being worked. The whole idea then was to lay out a system in accordance with the population density for the municipal area known then as the parish of St. Michael, and Eckstein started the service in St. Peter, and there was a subsidy when the

train was running. Eckstein Bros, then had the bulk of the buses and then there was no more subsidy and subsequently other people opened up new routes. Private enterprise started opening routes, but to save them from themselves the Government stepped in and controlled the system.

This is a very able Report, but it seems to miss one thing. The hon. member says that the Committee recommended three alternatives, but I see two, though they suggested a middle course; you would hardly find enough Barbadians to put up money to form a company. Now the hon. member who has just sat down says it does not matter to him whether there is transport, but he could more want it because he is an avowed Socialist and we are not. He has not got occasion to use a bus more than I have, but we have interest in people who must use the bus. Four buses at \$25,000 each would mean \$100,000, and if you multiply that by ten, that would mean forty buses for \$1 million, and if there are 80 buses it would be \$2 million. 4.30 p.m.

It is going to be difficult to get any one Barbadian of the class and type to own the seven units of the transport system of the country which is divided in half. Whether you say that this is the better half or that, what we are arguing is this. The Government has not told us, although we are discussing this Resolution, that this is as a result of the Report. Why I say that is for this reason. While you may find it difficult to get seven people like those owning half of the transport service, you will realise that the seven individuals own nearly the same number of buses as the Transport Board and they have been trying to bring out the up-to-date buses too. They did ask for an increase in bus fares, but yet they carried on. When the Government took over the buses, why is it that Mr. Birch ran and asked to give him back those buses?

What I am arguing is this. The Government has not yet told us that they have tried to get seven people just like the seven who are now running the other part of the service in order to take over. I am not going to say, like the hon. senior member for St. Peter, that you cannot get

seven people. Do you know this - and if I am not telling the truth, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph can say - there were a number of concessionaires who were willing and ready to take over from Mrs. Weatherhead when she sold hers. If seven people run the buses of the other part of the service and the Government is running the other part and losing money - I do not care who sat on that Committee; you did not say that anybody else lost money for the 20 years they were operating; therefore, where did they get money from to carry on? Did they get it by stealing? You cannot tell me so.

Mr. Chairman, let me ask you this. Let us say you are keeping sheep or running a motor car and you are losing money by it. Would you go on losing money year after year on that? Do you mean to tell me that the seven concessionaires who are running buses are such philanthropists that they continue to run them despite the fact that they are losing money. Do you think that I would put even \$15 in a company like the Transport Board? Do you think I will do that when buses go out at night and nobody knows where they are going? You get gasoline for the buses going into other peoples' vehicles.

It has been suggested that you would not get people putting up capital like the seven or eight people who have invested in the buses. Barbadians are not like that. I remember the night when I went to Banks Breweries. The ex-Minister of Trade told us that he was glad to be there and that the opening of Banks Breweries would teach a lot of Barbadians that it was not the best thing to put their money in banks, but to take shares and bonds. That suits people who have money to put down, but not the average

Barbadians.

Mr. Chairman, I say now that the alternative which the Ward Committee has given to have transport run by private enterprise is a very sound one. To suggest that you cannot get seven people to get together and run it is not a sound one. You will have to do that sooner or later. What Government would go on subsidising half of the transport service to such an extent as this while the other half is paying taxes? That just does not make sense. Which of you would do it? Part of the transport service is carried on by private enterprise, and the Government is sitting down as a silent partner and drawing income tax from them. If you do not draw it in trade tax, you draw it in income tax from the men who manage it.

When people realise that of this \$600,000 which you are voting today, the seven concessionaires who carry part of the service get nothing of it, but that this goes to the Transport Board, and it comes out of the people's pocket and next year you will be coming for more and every year you will be coming for money to keep the Transport Board going, they will see it in another light. This is not merely a criticism for the sake of criticism. I shall only criticise when I see something to criticise. Let us bring Bajan horse sense to bear upon it. What is Bajan horse sense? Eight entities enter into a race one of them carrying half, while the other seven carrying the other half. But you are going to subsidise the one entity to the tune of \$600,000 and the other seven carrying out the other half must pay. You say that the Bush Hall and the Black Rock routes are not the best routes in this Island. Whom are you talking to? There are buses which run to Bathsheba and Belleplaine and they are making a profit. Are you telling me that with all the people who now live in Grazettes that that route is not one of the best routes? Who runs it but the Transport Board? 4.40 p.m.

What we are saying is this: we cannot vote for this Resolution today and for the reasons which we have given. Tell us something if you can about the recommendations of the Committee which has been set up and what is really going to be done. Let me hear something about these things which you do not understand. I know that a bus company was going out of business, but that meant so much to the gasoline company that they said "We will sign the bond so that you can take the route." Hon. members will see that it was not so much a question of the person who was running the service, but it meant something to the gasoline

company. They would want to know if a bus takes 25 gallons of gasoline to run it per day and that sort of thing. They are quite prepared to talk to people who know something about the running of the bus service. You could not talk about running a bus service because I do not know anything about it; you would have to talk to me on the question of the valuation of land. Do you think that Messrs. Da. Costa & Co. Ltd. or Mussons would back me when it comes to the supply of gasoline? The hon. senior member for St. Joseph knows what the bus business will be during the crop time and he also knows what it will be during the hard time. He knows when to get his buses ready for service and the gasoline company will be prepared to back the hon. member. Of course, the gasoline people would back you. I am in a position to say dogmatically that this is an absolute fact, that there are people who are quite ready and willing to take a route if you were to allocate it to them. On the other hand, nobody is going to spend the sum of \$100,000 or \$200,000 and you say: "This is my route", and at the same time you are not signing anything for it. If a man signs for a route like the Speightstown route, it is a question of signing a bond so that if he were to die his estate has to carry on the business and if the estate did not carry it on, then the bondsman would have to pay.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that people are not going to spend money when they have no security for it. When you talk business with a businessman you must have some security. A businessman would say: \"Let me see what you think of this route. How much money have you put in?\" The normal life of a bus, he would say, is so-much and so-much. If there is a guarantee to the Government that you can run the Black Rock route - I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. senior member for St. Peter has left the Committee because he spoke against the hon. senior member for St. Michael because that hon. member started off with the workshop at the Transport Board. I am submitting to the hon. senior member for St. Peter that it is the policy of my party to point out that private enterprise is carrying on one half of the service up to now and you can ask yourself this question for how many years have they been carrying it on? Have they ever offered to give up that service? Those concessionaires who offered to give up the services ran and took them back up. Somebody is a fool or somebody is a liar. I am saying, Sir, that under the circumstances we, on this side of the House, will not be voting this \$600,000 for the purpose of subsidising the Transport Board unless you can satisfy us beyond the shadow of any doubt that the service cannot otherwise be run.

Mr. Chairman, I have read this Report. You have seven or eight routes and I was looking in the newspaper in order to see if anybody had offered to take over these routes. I am in a position to say that I know that people will buy these routes. The Government is bound to lose money when you take into consideration what is going on up there at the Transport Department. I am prepared to offer criticism when there is an opportunity for offering criticism; as a matter of fact, when the opportunity is ripe for criticising, I will do so. It is a long time since I have had to show my real spurs in here as Leader of the Opposition and today I stand firm, along with the few of us who are on this side, on the ground and to the extent that not one red cent will we vote for the Transport Board where you have one-half of the service being run by the Government and the other half being run by the private concessionaires. We do not agree with this Resolution which, as has been stated, is for the purpose of liquidating arrears of principal and interest due on outstanding loans. We will not vote for this Resolution. I am sorry that the hon. senior member for St. Peter has left his seat. He started off his harangue in stating that my colleague the hon. senior member for St. Michael was a Conservative. 4.50 p.m.

There are men with a jackass cart and an 18' x 10' house who are Conservatives, because they have a sow pig and they do not want.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I do not know about a sow pig.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

You know about a boar pig, and you know that in St. Thomas there are men with fruit trees and a quarter of an acre of land, and they are as conservative as the late Mr. Douglas Pile, because nobody is going to take that away from them. When the hon. member says that a man of his colour cannot be a Conservative, he knows that nearly every man will tell you that he came from the bottom, except those who were born with a gold spoon and threw away the money; but those who came from the bottom had to conserve and maintain, and though you may be a Conservative, you can be human. I do not think the hon. senior member for St. Andrew could be making a sotto voce remark to me, because he has been in here long enough to know what type of person I am when I get hot. I like him as a friend, because who can stop the tide? Large boats may venture far, but small moses keep near the shore.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Chairman, I really did not intend to talk on this Resolution, but the temptation has been open for hon. members to make second reading speeches in Committee. We have listened to the speeches of members who have given a history of the beginning of this service as a Government-aided service, and I think we have had our fill of this; but what really is contentious now when all is said and done is this \$600,000 we are asked for. I have heard over-simplifications. I have heard hon. members saying that one half of the island is being serviced by private concessionaires and they have not asked Government for any subvention, but the Government buses have got themselves in a mess. It is not that they have just got themselves in a mess. Hon. members who have been in the House for the last five years realise that when these buses were taken over, the Government bought buses and paid in cash for them, and some of these buses were not worth \$5; but all the time that was going on, the privately run buses never had such a load or such dead-weight. The Government had the dead weight and had to continue over the process of years with the dead weight until ultimately it became a bad business. To look at the matter contemporaneously, the service had to begin because the Government and certain private concessionaires did not get together and compromise. We had people here on both sides assessing and valuing, but those people who know know that many of the buses for which hard cash was paid were not worth half the cash Government paid for them. That is the beginning; so how can you compare that with the private concessionaires who had no such dead weight? It is unfair comparison to look at it and oversimplify the case, and nobody can gainsay that.

Public transport is of such that it is really a public utility, Mr. Chairman, and no Government can afford to take any chances with transport, water or mail or anything of that nature. If we look back and see what has been the heritage of the Board and what it has to live through, we cannot now say that the Board should reconsider and give out public transport to individual concessionaires. The hon. senior member for Bridgetown may be right, but he may also be wrong; but as far as the Company is concerned, I quite agree with what my colleague said. I do not see any people in Barbados today with \$4 million, \$3 million or even \$2 million coming forward to run this, when there are so many of us who can make money in cutting and selling land on the West Coast. We have been listening to an oversimplification of half of the problem, forgetting the other half. What individual or group of individuals forming themselves into a company would have taken over those buses at that price at that time? Some have depreciated so much that they would be valueless. Government had to be fair and pay solid cash, and this is the result of it now. Mark you, Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister of Communications may have expediently left unsaid certain things, he said there are other factors. I do not think that we walk about with our eyes closed and our ears plugged. There are a lot of unsavoury factors that we as people who live not with our eyes looking in the skies all day long and not with turned up noses, we who live near Mother Earth, know what militated against the Government-operated company. I do not think we have to go and study that anywhere, and the Minister can afford to be frank.

As far as hard business is concerned, we have to do Just like a man in sheer disgust. He owes away so much money he does not know what to do. Let us write off this and let us look ahead, instead of every year coming back in here with this nonsense. Let us clear it up and forget it once and for all. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Give it back to private enterprise.) 5.00 p.m.

I am not saying that. I am glad that I have heard that. I am a member who, when it comes to private enterprise, does not believe in giving them things to run which must serve the public. I am very, very wary of giving those things over to private enterprise. The beneficiaries are not all employees of the

public. Those same benefits do not accrue when those companies are being run by private enterprise. To give you an example, Mr. Chairman, for years and years, certain out-of-the-way districts in St. Peter were badly served with water, but little by little improvements were made to the water service and those out-of-the-way districts are being served Just because Government owes something to the people. When private enterprise runs a service, the Government sets up what is known as a Public Utilities Board and when a request is made to the public, the concessionaires take their case before that Board and in 99 cases out of 100 cases, the public stands to lose. That is everyday experience. I am talking what I know.

As long as the transport service remains a liability of Government, there is better chance of expansion of the service in the interest of the public. (A VOICE: in a good service?) Whatever you get in this life, you have to pay for it, There is nothing for nothing on earth. Would you want something for nothing?

I think, Mr. Chairman, that we have been over-simplifying what has been called for. We have been told that half of the Island is being served by private enterprise and the Government is aiding the other half of the bus service. But the Government has an inheritance which no private concessionaire would even begin to have. That is a fact. Let one private concessionaire rise when I sit down and give this statement of mine the lie. The Government cannot tell transportation to wait. The Government cannot tell the people that they would give them a service, not tomorrow, but next week. At the stroke of midnight, the Government had the responsibility of running those buses. The concessionaires who were running them said that they were through, and their term of concession was out. What was the Government to do? Suppose the hon. senior member for the City had inherited that. I am not saying that he would have deserved it, but having had it, he then would have to act. Therefore, why should he emphasise on one half and not the entire problem? Of course, I am glad that I have explained that part of the business because you can hear that talk going all the way around. I will go back to St. Peter and hear that talk tomorrow. I will hear that Mr. So-and-So runs his route and he does not get any subsidy. But did Mr. So-and-So had the same legacy as the Transport Board?

Mr. Chairman, I think I had had my say on the matter.

Mr. HOLDER:

Mr. Chairman, if I may speak on this Resolution, I have been hearing some very nice speeches this afternoon on this matter. Certainly, they are all really good, but they are definitely dealing with the Report. I have not a copy of that Report here, but this Resolution calls for the sum of \$600,000 and I daresay that this springs from the findings of that Report.

Now, I do not think any parliamentarian or anyone of us in this honourable Chamber would vote against this Resolution, but it is absolutely a certainty that all hon. members would like to speak on it. I am going to deal with the Resolution. I, personally, would be sticking to the Resolution. All hon. members have got a copy of the Resolution and there is no need my reading the Addendum. But I am certainly concerned deeply with the section which reads thus:

"It is therefore proposed to make available to the Board additional capital of \$600,000 to liquidate arrears of principal and interest due on the outstanding loans. The Government has also decided to write off the \$2,253,904.45 which has already been advanced to the Board and will authorise the Board to reduce its capital by writing off the accumulated losses by a similar amount."

It goes on to say:

"As a further measure of assistance to the Board it is proposed to assist it in raising capital for the purchase of forty (40) new buses and for the provision of workshop and office accommodation over the next four (4) years."

Mr. Chairman, that is the part of the Resolution which I am going to speak on now. I am hoping that the Government would be in a position to tell us what would be the position when we have voted this \$600,000 to liquidate the principal and to pay all the outstanding loans and also to write off the \$2,253,904.45 that has already been advanced to the Board and will authorise the Board to reduce its capital by writing off the accumulated losses by a similar amount. We can understand paragraph 3. These are the points which I want to know. They are asking us to vote for this \$600,000, but they are telling us that that is to liquidate arrears of principal and interest due on the outstanding loans? 5.10 p.m.

They are going to write off this big amount of \$2,253,904.45 and I assume that this is the total amount of money which we have been asked to vote in Estimates from time to time. I would like the Hon. Minister to be able to tell us that this money, which we are being asked to vote now, will liquidate the arrears of principal and interest due on the outstanding loans and that the Board will be able to start again. With the Report to which hon. members have referred, is the Government in a position to assure us that, when they have started again taking into account how things are going, all of the loose screws will be tightened. I hope they will see to it that all these loose screws will have been tightened. I do not run transport; I do not know who has carried away anything; but I am wondering if after they have tightened up all of these things, in the future they will be able to go on, as the statement says, to give an improved service in four years, after the service has been brought up to adequate strength. When you read that Report you will have seen the condition of the Transport Board.

As the hon. junior member for St. Peter has said, when the Government took over the bus services in this island, that is nothing new. The Hon. Minister gave a recapitulation of what has been going on at this Transport Board and he said he was doing that for the benefit of new members of this House. However, Sir, the Transport issue has been such a question, from the inception after it was taken over by the last Government, that all members of the community are well acquainted with that issue. With this Resolution which is now before us, when we have voted this \$600,000 and they have assured us that they are going to write off this money., this sum of \$2,253,904.45, when they liquidate these arrears of principal and interest due on outstanding loans and. they are in a position to make the workshop adequate and things of that sort, I want to know if they have gone into this matter so carefully that they have been able to arrive at this decision. I am not going to make any remarks about one-half of the service being run by the bus concessionaires and the other half being run by the Government. What concerns me is this: is it going to be for the improvement of the people of Barbados and not only for the improvement of the people of St. James which constituency I have the honour to represent? It was only this morning when I was in Speightstown at a leading drug store that I had to comment on the bus service.

I am hoping that the travelling public will be relieved where the bus service is concerned. This Government is asking us to vote this amount of money today and I do hope that the Government will continue the bus service and try and give an improved service. I am not here to talk about

the buses, and if one cent in the fares was going to be raised on the dead body of anybody. If the bus fares had not been raised at that time, they would still have to be raised now. There are certain things which will need to be changed; they cannot be changed overnight; but I think that the real thing which is needed is training for bus drivers and bus conductors. The Government should undertake to have some training for them so that they will be more courteous to the passengers. I hope that the Government will set up some training school for these employees. As far as going into the merits or otherwise of the concessionaires, when the Report comes before the House to be discussed, I hope to hear what hon. members have to say on it. However, Sir, from what has been stated in the Addendum to this Resolution, I hope that the Government will be able to offer a better service and that we will be able to see an improvement in the service.

Mr. LOWE:

Mr. Chairman, it is most surprising that in many instances when you have Government business which could be expedited in a few seconds, it is carried on consistently and the point at issue is not tackled*. When you consider this Resolution from the Government's standpoint, they are asking for this sum of \$600,000 for the purpose of liquidating arrears of principal and interest due on the outstanding loans, and they are also asking us to waive this sum of \$2,253,904.45. That was a very simple matter. The Hon. Minister of Communications has outlined to the House that from 1955 until 1961 when the Government took over the Transport Service, they have a deficit of \$2,253,904.45. This is now the year 1965. This new Resolution is for the sum of \$600,000 and it is required for the purpose of bringing in rolling stock and equipment and to liquidate arrears of principal and interest due on outstanding debts. We cannot, at this stage of our development, talk about giving back the buses or the transport service to the private concessionaires. I compliment the Government on the step which they are taking because I cannot at all see the Government nationalising the transport service and then allowing the private concessionaires to carry on at this stage of our development. I am suggesting that we should write off this \$2 million odd, give the Board this \$600,000 and then let us see what the state of affairs will be within the next four years. Nobody in this House can tell me anything when it comes to this question of the Transport service. 5.20 p.m.

I defy any one of the concessionaires who has run buses in this island to come here and state that he started off with a deficit to the tune of \$2 million. They started off and increased their fleet, and you can look back and see what was the operational cost of the private concessionaire and that of the Government. The Government in its wisdom raised the bus fares, and for the first time, as the Minister said, the Transport Board was able to show a profit. That proves to each and every one of us that if the Transport Board had started off as the private concessionaires had, we would not be here today discussing the \$2 million or the Resolution for \$600,000. Many of us are well aware of the things which the last Government did, and we know that the only people who suffered in the complete exercise at that time were the travelling public. When it comes to the saying \"not over my dead body\" with regard to the penny that was asked for, Mr. Chairman, five bodies went, and this is the problem which this Government will have to face. It is no sense beating a dead horse any longer.

I compliment the Government in coming to this conclusion to waive the payment of \$2 million odd, give them the \$600,000, and then we will be able to see what is the direct progress through this Government. This Resolution should have been passed three hours ago, and I hope that parliamentarians in future will let us forget things which happened ten or fifteen years ago, put our house in order and go forward in this developing community.

Mr. CORBIN:

Mr. Chairman, there is something I was watching all the time, and it is set out here in the Addendum. It says that the Board will be unable, on its own, to raise the capital required for the purchase of rolling stock and equipment and the provision of adequate workshop and office accommodation which are necessary if the travelling public is to be offered a satisfactory service.

Now we have to compliment the private concessionaires who have part of the sendee of this island, because had it not been for them, we do not know how many million dollars we would be in debt today. I would say to Government that these poor concessionaires should be considered in the future. We are giving the Transport Board a certain amount of money to help to carry out part of the service for the island, and if we want to have a satisfactory service in the whole island, we would have to assist the private concessionaires who are meeting it very difficult, and who have to pay their taxes. Where do they get their money? How do they buy new buses? A Board should be set up by the Government to allow private concessionaires to borrow money at a very low rate of interest to help them meet their obligations. If the Transport Board is given so many million dollars and every year they are in arrears, something must be done for these poor concessionaires because they are carrying on a service for this island and are absolutely suffering. They have to pay for every bolt, nut and other accessories on the buses they own, but nobody helps them. I know, Mr. Chairman, that the Transport Board will be a liability to Government as long as they keep it.

While the last Government was in power, I said on the floor of this House that the rain was falling and the tank was taking the water, but it was leaking out. We must search for these cracks and stop them; otherwise the Transport Board will run this island into Chancery. We will grant them this money now, but I will bet anyone a yacht to an ice-cream cone that if you give the Transport Board 100 new buses, within a couple of years they will still be in arrears. Let us try to find where the difficulties lie and solve them. It is like the song "My Roof has a hole in it." If this Government grants the Transport Board a certain amount of money to purchase new buses, they should check and see if any improvement is made. 5.30 p.m.

If no improvement is made, you will know what to do. The Government will have to look out for them because something is wrong. They should be able to balance their accounts. If I give you \$1,000 this year, next year I will have to give you \$4,000 and I will continually have to give you. Possibly, I will have to give you \$1/2 million.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this Resolution calls for \$600,000 and it says that it is necessary; therefore, I will have to vote for it.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one or two points. I daresay that enough has been said on this and the body of members has been satisfied about it. I listened attentively to the points which were made and some of them deserve further consideration. I refer to the points raised relative to a proper workshop and the question of the other half of the transport service.

It is a fact that, this Resolution coming at this time when the Report of the Ward Committee which was appointed to report on the Transport Service, and the Ninth Annual Report of the Transport Board

have been laid, hon. members would have had all the information which they needed. Nothing has been withheld so hon. members had the opportunity of examining the accounts of the Transport Board.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to talk much longer on this, but I want to make it doubly clear that whereas the amount of \$2,253,904.45 is the amount which is due and outstanding from 1961 when we came into office, the other amount is \$1,062,140.72 which is comprised as follows:- Creditor and Credit balances, \$190,169.97; Loans and accrued interest owing to Royal Bank of Canada, \$871,970.75

I just want to make it doubly clear that the \$600,000 which is being voted by this Resolution is to reduce the principal of \$871,970.75. This has nothing to do with the amount of \$2,253,904.45, which is the total of sums advanced to the Transport Board from 1955 to 1961 by way of Supplementary Resolutions and some set down in the Estimates. Therefore, that bad debt, we are not asking them to write it off. That indebtedness of the Board discredits it, and when it has been written off, it would give them the

opportunity of securing loans or making it viable in the eyes of the public.

That would not be on their books any longer and we are asking in the next Resolution to write off that; but on this occasion, we are asking for \$600,000 to put the Board in a better position so that it would look better in the eyes of its creditors.

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

AYES:

Honourables W. A. CRAWFORD, C. E. TALMA, G. G. FERGUSSEN, A. DaC. EDWARDS, Messrs. W. R. LOWE; J. B YEARWOOD; F. L. WALOOTT - 7.

NOES:

Mr. MOTTLEY - 1.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1964-65 No. 59

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of \$1,800 for the purchase of 150 chairs for the Enmore Health Centre. There were 300 chairs, but because of the fact that they were used not only at the Health Centres, but at other places, many of them have got out of order. There was a survey out on 150 of them, and it was recommended that those 150 should be replaced.

This Resolution therefore seeks to provide the sum of \$1,800 for the purchase of those chairs.

pass.

1, therefore, beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

On motion of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of three Resolutions in Committee of Supply. Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON in each case, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

RESOLUTION TO WAIVE REPAYMENT BY TRANSPORT BOARD

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am asking for leave to take the Resolution authorising the Government to waive the repayment by the Transport Board of certain sums of money granted from the Public Treasury from time to time which amount in the aggregate to the sum of \$2,253,904.45.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution is to authorise the Government to waive the repayment by the Transport Board of certain sums granted from the Public Treasury from time to time which sum amount in the aggregate to \$2,253,904.45, and which was made available by the Government for the purpose of the Transport Board. 5.40 p.m.

I have already given the House all the relevant information when I was dealing with the first Resolution for the sum of \$600,000, and on this occasion I do not think it is necessary for, me to repeat what I said. The sums of money which were provided by way of Resolutions or by Supplementary Estimates from the year 1955 until the year 1961 amount to a total of \$2,253,904.45. We are now seeking the authority of the Legislature to waive that sum of money by way of this Resolution or, in other words, we are seeking to obtain the approval of the Legislature for the waiving of this sum of money which was made available by the Government to the Transport Board over all of these years. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hardly think it necessary for me to recapitulate what I said a few moments ago when

dealing with the Resolution for the sum of \$600,000. I, therefore beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

CURRENCY BILL

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 4 be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. member is asking leave to take Order No. 4 as the next Order of the Day and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.(AFTER A PAUSE). I hear no objection and, accordingly, leave is granted.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Order which stands in the name of the Hon. Premier.

there being no objection, leave was granted the hon. member to take charge of the Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The next Order of the Day therefore stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House- To move the Second reading of a Bill to repeal the Currency Act, 1959 and to provide for giving legal effect to the provisions of the British Caribbean Currency Agreement, 1964.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, hon. member will see from the \" Objects and Reasons\" of this Bill that the Bill seeks to repeal the Currency Act, 1959, 1959-22, and to provide for giving legal effect to the provisions of the British Caribbean Currency Agreement, 1964, pursuant to Article 20 thereof. What has happened, Sir, is that the Governments of Trinidad and British Guiana decided to issue their own currency notes and, consequently, it became necessary to dissolve the existing Eastern Caribbean Currency Group, and to decide the terms and conditions under which that group would be dissolved. Naturally, it took some time to circulate to all the Governments concerned, the proposals for the dissolution and that is why we could not deal with this matter before. The first Conference was held in Trinidad in January last year and they had the assistance of the experts from the Bank of England, and the new Agreement with which I will deal later, was then drafted and proposed.

According to this Bill which is now before us, provision is made for the ordinary regulations of the Board. The main provisions of the new Agreement deal with making available the coin for use with the new Currency Board after the old Board has been dissolved, and provision is made for having certain sterling from the new issues and advances before the extraordinary situation arose in British Guiana in which currency found its way to Barbados.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think that hon. members would want to have an\" more details about the actual Provisions of the Bill in itself, because those provisions are all there. It is merely a question of dissolving the old Board by this instrument and making provision for the establishment of the new Board to the satisfaction of all the Governments and with the assets of the old Board, The new constituent Governments are absolutely the same as in the case of the old Currency Board with the exception of Trinidad and Tobago and the Colony of British Guiana. I beg to move that this Bill be now

read a second time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clause I was called. It reads as follows:-

This Act may be cited as the Currency Act, 1964.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, there is a slight amendment to be made to this Title Clause in that the figures \"1964\" should be changed to the figures \"1965\". I am asking leave to make that amendment*

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

With that amendment, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause I stand part of the Bill

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 2 to 5 inclusive were called and passed. 5.50p.m.

Clauses 6 to 13 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, there are several small amendments to be made to the Schedule to this Bill.

In Article 3, the first proviso is to be amended by deleting the words \"Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom\" appearing in the second and third lines thereof, and substituting therefor the words \"The Government of the United Kingdom.\"

In Article 18, Subparagraph (1) is to be amended by deleting the letter \"(b)\" appearing in the 3rd line thereof and substituting therefor the figure \"(2)\" and by deleting the word \"Constitution\" appearing in the 7th line thereof and substituting therefor the word \"Continuation\".

In Article 19, subparagraph (4) is to be amended by inserting the word \"made\" after the word \"refund\" appearing in the 6th line thereof.

Article 20 is to be amended by deleting the words \"Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom\" appearing at the beginning thereof and substituting therefor the words \"the Government of the United Kingdom.\"

In the Attestation Clauses, all the words and figures after the figures \"1964\" in Article 22 of the Agreement are to be deleted.

I beg to move that the Schedule as amended stand part. Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

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

On motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill as amended in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded in each case by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE CURRENCY (No. 2) ACT, 1965

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned member for St. John- to move the second reading of a Bill to provide for the implementation of an Agreement between this Government and the Government of Antigua, Dominica, Montserrat, St. Christopher-Nevis-Anguilla, St. Lucia and St. Vincent for the establishment of a common currency and an authority to issue and manage that currency.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to take charge of this Bill which stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. John.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Hon. Leader of the House is seeking the indulgence of the House that he may take charge of this Bill which stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned member for St. John, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted the hon. senior member for St. Philip.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, this Bill follows as a natural corollary to the one we have just done. With the dissolution of the old Board consequent upon the withdrawal of Trinidad, Tobago and British Guiana and the dissolution of the Agreement, it naturally became necessary for the remaining territories, if they so desired to constitute a new Agreement, and you will see from the Objects and Reasons that the new territories, as I said earlier, are precisely the same as those in the old Agreement with the exception of Trinidad and Tobago and British Guiana. The new ones are Antigua, Dominica, Montserrat, St. Christopher-Nevis-Anguilla, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and ourselves, and we are now seeking authority to establish a common currency and an authority to issue and manage it. You will see also that the Bill seeks to repeal certain provisions of the Currency Act, 1965, which provides for giving legal effect to the British Caribbean Currency Agreement, 1964, and the provisions to be repealed will no longer be needed after the enactment of this Bill. With the passing of this Bill, therefore, the new Currency Agreement between ourselves and the islands of the Windwards and Leewards which I have mentioned becomes effective, and we will have full authority to issue and manage that currency.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time. Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative five without division, 6.00 p.m.

On motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses I to 11 inclusive were called separately and passed,

The Schedule was called and passed.

On motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE SUGAR WORKERS SEVERANCE PAYMENTS ACT, 1965

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to take Order No. 7 as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

Order No. 7 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Philip Second reading of a Bill to provide for the making, in certain circumstances of Severance Payments to workers displaced as the direct result of the permanent closing of any sugar factory or cane syrup plant.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Hon. members have intimated that they would rather that we do not proceed with this Bill now after a long and tiresome debate and in view of the paucity of members that are present. However, I would like this Bill disposed of this afternoon. It is not because I have not paid due deference to the matter before us, but really because with the expressed desire of hon. members not necessarily to prolong this Session.

Sir, the matter before us has now reached this stage after protracted discussions and final agreements on the part of the Barbados Workers' Union, the Barbados Sugar Producers Federation and the Government, and I would like to say that the implementation by the Legislature of this Agreement would represent another step by this Government in its effort to put on the Statute Book of the colony legislation designed specifically to improve the lot of the workers in the Island.

The category of workers which this Bill is designed to benefit deserves yet the best that we can do. Naturally, I refer to the sugar workers: and while generally speaking, the Government has pledged itself to a full programme of labour legislation expressly drafted to profit the sugar workers, the circumstances dealing with this matter, I am sure are a matter which will bring satisfaction to every single member of this Chamber and everybody of this country because people who are employed in the sugar industry, perhaps, even the other workers are specially deserving of the best treatment which can be afforded on behalf of the Government, since the sugar industry is the most economic mainstay of the people of this colony. 6.10 p.m.

As I said earlier, people who are employed by the sugar factories of this country above all workers are deserving of the best treatment which could be afforded them at the hands of the Government, having regard to the fact that the sugar industry is the economic mainstay of the colony. This Bill provides for severance payments to sugar factory workers who have been displaced, and since the time when the proposals were first included in the Report on the Sugar Industry by the late Mr. Mc.Kenzie, at least ten sugar factories have ceased to operate. These sugar factories are:Cliff, Fair View, Bruce Vale, Moncrieffe, Gibbons, Oldbury, Sandy Lane, Harrow and Newton. Applewhaites has been closed down since then, and my information is that at least three more sugar factories are on the verge of being closed down within a reasonable short time from now. Sandy Lane Factory has already paid severance pay to the workers who were employed there before the factory ceased to operate. The workers who have been displaced from the other factories which have been closed down will become entitled to this severance pay on the coming into operation of the legislation which is now before us.

Hon. members will see from the Bill itself that it deals with the source of the funds for severance pay for these displaced workers, the method of displacement whether for technological reasons or whether the entire factory had to be closed down, and provision is also made for the different types of the closing down of the factories - workers who have been displaced as the result of the factory being sold or otherwise disposed of, and the decision having been made not to operate the factory but as a plantation

only. You also had workers in the sugar industry where the factory was sold or otherwise disposed of as part or parcel of a larger area of land which included a sugar plantation, and the purchaser or other person to whom it was disposed ceased to cultivate the sugar plantation.

The scale of benefits have been set out in the Bill. You will find that, with regard to the scale of benefits, there are two categories and there is the method of computation and of fixing the conditions under which workers should not be entitled to severance pay. Those conditions are where a worker had resigned or retired through illness in which case he is entitled to workmen's compensation, or if he is dismissed for satisfactory causes or laid off between the end of one crop season and the commencement of the next. A worker has the right of severance pay at the proper rate and with the agreement of the Sugar Producers' Federation, the Barbados Workers' Union and the officer discharging the functions of Labour Commissioner. Another condition is if the worker is temporary laid off as a result of the suspension of the operations or because of redundancy. The qualifying period for severance pay should be three years in the local service. I have been trying to get some detailed information as to the possible number of people who may be entitled to severance pay with the coming into operation of this Act and the amount which may be involved in the beginning. Naturally, it will not be an easy task to get the actual details because of the fact that this matter has been under negotiations for some time, as far back as the year 1956 or 1957, and the records are not available especially on the part of some of the factories either because they have disposed of them or, on the other hand, they have never been properly kept. However, Sir, it is proposed to capitalise the fund at the sum of \$1,200,000 in order to meet initial payments, and we are obtaining the approval of the Secretary of State for the Colonies for the proposed advance of this money from the Price Stabilization Fund.

Again, Sir, that also involves some time, and the drafting of the legislation and the preparation for the establishment or setting up of the required machinery will also consume a certain amount of time. Nevertheless, I should like to say that it is a matter for immense satisfaction that at long last this matter has reached the Legislature, and I am quite sure that hon. members will want to give their ready support to this Bill so that the people who are entitled to benefit under its provisions will not be much longer detained from so doing. 6.20 p.m.

In Clause 13 (2) (b), you will see that every care has been taken in view of the general sociological conditions existing in the country to ensure that workers and dependents really entitled to payments under this Bill should receive it with a minimum of trouble and fuss, and we have amended the term "dependents" from the original draft to its present form in the Bill. This corresponds to a similar definition in the recently enacted Workmen's Compensation legislation. You will see also that the definition of "dependents" includes now children of the worker or persons who were wholly or in part dependent upon the earnings of the worker prior to his death, members of his family other than his children, illegitimate children or grandchildren, or parents or grandparents of whom such worker is an illegitimate child or grand child, and reputed wives. As I said, care was taken by the Government to expand this definition to ensure that in view of the existing social conditions of the country, every single dependent on a worker would be lawfully entitled, and the definition has been broadened to ensure that no hardship would be experienced on the part of any dependent on the worker if the worker himself dies.

I do not think I should want to make any further demands on the time of hon. members in view of what I said at the beginning, because there is a marked difference in the debates at this stage tonight. As I said, I do not want the matter detained any longer, and I should be grateful if hon. members would

accord their support without much further contribution to the debate from me. If there is any specific matter they want answered, on any of the proposals which it is proposed to approve, I should be quite willing to hear and do what I can to explain. I need not say finally that the proposals on which this Bill has been based have been thrashed out over a protracted period by the Sugar Producers' Federation, the Barbados Workers' Union and the Government, and in its present form, the Bill, I think I am Justified in saying, has the agreement of all three parties, so that there is no justification to believe that any of the people especially involved in an exercise like this has not been consulted all along and are not fully aware of the proposals in the Bill.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time. Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you would not expect a Bill of this nature to pass without comment from me, because this matter has been the subject, as the Minister said, of years of discussion, much longer than I would like to remember. I am very glad that the Hon. Minister has decided to do it this afternoon, because if he did not, I would have objected very strenuously knowing that it was agreed to deal with it today. I was somewhat surprised as it was the last Item on the Order Paper at last week's meeting, that it did not find itself as the first Order today in view of its significance, and I would say, notwithstanding the debate we had on the Transport Board, that this matter is, if I may say so, of greater historical significance to this island than the transport question, because this is not going to have the controversy that we had on the transport system, and it is going to place on record once and for all a provision for workers which we are very glad to see on the Statute Book.

As you can see from the Bill, Mr. Speaker, it is the ratification that Parliament is going to give to a tripartite agreement between the Barbados Workers' Union, the Sugar Producers' Federation and the Government of Barbados, and I may say that it is an agreement that was in the making for close on twelve years,

When I returned from Havana in 1953, I informed my Union that we should proceed with a Bill to have this provision made, and we had general agreement with the Sugar Producers Federation, but we found that we required legislation to deal with certain aspects of it. You know, Mr. Speaker, that sugar workers are in receipt of severance pay now as a result of technical changes and other reasons of redundancy other than the complete closing down of a sugar factory, and the protracted discussions we had, Sir, were based on what were regarded as the economic factors guiding the closing down of a factory and whether the employers should pay. After many many years and meetings we eventually reached an agreement. As you heard, Mr. Speaker, some of these people are dead, and I think the Bill has made provision for the legal representatives who were entitled at the time before this is passed, because owing to the peculiar arrangements of our sugar industry, we have to come here to get ratification. If it were in Antigua or St. Kitts where you could have signed an agreement with one sugar factory and that would have been regarded as an agreement with one group, it would have ended; but in Barbados we cannot sign an agreement with one factory. We have nineteen factories and 250 plantations here; so it means that you have to get this legislation passed. This is a matter where men and women who have been displaced as far back as 1956 will receive payments; so you will see how long it was. 6 .30 p.m.

I would be failing in my duty as the workers' representative sitting in here, notwithstanding that hon.

members may want to get away, if I did not take this opportunity now that this Agreement which is going to give severance pay to workers - and I hope that the one with the Provident Fund would soon come to this House - I would be a complete failure if I did not say, in view of what we are passing through in the sugar industry of this Island and what we have done in 1963 when good prices were paid for sugar, what a tragedy it was to the sugar workers of this

Island that a substantial portion of the savings to the accredited workers for the utilization of economic and welfare matters were dissipated, and this country and the workers are poorer today from that situation.

The sugar industry, Mr. Speaker, in this Island is going to face an extremely, if I may say, rigid outlook in the future. Sugar in the world today has reached a stage where in some instances there is over-production. With Barbados producing 175,000 to 190,000 tons of sugar annually, that amount is like a mosquito on the mouth of a rhinoceros in the world situation where 50 million tons of sugar can be produced. Nobody would go to sleep without sugar in their coffee or tea if all of the sugar in Barbados was not produced, but the Barbados community would suffer terribly if the sugar industry passed away.

Mine is not a warning; mine is an inducement that workers and employers, Government and everybody, have to look upon this matter as a step to cushion some of the shocks that this Island has to face.

Mr. Speaker, my organization and I represent the mass of the working population in the Trade Union in this Island, and I would like to say from my seat that I am aware - and I have said this publicly - that 19 sugar factories operating in Barbados cannot be regarded as an efficient organisation for the production of 190,000 tons of sugar. I have visited a factory and I have seen the sugar produced in Cuba. I have visited Europe and I have seen what happens in the beet industry; therefore, when I say that we are going to face this problem, I am aware that the 19 sugar factories in Barbados have to be reduced, but the consequences are not going to be easy. We have therefore now to plan for these consequences, and I am very pleased to see that this Government has shown that it is willing to give the Union excellent co-operation in the issues relating to the sugar industry. However, the loss which we had last year by fires dissipated funds which, If it were not so, could have been utilized for the purposes of rehabilitation and the cushioning of the serious plight of the sugar workers. In a community like this, when people discourage other people from saving for economic purposes, they are not doing me or my organisation any harm; they are harming this country because I do not see that this country would be able to help those workers to get that money. When you find encouragement for workers not to save anything, not to utilise themselves, we are dealing with a completely ignorant society and a society which is not fit to be called one. The workers in this Island have been betrayed, and those who have betrayed them are going to pay a price for that betrayal. The price which the workers are going to pay is economic misery, and they are going to face that as a result of their non-participation in their future economic well being. The organisations of the past will have to make violent changes in order to cope with the future.

The Report of the recent Sugar Enquiry has been published, and from the recommendations, you can see that it is not going to be an easy matter. To ask this community to find 30 million dollars, the equivalent of the Government's budget, as has been stated in the Report to construct four central sugar

factories without producing any more sugar means that the national income will not be increased, but it will be a labour saving device for competitive prices of selling sugar. At the same time it would mean capital to the tune of 30 million dollars without any more income coming in from that investment. It means that you will be selling no more than 190,000 tons of sugar, which means that the national income would not be any more. It means that there would have to be some sort of contribution and that contribution would hit the workers.

I felt Mr. Speaker, that it is a very serious thing for all of us. I am very pleased to see the Hon. Premier has taken his seat because I know that he was a supporter of the proposal for those workers to put aside some of the money which accrued to them. He saw it very clearly. As Minister of Finance he was aware that if he is called upon to budget, and if this country has to look for 30 million dollars in the next five years and you are not producing any more sugar but only producing it cheaper, he is not going

to get any more income coming to Barbados to the extent of 30 million dollars.

That is why I am saying that it was a betrayal of the workers by those who forced them into the situation to believe that that was not money which should be put at the disposal of the workers to help them to enter into the economy of their own country for what it was going to be involved in in the future. The days of the old economic formation of the Island are coming to an end; therefore, we have to advise and encourage workers into thinking that the investment in this country is as much the worker's business as the industrialist's, and that they must not only be wageearners, but also builders of the economy.

Sir, I regret that I have to speak at this length, but I would be failing in my duty if I did not say that those who encouraged and supported the workers to abandon the situation which we are now trying to rehabilitate in another form must realise that they have deprived this country of a good opportunity to create for the workers a foundation of emancipation.

I am happy that this Bill has come here to be ratified. More will come: and as long as this Government gives support to these sorts of exercises, nobody in this Island can challenge them. Severance Pay for workers in factories is already in operation.

What I would ask the Hon. Minister to do now is this. I was going to bring in a Private Members' Bill, similar to that drafted in Yugoslavia asking the Government, now that Severance Pay is going to be enshrined in our legislation on the Statute Book, that every man and woman who work anywhere in industrial employment should be given it too. We can have them put in schedules if we are afraid to make a lock out, but every worker in this island after today should be able to feel that Severance Pay is a condition of employment should he lose his job other than for a cause which should be stipulated before a tribunal comprising the Labour Commissioner and other representatives so as to give workers their protection. 6.40 p.m.

I am not so narrow in my view on this matter because the Barbados Workers' Union has projected this sort of thing. That has been our projection; severance pay and compensation for these things is a part of the philosophy of the Trade Union, and when we find that we have a Government which is willing to support the Trade Union, we can go further. This is not anything which offends the conscience of the community or the liberties of the community, and the Government should be willing to enshrine it

in legislation to apply to the nation. We do not expect that the Trade Union Organization is going to be suitable to every type of employment. Some people hold an executive position and some people have been dismissed and others have been targets, but at the same time, we have to protect them.

I have requested the Hon. Minister to give consideration and to discuss with the Government the proper legislation which will meet national needs. Those boys and girls who work in the stores in Bridgetown have no protection. They can join the Union. I can see nothing wrong with that. Where a man is working for 10 or 20 years he may be given a walking ticket. This proposal here would force businesses to take out money for severance pay to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Inland Revenue. If a business does not make money, you cannot have that business operating. Where a man's total income is involved in his business and when it closes his income goes completely, and then he becomes a national charge. With our moral concept, we should not allow an industrial situation to create a national charge on business where no proper provision has been made for these things. Depreciation charges are made through machinery. The Government has given additional benefits for depreciation in machinery, for operation in machinery and the important human element of personality is left to chance. When we get the co-operation of the Government in these matters, I will give the Government the credit for that. 6.50 p.m.

It has been said by the last Government that they had these things and they left money there. We had an election in 1956, Mr. Speaker, and it is remarkable that if you search the files, you will find that legislation of this character was within the hands of the last Government for a complete session of five years. That is what they said they left. I fought them in the 1956 election alone, and this was legislation to be enacted. They went out in 1961 and have the effrontery now to say that they left this.

It is true, Sir, that the present Government was a little slow, too, in this and this should have seen the light of day before today, unless they can claim that they were new boys and did not like taking up anybody's old shoes and having them cleaned, or did not want to do this unless they had read it for themselves to be satisfied that they were ratifying something they wanted to bring. For that I do not hold them up too much, but I would say that while we have to pass this this evening, members will remember that this Government bought the Scotland Factory and some of these workers are out. Whenever we hold a meeting at the Union, Mr. Speaker, the St. Andrew men look at me as if they would cry, and I have to remind them that the boys at Oldbury went out before them. Hon. member a will realise that this is going to be for workers at Oldbuxy, Gibbons and Newton. Applewhaite's only went out last year, but the workers at factories which went out nearly five or six years ago are without anything. Sandy Lane went out in 1957 or 1958.

You will see, Mr. Speaker, that we are trying to separate this from the Provident Fund, and we begged the last Government not to mix this with a Provident Fund because a Provident Fund would take long, since it provides for pensions and other things, but this is giving payments. I am pleased to see that it has come about, and I would like to say that this has been the result of complete agreement between the Government, the Trade Union and the employers, and I hope that this is the forerunner of other Agreements, and that the tripartite committee that is now being formed will produce similar things, because the exercise of the Farley Report will require a lot of study, and this is the sort of thing that a Trade Union must be prepared to deal with.

I too would not like to be kept back here since I have an engagement tonight. I have to take out seven

ladies and three men, and at one stage I was going to extend an invitation to a male friend of mine, and I was informed by one of them to say something to the male friend, but I felt that might be too much competition, and therefore I prefer to stem the tide alone.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I take it these are not displaced workers!

Mr. WALCOTT:

Some of them are displaced in that this is not their homeland. In closing remarks, I would appeal to the Minister to look into legislation for severance pay for all, and as this has come about as a Trade Union and Employers' Agreement, I would take this opportunity to point out that I am not asking the Government to go in for witch-hunting because I do not believe in it. In emerging countries Government must watch these Trade Union nuisances of allowing people to extract money from people without any proper accounting for it, and then you give a man who is really hungry seven days for begging in Broad Street for a bread which he needs! I feel this is just as much a public nuisance as the man on the street begging for money by false pretences. One may say that if workers are willing to subscribe their money to anybody, let them do so. I say that because since there is some harmony between this Government and the Trade Union, there are attempts at creating industrial strife wherever possible as a means of creating a climate of industrial unrest for political purposes. Every man has a right to defend a worker against any Trade Union, no matter how long it has been established, if it is not performing its duty; but no one in any community has any right to sit by and see these little things begin.

We had the classic example, Mr. Speaker, of watching what took place in this country in 1963, and if some of us

did not have the courage to stand up and stem that tide, this island would have been over-run by a bunch of rogues whose only intention was to remove a legitimate Government by any mean and root out the Trade Union because they no longer held power there. I say there are rogues, because what took place in the sugar industry in 1963 was the most roguish behaviour, because lies were told that \$3 million were left in the Government and the Government did nothing about it when that was a patent lie. 7.00 p.m.

They had not even begun to reach a firm conclusion on some of the things which we wanted them to do. It is true to say that Ministers cannot divulge all that come to their knowledge. However, it was aimed at disrupting this country that some of the members were calling for an election then. The number of cane fires which took place was a classic demonstration. We have been through another this year. We did not call for any Minister to resign. We told them that we of the Trade Union were not satisfied with what they were doing, but we were willing to sit down with them at any time. I told the Minister that I was not subscribing to the setting up of a Commission and that the employers must sit down with us around a table and hammer out the differences. A Commission of Enquiry was to be the last resort.

I hope that the Government is going to bear these things in mind. My organization, the Barbados Workers' Union, has been through many things, but I would like to say this without boasting. I am the accredited leader of the Barbados Workers' Union and I speak for that organisation in this matter. The Barbados Workers' Union would support any Government that carries out a policy which is in consonant with the policy of the Trade Union. This Government has so far done so, and in so far as I and

the Barbados Workers' Union are concerned, we will support this Government. (Applause)

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I suppose as regards this Bill which is brought before this Chamber, it can truly be said that for many years the hon. member who has just sat down was hammering and making several requests to have this legislation passed.

Well, Sirt Sandy Lane Factory was one of the last factories which was closed down when this matter of severance pay was taken up with the then owners. Hon. members would recall that the then owners were willing to pay this severance pay, but there was some disagreement between the then Government and the Union and I was informed by those persons that they did not know to whom they should pay this money. 7.05 p.m.

We, on this side of the House, are giving our support to this Bill. We do appreciate that, in this age, what the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said is correct. Anyone who has read the Farley Report and who has been following the situation in this colony for years, will agree that, with the number of factories and sugar mills which we have had in this country over the past 25 years, most of them have been closed down and, as a result, quite a number of persons have been displaced. I went into a store some time ago and I met a man whose face was familiar to me, but I could not place him at the time. However, Sir, I recalled that we were at school together and in discussing with him as to how he was getting on, he told me that he was now looking for a Job. He said that he had been working for the last 25 years, but now he was looking for a job. In this 20th century you must realise that there are certain rights, and capital and labour must get together and therefore a Bill of this sort is necessary. That is so especially when it is realised, as has been mentioned in the Farley Report, that several factories have been closed down over a period of ten or fifteen years, and that was for the purpose of competing in the sugar market, but not for bringing any more revenue into this island. In other words, that is one of the reasons why we say from this Report, that we should give our support to this Bill.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter has rightly said that this proposal has been very long in coming to

the Legislature but, nevertheless, it has come to the Legislature. The legislation which we anticipated and which we hope soon to have before this Chamber, might make such a provision for other workers. In my public life I can remember a man whom I had known to have worked in Bridgetown at one particular place, and he had been working there for 45 years. I was more than struck when that man came before me in my position as a Poor Law Guardian and asked for assistance. The place where this man was working had been closed down and I expressed the view at the time that something should be done for that man. I still feel that same way today. There must be places other than the sugar factories where people have been working for sometime and they have been closed down. I say that provision should be made for such people.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter made reference to the clerks and people like that who have no security. The modern employees who have been working for long periods get a pension when they retire. There have been people in some employment where they have given of their best; they have made money for their employers but they have not been given any recompense. However, within recent years such recompense has been given to people. In the not too distant future I should like to see similar

legislation brought before this House dealing with such persons who would be displaced through no fault of their own, but who have been engaged in work which was of advantage to the employers. You cannot deny the fact, if you have read and followed the Farley Report carefully, that a number of factories have been closed down. Those factories have been closed down with a view to our obtaining greater efficiency in competition with other sugar-producing places. That in itself, although it does not bring in any more revenue to the Government, will in turn be of greater benefit to the actual shareholders or to those persons who could reduce as many as ten factories to four factories. The expense of making sugar as a result of the operation of four factories instead of ten factories would, I believe, be reduced by about 20% or 25%.

Mr. Speaker, free enterprise has a responsibility to the country, and they must realise that they must shoulder that responsibility without shrinking from it in any way. I must say, Sir, that they have accepted that responsibility without any shrinking at all. I could mention now a number of places which are not considered to be in the industrial line, but I do think that protection should be given to the workers there. I do not want to prolong the debate on this Bill because it is a long time since the hon. senior member for St. Peter has been pressing for this legislation, and now that such legislation is here, I think that we are all very happy about it. It was during the closing of the Sandy Lane Factory that I made certain enquiries and I was told by the Directors that the workers who were displaced by the closing down of the factory would be given severance pay. I understood that there was some difference of opinion between the last Government and the Barbados Workers' Union in relation to the matter but the money was there. Taking into account the fact that Sandy Lane Factory was a great benefit to many people, I think that a lot of consideration would have to be given in a matter of this sort. The closing down of factories might take place not only for economic reasons, but because people get great benefit from the capital which is coming into this island, and I do not think that this capital could go into the pockets of any one or two persons. Some of this capital should also go into the pockets of those who have laboured from childhood. I feel that these workers should be compensated in the same way. I hope that the Government will look into this matter and make the necessary provision for these workers. The Government has a responsibility for a good deal and I must give this Bill my whole-hearted support.

Mr. SPEAKER:

If there is no other hon. member who wants to contribute to this debate, the hon. senior member for St. Philip may exercise his right of final reply.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. Peter made passing reference to the fact that no pronouncement has been made with reference to the Social Security Scheme or a Provident Fund. My failure

to make such pronouncement is because hon. members wanted to get through with this Measure as soon as possible and not to prolong the debate today. As you know, Sir, we had the Actuary from the I.L.O. here in November Last year in connection with the Social Security Scheme and he was fixing the rate of contribution from the short-term measure with which he would deal immediately. He took back his Report to consider it and was expected to give it back to us sometime in March. The Administrator who is also coming down from the I.L.O., is expected momentarily. Within another month or two I expect to have the proposals of the Actuary in the hands of the Administrator who will be on the spot. The hon. senior member for St. Peter knows that this Organization is a member of the Committee which

is working on this matter. Within the last three days we had the Report; and I propose to submit that Report to the Cabinet this week and then the recommendations of the Ministry on the Report will follow. That, Sir, is the position.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses I to 8 inclusive were called and passed. 7.20 p.m.

Clauses 9 to 13 inclusive were called and passed. The Schedule was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded in each case by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, as you will notice, the Government front bench is present more or less in full strength, and it had been our intention to proceed this evening with the draft Order entitled \"The Boundaries Commission Order.\" but I see that we are presented with only two hon. members in the Opposition in their seats, including the Leader of the Official Opposition. If we were to proceed with the Measure now as we intended, I expect that we should be subjected to criticism on the grounds that we proceeded with it in the absence of a large section of the Opposition, but I am sure that Your Honour will recall that when we were in Opposition, it was the practice of the last Government to utilise our absence for enacting very important and controversial legislation.

However, Sir, in view of the fact that we do not want to arouse any criticism on this basis, we are going to postpone consideration of this matter until another time when we consider it more appropriate, but we are really sorry we cannot do it tonight, I mention this so that we cannot be accused, as we have been accused, of failure to deal with this matter earlier. The refusal to deal with it now is due to the

entire absence of the unofficial Opposition Party and the partial absence of the Official Opposition.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until next Tuesday, 2nd March, 1965, at 12 noon.

Hon. C E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 7.28 p.m.